

QUALITY OF WORK LIFE AND CORPORATE SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY: A MULTIPLE CASE STUDY.

Gilmara Lima de Elua Roble; UNICSUL/FATEC; gilmararoble@gmail.com
Alessandro Marco Rosini; UNIVAG-MT, UNDERP-MS, IFSP-SP; alessandro.rossini@yahoo.com
Maria do Carmo Oliveira; FMU; oliveira.mdcarmo@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

The main objective of this article was to know the perception of employees regarding their quality of life at work, to assess the satisfaction in the activity of employees of companies, which have social responsibility actions, regarding the main factors that interfere in their quality of life. Exploratory qualitative research was carried out, through multiple case studies, with 5 companies listed among the 150 best to work for, and which publish balance sheets in the Global Report Initiative (GRI). The study allowed us to conclude that the vast majority of life's quality indicators at work were satisfactorily evaluated in the 5 analyzed, which can be considered representative in Brazil in terms of Corporate Social Responsibility practices.

Keywords: Life quality at Work, Corporate Social Responsibility, Job Satisfaction

Date of receipt: 15/08/2022

Date of publication acceptance: 26/08/2022

Publication date: 31/08/2022

1 INTRODUCTION

Quality of Life is a topic discussed by the media, companies and society, with numerous definitions. The main one is from the World Health Organization, which defines it as “the perception that an individual has about their position in life, within the context of the culture and value systems in which they are inserted and in relation to their goals, expectations, standards and concerns” (WHO, 1998). According to Pereira, Teixeira and Santos (2012, p. 241) “the way it is approached and the indicators adopted are directly linked to the scientific and political interests of each study and research area, as well as the possibilities of operationalization and evaluation.

Quality of Work Life (QWL) arises as a result of globalization and the search for intellectual capital in terms of greater organizational competitiveness, as well as one of the management alternatives (Klein, Lemos, Pereira, & Beltrame, 2017). Organizations visualize that, the more they evidence the quality of life at work, the greater returns they will have on productivity, thus becoming increasingly competitive and providing greater participation, integration and development of the worker, in a holistic view of the human being (Gomes, Faustino, Fenato, & Diniz, 2018).

On the other hand, societies began to demand from companies a commitment to ethics, social development and respect for nature, which strengthened the debate on the social responsibility of companies, which is understood as a policy that aims to to a fair relationship between the corporation and all its stakeholders.

A factor of competitive advantage, in the current context, is being socially responsible and organizations that intend to compete in the market need, in addition to producing quality products at attractive prices, to demonstrate that they are concerned with their stakeholders, translated by interested parties, through specific actions for each of them. Carroll (1991) points out that, regardless of the level of importance of each group for each company, all stakeholders impact and are impacted by the organization's actions and, as a result, should be considered in a corporate social responsibility (CSR) project.

Carroll (1979) defines that the concept of corporate social responsibility, in order to meet the full range of obligations towards society, must encompass the economic, legal and discretionary categories of business performance, and the growth of companies in competitive and dynamics (Castro & Becera, 2012).

In this sense, Ousai, Beiranvand, Moeinfar and Amouzesh (2013) understand that companies that have CSR maintain, in addition to commercial success, the ethical and social values of their interest groups. Vasconcelos, Alves and Pesqueux (2012) state that the study of the role of companies and their political action in society should be deepened because, according to Chernev and Blair (2015), socially responsible programs were seen almost exclusively as an instrument to reinforce reputation and show goodwill towards customers.

Employees are the key stakeholders for organizations to achieve their goals towards society, specifically in the context of corporate social responsibility (Slack, Corlett, & Morris 2015); however, they have received little attention in the literature on this topic, despite companies using their efforts towards this public of interest, in order to reinforce their CSR actions as a competitive advantage. If organizations seek to keep their human resources adequately motivated, they can grow and develop more in the long term (Muthukumar, Rajesh, & Vidhya, 2014).

With the objective of making their social responsibility actions transparent, companies

started to prepare and disclose the corporate social report, aiming to inform stakeholders about what has been done by companies. The definition of the Global Reporting Initiative standard, also known as GRI, which is one of the main current standards in the world for the construction of corporate social reports, started to be used by organizations. In Brazil and around the world, companies recognize the importance of QWL and many have published GRI Balance Sheets annually.

