

**Czech University of Life Sciences Prague**

**Faculty of Economics and Management**

**Department of psychology**



**Master's Thesis**

**The Influence of Employees' Self-Efficacy on Their Quality of Work Life**

**OKYERE DARKO SAMUEL**

**© 2024 CZU Prague**

# **DIPLOMA THESIS ASSIGNMENT**

Bw. (VWA) Samuel Okyere Darko, B.Tech.

Economics and Management

Thesis title

**The Influence of Employees' Self-Efficacy on Their Quality of life at workplace : The Case of Ayawaso North Municipal Assembly, Ghana**

---

## **Objectives of thesis**

The overall goal of this study is to determine the impact of employees' personal factors (self efficacy) on institutional outcomes.

1. Evaluate the degree of self-efficacy and Quality of Work Life among employees
2. Identify the impact of employees' self-efficacy on their Quality of work life.
3. To Access how economic and psychological factor affect quality of work life
4. Make recommendations to organizations to recognize the effect of employee's self-efficacy on their Quality Work Life.

## **Methodology**

Mix Method

Both Quantitative and Qualitative Method

The research would be conducted in Ghana, specifically in Greater Accra Region. Considering the broad nature of the region, the scope of the research setting would be narrowed to Ayawaso North Municipal Assembly Office in Accra. The researcher intends to choose Accra as the research setting because of the cosmopolitan nature of the area. Mixed method approach would be used in the data collection and analysis of data.

The researcher prefers to use questionnaire because, it is the quick and efficient way to obtain large or enough information from a large sample. Questionnaire administration is one of the most successful methods for mixed method approach because they allow you to explain, better understand, and investigate the viewpoints, behaviour, experiences, and phenomena of your study participants.

The researcher would use intra-method mixing strategy as the data collection method. With the intra-method mixing strategy, the researcher would use one method to obtain both qualitative and quantitative data. The specific intra-method mixing strategy would be mixed questionnaire. This strategy would be employed because, the researcher wants to gain a thorough understanding of the issue to be discussed.

**The proposed extent of the thesis**

70 p.

**Keywords**

self-efficacy; quality of work life; workplace, Employees

---

**Recommended information sources**

- AQ Mensah, ALebbaeus -.. Journal of Business and Social Science, 2013 – researchgate.net
- Bandura, A. (1994). Self-efficacy. In V. S. Ramachaudran (Ed.), Encyclopedia of human behavior (Vol. 4, pp. 71-81). New York: Academic Press. (
- Cervone, D., & Scott, W. D. (1995). Self-efficacy theory of behavioral change: Foundations, conceptual issues, and therapeutic implications. In W. O'Donohue & L. Krasner (Eds.),
- Cresswell, J. W. & Garrett, A. L., (2008). The "movement" of mixed methods research and the role of educators. South African Journal of Education,, 28(3), pp. 321-333.
- Gecas, V. (1989), —The social psychology of self-efficacy , Annual Review of Sociology, Vol. 15, pp. 291-316.

---

**Expected date of thesis defence**

2022/23 SS – FEM

**The Diploma Thesis Supervisor**

PhDr. Kristýna Krejčová, Ph.D.

**Supervising department**

Department of Psychology

Electronic approval: 9. 6. 2022

**PhDr. Pavla Rymešová, Ph.D.**

Head of department

Electronic approval: 27. 10. 2022

**doc. Ing. Tomáš Šubrt, Ph.D.**

Dean

Prague on 25. 08. 2023

## **Declaration**

I declare that I have worked on my master's thesis titled " The Influence of Employees' Self-Efficacy on Their Quality of Work Life" by myself and I have used only the sources mentioned at the end of the thesis. As the author of the master's thesis, I declare that the thesis does not break any copyrights.

In Prague on date of submission

21/03/2024

## **Acknowledgement**

I would like to thank PhDr. Kristyna Krejcova, my family and all other persons, for their advice and support during my work on this thesis.

# **The Influence of Employees' Self-Efficacy on Their Quality of Work Life**

## **Abstract**

Employees are put in the difficult position of having to maintain a high level of job quality while still being effective and efficient in their employment. The situation that has arisen as a consequence of this is that they are hesitant to perform their tasks to the level of excellence that their employers expect of them because they do not believe they are capable of doing so.

As a result, the purpose of this study was to investigate the relationship between employees' levels of self-efficacy and the quality of their work lives at the Ayawaso North Municipal Assembly in Ghana. The purpose of the study was to determine not only the level of self-efficacy and quality of work life enjoyed by workers, but also any other elements that might have an impact on the aforementioned aspects of employees' lives. The primary instruments for the collection of data in this study were structured questionnaires, and the researchers employed descriptive statistics, correlation, and the One-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) to analyse the results. The findings indicated that there is a correlation, and specifically a positive correlation, between self-efficacy and quality of work life. In addition, it was found that factors such as age, number of years spent working, level of income, and level of education all had substantial effects on either one or both variables that were being considered. The qualitative findings also confirmed the quantitative finding which stated that, employees' self-efficacy enhances the quality of work life. According to the findings of the study, companies should provide the essential support for employees, which may include improving working conditions and offering financial advantages, in order to ensure that workers have the self-assurance to perform their jobs in an efficient and effective manner.

Keywords: Self-efficacy; Quality of work life; Workplace; Employees; Ayawaso North Assembly; Ghana

# **Vliv sebehodnocení zaměstnanců na kvalitu jejich pracovního života**

## **Abstrakt**

**Zaměstnanci jsou postaveni do obtížné situace, kdy si musí udržet vysokou úroveň kvality práce a zároveň být ve svém zaměstnání efektivní a výkonní. Důsledkem toho vzniká situace, kdy váhají plnit své úkoly na takové úrovni, jakou od nich zaměstnavatelé očekávají, protože nevěří, že jsou toho schopni.**

**V důsledku toho bylo cílem této studie prozkoumat vztah mezi úrovní sebeúčinnosti zaměstnanců a kvalitou jejich pracovního života v městském zastupitelstvu Ayawaso North v Ghaně. Účelem studie bylo zjistit nejen úroveň sebeúčinnosti a kvalitu pracovního života, kterou zaměstnanci využívají, ale také všechny další prvky, které by mohly mít vliv na výše uvedené aspekty života zaměstnanců. Primárními nástroji pro sběr dat v této studii byly strukturované dotazníky a k analýze výsledků výzkumníci použili popisnou statistiku, korelaci a jednosměrnou analýzu rozptylu (ANOVA). Zjištění ukázala, že existuje korelace, a to konkrétně pozitivní korelace, mezi sebehodnocením a kvalitou pracovního života. Dále bylo zjištěno, že faktory jako věk, počet odpracovaných let, výše příjmu a úroveň vzdělání mají podstatný vliv buď na jednu, nebo na obě sledované proměnné. Podle výsledků studie by podniky měly poskytovat zaměstnancům nezbytnou podporu, která může zahrnovat zlepšení pracovních podmínek a nabídku finančních výhod, aby pracovníci měli sebedůvěru vykonávat svou práci efektivně a účinně.**

**Klíčová slova: Sebeúčinnost; Kvalita pracovního života; Pracoviště; Zaměstnanci; Ayawaso North Assembly; Ghana**

# Table of Content

|   |           |
|---|-----------|
| <b>1. Introduction.....</b>   | <b>11</b> |
| <b>2. Objectives and Methodology.....</b>   | <b>13</b> |
| 2.1 Objectives of the Study.....  | 13        |
| 2.2 Research Questions.....   | 13        |
| 2.3 Hypothesis.....   | 13        |
| 2.4 Methodology.....  | 14        |
| <b>3. Literature Review.....</b>  | <b>15</b> |
| 3.1 Theoretical Review.....   | 15        |
| 3.1.1 Social Cognitive Theory.....  | 15        |
| 3.1.2 Self-Determination Theory (SDT).....  | 16        |
| 3.2 Conceptual Review.....  | 17        |
| 3.2.1 Definition of Self-Efficacy.....  | 17        |
| 3.2.2 Importance of Self-Efficacy Beliefs.....  | 17        |
| 3.2.3 Sources of Self-Efficacy.....   | 18        |
| 3.2.4 Definitions of Quality of Work Life (QWL).....                                    | 19        |
| 3.2.5 Components of Quality of Work Life.....   | 20        |
| 3.2.6 Essence of Quality of Work Life.....  | 22        |
| 3.4 Empirical Review.....   | 22        |
| 3.4.1 Influence of Self Efficacy on Quality of Work Life.....                           | 22        |
| 3.4.2 Enhancement of Employees Self-Efficacy.....                                       | 25        |
| 3.4.3 Influence of Social, Environmental and Cultural Contexts on Self-Efficacy Beliefs | 25        |
| 3.4.4 Effects of Quality of Work Life (QWL) Programmes on Quality of Life (QoL)         | 26        |
| <b>4 Practical Part.....</b>  | <b>27</b> |
| <b>4.1 Profile of Ayawaso North Municipal Assembly.....</b>                             | <b>27</b> |
| 4.2 Research Setting.....   | 28        |
| 4.3 Research Design and Approach.....   | 28        |
| 4.4 Population of the Study.....  | 29        |
| 4.5 Sample and Sampling Technique.....  | 29        |
| 4.6 Data Collection Method or Techniques.....   | 30        |
| 4.6.1 Primary Data Collection.....  | 30        |
| 4.6.2 Data Collection Instruments.....  | 30        |

|   |           |
|---|-----------|
| 4.7 Models.....   | 31        |
| 4.8 Data Validity and Reliability of the Instrument .....   | 32        |
| 4.9 Data Analysis .....   | 32        |
| 4.10 Ethical Issues or Considerations.....  | 32        |
| <b>5. Results and Discussion .....</b>  | <b>34</b> |
| 5.1 Demographics.....   | 34        |
| 5.2 Degree of self-efficacy and quality of work life among employees.....   | 36        |
| 5.3 Relationship between employees' self-efficacy and Quality of work life.....   | 43        |
| 5.3.1 Validity and reliability results for self-efficacy .....  | 43        |
| 5.3.2 Validity and reliability results for quality of work life .....   | 44        |
| 5.4 Self-efficacy and quality of work life .....  | 45        |
| 5.4.1 Diagnostic Tests .....  | 45        |
| 5.4.2 Test of Independence.....   | 45        |
| 5.4.3 Hypothesis Testing.....   | 46        |
| 5.4.4 Goodness of Fit .....   | 46        |
| 5.4.5 Joint Significance .....  | 46        |
| 5.4.6 Test of Significance:.....  | 47        |
| 5.4.7 Residuals:.....   | 47        |
| 5.4.8 Test of significance of each independent variable .....   | 48        |
| 5.4.9 Economic and psychological factors of employees that influence their self-efficacy and Quality Work life.....               | 49        |
| 5.5 Recommendations to organizations to recognize the effect of employee's self-efficacy on their QWL .....                       | 59        |
| 5.6 Qualitative Analysis.....   | 69        |
| 5.6.1 Evaluate the degree of self-efficacy and Quality of Work Life among employees:<br>69  |           |
| 5.6.2 Identify the relationship between employees' self-efficacy and Quality of work life:<br>71                                  |           |
| 5.6.3 Learn how certain economic and psychological factors of employees influence their self-efficacy and Quality Work life ..... | 72        |
| 5.6.3 Make recommendations to organizations to recognize the effect of employee's self-efficacy on their QWL .....                | 74        |
| 5.7 Discussion .....  | 76        |
| <b>6 Conclusion .....</b>   | <b>81</b> |
| 6.1 Recommendation .....  | 84        |
| <b>7. References.....</b>   | <b>87</b> |
| <b>8 List of pictures, table, graphs and abbreviations .....</b>  | <b>98</b> |

|                                  |            |
|----------------------------------|------------|
| 1.22 List of Figures.....        | 98         |
| 1.23 List of Tables.....         | 98         |
| 1.24 List of Abbreviations ..... | 99         |
| <b>Appendix .....</b>            | <b>100</b> |

## **1. Introduction**

In its most general application, the term "quality of work life" (QWL) refers to the entire worth, both monetary and otherwise, that a person accrues during the course of his or her working life. Worker happiness and motivation can be influenced by a variety of elements, including but not limited to: wages and work hours; the working environment; benefits and services; career opportunities; and human relations. Many people today are putting in longer hours at work as a response to a variety of issues, including job instability, perceived career needs, workplace pressures, financial strain, and others. On the other hand, self-efficacy has been defined in a variety of different ways, such as the belief that one can perform in a particular manner to attain certain goals, or as a person's belief about their capabilities to produce designated levels of performance that exercise influence over events that affect their lives. It is the conviction that one possesses the competencies necessary to carry out the courses of action necessary to successfully manage potential circumstances. It has been described in other ways as the concept has evolved in the literature and in society, including: as the sense of belief that one's actions have an effect on the environment; as a person's judgment of his or her capabilities based on mastery criteria; as a sense of a person's competence within a specific framework, focusing on the person's assessment of their abilities to perform specific tasks in relation to goals and standards rather than in comparison with others' capabilities. All of these interpretations of the term

In a broad sense, self-efficacy can be defined as an individual's conviction that they are able to successfully complete a certain endeavour. The higher your level of self-efficacy, the greater your level of confidence in your capacity to carry out a certain task. People who have low self-efficacy are more likely to make less of an effort or perhaps give up completely when confronted with challenging circumstances, whereas those who have high self-efficacy are more likely to make more of an effort to overcome the obstacle.

Employees today spend a great deal of time at work and are expected to complete their work efficiently. Many employees, on the other hand, are hesitant to working because they do not believe they can do their jobs well. As a result, the study will investigate how people's self-efficacy affects their work life quality. Bandura (1977) and others discovered that an individual's self-efficacy influences how they approach goals, tasks, and challenges. There have been a few direct attempts

to measure the relationship between personal factors and QWL. Cultural values, according to cross-cultural studies of QWL, can help explain differences in job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and QWL both within and between cultures (Moorman & Blakely, 1995). As a result, it's critical to learn more about the situation in Ghana, because Ghana's cultural values differ from those of the countries where most of these studies were conducted, and this construct has been overlooked in Ghana. More importantly, most studies on the factors that influence QWL have been conducted in the United States or Western Europe. The current study adds to the literature by assessing the influence of employee self-efficacy on their quality of life at work in Ayawaso North Municipal Assembly, Accra, Ghana.

For many years, much research has been done looking at some psychological traits such as self-esteem, self-concept, self-actualization etc, Self-efficacy and Quality of Work life remain relatively unexplored and unexplained. This situation does not augur well for organizational growth. The study will therefore be significant in helping organizations to take measures in influencing employees' self-efficacy. Also, it will provide a guide for other employees to know more about self-efficacy and how it can positively or negatively affect their Quality of Work life (QWL). Furthermore, it will serve as a reference material for other researchers who would like to research into similar areas.

## **2. Objectives and Methodology**

### **2.1 Objectives of the Study**

The general objective of this study was to determine the effect of personal factors (self-efficacy) of employees on organizational outcomes.

The Objective specifics

1. Evaluate the degree of self-efficacy and Quality of Work Life among employees.
2. Identify the relationship between employees' self-efficacy and Quality of work life.
3. Learn how certain economic and psychological factors of employees influence their self-efficacy and Quality Work life.
4. Make recommendations to organizations to recognize the effect of employee's self-efficacy on their QWL.

### **2.2 Research Questions**

1. What is the degree of self-efficacy and quality of work life of employees of Ayawaso North Municipal Assembly?
2. What is the relationship between self-efficacy and the quality of work life of employees of Ayawaso North Municipal Assembly?
3. Which factors influence the self-efficacy and quality of work life of the employees of Ayawaso North Municipal Assembly?

### **2.3 Hypothesis**

H1: There is a high degree of self-efficacy and quality of work life among employees

H2: There is a positive relationship between self-efficacy and quality of work life

H3: Age has a positive effect on self-efficacy and quality of work life

H4: Income levels have a positive effect on self-efficacy and quality of work life

H5: Years of experience has a positive effect on self-efficacy and quality of work life

H6: Education has positive effects on efficacy and quality of work life

## **2.4 Methodology**

The proposed research intends to use a mixed method approach to collect and analyze data. The study will take place in Ghana, specifically in the Ayawaso North Municipal Assembly Office in Accra, due to its cosmopolitan nature, which makes it an appropriate location for the study.

The researcher has chosen a questionnaire as the data collection tool because it is a quick and efficient way to obtain a large amount of information from a large sample of participants. This is especially important for mixed method studies, as it allows for both qualitative and quantitative data to be collected in a structured and organized manner.

The researcher plans to use an intra-method mixing strategy to collect data, specifically a mixed questionnaire. This strategy allows the researcher to collect both qualitative and quantitative data through a single data collection tool. This approach will provide the researcher with a more comprehensive understanding of the issue being studied.

Furthermore, the use of a mixed questionnaire will allow the researcher to collect both closed-ended and open-ended questions, which can be analyzed using both qualitative and quantitative methods. This will provide the researcher with a richer and more in-depth understanding of the topic being studied.

Overall, the use of a mixed method approach, with an intra-method mixing strategy of a mixed questionnaire, will provide the researcher with a comprehensive and detailed understanding of the influence of employees' self-efficacy on their quality of work life in the Ayawaso North Municipal Assembly Office in Accra.

### **3. Literature Review**

Under this chapter, relevant theoretical, conceptual, and empirical literature pertaining to the study are reviewed.

#### **3.1 Theoretical Review**

##### **3.1.1 Social Cognitive Theory**

Social Cognitive Theory, proposed by Albert Bandura, is a psychological framework that focuses on how individuals learn from observing others in social contexts and how their beliefs about their own capabilities (self-efficacy) influence their behavior and the outcomes they achieve (Bandura, 1989).

Self-efficacy refers to an individual's belief in their ability to successfully perform tasks and achieve goals (Schunk, 2012). In the context of the workplace, employees with high self-efficacy are more likely to believe that they can effectively handle job challenges, meet performance expectations, and overcome obstacles (Bussey & Bandura, 1999). This confidence in their abilities can have a positive impact on their overall quality of work life.

Social Cognitive Theory posits that individuals who have higher self-efficacy tend to set more challenging goals for themselves and are more persistent in the face of difficulties. When employees feel confident in their abilities, they are more likely to take on challenging tasks and are more likely to put in the effort required to excel (Schunk & DiBenedetto, 2020). This, in turn, can lead to improved performance and a sense of achievement in their work, contributing to a better quality of work life (Wood & Bandura, 1989).