In this context, the main objective of this article is to know the perception of employees regarding their quality of life at work, in companies that publish GRI balance, to assess their respective satisfaction in those that have social responsibility actions, regarding the main factors that interfere in your quality of life.

Estudos dessa natureza são relevantes, por serem os empregados um dos mais importantes *stakeholders* e, se conhecer a percepção sobre sua qualidade de vida no trabalho, poderá resultar em melhores ações por parte das empresas, para satisfação de ambas as partes, pois atuar de forma socialmente responsável para com o público interno significa mais do que se respeitar os direitos garantidos pela legislação: é um diferencial de qualidade.

Studies of this nature are relevant, as employees are one of the most important stakeholders and, if the perception of their quality of life at work is known, it may result in better actions by companies, to the satisfaction of both parties, as they act in a Socially responsible towards the internal public means more than respecting the rights guaranteed by legislation: it is a quality differential.

2 THEORETICAL REVIEW

2.1 Quality of Life at Work

People-centered management theories became the basis of Quality of Work Life studies. With the contribution of the sum of them, the theme "Quality of Life at Work - QVT", a name created in the 1950s, with the studies of Eric Trist, referring to a socio-technical approach in relation to the organization of work, together with the emergence of the so-called School of Human Relations (Sant'anna, Kilimnik, & Moraes, 2011).

The concept of QWL involves both physical and environmental aspects, as well as psychological aspects of the workplace, such as: motivation, satisfaction, working conditions, leadership styles, among others. Related to them, the list of factors that constitute the positive and negative points of the work is very wide. QWL is an expression that encompasses all dimensions of work, carrying an important meaning in a person's life.

It focuses beyond work factors, happiness and a sense of well-being (Verma, & Monga, 2014; Suchitra, 2014). There are several concepts that can be presented for this acronym but, in general, they are all linked to job satisfaction and benefits for companies (Costa, Bento, Sá, & Ziviani, 2013).

Walton (1973), one of the main exponents in the study of the issue, argues that the basis of Q.V.T. it is in the humanization of work and the company's social responsibility. For this author the Q.V.T. seeks to meet the needs and aspirations of the individual and reflects on an improvement of the organization. This author also states that the concept of QWL involves labor legislation, job security, equal employment opportunities, job enrichment plans and the positive relationship, proposed by psychologists, between morale and productivity.

Hackman and Suttle (1977), in turn, defined QWL as "the degree to which members of

an organization are able to satisfy important personal needs through their experience in that organization". Emphasizing only meeting human needs, the authors present a very limited definition of the QWL concept, since it is not only concerned with workers; but also with the organization and society.

Westley (1979) and Davis (1981) present very broad and generic concepts of QWL. For the first, QWL programs involve efforts aimed at humanizing work, seeking to solve problems generated by the very nature of productive organizations. For Davis, the concept refers to the favorable or unfavorable conditions of a work environment for people.

Nadler and Lawler (1983) define that quality of life encompasses the way of thinking about people, work and organizations. What distinguishes QWL programs, according to them, is the concern with the effects of work on people and the effectiveness of the organization, with the participation of employees in problem solving and organizational decision-making. The definition of these authors stands out as particularly interesting, which encompassed, in a comprehensive and precise concept, the basic precepts of QWL: the humanist philosophy and the socio-technical approach.

Another concept of QWL, which also emphasizes greater participation of people, was given by Bergeron, Petit and Bélanger (1984), who define it in two dimensions: the restructuring of jobs, or the distribution of individual work positions; and the establishment of semi-autonomous work groups, or the distribution of group work positions, factors that imply a certain degree of participation of people in the administration. Yeo and Li (2013) also reinforce this issue, when they state that QWL is concerned with employee participation in problem solving and decision making.

Mendes and Leite (2004) have conceptualized QWL by relating it to the quality of life outside the company, stating that it is directly related to work, but not isolated from the individual's life outside the company. In these terms, according to them, it represents a relationship between the individual's quality of life inside and outside the professional environment.

As can be seen in this brief review of some QWL concepts, each author defines it according to the values that seem most important to him, however, for most of them, it seeks to improve organizational effectiveness, through favorable performance conditions, activities, and the reformulation of positions, seeking to make them more productive for the company and more satisfactory for the employees.

2.2 The QVT Models

Quality of life at work is determined by the systemic action of individual and organizational characteristics, and QWL models offer a reference to assess worker satisfaction, each of which emphasizes certain categories and indicators that influence quality of life in the work of employees in certain working situations. It is important to highlight that each model should only serve as a reference for the implementation of a comprehensive QWL program, needing to be adapted for each particular situation.