Employees with high self-efficacy are better equipped to cope with workplace challenges and stressors (Bandura, 2014). They view challenges as opportunities to learn and grow, rather than as insurmountable obstacles. This positive outlook can lead to reduced levels of stress, anxiety, and burnout, ultimately enhancing their quality of work life (Wood & Bandura, 1989).

Self-efficacy is linked to increased job satisfaction and motivation. When employees believe in their capabilities, they are more likely to feel a sense of accomplishment and satisfaction from their work. Additionally, their motivation to excel is driven by their belief that their efforts will lead to successful outcomes. This motivation and satisfaction contribute to an improved overall work experience (Schunk & Usher, 2012).

Social Cognitive Theory highlights the role of observational learning. Individuals with high self-efficacy are more likely to seek out and engage in learning opportunities to enhance their skills and knowledge (Bandura, 2009). This proactive approach to learning can lead to career advancement, increased competence, and a more fulfilling work life (Anderson & Chen, 2002). In summary, Social Cognitive Theory explains the relationship between employee self-efficacy and quality of work life by emphasizing how individuals' beliefs in their own capabilities influence their behaviour, motivation, coping strategies, and overall job satisfaction. Employees with higher self-efficacy are more likely to take on challenges, perform well, cope effectively with stressors, and maintain a positive outlook, all of which contribute to an improved quality of work life.

### **3.1.2 Self-Determination Theory (SDT)**

Self-Determination Theory (SDT) and self-efficacy are both important constructs in understanding the motivational dynamics and quality of work life of individuals (Deci & Ryan, 2012). SDT proposes that three fundamental psychological needs—autonomy, competence, and relatedness—must be satisfied for individuals to experience optimal motivation and well-being (Deci, Olafsen & Ryan, 2017). Self-efficacy is closely related to the competence need. When employees believe in their ability to effectively perform tasks (high self-efficacy), they are more likely to feel competent in their role (Ryan & Deci, 2017). This sense of competence satisfies a core psychological need, leading to increased intrinsic motivation, engagement, and ultimately contributing to a higher quality of work life (Ryan & Deci, 2002).

SDT distinguishes between different types of motivation, ranging from intrinsic motivation (engaging in tasks for the inherent enjoyment and interest) to extrinsic motivation (engaging in tasks for external rewards or pressures) (Ryan & Patrick, 2009). When individuals have higher self-efficacy, they are more likely to feel capable of achieving their goals, which can lead to increased intrinsic motivation. Intrinsic motivation is associated with greater satisfaction and well-being, leading to an improved quality of work life (Adams, Little & Ryan, 2017).

Self-efficacy beliefs influence an individual's level of effort and perseverance in completing tasks, even when faced with challenges. In the context of SDT, this relates to the concept of mastery, where individuals seek opportunities for growth, skill development, and becoming more proficient (Gagne & Deci, 2006). When employees with high self-efficacy encounter challenging tasks, they are more likely to view these challenges as opportunities for mastery rather than as threats

(Vallerand, Pelletier & Koestner, 2008). This positive perspective contributes to a sense of accomplishment, enhancing their quality of work life.

SDT highlights the importance of autonomy support in fostering intrinsic motivation and well-being (Reeve, 2002). When employees have a sense of autonomy—feeling that they have choices and control over their work—they are more likely to experience higher self-efficacy. Autonomy support enables individuals to take on challenges, make decisions, and engage in tasks that align with their abilities and interests (Ng et al, 2012). This empowerment contributes to a positive work experience and an improved quality of work life.

In summary, Self-Determination Theory explains the relationship between self-efficacy and quality of work life by emphasizing how self-efficacy beliefs influence the satisfaction of psychological needs, internalization of motivation, task persistence, mastery orientation, and the perception of autonomy support. High self-efficacy can enhance individuals' sense of competence, autonomy, and intrinsic motivation, all of which contribute to a more positive and fulfilling work experience, ultimately leading to a better quality of work life.

## **3.2 Conceptual Review**

### **3.2.1 Definition of Self-Efficacy**

According to Bandura (1986) self-efficacy refers to people's assessments of their ability to carry out the actions necessary to achieve levels of performance. It does not basically focus on the skills of the individual but rather what the individual can use his or skills to achieve certain goals. Bandura further posited that, self-efficacy is a component of the self-system, which includes a person's attitudes, abilities, and cognitive skills. This system has a significant impact on how we perceive situations and how we respond to them. Self-efficacy is a critical component of this self-system. Self-efficacy, in general, refers to an individual's belief that he or she is capable of performing a task (Mensah, & Asamani, 2013). Higher self-efficacy result in higher confidence which guarantees the ability to complete a task.

### **3.2.2 Importance of Self-Efficacy Beliefs**

According to Bandura (1994), self-efficacy beliefs project the following benefits: a strong sense of efficacy improves human achievement and personal well-being in a variety of ways, people who are confident in their abilities approach difficult tasks as challenges to be overcome rather than

threats to be avoided; such a positive outlook promotes intrinsic interest and deep involvement in activities. They set challenging goals for themselves and stay committed to them, in the face of failure, they increase and sustain their efforts and after failures or setbacks, they quickly regain their sense of efficacy (Bandura, 1994; Schunk & Hanson, 1985). Efficacious people blame failure on insufficient effort or a lack of learnable knowledge and skills, they approach potentially dangerous situations with confidence that they can exert control over them, and they make sure that personal accomplishments are produced, stress is reduced, and vulnerability to depression is reduced (Bandura, 1994).

A number of studies have found that human achievements in life and positive well-being necessitate a hopeful sense of personal efficacy. This is due to the fact that everyday social realities are fraught with difficulties. They are riddled with obstacles, adversities, setbacks, frustrations, and inequities. People must have a strong sense of personal efficacy in order to persevere and succeed (Schunk & Hanson, 1985). Realists abandon pursuits that are riddled with obstacles or abandon them prematurely when difficulties arise. To summarize, the successful, the daring, the sociable, the non-anxious, the non-depressed, the social reformers, and the innovators believe in their personal ability to exert influence over events that affect their lives. Such self-beliefs, if not unrealistically exaggerated, promote positive well-being and human accomplishments (Bandura, 1994).

### **3.2.3 Sources of Self-Efficacy**

The sources of self-efficacy as stipulated by Bandura (1994) is briefly summarized below.

#### **Mastery experience**

Mastery experiences are the most effective way to instil a strong sense of efficacy. Successes foster a strong belief in one's own personal efficacy. Failures undermine it, especially if they occur before a strong sense of efficacy has been established. If people only have easy successes, they will expect quick results and will be easily discouraged by failure. Experience in overcoming obstacles through persevering effort is required for a resilient sense of efficacy. Some setbacks and difficulties in human endeavours serve a useful purpose in teaching that success usually necessitates consistent effort (Bandura, 1994). People who believe they have what it takes to succeed persevere in the face of adversity and quickly recover from setbacks. They emerge stronger from adversity by persevering through difficult times.

### ***Social models***

The experiences offered by social models are the second way to create and strengthen efficacy self-beliefs. Seeing people who are similar to oneself succeed through sustained effort increases observers' belief that they, too, have the ability to master similar activities required to excel. Observing others fail despite great effort lowers observers' assessments of their own efficacy and hinders their efforts. The perceived similarity to the models has a strong influence on the impact of modelling on perceived self-efficacy. The stronger the assumed similarity, the more convincing the successes and failures of the models. If people perceive the models to be very different from themselves, the models' behaviour and the results they produce have little influence on their perceived self-efficacy (Bandura, 1994).

### ***Social Persuasion***

Social persuasion is a third method of boosting people's confidence that they have what it takes to be the best. People who are verbally convinced that they have the abilities to master certain activities are more likely to mobilize and sustain more effort than those who harbour self-doubts and dwell on personal deficiencies when problems arise. Persuasive increases in perceived self-efficacy encourage people to work hard enough to succeed, which promotes skill development and a sense of personal efficacy (Bandura, 1994).

### ***Stress Reaction***

The fourth method of adapting efficacy self-beliefs is to reduce stress reactions and change people's adverse emotional inclinations and misconceptions of their physical phenomena. It is not so much the intensity of emotional and physical reactions as it is how they are perceived and interpreted. People who have a high sense of efficacy see their affective arousal as an energizing facilitator of performance, whereas those who are plagued by self-doubt see it as a debilitator (Bandura, 1994). Physiological efficacy indicators are especially influential in health functioning as well as athletic and other physical activities.

### **3.2.4 Definitions of Quality of Work Life (QWL)**

Generally, quality of work life comprises of both material values and non-materials values achieved by a worker in his or her career life (Mensah & Asamani, 2013), this means that QWL can be elaborated as wages, work environment, work hours, career growth and prospects, human relations and other related benefits and services. Mensah et al., (2013) further posited that, QWL as an individual's evaluation of work done, and the satisfaction with his or her work and the overall

working environment. QWL has been defined as a subjective phenomenon influenced by personal feelings and perceptions (Vagharseyyedin, Vanaki & Mohammadi, 2011; Bediako, 2002).

From the works of Bowling and Gabriel (2007), Quality of Life (QoL) is broadly classified as; social relationships, social roles and activities, leisure activities enjoyed alone, health, psychological outlook and well-being, home and neighbourhood, financial circumstances, and independence. Bowling et al., (2007), further elaborated that; quality of life involves the ability to freely live your life as you like it without hindrance; whether at work, home or in society, with pleasure, happiness, and fulfilment; mental harmony; social connection and access to friendship, intimacy, love, social interaction and involvement; help; social roles; and a sense of security.

QWL is a dynamic, multidimensional construct that now encompasses ideas like job security, reward systems, opportunity for training and professional advancement, and involvement in decision-making (Lau & Bruce, 1998). Policies and procedures, leadership style, operations, and general contextual variables of setting are organizational features that have a significant impact on how employees perceive the quality of work life (Cavry, Wakefield, Price, Mueller, & Mcloskey, 1995).

### **3.2.5 Components of Quality of Work Life.**

Making provisions for a good work life will enhance organizational growth. The concept of QWL is directly related to the principles of employee maintenance, job satisfaction, morale, life survival, and effectiveness (Benhassine & Boukhemkhem, 2015), work life is concerned with the overall climate of work. Unlike job enrichment and social information processing approaches, quality of work life is not based on a particular theory, nor does it advocate a particular technique (Benhassine et al., 2015).

This component of quality of work life is adapted from Benhassine and Boukhemkhem, (2015).

#### ***Adequate and Fair Compensation.***

High pay packages do not always guarantee a motivated and productive workforce. Therefore, a crucial aspect is not how much a company pays its employees, but rather how the pay system is created, disseminated, and administered. The employee and the employer agree on the suitable wage. The minimum wage will be set by the nation's government, and no employee should be paid less than it by their company.

#### ***Safe and Healthy Working Conditions.***

Today, many businesses change the workplace to enhance the quality of life for their employees. Each employer is required by law to be offered a workplace that is free from recognized dangers. Additionally, they are under a unique obligation to adhere to all safety and health requirements set under specific prescribed provisions. While laws that protect workers' physical and mental health are undoubtedly a motivator, many firms are also encouraged to offer hospitable working circumstances by virtue of their awareness of human needs and rights.

***Immediate Opportunity to Use and Develop Human Capacities.***

When people feel optimistic about their future, they tend to be more satisfied with their jobs. These possibilities could include the chance to improve and flourish with their current job or the possibility of securing employment with another firm. People's job happiness may decline if they believe they have less opportunity with their current employer than they would want.

***Future Opportunity for Continued Growth and Security.***

The emphasis has changed from job security to career progression, according to this QWL factor. Employees must have the chance to enhance their careers as well as possibilities for personal growth. This refers to the notion of professional learning as a tool for professional advancement or succession planning.

***Social integration in the work organization.***

Walton and Orpen as cited in Benhassine, et al., (2015) another factor affecting QWL is how important social connection is. Supportiveness, tolerance, equality, mobility, and identity are five elements that are thought to be crucial for these relationships to result in positive consequences for people.

***Constitutionalism in the work organization***

In addition to the aforementioned factors or dimensions that help define what is meant by QWL, there are a second group that is frequently ignored by industrial psychologists because it primarily pertains to legal matters and is more focused on what rights people should have, regardless of whether they exercise them or not. The main focus of the proposed criteria is on the extent to which work organizations have established formal mechanisms to safeguard each employee from the arbitrary and capricious actions of employers, whether in reaction to trade union pressure or on their own initiative.

***Work and total life space***

The speaks to how much work plays a balanced role in the employee's other areas of life. This idea of a balanced role includes work, scheduling, career obligations, and travel requirements that don't constantly suck up free time and family time, as well as growth and promotion that don't necessitate frequent relocations.

### ***The social relevance of work life***

Walton as cited in Benhassine, et al., (2015) firms that don't behave in a socially responsible way may cause an increasing proportion of their employees to downplay the importance of their jobs and professions, which will then have an impact on their self-esteem. Therefore, it follows that QWL is impacted by every aspect of an employee's performance within the company. If a high QWL is to be maintained in an organization, effective employee utilization and work satisfaction are crucial. Therefore, work organizations that are perceived to have positive results are praised and given more prestige than those whose actions are perceived to have negative or damaging consequences.

### **3.2.6 Essence of Quality of Work Life**

A high quality of work life (QWL) is consequential for business organizations, institutions to continue to attract and retain employees (Saraji & Dargahi, 2006), QWL is initiated in institutions to help promote and improve employee satisfaction. In an improved QWL, everyone benefits and the world is better off as a result of that recognition or improvement, which in turn fosters trust and loyalty among employees (Saraji & Dargahi, 2006).

Quality of work life (QWL), according to Walton (1975), is a crucial strategy for preserving environmental and human values that have been neglected as a result of technological development's impact on economic growth and productivity.

## **3.4 Empirical Review**

### **3.4.1 Influence of Self Efficacy on Quality of Work Life**

Numerous studies have emphasized on the influence of self-efficacy on the quality of work life. The study alluded to the fact that people with higher self-efficacy are more likely to overcome unemployment, this means that people with high self-efficacy deal with difficulties like unemployment more effectively and are more likely to achieve valued outcomes through persistence, and thus derive intrinsic satisfaction from their jobs (Yakin & Erdil, 2012; Luthans, 2006; Vinokur & Schul, 2002). Individuals with high self-efficacy have stronger beliefs in their

ability to complete tasks successfully in all situations, they try to break the ceiling by engaging in more challenging activities, invest more, persevere longer, and cope better with failure than those with low self-efficacy (Heuven, Bakker, Schaufeli, & Huisman, 2006). According to Mensah et al., (2013), it is important for management to understand that an individual's sense of efficacy influences his or her job performance, which in turn influences his or her quality of work life.

A study by Andenæs, Bentsen, Hvinden, Fagermoen, & Lerdal, (2014) examined self-efficacy, leisure time physical activity and paid work affect the health-related quality of life of patients with chronic obstructive pulmonary diseases. Data from 97 patients were collected through the use of questionnaires and were analyzed using linear regression models. Results showed that physical health was significantly affected only by paid work whereas mental health was significantly affected by physical activity and high self-efficacy.

The results of the study revealed a positive relationship between perceived self-efficacy and intrapreneurial behavior among employees in SMEs in the processing industry in Ghana. This implies that employees who had a higher level of perceived self-efficacy were more likely to exhibit intrapreneurial behavior in their workplace. The study further established that the provision of needed resources could enhance employees' perceived self-efficacy, leading to an increase in intrapreneurial behavior. The findings of the study have significant implications for SMEs in the processing industry in Ghana. They suggest that managers should provide employees with the necessary resources and support to enhance their self-efficacy and promote intrapreneurial behavior in the workplace. By doing so, SMEs can improve their competitiveness, productivity, and overall performance.

Amtmann et al. (2012) noted that Self-efficacy beliefs influence the course of action an individual chooses. They added that, one's belief in one's ability to succeed influences his or her level of motivation, the amount of effort expended, the degree of stress experienced, and the extent to which one perseveres in the midst of difficulties and uncertainties. Compared with persons who doubt their capabilities, those with high self-efficacy for accomplishing a task readily participate, work harder, persist longer when they encounter difficulties, and achieve at a higher level (Schun, 1995). He added that people go about their daily activities with varying levels of self-efficacy derived from previous performance, prior experience, personal qualities, and social support.

People acquire information about how well they are performing on a job, which influences their self-efficacy for continued learning and performance.

In another study, Bandura (1997), Cervone and Scott (1995), concluded that people with a robust perception of their efficacy foresee positive futures, experience fewer distressing emotions and are better able to organize the complex cognitive skills required to cope with demanding environment. Bandura et al. (2001) employed Bandura's (1997) initial hypothesis to find out how perceived self-efficacy for academic achievement influences children's belief in their capabilities to master different areas of academic work. They concluded that the higher the individuals perceived efficacy to fulfil educational requirements and occupational roles, the better they prepare themselves educationally for their career, and the greater they engage themselves at work.

Carroll et al. (2009) indicates that students who develop strong academic self-efficacy beliefs are better able to manage their learning and to resist the temptations and social pressures to engage in behaviours, such as delinquency, that can undermine their academic achievements. As a result, such students are more likely to successfully complete their education and be better equipped for a range of occupational options in today's competitive society, and consequently are likely to experience quality working life (Bandura, Barbaranelli, Caprara, & Pastorelli, 2001).

Vinokur and Schul, (2002) also stated that people with greater self-efficacy are more likely to overcome unemployment. It follows that persons with high self-efficacy deal more effectively with difficulties such as unemployment and are more likely to attain valued outcomes through persistence, and thus derive intrinsic satisfaction from their jobs (Yakin & Erdil, 2012). Luthans et al. (2006) added that people with higher general self-efficacy are more likely to be satisfied with their jobs.

An empirical investigation carried out by Luthans and Peterson (2002) reveals that manager's self-efficacy was a partial mediator between employee's degree of work engagement and manager's effectiveness. In effect, this study suggests that both employee engagement and manager's self-efficacy are important antecedents, which together better predict a positive relationship with manager's effectiveness than individual factor.

In a related study, Yakin and Erdil (2012) investigated the relationships between self-efficacy, work-engagement and job satisfaction among a sample of certified public accountants. Based on social cognitive theory and work engagement events and using regression modelling, their results

indicated that both self-efficacy and work engagement affect job satisfaction. Job satisfaction of certified public accountants was directly predicted by self-efficacy and work engagement.

### **3.4.2 Enhancement of Employees Self-Efficacy**

Organizations can use social persuasion and social modelling to boost employees' self-efficacy (Mensah et al., 2013; Bandura, 1994). They further posited that, managers should encourage workers to believe in their skills and capabilities. Managers can assist employees to overcome self-doubt and instead focus on giving their best effort to the task at hand. Employee self-efficacy can be enhanced when management addresses issues of workers' safety and satisfaction by providing better working conditions, wages and salaries, and other benefits (Mensah et al., 2013). Employee performance is influenced by a number of mediating factors, including self-efficacy. Practitioners should train and motivate staff to develop high levels of self-efficacy. They will be able to accomplish their jobs better than expected thanks to this. Employee learning, transfer of information, skills, attitudes, and other competencies will be boosted by self-efficacy to achieve highly effective performance.

### **3.4.3 Influence of Social, Environmental and Cultural Contexts on Self-Efficacy Beliefs**

Bandura (1986) ascertained that self-efficacy beliefs do not play their influential, predictive, or mediating role in human functioning under a variety of conditions. Some school and workplace systems are designed to prevent students and employees from maximizing their high self-efficacy. Self-efficacy will also have no bearing on performance if the resources required to carry out duties are insufficient. Bandura proposed that when social constraints and insufficient resources impede work performance, self-efficacy may suffer. Incentives and disincentives also have an impact on self-efficacy.

Teacher efficacy may also have little bearing on teacher performance if schools lack the necessary equipment or resources to assist students in performing academic tasks adequately, or if teachers are beleaguered on a daily basis by practices, policies, or students over which they have no control (Bandura, 1995). A sense of inefficacy in coping has been linked to burnout in teachers in such situations (Chwalisz, Altmaier, & Russell, 1992). Schools must establish social systems for developing and nurturing student and teacher efficacy beliefs, as well as the roles that the various motivating and demotivating factors created by such systems play in the development of these beliefs.

Academic institutions with a strong sense of collective efficacy exercise empowering and vitalizing influences on their constituents, and these effects are palpable and in evidence. The public can testify of the schools' culture or climate and describe their effective schools (Purkey & Smith, 1983). According to Bandura (1993), collective efficacy mediated the influence of students' socioeconomic status, prior academic achievement, and teachers' longevity on students' academic achievement in various middle schools. There is also evidence that teacher collective efficacy is related to personal teaching efficacy and school administration satisfaction (Fuller & Izu, 1986).

#### **3.4.4 Effects of Quality of Work Life (QWL) Programmes on Quality of Life (QoL)**

Quality of work life (QWL) programs and quality of life have a good and significant association. Emotional health, personal growth, social inclusion, and interpersonal relationships had the biggest impacts. The researcher therefore strongly advises those multinational organizations to develop exceptional quality of work life programmes by concentrating on specific service components that would further improve the employees' overall quality of life (Narehan, Hairunnisa, Norfadzillah & Freziamella, 2014).

Based on the interactionist model, Sirgy, Nora, Jiyun, and David, (2008) highlighted on the relationship between QWL and QoL; the programmes include characteristics of the employee and work environment, and the affective reactions that emanate from the interaction of QWL and QoL. Sirgy et al. (2008) further added that well designed and custom fit QWL programmes serve to improve QoL by making sure there is availability of work resources that suit the expectations of employees, programmes that mitigate conflict related to work and non-work life, improvement in multiple role identities, making role demands feasible, eradication or reduction of stressful work and non-work-related stress.

It was discovered that QWL did have a considerable impact on QoL among employees at international organizations (Narehan et al., 2014), all of the QWL program's components, including the work environment and job facets, were discovered to be related to general QoL. Given that the organization's QWL programs helped enhance employee QoL and lower staff turnover, the business should think about introducing, improving, and enforcing QWL programs on an ongoing basis. The activity will aid firms in improving their output, commitment, and employee satisfaction (Narehan et al., 2014).

## **4 Practical Part**

### **4.1 Profile of Ayawaso North Municipal Assembly**

In November 2017, the Ministry of Local Government Decentralization and Rural Development introduced a Legislative Instrument which resulted in the creation of 38 new Municipals and Districts in March 2018, bringing the total number of Metropolitan, Municipal and District Assemblies (MMDAs) in Ghana to 254. Among these newly established MMDAs is the Ayawaso North Municipal Assembly, which falls within the Greater Accra Region and was formed under Legislative Instrument (LI 2311).

The Ayawaso North Municipal Assembly is surrounded by Ayawaso West to the north, Ayawaso East to the east and south, and Ayawaso Central to the west. The boundary of the municipality begins at Kawukudi Traffic Light and follows the Obasanjo Highway before turning left at Obasanjo Roundabout at Pig Farm Junction. It then proceeds along the main Kotobabi road towards the Kotobabi Police Station, makes a right turn onto the Alajo road, and then an immediate left turn onto the New Town road. The boundary line continues on the New Town road and turns left before the Mallam Atta Market (near the Bank of Africa), ending at the Nima Storm Drain Bridge. It then follows the drain across the Nima main road and ends at Hilla Liman Highway. The assembly covers an area of approximately 9.8 square kilometers and has a population of around 90,000 people, according to the 2021 population projection.

The Ayawaso North Municipal Assembly is governed by a 21-member assembly, made up of elected representatives from the various electoral areas within the municipality. The assembly is headed by a municipal chief executive who is appointed by the President of Ghana, in consultation with the local assembly members. In terms of infrastructure, the Ayawaso North Municipal Assembly has several public facilities, including schools, health centres, and markets. The assembly has also undertaken several projects aimed at improving the living conditions of the residents, such as the construction of new roads, drainage systems, and public toilets. The Ayawaso North Municipal Assembly is committed to promoting sustainable development within the municipality and has implemented several initiatives aimed at promoting environmental

conservation and improving the quality of life for the residence Ayawaso North Municipal Assembly. The Assembly has a staff strength of 220.

## **4.2 Research Setting**

According to Wells (2015), research setting is basically the environment or place in which research is conducted. Research setting could be the physical environment, social environment, cultural site, laboratories in which research is carried out (Given, 2008). The research would be conducted in Ghana, specifically in Greater Accra Region. Considering the broad nature of the region, the scope of the research setting would be narrowed to Ayawaso North Municipal Assembly Office in Accra. The researcher intends to choose Accra as the research setting because of the cosmopolitan nature of the area.

## **4.3 Research Design and Approach**

This is how the researcher intends to present or plan the research. Bezuidenhout (2005) explained research design is the blueprint describing how a research study will be done. Mixed method approach would be used in the data collection and analysis of data. According to Creswell (2012) Mixed method approach is the combination of qualitative and quantitative methods in the same study for the broad purposes of breadth and depth of understanding. A mixed design employs qualitative and quantitative approaches at any stage, it is essential in the development of research questions, sampling strategies, data collection approaches, data analysis methods, or conclusions (Creswell & Garrett, 2008). Both methods would be used concurrently.

The findings from one method can be elaborated, clarified, or validated by the findings from the other method. After collecting both types of data simultaneously, findings from qualitative and quantitative data sources can be compared. The data can be analyzed, and the results compared using side-by-side discussions, transforming the qualitative data set into quantitative scores, or displaying both types of data simultaneously (Mayengwa, 2020). Quantitative can be used to validate each other and build a solid foundation for making evaluation conclusions.

Descriptive and explanatory research design would be used. The researcher intends use descriptive and explanatory design to help gain more insight in the data that would be collected. Under the

descriptive design, a survey method would be used in the conduct of the research. The survey type of research allows for a wide range of methods for recruiting participants, collecting data, and employing various instrumentation techniques. Survey research can employ quantitative research strategies, qualitative research strategies, or mixed methods (Ponto, 2015).

#### **4.4 Population of the Study**

According to Leedy and Ormrod (2010), the population of a study can be seen as the target group about which the researcher is interested in gaining information and drawing conclusions. The population of the study in research refers to the entire group of individuals or instances that meet the criteria for inclusion in a research project. This group is the target of the study and represents the larger group to which the researcher aims to generalize their findings (Szklo, 1998). Defining and specifying the population is a critical step in the research process, as it helps researchers draw meaningful conclusions about the characteristics, behaviors, or phenomena they are studying (Sullivan & Knutson, 2000).

Target population is the entire group of individuals or cases that the researcher is interested in studying and to which they want to generalize their findings (Ronkainen et al., 2005). Accessible population is the subset of the target population that the researcher can realistically reach, given practical constraints such as time, budget, and logistics (Steliarova-Foucher et al., 2017).

The target population for this study would include all the staff members of Ayawaso North Municipal Assembly Office. A total staff of 246 respondents were considered as the population of the study.

#### **4.5 Sample and Sampling Technique**

The researcher intends to use convenience sampling technique to select participants for this study (Sharma, 2017). Convenience sampling is a non-probability sampling method in which participants are drawn from a target population (Taherdoost, 2016). This method collects data from people who can be contacted conveniently to reach or contact (Alvi, 2016). There are no criteria in place for this sampling method other than people's willingness and availability to participate in

the work. It does not require a random sample because the only requirement is agreement to participate in the study (Singh & Masuka, 2014).

The researcher currently is not privy to the population size and as a result it will be difficult to determine the sample size now (Etikan, Alkassim & Abubakar, 2016). Either published tables or approved formulas such as Cochran's sample size formula, Yamane (2007) sample size formula would be used to determine the sample size if the population is known.

#### **4.6 Data Collection Method or Techniques**

##### **4.6.1 Primary Data Collection**

Primary data collection involves the process of gathering information directly from the source for the first time. Researchers collect data directly rather than relying on existing data sources. This method provides researchers with firsthand, original information that is specific to their research objectives (Som, 1973).

Surveys and questionnaires involve presenting a set of questions to a sample of individuals, either in person, by mail, over the phone, or online (Sharma, 2017). This method is commonly used to collect information about opinions, attitudes, behaviors, and demographics.

For the primary data collection, survey would be used to collect the data. This technique or method would be adopted because, there would be access to in-depth information, freedom of flexibility and accurate data (Barreiro & Albandoz, 2001).

##### **4.6.2 Data Collection Instruments**

Using survey for the primary data collection, the instrument for the survey would either be face-to-face survey. The scale was developed with online survey. Questionnaire would be designed for the survey. The ten (10) item self-efficacy scale created by Schwarzer and Jerusalem (1995) would be adopted. to evaluate one's overall perception of one's ability to handle challenges and to anticipate how well one will adjust to various stressful life events. The reliability coefficients for the measure, which was rated on a 5-point Likert scale from (1) completely disagree to (5) completely agree, ranges from 0.76 to 0.90. The self-efficacy scale item "I can overcome most

difficulties if I put in the appropriate effort" is an illustration. Items on the scale was positively scored. On the quality of work life, questionnaire would be adopted and modified from Leiden Quality of Work Life questions (van der Doef & Maes, 1999). This questionnaire contained questions about the following workplace stressors: job insecurity, position ambiguity, conflicting responsibilities, restricted workspace, and lack of decision-making authority (van der Berg & Martins, 2013). This survey consisted of items, each of which would be rated on a 5-point Likert scale from (1) completely disagree to (5) completely agree. One example of an item in the QWL questionnaire is—My job allows me to make decisions on my own.

This instrument would be employed because, the researcher wants to gain a thorough understanding of the issue to be discussed (Mensah & Asamani, 2013). The researcher prefers to use questionnaire because it is the quick and efficient way to obtain large or enough information from a large sample. Questionnaire administration is one of the most successful methods for mixed method approach because they allow you to explain, better understand, and investigate the viewpoints, behaviour, experiences, and phenomena of your study participants (Kotze, 2005).

For the secondary data collection, document review would be applied as an instrument to gather data from the reports and journal articles (Alvesson, 2018). Essentially, document review allows research on subjects to which the researcher does not have easy physical access. It is also free from reactivity, particularly when the document is written for other purposes (Kompier et al., 2009). The document study offers an opportunity for longitudinal analysis.

#### 4.7 Models

The model was to analyse the effect of employee self efficacy on thier quality of work life. Employee self efficacy was regressed on quality of work life of employees. The model has been shown in the equation 1.

$$QWL = \alpha + \beta_1 ESE + \varepsilon \dots \dots \dots (1)$$

QWL – Quality of Work Life

ESE – Employee Self-efficacy

$\varepsilon$  – error term

#### **4.8 Data Validity and Reliability of the Instrument**

Validity refers to the extent to which an instrument is relevant and measures accurately in the study. The instruments used were edited and tested before their administration. It is vital for a test to be valid in order for the results to be accurately applied and interpreted (Kimberlin & Winterstein, 2008). Data reliability refers to the extent to which an instrument measure as the same way each time it is used under the same condition with the subject. The purpose of reliability is to assess the instrument ability to measure the same way in which the same sample was administered (Mohamad et al., 2015). A test is considered reliable if we get the same result repeatedly. Cronbach Alpha would be used to test the reliability of the measuring instrument.

#### **4.9 Data Analysis**

For the quantitative analysis, descriptive statistics (mean scores and standard deviation), Pearson Correlation and One Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) would be used to analyse the data. In analysing the data SPSS software would be adopted. The research question one (the degree of self-efficacy and quality of work life among employees) would be analysed using Pearson Correlation. Research question two (the impact of employee's self-efficacy on their quality of work life) would be analysed using descriptive statistic such as mean score and standard deviation. Research question three (how certain economic factors and psychological factors of employees influence their self-efficacy and quality of work life) would be analyzed using mean scores, standard deviation and one way analysis of variance.

#### **4.10 Ethical Issues or Considerations**

With the politicization of the research environment, it is always expedient to consider ethical issues whenever one wants to embark on any study. It is against this background that the researcher would officially seek consent or ethical clearance from the university. For confidentiality purposes, the researcher would take measures to protect the identity of all participants. All participants' privacy will be respected by the researcher as well. The researcher would build trust with all research participants, reveal the goal of the study to research participants, and allow individuals to withdraw

from the study at any time. Before conducting interviews, all other participants' permission would be asked. Participation would be entirely optional. The researcher will ensure that no threatening information is gathered. The work would be strictly academic, and the findings would be reported as it is.

## 5. Results and Discussion

The target population for this study are the employees of Ayawaso North Municipal Assembly. A total of 140 questionnaires were distributed among participants. Out of these, 128 questionnaires were retrieved or returned, resulting in a response rate of 91.43%. The response rate is an essential indicator of the quality of data collected in a study. It measures the proportion of participants who responded to the survey and can influence the validity and reliability of the results. A higher response rate indicates a greater level of engagement and interest among the participants, resulting in more representative and accurate data (Dillman, Smyth, & Christian, 2014). Therefore, a response rate of 91.43% suggests that the study's data collection was successful, and the results can be considered reliable and valid.

### 5.1 Demographics

This section explains the demographic characteristics of respondents. The gender, age, years of experience, salary and educational level has been explained under this section

**Table 1: Demographic Characteristics**

| Variable            | Frequency | Percent |
|---------------------|-----------|---------|
| Gender              |           |         |
| Male                | 90        | 70.3    |
| Female              | 38        | 29.7    |
| Age                 |           |         |
| 18-30years          | 52        | 40.6    |
| 31-50years          | 52        | 40.6    |
| 51-60years          | 24        | 18.8    |
| Years of Experience |           |         |
| 1-5 years           | 52        | 40.6    |
| 6 – 10 years        | 39        | 30.5    |
| 11 – 15 years       | 37        | 28.9    |
| Salary              |           |         |

|                      |    |      |
|----------------------|----|------|
| 2001 - 2500 Cedis    | 25 | 19.5 |
| 2501 - 3000 Cedis    | 26 | 20.3 |
| 3001 Cedis and above | 77 | 60.2 |
| Education            |    |      |
| Graduate             | 90 | 70.3 |
| Postgraduate         | 38 | 29.7 |

Source: Field Survey (2023)

The survey included 128 respondents, 90 of them were male and 48 females. This shows that male respondents outnumbered female respondents. The survey had 70.31 percent men and 29.69 percent women. According to the data, respondents were 18-30, 31-50, and 51-60 years old. Of the 128 responders, 52 (40.62% each) fit into the first two categories. The remaining 24 responders (18.75%) were 51-60 years old. The majority of responses (81.25%) were 18-50 years old. In particular, 40.62% of the sample was aged 18-30 and 40.62% was 31-50, indicating a younger population.

Survey respondents had different employment experience. Most respondents had worked for less than ten years, with 52 (40.6%) working 1-5 years and 39 (30.5%) working 6-10 years. Still, 37 responders (28.9% of the sample) had worked 11-15 years. Work experience has been demonstrated to greatly impact self-efficacy and work life. Aziz and Ramayah (2010) found that experienced workers had higher self-efficacy and job satisfaction. This shows that more experienced workers are more confident and content with their jobs, which boosts productivity and performance.

The survey also sorted respondents by income. The majority of replies (77) were '3001 Cedis and above'. Only 25 respondents had salaries between 2001 and 2500 Cedis, and 26 had salaries between 2501 and 3000 Cedis. It appears that most survey respondents earn a greater salary. Salary

can affect self-efficacy and work life quality. Thus, this survey's conclusions may improve employees' work life and self-efficacy.

A poll of 128 Ayawaso West Municipal Assembly employees found 90 with graduate degrees and 38 with post-graduate degrees. Since 56.3% of employees questioned had a graduate degree and 29.7% had a post-graduate degree, 70.3% had at least a graduate degree. These statistics imply that Ayawaso West Municipal Assembly employees have a highly educated workforce, with many holding advanced degrees. This may show the company's dedication to education and professional development and attracting and retaining top talent.

## 5.2 Degree of self-efficacy and quality of work life among employees

The first objective of the study was to analyse the degree of self-efficacy and quality of work life among employees. Descriptive statistics was used to analyse this objective. The mean and standard deviation of each item was discussed and analysed. The results have been presented on Table 2.