The first model presented, and also the most widespread among QWL researchers, was proposed by Walton (1973) and, as it is quite complete and broad, it served as a guide for several studies, such as that by Vieira (1993), by Lima (1994) and Tannhauser (1994) and others. Walton (1973) identifies eight factors that affect QWL, each with their respective variables, which allow analyzing the main characteristics of this line. The Walton model can be

schematized as shown in Chart 1.

Chart 1 - Walton's Model

QWL CATEGORIES	OBJECTIVE	QWL VARIABLES
1. Fair and Adequate Compensation.	Evaluate the perception of workers in relation to the company's remuneration system.	- Adequate remuneration. - Internal equity. - External equity.
2. Working conditions.	Measure QWL in relation to existing conditions in the workplace.	- Reasonable working hours. - Safe and healthy physical environment. - Work load adequate to the physical capacity of the worker.
3. Opportunities for capacity use and development.	Measure the possibilities that workers have to apply their knowledge and professional skills on a daily basis.	- Autonomy. - Use of multiple abilities and skills. - Information about the total work process. - Meaning of the task. - Task identity. - Retro information.
4. Opportunities for growth and security.	Avaliar as oportunidades que a organização oferece para o desenvolvimento de seus colaboradores e para a estabilidade no emprego.	-Development of potential and acquisition of new knowledge and skills. - Possibility of career. - Job security.
5. Social integration in the organization.	Evaluate the opportunities that the organization offers for the development of its employees and for job stability.	- Absence of prejudices. - Equal opportunities. - Interpersonal relationship. - Community sense. - Work environment climate.
6. Constitutionalism in the organization	Assess the degree to which the organization respects employee rights.	- Labor rights. - Personal privacy. - Freedom of expression. - Impersonal and egalitarian treatment.
7. Total work and living space.	Measure the employee's work-life balance.	- Balance between work schedules, career requirements, travel, family life and leisure. - Few geographic changes.
8. The social relevance of work in life.	Evaluate the workers' perception of the organization's social responsibility, relationship with employees, ethics and the quality of its products and services.	- Image of the organization. - Social responsibility of the organization. -Responsibility for the products and services offered. - Human resources practices. - Efficient administration. -Valuing work and profession

Source: adapted from Walton, 1973.

According to Walton (1973), QWL can be evaluated according to the degree of workers' satisfaction with the factors that interfere with their well-being at work. The author also emphasizes that new categories or variables can be generated, depending on the situational aspects of each environment.

To recapitulate, then, the central idea of QWL Programs is to identify the factors that interfere with the satisfaction of individuals in a work situation and, as far as possible, make them more favorable to the workers' perception. With this, the productivity, motivation and commitment of employees increase, consequently increasing the performance of the organization.

Currently, forms of management based on QWL can bring significant improvements to the satisfaction of workers and the organization's results. The importance of QWL Programs in the near future is questionable. The traditional concept of work is changing. Nadler and Lawler (1983) studied the different conceptions of this concept, over time, from 1959, when it was seen only as a variable, through the understanding of approach, method and movement, until the period from 1979 to 1982, when QWL came to be seen as “everything”: the solution to all business problems.

In this phase, which is believed to last until today, the current work organization is still the same as in industrial society, where companies seek to survive in a competitive international market through increased productivity and quality. And QWL is essential for the competitiveness and productivity of companies, as only satisfied employees tend to be motivated and committed to their respective work.

Therefore, QWL becomes the way to improve productivity, product quality and performance of human resources and, consequently, of the organization. Because, if competitive advantage occurs through people, and, according to Slack, Corlett and Morris (2015) employees are the key stakeholders for organizations, in order to grow and develop, organizations need to keep their human resources motivated (Muthukumar, Rajesh, & Vidhya, 2014).

2.3 CORPORATE SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY (CSR)

In recent years, the topic of corporate social responsibility (CSR) has been a subject of great interest by researchers. Because of this, several are the concepts attributed to it. Moretti and Campanário (2009) state that it is a polysemic area, with a wide range of meanings. Castro and Becera (2012) define it as the commitment that companies make to society to maintain a balance between economic growth and social well-being.