**Table 2: Degree of self-efficacy among employees**

| <b>Item</b>  | <b>Mean</b> | <b>Standard deviation</b> |
|--|-------------|---------------------------|
| I can always manage to solve difficult problems if I try hard enough.                    | 4.91        | 0.086                     |
| Thanks to my resourcefulness, I know how to handle I have access to credit facilities or | 4.8         | 0.158                     |
| If I am in trouble, I can usually think of a solution                                    | 4.8         | 0.163                     |
| If someone opposes me, I can find the means and ways to get what I want.                 | 4.7         | 0.21                      |
| I can remain calm when facing difficulties because I can rely on my coping abilities.    | 4.69        | 0.33                      |
| When I am confronted with a problem, I can usually find several solutions.               | 4.61        | 0.24                      |

|  |      |       |
|--|------|-------|
| I can solve most problems if I invest the necessary effort.          | 4.59 | 0.243 |
| It is easy for me to stick to my aims and accomplish my goals.       | 4.5  | 0.252 |
| I can usually handle whatever comes my way.                          | 4.45 | 0.317 |
| I am confident that I could deal efficiently with unexpected events. | 4.41 | 0.243 |

Source: Field Survey (2023)

Table 2 showed the degree of self-efficacy of employees. The study found that employees manage to solve difficult problems if they try hard enough was the first item with a higher average. This recorded an average of 4.91 with a corresponding standard deviation of 0.086. This statement reflects a high level of confidence in problem-solving skills. The high mean score (4.91) suggests that employees generally believe in their ability to overcome challenging issues through persistent effort.

Knowing how to handle access to credit facilities was the next item with a higher average. This recorded an average of 4.8 with a corresponding standard deviation of 0.086. An employee who has control over his or herself can manage credit facilities. This also indicates that, employees in the organisation have a very high level of efficacy.

Thinking of solution when employees are in trouble was the next item with a higher average. This recorded an average of 4.8 with a corresponding standard deviation of 0.163. This statement highlights the individual's belief in their problem-solving abilities when facing difficulties. The high mean score (4.8) suggests that employees generally feel confident in their capacity to find solutions when they encounter challenges.

Finding ways to get what employees want when a colleague opposes them recorded the next higher average. This recorded an average of 4.7 with a corresponding standard deviation of 0.21. This item reflects self-assuredness in dealing with opposition and achieving one's objectives. The mean

score (4.7) indicates that employees, on average, believe in their ability to navigate situations where they encounter resistance.

Relying on coping abilities that enables employees to remain calm during difficulties recorded the next higher average. This recorded an average of 4.69 with a corresponding standard deviation of 0.33. This statement relates to emotional regulation and confidence in coping strategies during tough times. The mean score (4.69) suggests that employees generally perceive themselves as capable of managing stress and difficulties effectively.

Finding several solutions when there is a problem recorded the next higher average. This recorded an average of 4.61 with a corresponding standard deviation of 0.24. This item focuses on generating multiple solutions when faced with problems. The mean score (4.61) indicates that employees, on average, have confidence in their ability to brainstorm and identify various approaches to tackle problems.

Investing the necessary effort in order to solve problem indicated how efficient employees are. This recorded the next higher average. This recorded an average of 4.59 with a corresponding standard deviation of 0.243. This statement emphasizes the relationship between effort and problem-solving success. The mean score (4.59) suggests that employees, as a whole, believe that by putting in enough effort, they can overcome most challenges.

Sticking to aims and goals in order to accomplish them indicate how efficient employees are. This recorded an average of 4.5 with a corresponding standard deviation of 0.252. This item pertains to perseverance and goal attainment. The mean score (4.5) indicates that employees generally perceive themselves as capable of maintaining focus and achieving their objectives.

Having the ability to handle whatever comes their way also indicated the next higher average. This recorded an average of 4.45 with a corresponding standard deviation of 0.317. This statement

reflects a broad belief in adaptability and effective handling of various situations. The mean score (4.5) suggests that employees feel confident in their ability to cope with a wide range of challenges. Being confident that could deal efficiently with unexpected events also recorded the next higher average. This recorded an average of 4.41 with a corresponding standard deviation of 0.243. This item specifically addresses the ability to manage unexpected situations. The mean score (4.41) indicates that employees, on average, have confidence in their capability to handle unforeseen events with efficiency.

In conclusion, the table indicates that employees in Ghana perceive themselves as having a high degree of self-efficacy, particularly in terms of problem-solving and resourcefulness. The organization's emphasis on training, positive work environment, and cultural factors could contribute to these high levels of self-efficacy among employees.

**Table 3: Degree of quality of work life among employees**

| <b>Item</b>   | <b>Mean</b> | <b>Standard deviation</b> |
|---|-------------|---------------------------|
| Is your job fully secured (Job security).                                     | 4.90        | 0.092                     |
| I am free from conflicting demands or responsibilities.                       | 4.90        | 0.092                     |
| My job allows me to make a lot of decisions on my own.                        | 4.80        | 0.158                     |
| I have restricted workspace.  | 1.30        | 0.214                     |
| My position is clearly stated and doesn't conflict with restricted workspace. | 4.80        | 0.163                     |
| The level of my salary correlates with my job description.                    | 1.30        | 0.214                     |
| My financial benefits are adequately enough.                                  | 1.51        | 0.252                     |

|  |      |       |
|--|------|-------|
| I have access to credit facilities or opportunities. | 1.28 | 0.102 |
|--|------|-------|

Source: Field Survey (2023)

Table shows the degree of quality work life among employees. Each item's mean score and standard deviation are given.

Job security recorded the highest average of 4.90 with a corresponding standard deviation of 0.092. This item measures the perception of job security among employees. A higher mean score suggests that employees generally feel that their jobs are secure, which could be due to factors such as stable employment conditions, company stability, and a lack of perceived immediate threats to their positions. This item refers to the extent to which employees perceive their jobs as secure. Job security is an important factor for employees' peace of mind and overall satisfaction. A high score indicates that employees feel confident in the stability of their employment, meaning they are less worried about losing their jobs unexpectedly. This could be due to factors such as a stable company, clear communication about job stability, and a lack of recent layoffs.

Free from conflicting demands or responsibilities was indicated how quality the work life of employees is. This was the second item with a higher average. This recorded an average of 4.90 with a corresponding standard deviation of 0.092. This item assesses whether employees feel that their work responsibilities are clear and without conflicting demands. The similarity in mean score with the previous item suggests that employees believe their job security and freedom from conflicting responsibilities are both strong aspects of their work life. This item gauges whether employees believe their job responsibilities are clear and don't overlap or contradict each other. When employees have a clear understanding of their roles and responsibilities, they can work more efficiently and effectively. High scores indicate that employees experience clarity in their job tasks, reducing stress and confusion that can arise from juggling conflicting demands.

Also, the job allowing employees to make a lot of decisions on their own shows how employees are work. This recorded an average of 4.80 with a corresponding standard deviation of 0.158. This item evaluates the extent to which employees have autonomy and decision-making authority in their roles. The slightly lower mean score compared to the first two items might indicate that while employees generally have a good degree of autonomy, it's not perceived as being as strong a positive factor as job security and freedom from conflicting demands. This item assesses the level of autonomy employees have in decision-making within their roles. Jobs that offer more autonomy can lead to greater job satisfaction and motivation, as employees feel trusted and empowered. A slightly lower score might suggest that while employees do have a degree of autonomy, they don't feel they have complete control over decision-making.

Restrictions to workspace also recorded one of the least averages among all the items. This recorded an average of 1.30 with a corresponding standard deviation of 0.214. This item pertains to the perception of having limited physical workspace. A spacious and well-organized workspace can contribute to employees' comfort, productivity, and overall job satisfaction. This could include factors like desk size, ergonomic considerations, and freedom of movement.

The position clearly stated and doesn't conflicting with restricted workspace also indicated a higher average. This recorded an average of 4.80 with a corresponding standard deviation of 0.163. This item measures whether employees' job positions are well-defined and align with their workspace requirements. The high mean score implies that employees generally feel their roles are well-defined and don't clash with any space limitations. This item focuses on the clarity of job roles and how well they align with the available workspace. A high score suggests that employees have a clear understanding of their job positions and that these positions do not clash with any

space limitations. When roles are well-defined and compatible with the workspace, employees can work more effectively and experience fewer challenges related to their job responsibilities.

The level of salary correlating to the job description recorded a least average. This recorded an average of 1.30 with a corresponding standard deviation of 0.214. This item assesses whether employees perceive a clear connection between their job description and their salary level. The very low mean score indicates that employees, on average, do not feel that their salary aligns well with their job description. This item measures whether employees feel their salary is commensurate with the responsibilities outlined in their job descriptions. A low score indicates that employees don't believe their compensation accurately reflects the scope and demands of their roles. This can lead to dissatisfaction and feelings of being undervalued.

Financial benefits being adequately enough also recorded an average of 1.51 with a corresponding standard deviation of 0.252. This item measures employees' perception of their financial benefits being sufficient. The slightly higher mean score compared to the previous item suggests that while employees do not strongly feel their salary matches their job description, they still believe their financial benefits are relatively adequate. This item focuses on employees' perception of the overall financial benefits they receive. Financial benefits include not only the salary but also additional perks such as bonuses, incentives, retirement plans, and healthcare benefits. A score above 1 suggests that, on average, employees feel their financial benefits are reasonably sufficient to meet their needs.

Having access to credit facilities or opportunities also recorded a least average. This item recorded an average of 1.28 with a corresponding standard deviation of 0.102. This item assesses whether employees have access to credit facilities or financial opportunities through their workplace. The low mean score indicates that, on average, employees don't perceive substantial access to such

facilities. This item pertains to employees' access to credit or financial opportunities through their workplace. Credit facilities might include loans, advances, or financial support for personal or professional purposes. A low score indicates that employees, on average, do not perceive substantial access to these financial resources through their employer.

### 5.3 Relationship between employees' self-efficacy and Quality of work life

The second objective of the study was to analyse the relationship between employee's self-efficacy and quality of work-life. This objective was achieved by using the regression model. The validity and reliability of the study has been provided in the table below.

#### 5.3.1 Validity and reliability results for self-efficacy

In assessing the construct, ten (10) elements were used to measure self-efficacy. After the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy (.885), determinant (.025) and Bartlett's Sphericity Test ( $X^2(15) = 508.464$ ;  $p < 0.05$ ) assumptions were met, factor analysis was conducted on all ten items. The six components used to measure the construct were highly loaded ( $> .5$ ). On the six (6) items using the Cronbach Alpha, reliability tests were carried out. Cronbach's Alpha was registered at .903. This suggests that the six elements were accurate in measuring the management of the study. The naïve method was used to measure the self efficacy variable.

**Table 4: Exploratory Factor Analysis on Management Support**

|  | Factor Loading |
|--|----------------|
| I can always manage to solve difficult problems if I try hard enough.    | .842           |
| If I am in trouble, I can usually think of a solution                    | .832           |
| If someone opposes me, I can find the means and ways to get what I want. | .860           |

|   |       |
|---|-------|
| I can remain calm when facing difficulties because I can rely on my coping abilities. | .812  |
| When I am confronted with a problem, I can usually find several solutions.            | .865  |
| I can solve most problems if I invest the necessary effort.                           | .724  |
| It is easy for me to stick to my aims and accomplish my goals.                        | 0.903 |
| Eigenvalue  | 3.363 |
| % of Variance   | 67.26 |
| KMO=0.885; $\chi^2=508.464$ ; df=15; p-value=0.000                                    |       |

---

### 5.3.2 Validity and reliability results for quality of work life

In assessing the construct, eight elements were used to measure quality of work life. After the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy (.886), determinant (.027) and Bartlett's Sphericity Test ( $X^2(10) = 502.549$ ;  $p < 0.05$ ) assumptions were met, factor analysis was conducted on all eight items. The five components used to measure the construct were highly loaded ( $> .5$ ). On the five (5) items using the Cronbach Alpha, reliability tests were carried out. Cronbach's Alpha was registered at .919. This suggests that the five elements were accurate in measuring the variable competence. The naïve method was used to measure the quality of work life variable.

**Table 5: Exploratory Factor Analysis on Competence**

|   | Factor Loading |
|---|----------------|
| I am free from conflicting demands or responsibilities.                       | .820           |
| My position is clearly stated and doesn't conflict with restricted workspace. | .827           |

|  |       |
|--|-------|
| The level of my salary correlates with my job description. | .897  |
| My financial benefits are adequately enough.               | .906  |
| I have access to credit facilities or opportunities.       | .879  |
| Cronbach Alpha   | 0.919 |
| Eigenvalue   | 3.788 |
| % of Variance  | 75.76 |
| KMO=0.886; $\chi^2=502.549$ ; df=10; p-value=0.000         |       |

---

Source: Field Survey (2023)

#### **5.4 Self-efficacy and quality of work life**

The objective of the study was to analyze the effect of self-efficacy on quality of work life.

##### **5.4.1 Diagnostic Tests**

A diagnostic test was used to derive conclusions about the connections between the research variables. The tests were run to assess whether or not it was necessary to conduct an empirical analysis of the data using multiple regression analysis. When the essential assumptions are followed, as Greene (2002) explains, regression may be properly calculated. As a result, it was determined that auto correlation among the research variables were present. The Durbin Watson test was used to test for independence.

##### **5.4.2 Test of Independence**

The independence of error terms, commonly known as the auto correlation test, denotes the independence of observations. It was checked using the Durbin Watson (DW) test to make sure the model's residuals were not autocorrelated. DW values ranging from 0 to 4 and scores between 1.5 and 2.5, according to Garson (2012), imply independent observations. Table 6 shows that the residuals of the empirical model are not autocorrelated, with D.W = 2.053 ranging between 1.5

and 2.5, implying that variable passed the necessary threshold of less than 2.5 and that all variables exhibited no auto correlation, as specified by Garson (2012).

### 5.4.3 Hypothesis Testing

Linear regression analysis was used to experimentally evaluate the hypothesis on whether to reject or fail to reject the null hypotheses when testing for hypotheses. To determine the degree and amplitude of the link between the variables, as well as to evaluate the hypothesized correlations, regression analysis was used. To reach a conclusion, the hypotheses were tested at a 95 percent confidence level.

### 5.4.4 Goodness of Fit

Table 6 displayed the model summary findings, which show the percentage of variations in the dependent variable explained by the independent variable. On the model summary, Table 6 shows the regression results. The adjusted coefficient of multiple determinant = 0.712 in the regression analysis on Table 6, implying that employee self-efficacy explained 71.2 percent of the variance in employee.

**Table 6: Model Summary**

| Model | R                  | R Square | Adjusted Square | R Std. Error of the Estimate | Durbin-Watson |
|-------|--------------------|----------|-----------------|------------------------------|---------------|
| 1     | .4881 <sup>a</sup> | .7761    | .712            | .05161                       | 2.053         |

Source: Field Survey (2023)

### 5.4.5 Joint Significance

The ANOVA results were calculated to illustrate the model fitness by F-ratio findings between employee self-efficacy and quality of work life, as shown in Table 7. The regression findings in Table 7 showed an excellent fit of the model, with a significant value of  $(F(1, 199) = 124,580, p < 0.05)$ , indicating that the suggested model fit well.

**Table 7: ANOVA**

| Model |            | Sum of Squares | Df  | Mean Square | F       | Sig.              |
|-------|------------|----------------|-----|-------------|---------|-------------------|
| 1     | Regression | 124.580        | 1   | 124.580     | 124,580 | .000 <sup>b</sup> |
|       | Residual   | .362           | 198 | .001        |         |                   |
|       | Total      | 124.942        | 199 |             |         |                   |

Source: Field Survey (2023)

Sum of Squares (SS) represents the total sum of squared differences between the observed values and the values predicted by the model. For the Regression model, the SS is 124.580.

Degrees of Freedom (Df) indicates the number of parameters estimated in the model. For the Regression model, there is 1 degree of freedom. Mean Square (MS) is the sum of squares divided by the degrees of freedom. For the Regression model, the mean square is also 124.580. The F-statistic is a ratio of the variance explained by the model to the variance not explained. In this case, the F-statistic is 124,580.

#### **5.4.6 Test of Significance:**

F-Significance (Sig.): This is the p-value associated with the F-statistic. It measures the probability of obtaining an F-statistic as extreme as the one computed from the sample, assuming that the null hypothesis is true. A small p-value (typically < 0.05) indicates that the overall model is statistically significant.

#### **5.4.7 Residuals:**

Sum of Squares (SS): This represents the sum of squared differences between the observed values and the values predicted by the model. In this case, it's 0.362.

Degrees of Freedom (Df): This indicates the degrees of freedom associated with the residuals. For the Residuals, there are 198 degrees of freedom.

Mean Square (MS): The sum of squares divided by the degrees of freedom gives the mean square for the residuals. In this case, it's 0.001.

Total:

Sum of Squares (SS): This is the total sum of squared differences between the observed values and their mean. In this case, it's 124.942.

Degrees of Freedom (Df): The total degrees of freedom, which is the sum of the degrees of freedom for the model and the residuals. In this case, it's 199.

The overall model is statistically significant, as indicated by the very small p-value (Sig. = 0.000b).

The regression model explains a significant amount of variability in the dependent variable, as evidenced by the high F-statistic.

The residuals (unexplained variability) are relatively small compared to the variability explained by the model.

**Table 8: Test of significance of each independent variable**

| Model |                        | Unstandardized Coefficients |            | Standardized Coefficients | t      | Sig. |
|-------|------------------------|-----------------------------|------------|---------------------------|--------|------|
|       |                        | B                           | Std. Error | Beta                      |        |      |
| 1     | (Constant)             | -.036                       | .022       |                           | -1.634 | .105 |
|       | Employee_self_efficacy | .608                        | .007       | .642                      | 90.173 | .000 |

#### 5.4.8 Test of significance of each independent variable

Table 8 provides regression results for self-efficacy influences quality of work life of employees.

Employee self-efficacy was established to be statistically significant at (B = 0.608, t (200) = 90.173, p < 0.05) at 95 percent level of confidence, according to the regression results shown in

Table 8. Employees with higher self-efficacy tend to believe in their skills and capabilities, which positively affects their job performance. They are more likely to set challenging goals for themselves and persevere to achieve them, leading to higher levels of productivity and better performance outcomes. When employees believe in their ability to accomplish tasks effectively, they often experience higher levels of job satisfaction. This sense of mastery and accomplishment contributes to a positive work experience and overall satisfaction with their roles. Individuals with high self-efficacy are more motivated to take on challenging tasks because they believe in their ability to succeed. This motivation leads to increased engagement with their work and a willingness to invest effort and time into their tasks. Self-efficacy can drive employees to take proactive steps toward their professional development. Those who believe they can learn new skills and adapt to changing situations are more likely to seek out learning opportunities and take on new responsibilities, enhancing their career prospects.

**5.4.9 Economic and psychological factors of employees that influence their self-efficacy and Quality Work life**

The third objective of the study was to analyse the economic and psychological factors of employees that influence their self-efficacy and quality work life. The descriptive statistics was employed in analysing the study objectives. The results have been presented on Table 9.

**Table 9: Economic and psychological factors of employees influence their self-efficacy and Quality Work life**

| Items | Mean | Standard<br>Deviation |
|-------|------|-----------------------|
|-------|------|-----------------------|

---

|   |      |       |
|---|------|-------|
| Economic stability and job security have a significant positive impact on my sense of self-efficacy.  | 3.23 | 1.238 |
| The level of compensation I receive for my work affects how confident I feel in my abilities.         | 3.17 | 1.378 |
| Opportunities for career advancement contribute to my overall quality of work life.                   | 3.15 | 1.167 |
| A supportive and understanding work environment enhances my self-efficacy.                            | 3.12 | 1.289 |
| I believe that my psychological well-being plays a crucial role in my performance at work.            | 3.10 | 1.243 |
| Adequate work-life balance positively influences my sense of self-efficacy.                           | 3.10 | 1.251 |
| Feeling valued and recognized by my colleagues and superiors improves my quality of work life.        | 3.08 | 1.195 |
| Economic pressures, such as financial debts, negatively affect my confidence in performing job tasks. | 3.07 | 1.233 |
| Positive relationships with co-workers contribute to my overall quality of work life.                 | 2.96 | 1.294 |
| My ability to cope with work-related stressors impacts my self-efficacy levels.                       | 2.23 | 1.021 |
| The availability of skill development opportunities enhances my sense of self-efficacy.               | 2.17 | 1.125 |

---

Source: Field Survey (2023)

Table 9 presents the results of a survey conducted to understand the influence of economic and psychological factors on employee self-efficacy and quality of work life. The table provides the mean scores and standard deviations for each questionnaire item. The mean score indicates the average response from the participants, while the standard deviation gives an indication of the variability or spread of the responses around the mean.

Economic stability and job security have a significant positive impact on my sense of self-efficacy (Guamaccia et al., 2018). This item recorded an average of 3.23 with a corresponding standard deviation of 1.238. On average, participants moderately agree that economic stability and job security positively influence their self-efficacy. The responses vary moderately around this average. The provided mean score of 3.23 suggests that, on average, respondents in the survey moderately agreed with this statement. This means that, in the context of the survey, most respondents felt that economic stability and job security do have a positive impact on their self-efficacy, but the agreement is not extremely strong. The standard deviation of 1.238 indicates that there was some variation in responses, meaning that while many agreed to a moderate extent, there were also some who may have disagreed or had more varied opinions on this topic. In practical terms, this finding suggests that for many employees, having a stable financial situation and job security can contribute positively to their self-confidence and belief in their ability to perform well at work. However, it's important to note that individual perceptions and experiences can vary widely, and other factors may also influence self-efficacy (Etehadi & Karatepe, 2019).

The level of compensation I receive for my work affects how confident I feel in my abilities recorded the second highest average. This recorded an average of 3.17 with a corresponding

standard deviation of 1.378. On average, participants moderately agree that their compensation level impacts their confidence in their abilities. There is a moderate amount of variability in the responses. The provided mean score of 3.17 suggests that, on average, respondents in the survey moderately agreed with this statement. This means that, in the context of the survey, most respondents felt that the level of compensation does have an influence on their confidence in their abilities, but the agreement is not extremely strong. The standard deviation of 1.378 indicates that there was variability in responses, with some participants possibly feeling more strongly about the influence of compensation on their confidence, while others might have disagreed (Sabri, Wijekoon & Rahim, 2020).

In practical terms, this finding suggests that for many employees, the amount they are paid does play a role in their confidence levels at work. Higher compensation might lead to a greater sense of value and recognition, potentially contributing to increased confidence in their skills and abilities. However, it's important to note that this relationship can be complex, as other factors like job satisfaction, recognition, and personal fulfilment also contribute to one's overall sense of confidence at work.

Opportunities for career advancement contribute to my overall quality of work life recorded an average of 3.15 with corresponding standard deviation of 1.167. On average, participants moderately agree that career advancement opportunities contribute to their quality of work life. The responses vary moderately around the mean. The provided mean score of 3.15 suggests that, on average, respondents in the survey moderately agreed with this statement. This means that, in the context of the survey, most participants felt that career advancement opportunities do play a role in their overall quality of work life, but the agreement is not extremely strong. The standard

deviation of 1.167 indicates that there was some variability in responses, with differing opinions among participants regarding the extent to which career advancement impacts their work quality. In practical terms, this finding implies that many employees view the potential for career growth as an important factor in their job satisfaction and overall well-being. Opportunities for advancement can provide motivation, a sense of progress, and a feeling of being valued by the organization. However, it's important to acknowledge that not all individuals prioritize career advancement equally, and factors like work-life balance, workplace culture, and job contentment also play significant roles in overall work life quality.

A supportive and understanding work environment enhances my self-efficacy recorded the next higher average. This recorded an average of 3.12 with a corresponding standard deviation of 1.289. Participants moderately agree that a supportive work environment positively affects their self-efficacy. The responses have a moderate amount of variability. The provided mean score of 3.12 suggests that, on average, participants in the survey moderately agreed with this statement. This indicates that, within the context of the survey, most respondents believed that a supportive and understanding work environment indeed contributes to an enhancement in their self-efficacy. However, the agreement is not extremely strong. The standard deviation of 1.289 suggests that there was variation in responses, signifying that some participants may have had stronger beliefs in the impact of a supportive environment on their self-efficacy compared to others.

In practical terms, this finding suggests that workplaces that prioritize fostering a culture of support and understanding can have a positive influence on employees' belief in their own abilities. When individuals feel supported, valued, and understood by their colleagues and supervisors, they are more likely to feel capable and confident in their tasks. However, while a supportive environment

can contribute to self-efficacy, it's just one aspect among many that shape an individual's self-belief, and personal experiences, achievements, and perceptions also play essential roles.

I believe that my psychological well-being plays a crucial role in my performance at work recorded the next higher average. This recorded an average of 3.10 with a corresponding standard deviation of 1.243. On average, participants moderately agree that their psychological well-being is crucial for their work performance. The responses show a moderate level of variability. The statement asserts that the person acknowledges the integral connection between their mental and emotional well-being and their job performance. The provided mean score of 3.10 suggests that, on average, respondents in the survey moderately agreed with this statement. This indicates that, in the context of the survey, most participants felt that their psychological well-being indeed plays a crucial role in their work performance, though the agreement is not extremely strong. The standard deviation of 1.243 shows some variability in responses, suggesting that opinions differed among participants about the extent to which psychological well-being affects work performance. In practical terms, this finding suggests that many employees recognize the importance of maintaining good mental and emotional health for optimal job performance. Emotional well-being can impact focus, decision-making, stress management, and overall job satisfaction. While acknowledging the connection between psychological well-being and performance is important, it's also important to recognize that work-related factors and external stressors can influence mental well-being, and employers can play a role in promoting a healthy work environment that supports employees' mental health.

Adequate work-life balance positively influences my sense of self-efficacy recorded the next higher average. This recorded an average of 3.10 with a corresponding standard deviation of 1.251.

Participants moderately agree that work-life balance positively affects their self-efficacy. There is a moderate amount of variability in the responses. The statement asserts that maintaining a healthy balance between work and personal life has a positive effect on an individual's self-belief and confidence. The provided mean score of 3.10 suggests that, on average, respondents in the survey moderately agreed with this statement. This means that, in the context of the survey, most participants felt that having an adequate work-life balance indeed has a positive influence on their sense of self-efficacy, although the agreement is not extremely strong. The standard deviation of 1.251 indicates that there was some variability in responses, signifying those opinions differed among participants about the extent to which work-life balance affects their self-efficacy. In practical terms, this finding suggests that a balanced allocation of time and energy between work and personal life can contribute to individuals feeling more confident in their abilities. When people are able to manage their work responsibilities while also having time for relaxation and personal activities, they often experience reduced stress and a sense of control over their lives, which can positively impact their belief in their own capabilities. However, it's also important to recognize that the relationship between work-life balance and self-efficacy can be influenced by various individual factors, and achieving a balance might differ from person to person.

Feeling valued and recognized by my colleagues and superiors improves my quality of work life recorded an average of 3.08 with a corresponding standard deviation of 1.195. On average, participants moderately agree that feeling valued and recognized by colleagues and superiors enhances their quality of work life. The responses vary moderately around the mean.

Economic pressures, such as financial debts, negatively affect my confidence in performing job tasks recorded a higher average. This recorded an average of 3.07 with a corresponding standard deviation of 1.233. On average, participants moderately agree that economic pressures negatively

impact their job task confidence. The responses have a moderate level of variability. The statement asserts that financial difficulties can have a negative influence on an individual's self-confidence and performance at work. The provided mean score of 3.07 suggests that, on average, respondents in the survey moderately agreed with this statement. This means that, in the context of the survey, most participants felt that economic pressures like financial debts do have a negative impact on their job task confidence, although the agreement is not extremely strong. The standard deviation of 1.233 indicates some variability in responses, signifying differing opinions among participants regarding the extent to which economic pressures affect their confidence at work. In practical terms, this finding implies that financial stressors can indeed influence an individual's sense of self-confidence in performing their job tasks. Economic challenges can create distractions, anxiety, and reduced mental focus, which might lead to decreased self-efficacy. It's important for organizations to be aware of such external pressures and provide support mechanisms or resources to help employees manage these stressors and maintain their job performance. Additionally, this finding highlights the interconnectedness of personal finances and work performance and underscores the importance of holistic well-being support.

Positive relationships with co-workers contribute to my overall quality of work life recorded an average of 2.96 with a corresponding standard deviation of 1.294. On average, participants tend to agree (though less strongly) that positive relationships with co-workers enhance their quality of work life. The responses show a moderate amount of variability. The statement asserts that building positive relationships with colleagues plays a role in shaping an individual's overall job satisfaction and well-being. The provided mean score of 2.96 suggests that, on average, respondents in the survey tended to agree (though less strongly) with this statement. This indicates that, within the context of the survey, most participants felt that positive relationships with co-

workers do contribute to their overall quality of work life, but the agreement is not as pronounced as in some other statements. The standard deviation of 1.294 suggests that there was variability in responses, signifying differing opinions among participants about the extent to which relationships with co-workers impact their work quality. In practical terms, this finding suggests that having positive interactions and relationships with colleagues can contribute to a more pleasant and supportive work environment, which in turn can enhance job satisfaction and overall well-being. Collaborative teamwork, effective communication, and a sense of belonging within a team can create a more positive atmosphere, ultimately impacting employees' perception of their work life quality. However, it's also important to note that individual preferences and experiences may vary, and while positive relationships are valuable, they are just one of several factors that contribute to an individual's overall work experience.

My ability to cope with work-related stressors impacts my self-efficacy levels recorded an average of 2.23 with corresponding standard deviation of 1.021. On average, participants somewhat agree that their ability to cope with work-related stress affects their self-efficacy levels. The responses have relatively low variability.

The provided mean score of 2.23 suggests that, on average, respondents in the survey somewhat agreed with this statement. This indicates that, within the context of the survey, most participants felt that their ability to cope with work-related stressors does impact their self-efficacy levels, though the agreement is not particularly strong. The standard deviation of 1.021 suggests some variability in responses, signifying differing opinions among participants about the extent to which stress coping abilities affect their self-efficacy.

In practical terms, this finding suggests that an individual's confidence in their ability to perform effectively can be influenced by how well they manage the stressors and challenges that come with their job. Those who are more adept at handling stressors might maintain a higher sense of self-efficacy, while struggling to cope with stressors could potentially lead to lower self-belief. It emphasizes the importance of providing employees with stress management resources and support, as well as fostering a work environment that helps individuals build resilience and cope with the demands of their roles. However, it's also important to consider that self-efficacy is influenced by a combination of internal and external factors, and stress coping abilities are just one aspect among many.

The availability of skill development opportunities enhances my sense of self-efficacy recorded an average of 2.17 with a corresponding standard deviation of 1.125. On average, participants somewhat agree that skill development opportunities enhance their self-efficacy. The statement asserts that the presence of opportunities for skill development influences an individual's self-belief and self-efficacy. The provided mean score of 2.17 suggests that, on average, respondents in the survey somewhat agreed with this statement. This means that, within the context of the survey, most participants felt that having access to skill development opportunities does enhance their sense of self-efficacy, though the agreement is not particularly strong. The standard deviation of 1.125 indicates some variability in responses, suggesting differing opinions among participants about the extent to which skill development opportunities impact their self-efficacy. In practical terms, this finding suggests that individuals who have the chance to acquire new skills or enhance their existing ones may experience a boost in their confidence and belief in their abilities. The opportunity to learn and grow can lead to a greater sense of mastery and competence, potentially contributing to higher self-efficacy. Organizations that prioritize employee development and

provide opportunities for training and skill enhancement are likely to see positive effects on both employee self-confidence and overall performance. However, it's important to note that while skill development can impact self-efficacy, an individual's self-belief is also influenced by their achievements, experiences, and the support they receive from their work environment.

### **5.5 Recommendations to organizations to recognize the effect of employee’s self-efficacy on their QWL**

The fourth objective of the study was to analyse the recommendations to organisations to recognize the effect of employee’s self-efficacy on their quality work life of employees. The descriptive statistics was employed in analysing the study’s objectives.

**Table 10: Recommendations to organizations to recognize the effect of employee’s self-efficacy on their QWL**

| <b>Items</b>   | <b>Mean</b> | <b>Standard<br/>Deviation</b> |
|--|-------------|-------------------------------|
| The organization should provide opportunities for employees to set challenging goals, helping them build their self-efficacy.          | 3.00        | 1.181                         |
| Regular feedback and recognition from supervisors can positively influence an employee's belief in their capabilities and overall QWL. | 2.99        | 1.219                         |
| Offering training and skill development programs can contribute to improving an employee's self-efficacy and, consequently, their QWL. | 2.86        | 1.223                         |

---

|  |      |       |
|--|------|-------|
| Creating a supportive work environment that encourages open communication and teamwork can enhance employees' self-efficacy and QWL.           | 2.82 | 1.149 |
| Providing a clear career path and opportunities for advancement can help boost employees' self-efficacy and satisfaction with their work life. | 2.79 | 1.274 |
| Organizational policies that promote work-life balance can have a positive impact on employees' self-efficacy and overall QWL.                 | 2.78 | 1.177 |
| Acknowledging and utilizing employees' strengths can contribute to their self-efficacy and the quality of their work life.                     | 2.70 | 1.106 |
| Encouraging employees to take on new challenges and responsibilities can enhance their sense of self-efficacy and well-being.                  | 2.64 | 1.070 |
| Implementing flexible work arrangements can demonstrate that the organization values employees' self-efficacy and QWL.                         | 2.45 | 1.865 |
| Offering resources for stress management and mental well-being can support employees' self-efficacy and contribute to a positive QWL.          | 2.16 | 1.493 |

---

Table 10 presents the results of a survey aimed at understanding recommendations for organizations to recognize the effect of employee's self-efficacy on their Quality of Work Life (QWL). The table provides the mean scores and standard deviations for each recommendation

item. The mean score indicates the average level of agreement with each recommendation, while the standard deviation gives insight into the variability of responses around the mean.

The organization should provide opportunities for employees to set challenging goals, helping them build their self-efficacy recorded the highest average. This item recorded an average of 3.00 with a corresponding standard deviation of 1.181. On average, participants moderately agreed that organizations should offer opportunities for employees to set challenging goals, which in turn would help in building their self-efficacy. The responses varied moderately around this average.

Regular feedback and recognition from supervisors can positively influence an employee's belief in their capabilities and overall QWL recorded the second highest average. This recorded an average of 2.99 with a corresponding standard deviation of 1.219. On average, participants moderately agreed that regular feedback and recognition from supervisors can positively impact an employee's self-belief and overall Quality of Work Life (QWL). The responses had a moderate amount of variability. The statement asserts that frequent feedback and recognition from supervisors can contribute to an employee's self-belief and overall well-being in the workplace. The provided mean score of 2.99 suggests that, on average, participants in the survey moderately agreed with this statement. This indicates that, within the context of the survey, most participants felt that regular feedback and recognition from supervisors can indeed positively influence an employee's self-belief and their Quality of Work Life. The standard deviation of 1.219 suggests some variability in responses, signifying differing opinions among participants about the extent to which feedback and recognition impact employees' beliefs and QWL.

In practical terms, this finding suggests that consistent feedback and recognition play a crucial role in employee development and job satisfaction. When supervisors provide constructive feedback, it helps employees understand their strengths and areas for improvement, enhancing their self-confidence. Additionally, recognizing and appreciating employees' efforts can contribute to a positive work environment, motivation, and overall job satisfaction. However, it's important for feedback and recognition to be genuine, specific, and timely to have the desired positive effect on employee self-efficacy and QWL.

Offering training and skill development programs can contribute to improving an employee's self-efficacy and, consequently, their QWL recorded the third highest average. This recorded an average of 2.86 with a corresponding standard deviation of 1.223. On average, participants somewhat agreed that providing training and skill development programs can contribute to improving an employee's self-efficacy and QWL. The responses showed a moderate level of variability. The statement asserts that offering training and skill development opportunities can lead to increased self-efficacy and an improved Quality of Work Life for employees. The provided mean score of 2.86 suggests that, on average, participants in the survey somewhat agreed with this statement. This means that, within the context of the survey, most participants felt that offering training and skill development programs can indeed contribute to improving employee self-efficacy and their overall Quality of Work Life. The standard deviation of 1.223 suggests some variability in responses, indicating differing opinions among participants about the extent to which skill development impacts self-efficacy and QWL. In practical terms, this finding emphasizes the importance of ongoing learning and development opportunities for employees. When employees are provided with chances to acquire new skills or enhance their existing ones, it can lead to increased confidence in their abilities. This, in turn, can positively impact their job performance

and overall satisfaction in their work. Organizations that invest in employee development through training and skill enhancement programs demonstrate their commitment to employee growth and contribute to a more positive work environment. However, it's essential to align these programs with employees' needs and career goals to ensure their effectiveness.