In this context, Fernández, Jara-Bertin and Pineaur (2015) define it as the whole process with which companies contribute to a better society and a cleaner environment. Still in this aspect, Korschun, Bhattacharya and Swain (2014), conceptualize it as practices that contribute, with corporate resources aimed at improving social well-being, and that it is necessary to research whether employees' perception of it affects their performance at work.

CSR is the form of management that is defined by the company's ethical and transparent relationship with all its stakeholders, and by the establishment of business goals that promote the sustainable development of society, preserving environmental and cultural resources for future generations; respecting diversity; and, promoting the reduction of social inequalities (Ethos, 2011).

Vasconcelos, Alves and Pesqueux (2012) understand that the concept of CSR should transcend the view that its actions are purely aimed at creating value for companies, in the long term, but that also include others related to regulation and production. of public goods.

The ISO 26000 standard, published in 2010, defines social responsibility as the responsibility of an organization for the impacts of its decisions and activities on society (Inmetro, 2010) and on the environment through ethical and transparent behavior that:

- (a) contribute to sustainable development, including the health and well-being of society;
- (b) take into account stakeholder expectations;
- (c) complies with applicable law and is consistent with international standards of behavior;
- (d) is integrated throughout the organization and is practiced in its relationships (Inmetro, 2010, p. 4).

It is pertinent to report that there is a proliferation of approaches, theories and terminology on CSR, but there is no single and precise definition, nor basic assumptions that distinguish each of the approaches: the picture is not very clear. Different approaches tend to mix and use the same terminology, sometimes with different meanings (Carroll, 1999).

Its concept has evolved, but it is still flexible, and varies according to each stakeholder, although some points are common between the different concepts: the association with the definition of ethics; the involvement of interested parties, both internal and external; the importance of linking the concept to all the company's actions; and the need for all stakeholders to participate effectively in the process (Patrus, Carvalho, Coeho, & Teodósio, 2013).

Mousavi, Beiranvand, Moeinfar and Amouzesh (2013) report that several researchers have developed indicators to measure CSR and that one of them, namely, uses three parameters: employees, environment and community. Responsibility to employees includes five criteria: (i) safety and health, (ii) employee education and development system, (iii) equal opportunity policies, (iv) good communication and job creation systems, and (v) employment security systems for workers.

Most CSR measures are based on assessments carried out by individuals and organizations that are outsiders, and may be influenced by a symbolic view, e.g. philanthropy, and do not see activities that are linked to the organization's mission and implemented by the entire organization (Glava, & Kelley, 2014).

For Neto and Froes (2001), supporting the development of the community and preserving the environment is not enough to attribute a socially responsible status to a company. It is necessary to invest in the well-being of its employees and dependents, and in a healthy work environment, in addition to promoting transparent communication; return to shareholders and ensure customer satisfaction. In other words, it is essential to pay attention to the company's internal corporate social responsibility.

Since CSR is an ethical and transparent relationship between the company and all the publics with which it relates (Ethos, 2011), it must also fulfill its role with the internal public, through actions to improve working conditions and evidence them in its annual reports.

3 METHODOLOGY

Science is constituted by applying techniques; following a method and relying on epistemological foundations (Severino, 2007). It is through the definition of the research methodology that the study method and the techniques to be used by the researcher are outlined. According to Marconi and Lakatos (2011), its specification covers a large number of items, as it answers several questions, giving conditions to the researcher to achieve the objectives of his work proposal.

This study used the multiple case analysis method. A case study is an empirical investigation that investigates a contemporary phenomenon within its real-life context, especially when the boundaries between phenomenon and context are not clearly defined (Yin, 2016).

The study approach is qualitative in nature, and the research is of the documental type, which Bardin (2011 p. 51) defines as “an operation, or a set of operations, aimed at representing the content of a document, in a different form. of the original, in order to facilitate, at a later stage, its consultation and reference”.

The companies that make up the study sample were chosen among those that are among the 150 best to work for, published by Exame magazine by Editora Abril, in 2013, with data

provided by the PROGEP-FIA team, the institute responsible for conducting the process of choosing and processing data for the best companies, which publish GRI balance sheets. Five of them were selected, as follows: one from the chemical and petrochemical segment; one from the health services sector; two of miscellaneous services; and one from the financial services and banking sector.

The study variables, proposed in the Walton model (1973), were selected from a list of variables used in the process of choosing the best companies to work for. Variables that fit into the categories and subcategories proposed by Walton (1973) were chosen, which he called QWL categories and factors.

4 PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION OF RESULTS

From the analysis of the results of the 5 selected companies, it was possible to ascertain the current situation of these and their workers. However, as it is a very small sample, and chosen by convenience for this study, the results cannot be generalized to all employees of the companies, which are among the 150 best to work for in 2013. The results of perceptions of employees is the sum of the percentage of grades 5 and 4 attributed by them, on a scale from 1 to 5, the system used by PROGEP for that year.

The research showed that the employees of the analyzed companies are relatively young, most of them are between 25 and 39 years old and have a degree from higher to postgraduate education. It is also observed that half of the employees have between zero and six years of service at the institution and that the other part has worked there for more than six, showing a low turnover, as evidenced by the turnover rate for the year 2013, which was 2%. This data may indicate their level of satisfaction with the company, which, for Slack, Corlett and Morris (2015) “is justified by the fact that employees are the key stakeholders of an organization.”

All studied companies have health care plans for all employees, with subsidies of more than 50% at all hierarchical levels, with 40% of them offering access to medical offices at the company's premises to all employees. Regarding dental care, it is offered with more than 50% subsidies in 60% of them, and with less than 50% subsidies in 40% of them.

In addition, for the purchase of medicines, only 40% of them offer subsidies. Also, when it comes to medical care, 100% of those selected offer access to psychological care for all hierarchical levels, and 60% of them offer access to group life insurance for all levels. 20% offer access to group life insurance only for directors, managers and supervisors; and 20% do not offer this type of benefit.

The results presented for medical, dental and psychological care demonstrate that companies care about the well-being of their employees, a fact that, according to Verma and Monga (2014); Suchitra (2014) is one of the focuses of QVT and, according to Inmetro (2010), it is contributing to the health and well-being of society. For, as Walton (1973) points out, taking care of physical health is, in a way, humanizing the environment.

It was also found that 100% of the companies offer access to a Private Pension Plan for all levels; and, 60% of them declared that they offer access to subsidies for educational training for Directors, Managers and Supervisors; 80% of them offer to other employees. Also, when it comes to access to a subsidy for educational training, 80% of them declared that they offer access to a subsidy for professional specialization and also for language study for all levels of the company. According to Walton's (1973) model, these variables fall within the category “security growth opportunities”.

The employees' perception index, regarding the fulfillment of their needs in the area of health and other benefits, was 87.8%. The confidence in the company was 88.8%. The company, which presented the highest index in this category, reached 99.3%, which means that almost all employees trust it, and the one with the lowest confidence index reached 82.6%, an index that is also not a bad percentage.

The rate of perception of improvement in functional life was 85%, with the lowest percentage being 76.8% and the highest being 99.3%. The demonstration of confidence in the company's concern with QWL was 76.4% and this indicator reinforces the perception of improvement in life.

The lowest rate presented, 58.9%, is also a very good percentage, considering that it reflects employee satisfaction with the Quality of Life at Work. Such data corroborate the transcendence of the vision, in which CSR actions are not only aimed at creating value for companies, brought by Vasconcelos, Alves and Pesqueux (2012) and contribute, as pointed out by Castro and Becera (2012), in the company's growth and development.

The index of perception of recognition and appreciation of work, which was 74.9%, was very close to the index of perception of fair reward, which reached 73.8%, which leads to the inference that the index studied has a high correlation with the perception of fair reward. It is also possible to relate the perception of justice, in the payment of PLR, and the perception of justice, regarding salaries, with rates of 67.4% and 70.3%, with the indicators above.

The employees' perception of the equitable treatment of diversity by the selected companies was 93.5%, the lowest was 90.3% and the highest was 99.5%, which shows that most of the employees of them has a clear vision of the actions of the companies to insert and keep the diversities at the same level of the other employees, which shows that they, according to Ethos (2011), respect diversity and promote the reduction of social inequalities.

Considering Walton's QVT model (1973), in the category Opportunities for growth and security, the research showed that 100% of companies have a formal process to identify leadership potential in work teams, and 80% of them maintain structured programs, aimed at to the development of competencies related to leadership, offering subsidies for the realization of courses aimed at the development of competencies related to leadership.

Employees recognize the company's effort in this indicator, as 83.6% of employees have the perception that everyone has the opportunity to participate in training activities in the company, and 78.3%, the idea of how much the employees feel encouraged to seek new knowledge outside the company.