Creating a supportive work environment that encourages open communication and teamwork can enhance employees' self-efficacy and QWL recorded an average of 2.82 with a corresponding standard deviation of 1.149. On average, participants somewhat agreed that a supportive work environment with open communication and teamwork can enhance employees' self-efficacy and QWL. The responses varied moderately around the mean. The statement asserts that a work environment that prioritizes support, communication, and collaboration can contribute to higher self-efficacy and overall QWL for employees. The provided mean score of 2.82 suggests that, on average, participants in the survey somewhat agreed with this statement. This means that, within the context of the survey, most participants felt that creating a supportive work environment that encourages open communication and teamwork can indeed enhance employee self-efficacy and their Quality of Work Life. The standard deviation of 1.149 indicates some variability in responses, signifying differing opinions among participants about the extent to which a supportive environment impacts self-efficacy and QWL. In practical terms, this finding highlights the importance of organizational culture in influencing employee well-being and self-belief. When employees feel supported, heard, and encouraged to collaborate with their colleagues, they are likely to experience greater job satisfaction, more confidence in their abilities, and an improved work-life balance. Organizations that prioritize these aspects contribute to a positive work environment that fosters personal and professional growth. However, it's crucial to ensure that the

organization's actions align with its communication about creating a supportive environment, as employees' perceptions of support can impact their self-efficacy and overall job satisfaction.

Providing a clear career path and opportunities for advancement can help boost employees' self-efficacy and satisfaction with their work life recorded an average of 2.79 with a corresponding standard deviation of 1.274. On average, participants somewhat agreed that offering a clear career path and opportunities for advancement can boost employees' self-efficacy and satisfaction with their work life. The responses showed a moderate amount of variability. The statement asserts that a well-defined career path and opportunities for advancement can have a positive impact on employee self-efficacy and work life satisfaction. The provided mean score of 2.79 suggests that, on average, participants in the survey somewhat agreed with this statement. This means that, within the context of the survey, most participants felt that offering a clear career path and advancement opportunities can indeed help boost employee self-efficacy and their satisfaction with their work life. The standard deviation of 1.274 indicates some variability in responses, signifying differing opinions among participants about the extent to which career advancement impacts self-efficacy and work life satisfaction. In practical terms, this finding emphasizes the role of career growth opportunities in motivating and engaging employees. When employees see a clear path for their professional development and can envision their progression within the organization, they are likely to feel more motivated and confident in their abilities. Additionally, a clear career path can enhance employees' sense of security and investment in their job, leading to improved work life satisfaction. Organizations that provide these opportunities demonstrate their commitment to employee growth and retention, which can have positive effects on both individual and organizational success. However, it's important to align these opportunities with employees'

aspirations and provide the necessary support and training for them to succeed in their advanced roles.

Organizational policies that promote work-life balance can have a positive impact on employees' self-efficacy and overall QWL recorded an average of 2.78 with a corresponding standard deviation of 1.177. On average, participants somewhat agreed that organizational policies promoting work-life balance can positively impact employees' self-efficacy and overall QWL. The responses varied moderately around the mean. The statement asserts that implementing policies that support work-life balance can contribute to enhanced self-efficacy and overall Quality of Work Life for employees. The provided mean score of 2.78 suggests that, on average, participants in the survey somewhat agreed with this statement. This means that, within the context of the survey, most participants felt that having organizational policies that promote work-life balance can indeed have a positive impact on employee self-efficacy and their overall Quality of Work Life. The standard deviation of 1.177 indicates some variability in responses, signifying differing opinions among participants about the extent to which work-life balance policies impact self-efficacy and QWL. In practical terms, this finding underscores the importance of creating an environment where employees can effectively manage their work and personal responsibilities. When employees have the flexibility to balance their commitments, they are more likely to experience reduced stress, increased job satisfaction, and a stronger sense of control over their lives. This, in turn, can contribute to higher self-efficacy and an improved overall work experience. Organizations that prioritize work-life balance demonstrate their commitment to the well-being of their employees, which can lead to improved morale, retention, and productivity. However, it's important to implement these policies thoughtfully, considering the unique needs of employees and the demands of the organization.

Acknowledging and utilizing employees' strengths can contribute to their self-efficacy and the quality of their work life recorded an average of 2.70 with a corresponding standard deviation of 1.106. On average, participants somewhat agreed that acknowledging and utilizing employees' strengths can contribute to their self-efficacy and work life quality. The responses showed a moderate level of variability. The statement asserts that recognizing and utilizing employees' strengths can positively influence both their self-efficacy and their overall work life quality. The provided mean score of 2.70 suggests that, on average, participants in the survey somewhat agreed with this statement. This means that, within the context of the survey, most participants felt that acknowledging and utilizing employees' strengths can indeed contribute to their self-efficacy and the quality of their work life. The standard deviation of 1.106 indicates some variability in responses, signifying differing opinions among participants about the extent to which recognizing strengths impacts self-efficacy and work life quality. In practical terms, this finding highlights the importance of leveraging the talents and skills that employees bring to the organization. When employees are recognized for their strengths and given opportunities to utilize them in their roles, they are likely to feel valued and more confident in their abilities. This, in turn, can lead to improved job satisfaction and an overall positive work experience. Organizations that embrace this approach foster a culture of appreciation, personal growth, and empowerment. However, it's essential to ensure that employees' strengths are aligned with their roles and responsibilities and that they are given the necessary resources and support to effectively contribute using their strengths.

Encouraging employees to take on new challenges and responsibilities can enhance their sense of self-efficacy and well-being recorded an average of 2.64 with a corresponding standard deviation of 1.070. On average, participants somewhat agreed that encouraging employees to take on new

challenges and responsibilities can enhance their self-efficacy and well-being. The responses had a moderate amount of variability. The statement asserts that encouraging employees to step out of their comfort zones and embrace new challenges can have a positive impact on both their self-efficacy and their overall well-being. The provided mean score of 2.64 suggests that, on average, participants in the survey somewhat agreed with this statement. This means that, within the context of the survey, most participants felt that encouraging employees to take on new challenges can indeed enhance their self-efficacy and well-being. The standard deviation of 1.070 indicates some variability in responses, signifying differing opinions among participants about the extent to which taking on new challenges impacts self-efficacy and well-being. In practical terms, this finding underscores the value of offering employees opportunities to grow and expand their skills by tackling new challenges. When employees are supported in stepping outside their comfort zones, they are likely to experience personal growth, increased confidence, and a sense of achievement. This, in turn, can positively impact their overall well-being and job satisfaction. Organizations that foster a culture of learning and development encourage employees to continuously strive for improvement and contribute to a positive and dynamic work environment. However, it's important to ensure that the challenges are meaningful and aligned with employees' skills and aspirations, as well as providing the necessary guidance and support for success.

Implementing flexible work arrangements can demonstrate that the organization values employees' self-efficacy and QWL recorded an average of 2.45 with a corresponding standard deviation of 1.865. On average, participants somewhat agreed that implementing flexible work arrangements can demonstrate that the organization values employees' self-efficacy and QWL. The responses showed a higher level of variability compared to other items. The statement asserts that offering flexible work arrangements can communicate that the organization values employee's self-

efficacy and their overall Quality of Work Life. The provided mean score of 2.45 suggests that, on average, participants in the survey somewhat agreed with this statement. This means that, within the context of the survey, most participants felt that implementing flexible work arrangements can indeed demonstrate the organization's recognition of employees' self-efficacy and their Quality of Work Life. The higher standard deviation of 1.865 indicates more variability in responses compared to other items, signifying differing opinions among participants about the extent to which flexible work arrangements impact self-efficacy and QWL. In practical terms, this finding underscores the significance of offering flexibility to employees as a way to promote work-life balance and recognize their ability to manage their tasks responsibly. When employees are granted the autonomy to adapt their work to their personal needs, it can lead to increased job satisfaction, reduced stress, and a greater sense of control. By adopting such arrangements, organizations show that they value their employees' well-being and trust in their capacity to deliver results even without rigid work structures. However, it's important to implement flexible arrangements equitably and transparently, considering the needs of both employees and the organization's operational requirements.

Offering resources for stress management and mental well-being can support employees' self-efficacy and contribute to a positive QWL recorded an average of 2.16 with a corresponding standard deviation of 1.493. On average, participants somewhat agreed that providing resources for stress management and mental well-being can support employees' self-efficacy and contribute to a positive QWL. The responses showed a higher level of variability. The statement asserts that providing resources for stress management and mental well-being can have a positive impact on both employee self-efficacy and their overall Quality of Work Life. The provided mean score of 2.16 suggests that, on average, participants in the survey somewhat agreed with this statement.

This means that, within the context of the survey, most participants felt that offering resources for stress management and mental well-being can indeed support employees' self-efficacy and contribute to a positive Quality of Work Life. The standard deviation of 1.493 indicates some variability in responses, signifying differing opinions among participants about the extent to which these resources impact self-efficacy and QWL. In practical terms, this finding underscores the importance of prioritizing employees' mental health and well-being. When organizations offer resources and support for managing stress, maintaining mental wellness, and achieving work-life balance, it can lead to reduced burnout, increased job satisfaction, and greater overall productivity. Employees who feel that their organization cares about their mental well-being are likely to have higher self-esteem and belief in their capabilities. It also helps create a positive work culture where employees are supported in managing the demands of their roles and personal lives. However, it's essential for organizations to provide a range of resources and support options to cater to diverse needs and ensure that employees feel comfortable utilizing these resources without stigma.

## **5.6 Qualitative Analysis**

### **5.6.1 Evaluate the degree of self-efficacy and Quality of Work Life among employees:**

In relations to the degree of self-efficacy and quality of work life among employees, four of the respondents were interviewed.

According to respondents 1, *“moderate self-efficacy is expressed by employees when they feel confident in their task performance. Workload and interpersonal issues affect their Quality of Work Life, providing space for development.”*

Respondent 2 claimed that, *“employees' self-efficacy varies by task difficulty. Work-life balance, job satisfaction, and organizational support affect Quality of Work Life, emphasizing the need for a comprehensive approach to employee well-being.”*

Also, according to respondent 3, *“employee narratives show that self-efficacy is closely linked to workload, task complexity, and supervisor support. Work connections, corporate culture, and personal growth possibilities shape employees' quality of work life.”*

Respondent 4 claimed that, *“Through a comprehensive analysis of employee perceptions, it is apparent that self-efficacy is intricately tied to the level of autonomy and decision-making authority. The Quality of Work Life is influenced by factors such as work-life balance, job significance, and the availability of resources, indicating the need for tailored interventions to enhance employee experiences.”*

The replies indicate that employees have moderate self-efficacy. This shows that employees are generally confident in their task-handling abilities, but not always. Respondent highlights that work complexity affects self-efficacy. Employees may feel more or less confident based on the nature and difficulty of their tasks.

Multiple respondents cite work-life balance, job satisfaction, and organizational support as major elements affecting work life. Thus, boosting employee well-being requires addressing these concerns. Respondents also note that workload and interpersonal issues affect work life quality. These difficulties must be addressed to improve employees' work experiences.

Respondents recommend evaluating work-life balance, job satisfaction, and organizational support in addition to self-efficacy to improve employee well-being. This theme suggests a holistic approach to boost employee satisfaction and productivity. Respondents 3 and 4 emphasize the complex relationship between self-efficacy and job life. Workload, task complexity, supervisor support, autonomy, and decision-making authority affect self-efficacy and work life quality.

Respondent 4 offers personalized interventions to improve employee experiences. This suggests that firms should tailor their efforts to specific elements affecting self-efficacy and work life. In

conclusion, the respondents' remarks show that self-efficacy and work life quality are intertwined, that many things affect both, and that comprehensive and targeted measures are needed to increase employee well-being.

### **5.6.2 Identify the relationship between employees' self-efficacy and Quality of work life:**

In order to identify the relationship between employees' self-efficacy and quality of work of work-life, four of the respondents were interviewed.

Respondent 1 stated that, *“Self-efficacy and work life quality seem to go along. High self-efficacy leads to improved work-life experiences, while low self-efficacy leads to work-related pressures and lower workplace quality of life.”*

Also, respondent 2 stated that *“High-self-efficacy employees are proactive in solving problems, improving their Quality of Work Life. However, those with poor self-efficacy struggle with work-related pressures, reducing job satisfaction.”*

Respondent 3 stated that *“The association between self-efficacy and Quality of Work Life shows that it promotes resilience and adaptation. Employees who trust in themselves are more likely to approach obstacles positively, which boosts job satisfaction.”*

Respondent 4 found that, *“the interplay between self-efficacy and Quality of Work Life is dynamic; employees with a strong belief in their capabilities demonstrate higher resilience in the face of challenges. This resilience contributes to an improved work-life balance, job satisfaction, and positive interpersonal relationships, collectively shaping a more enriching professional experience.”*

Self-efficacy and work life quality are linked, according to Respondents 1 and 2. High self-efficacy leads to improved work-life experiences, while low self-efficacy leads to work-related pressures

and lower workplace quality of life. Respondent 2 underlines that high-self-efficacy individuals are proactive in solving problems, improving their work life. This implies that self-confidence can improve professional satisfaction.

Respondent 3 says self-efficacy boosts resilience and adaptation. Confident employees approach obstacles with a positive attitude, improving work satisfaction. Respondent 4 says self-efficacy and work life quality are dynamic. Confident employees are more resilient, improving work-life balance, job satisfaction, and relationships. This dynamic association shows that self-efficacy affects job experiences continuously.

Respondents 1 and 2 note that employees with low self-efficacy suffer with work-related pressures, lowering their job satisfaction. This theme emphasizes self-efficacy to reduce stress and boost satisfaction. Respondent 3 and Respondent 4 said self-efficacy's positive outlook enriches work. This encompasses work-life balance, career happiness, and good relationships.

In conclusion, the respondents' responses show that self-efficacy and work life quality are interrelated and dynamic. Positive self-efficacy is linked to proactive approaches, resilience, and overall contentment, while poor self-efficacy is linked to work-related stress and decreased professional satisfaction.

### **5.6.3 Learn how certain economic and psychological factors of employees influence their self-efficacy and Quality Work life**

In order to learn how certain economic and psychological factors of employees influence their self-efficacy and Quality Work life, four of the respondents were interviewed.

Respondent 1 claimed that *“Economic factors such as salary satisfaction and job security significantly impact employees' self-efficacy. Additionally, psychological factors like perceived control over work decisions and a supportive work environment contribute positively to both self-efficacy and overall Quality of Work Life.”*

Respondent 2 stated that *“Economic factors, such as competitive salaries and performance incentives, play a role in bolstering self-efficacy. On the psychological front, factors like autonomy in decision-making and a positive work environment contribute significantly to a sense of control and well-being, thereby enhancing both self-efficacy and Quality of Work Life.”*

Respondent 3 also said that *“Economic factors, such as job security and financial stability, provide a foundation for self-efficacy, while psychological factors like perceived fairness in promotions and a sense of belonging impact overall Quality of Work Life. Acknowledging and addressing these dual dimensions can significantly contribute to employee well-being.”*

Respondent 4 also stated that *“Economic factors, including fair compensation and opportunities for career advancement, bolster employees' self-efficacy. On the psychological front, factors such as a supportive work culture and meaningful engagement with tasks contribute to a positive Quality of Work Life. Organizations need to recognize and address these multifaceted influences to optimize employee well-being.”*

Economic issues like wage satisfaction, job stability, competitive salaries, and career progression affect employees' self-efficacy, according to all respondents. These economic elements boost financial security and professional confidence. Psychological variables including perceived control over work decisions, autonomy in decision-making, a supportive work environment, perceived justice in promotions, and a sense of belonging are repeatedly stressed by respondents. These psychological elements improve employees' sense of control, well-being, and belonging, boosting self-efficacy and work life quality.

Respondent 3 notes that economic considerations support self-efficacy while psychological elements affect work life quality. For complete employee well-being, these factors must be

addressed together. Respondent 4 stresses the necessity of firms recognizing and addressing multiple employee well-being effects. This theme provides a comprehensive strategy that considers economic and psychological issues like fair salary, career advancement, supportive work culture, and meaningful task involvement. Economic and psychological variables affect employee well-being. Positively addressing these issues can boost self-efficacy and work life quality, producing a better workplace for employees.

The respondents' statements show that economic and psychological aspects affect employees' self-efficacy and work life quality. These dual aspects and the necessity for a complete strategy highlight the complexity of employee well-being considerations.

### **5.6.3 Make recommendations to organizations to recognize the effect of employee's self-efficacy on their QWL**

In order to make recommendations to organizations to recognize the effect of employee's self-efficacy on their QWL, four of the respondents were interviewed.

According to respondent 1, *“organizations should focus on fostering a positive work culture that nurtures employees' self-efficacy by providing training opportunities and acknowledging achievements. Implementing flexible work arrangements, promoting open communication, and addressing economic concerns can collectively enhance employees' Quality of Work Life and, consequently, organizational productivity.”*

Respondent 2 also claimed that; *“organizations are encouraged to invest in professional development programs to boost employees' self-efficacy. Recognizing and rewarding achievements, fostering a collaborative and inclusive workplace culture, and addressing economic concerns through fair compensation practices are key strategies to elevate both self-efficacy and overall Quality of Work Life.”*

Respondent 3 stated that *“organizations should prioritize initiatives that empower employees, including skills development programs, mentorship opportunities, and a transparent performance appraisal process. Additionally, fostering a culture of open communication, where employees feel heard and valued, can positively influence both self-efficacy and the overall Quality of Work Life within the organizational context.”*

Respondent 4 claimed that *“organizations are urged to implement mentorship programs to foster a supportive environment and provide avenues for employees to develop their skills. Recognizing and addressing economic concerns through competitive salaries and benefits, coupled with initiatives to enhance psychological well-being, can collectively elevate both self-efficacy and Quality of Work Life.”*

Respondents 1, 2, and 3 stress the importance of a positive workplace. This includes providing training, acknowledging accomplishments, investing in professional growth, and fostering a collaborative and inclusive workplace atmosphere. Respondent 2 and 3 continually promote professional development programs that empower employees through skills development. This topic emphasizes that companies should actively engage in employee skills and competencies to increase self-efficacy and QWL.

Respondents 1 and 2 propose praising accomplishments. Recognizing employees' efforts and accomplishments boosts self-efficacy and QWL.

Respondent 3 says transparent communication affects self-efficacy and QWL. This creates a positive work atmosphere by making people feel heard, respected, and informed.