Next, the perception of fairness in the promotion and career criteria adopted by the company was analyzed, with an index of 67% (minimum index of 50.9% and maximum of 92.7%). Also, 100% of the companies declared, in the survey, that the adoption of formal mechanisms to stimulate and offer support for the employee to plan his career.

Therefore, in agreement with Mousavi, et al. (2013), these indicators, mentioned above, meet one of the 5 criteria of responsibility towards employees, which is education and the development system. Still, this corroborates, as reported by Muthukumar, Rajesh and Vidhya (2014) that it is necessary to keep employees motivated and committed to growth.

Further on, in Walton's (1973) model, they represent working conditions, the variables working hours, a safe and healthy physical environment and adequate workload for the physical capacity of the worker, which, for Westley (1979), are efforts aimed at the humanization of work.

Addressing another factor, although the rate of adequacy of the volume of work for the

normal journey was 67.7%, above 50%, it was the second lowest in the entire survey, reflecting the current dynamics of companies, in seeking to maintain competitiveness. The perception of comfort, safety and cleanliness of facilities and workspaces had an index of 88.4%, with a minimum of 81.6% and a maximum of 99.2%.

The survey also identified that 33.7% of the employees of the selected companies are satisfied and motivated with their work; 23.2% perceive that they are learning more and more and that they have the opportunity to grow; and 15.6% of them agree with the company's goals and are proud to work there, as shown in Table 1. According to Verma and Monga (2014) and Suchitra (2014), these indicators reinforce the concept that QWL it also focuses on happiness and a sense of well-being.

Table 1 - Percentage of responses by alternatives

WHAT MAKES ME CONSIDER A COMPANY A GREAT PLACE TO WORK	COMPANIES					TOTAL	%
	1	2	3	4	5		
A) Agree with the company's goals and be proud to work there	126	37	41	140	37	381	15,6
B) Feel satisfied and motivated with the work I do in the company	120	84	164	350	108	826	33,7
C) Being in an environment of good relations with co-workers	24	15	17	26	11	93	3,8
D) Receive the best pay and best benefits	27	26	24	65	16	158	6,5
E) Realizing that I am learning more and more and that I have the opportunity to grow	143	59	89	202	75	568	23,2
F) Having bosses that I respect, trust and who guide their work team.	15	11	13	27	3	69	2,8
G) Being treated fairly	5	7	7	20	8	47	1,9
H) Have stability and security	22	17	7	42	6	94	3,8
I) Admire what the company does to its customers, society and community.	64	27	27	67	17	202	8,3
J) None of the reasons described above	0	3	2	4	0	9	0,4
TOTALS	546	286	391	943	281	2447	100

Source: Prepared by the authors based on data from PROGEP/FIA (2016)

Companies were also asked whether there was formal communication of their strategy to employees, and 100% answered yes, and this process was carried out by murals, bulletin boards, intranet pages, newspapers, internal films, and by leaders.

Regarding the existence of a formal program to promote employee communication with the company, 80% stated that there are channels of complaint, or reserved and confidential contact, with an internal or external ombudsman. 80% stated that there are discussion groups on organizational issues; 100% of them promote periodic meetings with the governing body; and, 80% stated that there is adoption of ideas coming from employees, regardless of area or hierarchical level.

These data demonstrate the respect that companies have for their employees and, according to Mousavi et al (2013), this is one of the criteria of responsibility towards employees.

The survey showed that all companies monitor organizational climate management, with periodic surveys, consulting all employees and implementing actions to improve the climate, with the participation of all hierarchical levels. This indicator fits the model of Walton (1973), in the category Social integration in the organization, whose objective is to measure the

degree of social integration and the existing climate in the organization.

The study also identified that 100% of the companies promote lectures and courses focused on disease prevention for employees and their families. Still, all of them have facilities and programs for leisure or for the search for balance between professional and personal.

All the companies promote programs and places for the practice of sports and/or subsidies for the gym. Finally, all of them declared that there are structured meetings with professionals from the company or those specifically hired to discuss and implement actions aimed at a better quality of life at work.

5 FINAL CONSIDERATIONS

The study of quality of life at work, as presented here, provides important data to support the management of social responsibility in companies for their internal public. The company's internal and external environments undergo significant changes and should lead to new analyses, in order to verify whether the research conclusions remain valid, as they are linked to an organizational context, which is influenced by the company's policies, strategies and climate. organization, as well as the external market, becoming another limitation.

It is inferred, therefore, that in the future, everyone will be concerned with continuously improving their quality of life, making the best use of their free time, and increasing their knowledge. QWL, as we know it today, will no longer make sense in a society of the future.

In this study, the evaluation of QWL indicators were analysed, such as: meeting health needs and other benefits; trust in the company; perception of improvement in life; degree of reliability in the company's concern with QWL; the perception of recognition and appreciation of the work, also that of fair reward; equity in the treatment of diversities; opportunities for growth and security, fairness in promotion and career criteria and working conditions.

It appears that the objectives of the present study were achieved, insofar as it was possible to measure the degree of employee satisfaction of the five companies listed among the 150 best to work for, in relation to the main elements involved in their QWL.

Through the evaluation of the investigated QWL indicators, meeting the needs in the health area and other benefits, trust in the company, perception of improvement in life, trust in the company's concern with QWL, perception of recognition and appreciation of work, perception of fair reward, equity in the treatment of diversity, opportunities for growth and security, fairness in promotion and career criteria and working conditions, tangible results were achieved.

Based on the research results, it was found that the vast majority of QWL indicators were satisfactorily evaluated, however, all can receive corrective measures in order to increase the satisfaction of the investigated population, obviously those who recorded the lowest satisfaction rates.

It is important to point out that the research to evaluate the QWL must be carried out systematically, in predetermined periods, seeking to establish the benefits resulting from the actions generated by the previous researches; monitoring the results obtained and identifying other points that should be addressed. In addition, the simple fact of systematically listening to the worker invariably contributes to making them feel valued.

As a natural limitation of an article, it is identified that it is a case study, being a survey carried out with only five companies out of a total universe of 150, listed as the best to work for. Therefore, the study variables cannot be generalized, being restricted to the investigated business reality. Still, it can be considered that the fact that there is a confusion between the

terms “quality of life”, which has different understandings, and the line of research “quality of life at work”, is, in itself, a limiting factor. for understanding the real importance of the results obtained.

It is expected that the realization of this study, despite its limitations, will contribute to the identification of factors that favor the well-being of employees, for a more effective management of human resources in organizations, constituting a stimulus for future research in this area. , expanding the universe of results. However, although the work can only raise a brief reflection on the importance of workers' satisfaction with their quality of life at work for the performance of organizations, its realization was fully justified.

REFERENCES

- Bardin, L. (2011). Content analysis. 6th ed. São Paulo: Editions 70.
- Bergeron, J.L., Petit, A., & Bélanger, L. (1984). *Human Resources Management: A Global Approach. integrated*. Quebec: Gaëtan Morin Publisher.
- Bowers, D. (2015). The Role of the Quality Professional in Integrating Social Responsibility into Business Strategy. *The Journal for Quality & Participation*. January.
- Carroll, A. B. A. (1979). Three-dimensional Conceptual Model of Corporate Performance. *Academy of Management Review*, 4 (4), pp. 497-505.
- Carroll, A. B. A. (1991). The Pyramid of Corporate Social Responsibility: Toward the Moral Management of Organizational Stakeholders. *Business Horizons*, July-August.
- Castro, A. A., & Becera, D. P. P. (2012). Business Growth Based on Social Responsibility. *Thought & Management*, 32, pp. 1-26.
- Chernev, A., & Blair, S. (2015). Doing Well by Doing Good: The Benevolent Halo of Corporate Social Responsibility. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 41, april.
- Costa, C. A. da, Bento, K. G. R., Sá, F. B. de, & Ziviani, F. (2013). Quality of Work Life, Worker Satisfaction and Motivation in the Retail Sector. *UNIMEP Administration Journal*, 11 (1), January/April.
- Davis, K. (1981). Human Behavior at Work. New York: McGraw Hill.
- Ethos. Instituto de Responsabilidade Social Empresarial. (2011). *Frequently asked questions: what is corporate social responsibility?* Available at: <<http://www.ethos.org.br/DesktopDefault.aspx?TabID=3344&Alias=Ethos&Lang=pt-BR>>. Accessed on: 03/09/2012.
- Fernández, L. V., Jara-Bertin, M., & Pineaur, F. V. (2015). Practices of Social Responsibility, Corporate Reputation and Financial Performance. *RAE*, 55 (3), May/June.
- Glavas, A.; Kelley, K. (2014). The Effects of Perceived Corporate Social Responsibility on Employee Attitudes. *Business Ethics Quarterly*, 24 (2), abr.
- Gomes, C. M., Faustino, E. A. M., Fenato, S. H., & Diniz, M. S. K. (2018). Quality of Life at Work from the Perspective of Workers in the Analytical Development/Stability Sector in a Pharmaceutical Industry in Anápolis – Goiás. *Anais Lato Sensu Postgraduate Courses UniEVANGÉLICA*, 2 (2), Aug/Dec.
- GRI. *Conference in Review*. (2006). Available at: <<http://www.globalreporting.org>>. Accessed on 03/09/2012.
- GRI *Global Reporting Initiative*. (2015). Available at <<https://www.globalreporting.org/Information/about-gri/Pages/default.aspx>>. Accessed