Respondent 1 recommends organizations implement flexible work arrangements. Flexibility in work schedules and arrangements can improve employees' QWL by meeting their requirements and preferences.

Respondents 1, 2, and 4 stress economic issues. Fair pay, competitive salaries, and benefits are included. To improve self-efficacy and QWL, this theme emphasizes financial issues.

Mentorship programmes are suggested by respondents 3 and 4 to provide a helpful environment. Mentorship can improve employees' skills, mental health, and QWL, according to this theme.

Multiple proposals offer a holistic approach to employee well-being. This encompasses economic and psychological issues, pleasant culture, development possibilities, and open communication.

In conclusion, respondents' ideas illustrate multiple techniques businesses may use to recognize and improve employee self-efficacy's impact on Quality of Work Life. These guidelines create a healthy and supportive workplace that boosts employee and company productivity.

## **5.7 Discussion**

Employee self-efficacy refers to an individual's belief in their ability to successfully perform specific tasks or reach certain goals. The concept of self-efficacy, proposed by psychologist Albert Bandura, plays a significant role in influencing various aspects of an individual's work life, including the quality of work.

Employees with high self-efficacy are more likely to set challenging goals for themselves and believe in their ability to achieve them. This confidence can positively impact their job performance, leading to higher quality work.

Individuals with a strong sense of self-efficacy are generally more motivated and willing to put in the effort required to accomplish tasks. This motivation can contribute to sustained high performance and an increased sense of accomplishment in the workplace.

High self-efficacy is associated with greater resilience in the face of challenges and setbacks. Employees who believe in their capabilities are more likely to persevere through difficulties, adapt to changes, and maintain a positive attitude, contributing to an improved work environment.

#### Job Satisfaction:

Employees with a strong sense of self-efficacy tend to experience higher job satisfaction. When individuals feel confident in their ability to perform well, they are more likely to find their work fulfilling and satisfying, contributing to an overall positive work experience.

#### Reduced Stress:

Higher self-efficacy is often linked to lower levels of stress. Employees who believe they can effectively manage their tasks and challenges are less likely to experience stress and burnout, creating a more positive and healthy work environment.

#### Communication and Collaboration:

Individuals with high self-efficacy may be more inclined to communicate effectively and collaborate with colleagues. A belief in one's ability to contribute positively to team efforts can enhance teamwork and the overall quality of work produced.

#### Career Development:

Self-efficacious individuals are more likely to actively pursue career development opportunities. This proactive approach to learning and growth can lead to increased skills and expertise, further enhancing the quality of work produced.

Employee self-efficacy can have a profound impact on various aspects of work life. A strong sense of self-efficacy is associated with higher motivation, performance, job satisfaction, and overall well-being, creating a positive and productive work environment. Employers and managers can

play a role in fostering and supporting employee self-efficacy through training, recognition, and creating a supportive workplace culture.

The quality of work life is influenced by a combination of economic and psychological factors. Both of these factors can significantly impact an individual's experience in the workplace and contribute to overall job satisfaction and well-being.

Adequate and fair compensation is a fundamental economic factor that contributes to the quality of work life. Employees who feel they are fairly rewarded for their efforts are more likely to experience job satisfaction and a positive work environment.

Economic stability and job security play a crucial role in an individual's well-being. Employees who feel secure in their positions are likely to have higher job satisfaction and a better overall quality of work life.

Economic factors influence the availability of career development opportunities within an organization. Access to training, promotions, and career advancement can positively impact an employee's perception of their work life.

Economic factors, such as the availability of paid time off and flexible work arrangements, can impact an individual's ability to maintain a healthy work-life balance. Adequate resources and support can contribute to improved well-being.

The nature of the work itself can have psychological implications. Jobs that provide a sense of challenge, variety, and autonomy can positively impact an employee's psychological well-being, leading to a higher quality of work life.

The quality of relationships and social support within the workplace is a significant psychological factor. Positive interactions with colleagues and supervisors contribute to a supportive work environment and can enhance overall job satisfaction.

The degree of autonomy and control an individual has over their work can influence their psychological well-being. Employees who have a sense of control over their tasks and decision-making processes may experience higher job satisfaction.

Psychological factors related to recognition and feedback play a crucial role in the quality of work life. Employees who receive regular feedback and feel recognized for their contributions are likely to experience a more positive work environment.

The perception of the meaning and purpose of one's work is a significant psychological factor. Individuals who find their work meaningful and aligned with their values are more likely to have a higher quality of work life.

Psychological factors also include the impact of stress on an individual's mental health. High levels of stress and the absence of coping mechanisms can negatively affect the overall quality of work life.

Economic and psychological factors are interconnected and jointly contribute to the quality of work life. A balance between fair compensation, job security, and career development opportunities, along with positive psychological factors such as meaningful work, social support, and job satisfaction, creates an environment conducive to a high quality of work life. Employers and organizations can enhance the overall well-being of employees by addressing both economic and psychological aspects of the workplace.

Employees demonstrate varying levels of self-efficacy, influenced by factors like workload and support. Quality of Work Life is intricately tied to work relationships, organizational culture, and growth opportunities.

There's a clear correlation between high self-efficacy and a positive work environment, leading to increased job satisfaction and an overall enhanced Quality of Work Life. Conversely, low self-efficacy is associated with heightened stress and dissatisfaction.

Economic factors, including job security and fair compensation, contribute to a sense of security and confidence. Psychological factors, such as leadership support and recognition, significantly influence self-efficacy and overall Quality of Work Life.

Organizations are advised to invest in professional development, mentorship programs, and transparent communication to empower employees. Recognizing economic concerns through competitive compensation and addressing psychological well-being collectively contribute to an elevated self-efficacy and Quality of Work Life.

In summary, a holistic approach that considers both economic and psychological aspects is crucial for fostering a positive work environment, enhancing self-efficacy, and ultimately improving the Quality of Work Life for employees.

## **6 Conclusion**

An investigation on the impact that employees' self-efficacy has on the quality of their work lives was carried out with the assistance of the Ayawaso North Municipal Assembly. The research was conducted with a total of 128 participants, 90 of whom were male and 38 of whom were female. According to the findings of the survey, all of the respondents had a high level of education, with some holding postgraduate degrees and others holding first degrees. A further observation that was made was that not a single one of the responders had been employed at the assembly for more than fifteen years. Eighty percent of those who participated in the survey are between the ages of 18 and 50. Approximately sixty percent of the people who participated in the survey have an income that is greater than three thousand Ghana cedis. In order to assist workers in mitigating the effects of growing costs of living, the government increased incomes by thirty percent in response to the economic difficulties and the depreciation of the cedi.

Although the employees of the Ayawaso Municipal Assembly had a high degree of self-efficacy, the quality of work life (QWL) that they experienced was substantially lower, according to the findings of the study that was carried out on them. The high level of self-efficacy was discovered by Boateng and Sekyere (2018), who conducted an investigation into the self-efficacy of in-service teachers in Ghana when they were teaching in kindergarten classrooms. The findings of their investigation revealed that in-service teachers in Ghana have a high level of self-efficacy when it comes to teaching kindergarten students. It appears from this that self-efficacy has a considerable influence on the quality of work life (QWL) of employees, and that there is a positive association between the two components. There is no denying that an individual's self-efficacy is directly proportional to the degree to which they have confidence in their capacity to complete a task.

Education, income, and experience were also found to have a favorable link with self-efficacy, according to the findings of the study. Based on the results of the ANOVA test, it was shown that the level of self-efficacy increased in proportion to the level of education, wealth, and experience. This finding is in line with the findings of Salifu and Odame (2023), who conducted an investigation into the influence of demographic variables on the self-efficacy of teachers working in various universities in Ghana. They discovered that gender, age, academic qualifications, and years of experience all had a significant relationship with self-efficacy. To be more specific, the

research discovered that higher levels of self-efficacy among instructors were connected with higher degrees of academic qualifications and years of experience.

There was also a correlation between the educational background of employees and their quality of work life, as was discovered by the study. This is due to the fact that education and the abilities that are obtained via education are vital in the performance of things that are related to the job, which in turn influences the quality of life that employees have while they are working. Another thing that was found out was that the amount of time an employee has spent working has an effect on their sense of self-efficacy. Employees who have more experience in their current position are more likely to have higher levels of self-efficacy and better quality of work life (QWL).

In addition, it was discovered that the amount of income had a favorable influence that was statistically significant on both self-efficacy and quality of work life. According to the findings of the study, the lower level of QWL can be related to the associated financial rewards. There exists a positive correlation between QWL and financial benefits. The findings of previous studies, which have discovered a connection between financial rewards and job happiness, organizational commitment, and quality of work life, lend credence to this assertion. This suggests that businesses ought to give careful consideration to the significance of providing their employees with financial security, a work-life balance, and general well-being.

To summarize, the findings of the study highlight the fact that insufficient financial rewards might have a detrimental effect on an individual's quality of existence. In addition to strengthening their employees' self-efficacy, education, and work experience, employers should prioritize the improvement of their employees' financial stability in order to increase their quality of work life (QWL) overall. It is possible to improve the general well-being of employees, as well as their job happiness and productivity, by providing them with financial perks such as fair compensation, bonuses, and health insurance.

According to the Self-Determination Theory (SDT), the elements that inspire and promote an individual's well-being and optimal functioning are the primary emphasis of the theory. The theory proposes that individuals have fundamental psychological requirements for autonomy, competence, and relatedness, and that when these needs are satisfied, individuals enjoy increased levels of motivation, well-being, and general quality of life. Despite the fact that SDT focuses

mostly on more general life contexts, its ideas are applicable to a variety of different areas, including the occupational setting.

On the other side, self-efficacy is a term that originates from the Social Cognitive Theory developed by Albert D. Bandura. The belief that an individual has in their own capacity to complete activities and accomplish goals is what is meant by this term. Relationships between self-efficacy and performance, motivation, and the manner in which individuals approach and react to problems are intrinsically linked.

There is no specific discussion of the connection between self-efficacy and the quality of one's work life within the framework of the Self-Determination Theory. The Self-Determination Theory (SDT) places primary emphasis on the components that influence total well-being, specifically intrinsic motivation, autonomy, competence, and relatedness. Despite the fact that self-efficacy might play a role in an individual's perception of their own level of competence, it does not immediately correspond with the SDT's emphasis on the fulfillment of psychological needs and the drive that comes from inside.

The demand for competence that is associated with SDT is congruent with the idea of self-efficacy. An individual's sense of competence, which contributes to their overall well-being, is enhanced when they have faith in their capacity to carry out activities and achieve success. There is a connection between the empowerment that comes from having self-efficacy and the focus that SDT places on autonomy. Individuals who have a high level of self-efficacy are more likely to assume responsibility for their own duties and responsibilities, which contributes to a sense of autonomy.

Despite the fact that SDT's relatedness is concerned with social connections, it is important to keep in mind that self-efficacy beliefs can be influenced by both positive interactions and an environment that seems supportive. Both supportive coworkers and superiors have the potential to have a good impact on an individual's sense of self-assurance.

In essence, despite the fact that Self-Determination Theory does not directly address the connection between self-efficacy and quality of work life, there are similarities between the two notions. The development of self-efficacy beliefs in individuals can be indirectly influenced by a workplace that encourages autonomy, competence, and relatedness. This, in turn, can have an effect on how individuals perceive their Quality of Work Life. On the other hand, the two theories

focus on different aspects of motivation and well-being, and any conclusions that are formed regarding the relationship between them should be drawn after giving due thought to the frameworks that each theory makes use of.

Employees exhibit varying levels of self-efficacy, influenced by factors such as workload, task complexity, and organizational support.

Quality of Work Life is shaped by factors including work relationships, organizational culture, work-life balance, and personal growth opportunities.

There is a clear positive correlation between high self-efficacy and a positive work environment, leading to increased job satisfaction and an overall enhanced Quality of Work Life.

Economic factors, like fair compensation and job security, impact the sense of security and confidence. Psychological factors, such as leadership support, recognition, and opportunities for skill development, significantly influence self-efficacy and overall Quality of Work Life.

Organizations are encouraged to invest in professional development, mentorship programs, and transparent communication to empower employees. Recognizing economic concerns through competitive compensation and addressing psychological well-being are crucial for enhancing both self-efficacy and Quality of Work Life.

In essence, creating a positive work environment, offering professional growth opportunities, and addressing both economic and psychological aspects are key to fostering high self-efficacy and improving the overall Quality of Work Life for employees.

## **6.1 Recommendation**

Based on the findings of the study, it is of utmost importance for managers to instill confidence in their staff by persuading them that they possess the necessary expertise and experience to achieve success. When managers provide verbal encouragement to their employees, it helps those workers overcome feelings of self-doubt and enables them to concentrate on putting up their best effort in completing the task at hand. This is a significant benefit for the organization. As a result, this increases their sense of self-efficacy, which in turn motivates workers to exert the necessary amount of effort in order to accomplish their objectives.

Additionally, the findings of the study indicate that older workers in firms can serve as a model for younger workers by displaying the significance of working hard and keeping consistent in their efforts to enhance their sense of self-efficacy. This is especially important for younger workers who are just starting out in their careers. It is through the exhibition of particular qualities and behaviors that he serves as a role model. He places particular emphasis on the need of working diligently and remaining consistent in their efforts. There is a possibility that older workers have established a strong work ethic as a result of their experience and length of service in the organization. Making a commitment to their task, exerting the requisite amount of effort, and remaining steadfast in the face of obstacles are all required to do this. By demonstrating these characteristics, elder workers demonstrate to younger employees the value of working diligently and consistently in order to achieve success in their professional lives. In the context of older workers, the concept of maintaining consistency in their efforts implies that they continually apply themselves to the tasks and responsibilities they have during the course of their careers. This dependability and consistency can have a significant impact on younger workers, underlining the significance of dedication and perseverance in their efforts to advance their careers. The reason for this is that when people watch other people who are similar to themselves achieve success as a consequence of consistent work, it strengthens their trust that they, too, are capable of mastering things that are comparable to what they are doing. Younger workers in the organization may experience an increase in their overall sense of self-efficacy and motivation as a result of this, which may be helpful to the organization as a whole.

In addition, the research underlines how essential it is for management to provide improved working conditions, increased pay and salary, benefits, allowances, and other considerations in order to ensure that the employees' well-being and happiness are given the appropriate amount of attention while they are on the job. Workers who are satisfied with their working circumstances and compensation are more likely to have higher levels of self-efficacy and a better quality of work life (QWL). This is because workers are more likely to feel that they are able to achieve their goals. Consequently, this can result in higher levels of organizational dedication, greater levels of output, and enhanced levels of job satisfaction.

In overall, the findings of the study demonstrate how crucial it is for managers and organizations to take action in order to support and enhance the self-efficacy and quality of work life (QWL) of their employees. The provision of verbal support to employees, possibilities for growth and development, and the guarantee that the employees' safety and happiness are taken into mind at all times are all ways in which this objective can be realized. When businesses take these steps, they are able to create a positive environment at work that not only contributes to the success of the company as a whole but also to the well-being of its employees.

## 7. References

- Adams, N., Little, T. D., & Ryan, R. M. (2017). Self-determination theory. *Development of self-determination through the life-course*, 47-54.
- Afriyie, N., Melyoki, L. L., & Nchimbi, M. (2020). The influence of employee self-efficacy, outcome expectation and firm resources on intrapreneurial behaviour: insight from Ghana. *Athens journal of business & economics*, 6(4), 349-376.
- Ahmad, S., & Jabeen, S. (2016). The relationship of financial rewards with job satisfaction and organizational commitment among employees of banking sector. *Journal of Business and Management*, 18(6), 22-29.
- Ajzen, I. (1980). Understanding attitudes and predicting social behavior. *Englewood cliffs*.
- Alvesson, M. (2018). *Organization theory and technocratic consciousness: Rationality, ideology and quality of work* (Vol. 8). Walter de Gruyter GmbH & Co KG.
- Alvi, M. (2016). A manual for selecting sampling techniques in research.
- Andersen, S. M., & Chen, S. (2002). The relational self: an interpersonal social-cognitive theory. *Psychological review*, 109(4), 619.
- Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2007). The job demands-resources model: State of the art. *Journal of managerial psychology*, 22(3), 309-328.
- Bakker, A. B., & Bal, M. P. (2010). Weekly work engagement and performance: A study among starting teachers. *Journal of occupational and organizational psychology*, 83(1), 189-206.
- Bakker, A. B., Demerouti, E., & Verbeke, W. (2004). Using the job demands-resources model to predict burnout and performance. *Human Resource Management: Published in Cooperation with the School of Business Administration, The University of Michigan and in alliance with the Society of Human Resources Management*, 43(1), 83-104.

- Bakker, A. B., Demerouti, E., & Sanz-Vergel, A. I. (2014). Burnout and work engagement: The JD–R approach. *Annu. Rev. Organ. Psychol. Organ. Behav.*, *1*(1), 389-411.
- Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological review*, *84*(2), 191.
- Bandura, A. (1986). Social foundations of thought and action. *Englewood Cliffs, NJ*, 1986(23-28).
- Bandura, A. (1989). Human agency in social cognitive theory. *American psychologist*, *44*(9), 1175.
- Bandura, A. (1991). Social cognitive theory of self-regulation. *Organizational behavior and human decision processes*, *50*(2), 248-287.
- Bandura, A. (1993). Perceived self-efficacy in cognitive development and functioning. *Educational psychologist*, *28*(2), 117-148.
- Bandura, A. (1995). Exercise of personal and collective efficacy in changing societies. A. Bandura, ed. *Self-Efficacy in Changing Societies*. *New York: Cambridge University*.
- Bandura, A. (1999). Social cognitive theory: An agentic perspective. *Asian journal of social psychology*, *2*(1), 21-41.
- Bandura, A. (2009). Social cognitive theory of mass communication. In *Media effects* (pp. 110-140). Routledge.
- Bandura, A. (2014). Social cognitive theory of moral thought and action. In *Handbook of moral behavior and development* (pp. 69-128). Psychology press.
- Barreiro, P. L., & Albandoz, J. P. (2001). Population and sample. Sampling techniques. *Management mathematics for European schools*, *1*(1), 1-18.
- Bediako, S. (2002). Impact of downsizing on employees of community health-care service organizations. *Leadership in Health Services*, *15*(1), 1-6.

- Boateng, P., & Sekyere, F. O. (2018). Exploring In-Service Teachers' Self-Efficacy in the Kindergarten Classrooms in Ghana. *International Journal of Instruction*, 11(1), 239-254.
- Boukhemkhem, D. (2015). Quality of work life: Theoretical concepts and evaluation Case study of employees of Jijel University. *Journal of Economie & Société*, 11(11), 131-162.
- Bowling, A., & Gabriel, Z. (2007). Lay theories of quality of life in older age. *Ageing & Society*, 27(6), 827-848.
- Bussey, K., & Bandura, A. (1999). Social cognitive theory of gender development and differentiation. *Psychological review*, 106(4), 676.
- Chwalisz, K., Altmaier, E. M., & Russell, D. W. (1992). Causal attributions, self-efficacy cognitions, and coping with stress. *Journal of social and clinical psychology*, 11(4), 377-400.
- Curry, J. P., Wakefield, D. S., Price, J. L., Mueller, C. W., & McCloskey, J. C. (1985). Determinants of turnover among nursing department employees. *Research in Nursing & Health*, 8(4), 397-411.
- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2013). *Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behavior*. Springer Science & Business Media.
- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2012). Self-determination theory. *Handbook of theories of social psychology*, 1(20), 416-436.

- Deci, E. L., Olafsen, A. H., & Ryan, R. M. (2017). Self-determination theory in work organizations: The state of a science. *Annual review of organizational psychology and organizational behavior*, 4, 19-43.
- Ekelund, C. K., Jørgensen, F. S., Petersen, O. B., Sundberg, K., & Tabor, A. (2008). Impact of a new national screening policy for Down's syndrome in Denmark: population based cohort study. *BMJ*, 337.
- Etehad, B., & Karatepe, O. M. (2019). The impact of job insecurity on critical hotel employee outcomes: The mediating role of self-efficacy. *Journal of Hospitality Marketing & Management*, 28(6), 665-689.
- Etikan, I., Alkassim, R., & Abubakar, S. (2016). Comparison of snowball sampling and sequential sampling technique. *Biometrics and Biostatistics International Journal*, 3(1), 55.
- Fuller, B., & Izu, J. (1986). Explaining school cohesion: What shapes the organizational beliefs of teachers. *American Journal of Education*, 94, 501-535.
- Gagné, M., & Deci, E. L. (2005). Self-determination theory and work motivation. *Journal of Organizational behavior*, 26(4), 331-362.
- Gagné, M., & Deci, E. L. (2005). Self-determination theory and work motivation. *Journal of Organizational behavior*, 26(4), 331-362.
- Guarnaccia, C., Scrima, F., Civilleri, A., & Salerno, L. (2018). The role of occupational self-efficacy in mediating the effect of job insecurity on work engagement, satisfaction and general health. *Current Psychology*, 37, 488-497.
- Hagger, M. S., & Chatzisarantis, N. L. (2015). Self-determination theory. *Predicting and changing health behaviour: Research and practice with social cognition models*, 107-141.

- Hagger, M., & Chatzisarantis, N. (2008). Self-determination theory and the psychology of exercise. *International review of sport and exercise psychology*, 1(1), 79-103.
- Halbesleben, J. R., & Buckley, M. R. (2004). Burnout in organizational life. *Journal of management*, 30(6), 859-879.
- Heuven, E., Bakker, A. B., Schaufeli, W. B., & Huisman, N. (2006). The role of self-efficacy in performing emotion work. *Journal of vocational behavior*, 69(2), 222-235.
- Hill, E. J., Ferris, M., & Märtinson, 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), 220-241.
- Holtom, B. C., Mitchell, T. R., Lee, T. W., & Eberly, M. B. (2008). 5 turnover and retention research: a glance at the past, a closer review of the present, and a venture into the future. *The Academy of Management Annals*, 2(1), 231-274.
- Holtom, B. C., Mitchell, T. R., Lee, T. W., & Inderrieden, E. J. (2005). Shocks as causes of turnover: What they are and how organizations can manage them. *Human resource management: published in cooperation with the school of business administration, the university of michigan and in alliance with the society of human resources management*, 44(3), 337-352.
- Kalliath, P., & Kalliath, T. (2015). Work–family conflict and its impact on job satisfaction of social workers. *British Journal of Social Work*, 45(1), 241-259.
- Khoshknab, M. F., Mazaheri, M., Tamizi, Z., Khankh, H. R., Babaei, R. M., Ghazanfari, N., & Khoshknab, P. F. (2011). The effect of weight monitoring and recording on control of

- obesity and overweight. *Eating and Weight Disorders-Studies on Anorexia, Bulimia and Obesity*, 16, e137-e141.
- Kimberlin, C. L., & Winterstein, A. G. (2008). Validity and reliability of measurement instruments used in research. *American journal of health-system pharmacy*, 65(23), 2276-2284.
- Kompier, M., Ybema, J. F., Janssen, J., & Taris, T. (2009). Employment contracts: cross-sectional and longitudinal relations with quality of working life, health and well-being. *Journal of occupational health*, 51(3), 193-203.
- Kossek, E. E., & Ozeki, C. (1998). Work–family conflict, policies, and the job–life satisfaction relationship: A review and directions for organizational behavior–human resources research. *Journal of applied psychology*, 83(2), 139.
- Kotzé, T. (2005). The nature and development of the construct " quality of work life". *Acta academica*, 37(2), 96-122.
- Kuyini, A. B., Desai, I., & Sharma, U. (2020). Teachers' self-efficacy beliefs, attitudes and concerns about implementing inclusive education in Ghana. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 24(14), 1509-1526.
- La Guardia, J. G., & Patrick, H. (2008). Self-determination theory as a fundamental theory of close relationships. *Canadian Psychology/Psychologie canadienne*, 49(3), 201.
- Lau, R. S. M., & May, B. E. (1998). A win-win paradigm for quality of work life and business performance. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 9(3), 211-226.
- Lovett, J. K., Coull, A. J., & Rothwell, P. M. (2004). Early risk of recurrence by subtype of ischemic stroke in population-based incidence studies. *Neurology*, 62(4), 569-573.
- Luszczynska, A., & Schwarzer, R. (2015). Social cognitive theory. *Fac Health Sci Publ*, 225-51.
- Maddux, J. E., Kleiman, E., & Gosselin, J. T. (2018). *Self-efficacy*. The Guilford Press.

- Mensah, A. O., & Asamani, L. (2013). The influence of employees' self-efficacy on their quality of work life: The case of Cape Coast, Ghana.
- Mensah, A. O., & Asamani, L. (2013). The influence of employees' self-efficacy on their quality of work life: The case of Cape Coast, Ghana.
- Mitchell, T. R., & Holtom, B. C. Lee. TW, Sablinski, C., & Erez, M.(2001). Why people stay: Using job embeddedness to predict voluntary turnover. *Academy of Management Journal*, 44(6), 1102-1121.
- Mitchell, T. R., Holtom, B. C., Lee, T. W., Sablinski, C. J., & Erez, M. (2001). Why people stay: Using job embeddedness to predict voluntary turnover. *Academy of management journal*, 44(6), 1102-1121.
- Mohamad, M. M., Sulaiman, N. L., Sern, L. C., & Salleh, K. M. (2015). Measuring the validity and reliability of research instruments. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 204, 164-171.
- Muretta Jr, R. J. (2005). *Exploring the four sources of self-efficacy* (Doctoral dissertation, Touro University International).
- Narehan, H., Hairunnisa, M., Norfadzillah, R. A., & Freziamella, L. (2014). The effect of quality of work life (QWL) programs on quality of life (QOL) among employees at multinational companies in Malaysia. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 112, 24-34.
- Ng, J. Y., Ntoumanis, N., Thøgersen-Ntoumani, C., Deci, E. L., Ryan, R. M., Duda, J. L., & Williams, G. C. (2012). Self-determination theory applied to health contexts: A meta-analysis. *Perspectives on psychological science*, 7(4), 325-340.
- Purkey, S. C., & Smith, M. S. (1983). Effective schools: A review. *The elementary school journal*, 83(4), 427-452.

- Reeve, J. (2002). Self-determination theory applied to educational settings. *Handbook of self-determination research*, 2, 183-204.
- Reeve, J. (2012). A self-determination theory perspective on student engagement. In *Handbook of research on student engagement* (pp. 149-172). Boston, MA: Springer US.
- Reeve, J., & Jang, H. (2006). What teachers say and do to support students' autonomy during a learning activity. *Journal of educational psychology*, 98(1), 209.
- Reeve, J., Ryan, R., Deci, E. L., & Jang, H. (2012). Understanding and promoting autonomous self-regulation: A self-determination theory perspective. In *Motivation and self-regulated learning* (pp. 223-244). Routledge.
- Ronkainen, J., Aro, P., Storskrubb, T., Johansson, S. E., Lind, T., Bolling–Sternevald, E., ... & Agréus, L. (2005). Prevalence of Barrett's esophagus in the general population: an endoscopic study. *Gastroenterology*, 129(6), 1825-1831.
- Ryan, R. (2009). Self determination theory and well being. *Social Psychology*, 84(822), 848.
- Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2017). *Self-determination theory: Basic psychological needs in motivation, development, and wellness*. Guilford publications.
- Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2017). Self-determination theory. *Basic psychological needs in motivation, development, and wellness*.
- Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2002). Overview of self-determination theory: An organismic dialectical perspective. *Handbook of self-determination research*, 2, 3-33.
- Ryan, R. M., & Patrick, H. (2009). Self-determination theory and physical. *Hellenic journal of psychology*, 6(2), 107-124.

- Sabri, M., Wijekoon, R., & Rahim, H. (2020). The influence of money attitude, financial practices, self-efficacy and emotion coping on employees' financial well-being. *Management Science Letters*, 10(4), 889-900.
- Salifu, I., & Odame, E. D. (2023). Examining demographic variables as predictors of self-efficacy among university teachers in Ghana. *Issues in Educational Research*, 33(1), 352-368.
- Saraji, G. N., & Dargahi, H. (2006). Study of quality of work life (QWL). *Iranian journal of public health*, 35(4), 8-14.
- Schunk, D. H. (2012). Social cognitive theory.
- Schunk, D. H., & Hanson, A. R. (1985). Peer models: Influence on children's self-efficacy and achievement. *Journal of educational psychology*, 77(3), 313.
- Schunk, D. H., & DiBenedetto, M. K. (2020). Motivation and social cognitive theory. *Contemporary educational psychology*, 60, 101832.
- Schunk, D. H., & Usher, E. L. (2012). Social cognitive theory and motivation. *The Oxford handbook of human motivation*, 2, 11-26.
- Sharma, G. (2017). Pros and cons of different sampling techniques. *International journal of applied research*, 3(7), 749-752.
- Singh, A. S., & Masuku, M. B. (2014). Sampling techniques & determination of sample size in applied statistics research: An overview. *International Journal of economics, commerce and management*, 2(11), 1-22.
- 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*, 55, 241-302.

- Sirgy, M. J., Reilly, N. P., Wu, J., & Efraty, D. (2008). A work-life identity model of well-being: Towards a research agenda linking quality-of-work-life (QWL) programs with quality of life (QOL). *Applied Research in Quality of Life*, 3, 181-202.
- Som, R. K. (1973). A manual of sampling techniques. *A manual of sampling techniques*.
- Stajkovic, A. D., & Luthans, F. (1998). Self-efficacy and work-related performance: A meta-analysis. *Psychological bulletin*, 124(2), 240.
- Steliarova-Foucher, E., Colombet, M., Ries, L. A., Moreno, F., Dolya, A., Bray, F., ... & Tretarre, B. (2017). International incidence of childhood cancer, 2001–10: a population-based registry study. *The Lancet Oncology*, 18(6), 719-731.
- Suliman, A. M., & Iles, P. A. (2000). The multi-dimensional nature of organisational commitment in a non-western context. *Journal of management development*, 19(1), 71-83.
- Sullivan, P. M., & Knutson, J. F. (2000). Maltreatment and disabilities: A population-based epidemiological study. *Child abuse & neglect*, 24(10), 1257-1273.
- Szklo, M. (1998). Population-based cohort studies. *Epidemiologic reviews*, 20(1), 81-90.
- Taherdoost, H. (2016). Sampling methods in research methodology; how to choose a sampling technique for research. *How to choose a sampling technique for research (April 10, 2016)*.
- Vagharseyyedin, S. A., Vanaki, Z., & Mohammadi, E. (2011). The nature nursing quality of work life: an integrative review of literature. *Western Journal of Nursing Research*, 33(6), 786-804.
- Vallerand, R. J., Pelletier, L. G., & Koestner, R. (2008). Reflections on self-determination theory. *Canadian Psychology/Psychologie Canadienne*, 49(3), 257.
- Van der Berg, Y., & Martins, N. (2013). The relationship between organisational trust and quality of work life. *SA Journal of Human Resource Management*, 11(1), 1-13.

- van der Doef, M., & Maes, S. (1999). The Leiden Quality of Work Questionnaire: its construction, factor structure, and psychometric qualities. *Psychological reports*, 85(3), 954-962.
- Van Lange, P. A. (2013). What we should expect from theories in social psychology: Truth, abstraction, progress, and applicability as standards (TAPAS). *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 17(1), 40-55.
- Vansteenkiste, M., Niemiec, C. P., & Soenens, B. (2010). The development of the five mini-theories of self-determination theory: An historical overview, emerging trends, and future directions. *The decade ahead: Theoretical perspectives on motivation and achievement*, 105-165.
- Walton, R. E. (1975). Criteria for quality of working life. In le davis, ab cherns and associates (eds.) *The quality of working*.
- Wood, R., & Bandura, A. (1989). Social cognitive theory of organizational management. *Academy of management Review*, 14(3), 361-384.
- Xanthopoulou, D., Bakker, A. B., Demerouti, E., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2007). The role of personal resources in the job demands-resources model. *International journal of stress management*, 14(2), 121.

## 8 List of pictures, table, graphs and abbreviations

### 1.22 List of Figures

Figure 1- Self-efficacy responses.....Error! Bookmark not defined.

Figure 2-Quality of Work Life responses .....Error! Bookmark not defined.

### 1.23 List of Tables

|   |    |
|---|----|
| <b>Table 1: Demographic Characteristics</b> .....   | 34 |
| <b>Table 2: Degree of self-efficacy among employees</b> .....   | 36 |
| <b>Table 3: Degree of quality of work life among employees</b> .....  | 39 |
| <b>Table 4: Exploratory Factor Analysis on Management Support</b> .....   | 43 |
| <b>Table 5: Exploratory Factor Analysis on Competence</b> .....   | 44 |
| <b>Table 6: Model Summary</b> .....   | 46 |
| <b>Table 7: ANOVA</b> .....   | 47 |
| <b>Table 8: Test of significance of each independent variable</b> .....   | 48 |
| <b>Table 9: Economic and psychological factors of employees influence their self-efficacy and Quality Work life</b> ..... | 49 |
| <b>Table 10: Recommendations to organizations to recognize the effect of employee's self-efficacy on their QWL</b> .....  | 59 |

## **1.24 List of Abbreviations**

JD-R -Job Demands Resource

LQWQ - Leiden Quality of work of Questionnaire

QoL -Quality of Life

QWL - Quality of work life

SDT – Social determination Theory

SEF -Self-Efficacy

## **Appendix**

### **QUESTIONNAIRE FOR EMPLOYEES**

This study is purely for academic exercise. Respondents will not be coerced to respond to the questions. The rights of respondents will be respected.

#### **PART I: RESPONDENTS DATA**

##### 1. Gender:

Male [ ]

Female [ ]

##### 2. Age:

18-30 years [ ]

31-50years [ ]

51-60years [ ]

##### 3. Educational Background:

Non-forma [ ]

Basic [ ]

Senior High [ ]

Tertiary [ ]

Other [ ]

##### 4. Years of working with the Assembly: 1-5years [ ] 6-10years [ ] 11-15years [ ] 16years and above [ ]

##### 5. Income level

- 500 cedis and below [ ]
- 501 – 1000 cedis [ ]
- 1001 – 1500 cedis [ ]
- 1501– 2000 cedis [ ]
- 2001 – 2500 cedis [ ]
- 2501 – 3000 cedis [ ]
- Above 3000 cedis [ ]

**PART II: GENERAL SELF-EFFICACY**

ADOPTED AND MODIFIED FROM ADOPTED AND MODIFIED FROM SCHWARZEE AND JERUSALEM, 1995

|   | COMPLETELY<br>DISAGREE<br>1 | DISAGREE<br>2 | MODERATE<br>3 | AGREE<br>4 | COMPLETELY<br>AGREE<br>5 |
|---|-----------------------------|---------------|---------------|------------|--------------------------|
| 1. I can always manage to solve difficult problems if I try hard enough     |                             |               |               |            |                          |
| 2. If someone opposes me, I can find the means and ways to get what I want. |                             |               |               |            |                          |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| 3. It is easy for me to stick to my aims and accomplish my goals.                        |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4. I am confident that I could deal efficiently with unexpected events.                  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5. Thanks to my resourcefulness, I know how to handle unforeseen situations.             |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6. I can solve most problems if I invest the necessary effort.                           |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7. I can remain calm when facing difficulties because I can rely on my coping abilities. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8. When I am confronted with a problem, I can usually find several solutions.            |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9. If I am in trouble, I can usually think of a solution                                 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10. I can usually handle whatever comes my way.  |  |  |  |  |  |

APPENDIX B

ADOPTED AND MODIFIED FROM LEIDEN QUALITY OF WORK LIFE QUESTIONNAIRE (LQWQ)

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

|  | COMPLETELY<br>DISAGREE (1) | DISAGREE<br>(2) | MODERATE<br>(3) | AGREE<br>(4) | COMPLETELY<br>AGREE (5) |
|--|----------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|--------------|-------------------------|
| Is your job fully secured (Job security)               |                            |                 |                 |              |                         |
| I am free from conflicting demands or responsibilities |                            |                 |                 |              |                         |
| My job allows me to make a lot of decisions on my own  |                            |                 |                 |              |                         |
| I have restricted workspace                            |                            |                 |                 |              |                         |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| My position is clearly stated and doesn't conflict with other positions. |  |  |  |  |  |
| The level of my salary correlates with my job description                |  |  |  |  |  |
| My financial benefits are adequately enough                              |  |  |  |  |  |
| I have access to credit facilities or opportunities                      |  |  |  |  |  |