- on 09/09/2015.
- Hackman, J. R., & Suttle, L. J. (1977). *Improving Life at Work: behavioral science approaches to organizational change*. Santa Monica: Goodyear.
- Huse, E., & Cummings, T. (1985). *Organization development and change*. Minnesota: West Publishing, p. 558, 1985.
- Inmetro. National Institute of Metrology (2010). *ISO 26000. Brazilian Association of Technical Standards (ABNT)*. Available at <http://www.inmetro.gov.br/qualidade/responsabilidade_social/iso26000.asp>. Accessed on 20 Jun. 2015.
- Kilimnik, Z.M., Moraes, L.F.R., & Ramos, W.M. (1994). The Current State of the Art of Quality of Life in Brazil. In: Annual Meeting of the National Association of Graduate Programs in Administration, 1994, Curitiba/PR. *Annals Florianópolis: ANPAD, 10*, pp. 305-325.
- Klein, L.L., Lemos, R.B., Pereira, B.A.D., & Beltrame, G. (2017). Quality of Life in the Public Service: an evaluation in a Higher Education Institution. *REAd, 23* (special), pp. 3017-3044.
- Korschun, D., Bhattacharya, C. B., & Swain, S. D. (2014). Corporate Social Responsibility, Customer Orientation, and the Job Performance of Frontline Employees. *Journal of Marketing, 78*, pp. 20–37, maio. *Anais*. Florianópolis: ANPAD.
- Lima, I.S. (1994). The Quality Program in Building Construction and Quality of Life at Work. In: Annual Meeting of the National Association of Graduate Programs in Administration, 1994., Curitiba
- Marconi, M.A., & Lakatos, E.M. (2011). *Scientific methodology*. 6th ed. Sao Paulo: Atlas, 2011.
- Mendes, R.A., & Leite, N. (2004). *Labor Gymnastics: Principles and Practical Applications*. Barueri: Manole.
- Moretti, S.L.A., & Campanario, M.A. (2009). The Brazilian Intellectual Production in Corporate Social Responsibility - CSR from the Bibliometrics Perspective. *RAC, 13* (Special Edition), art. 5, pp. 68-86, Jun.
- Mousavi, Z., Beiranvand, F., Moeinfar, Z., & Amouzesh, N. (2013). Corporate Social Responsibility. *Life Science Journal, 10* (6).
- Muthukumar, E., Rajesh, G. A., & Vidhya, S. (2014) A Critical Analysis of Quality of Work Life Practices at Salem Steel Plant and JSW Steel Limited, Tamil Nadu. *International Journal of Business and Administration Research Review, 2* (3), Jan. /mar.
- Nadler, D. A., & Lawler, E. E. III. (1983). Quality of Working Life: perspective and directions. *Organization Dynamics, 11*, pp. 20-30.
- Neto, F.P.M., & Froes, C. (2001). *Corporate social responsibility management: the Brazilian case*. Rio de Janeiro: Qualitymark.
- WHO. World Health Organization. (1998). *Health promotion: glossary*. Geneva: WHO.
- Patrus, R., Carvalho, A. M. Neto, Coelho, H. M.Q., & Teodósio, A. S.S. (2013). Corporate Social Responsibility and labor relations: a research agenda about internal stakeholder's management in un's global compact signatory corporations. *Review of Business Management, 15* (46), pp. 22-38, Jan. /mar.
- Pereira, E.F., Teixeira, C.S., & Santos, A.dos. (2012). Quality of Life: approaches, concept and evaluation. *Rev. bras Educ. physis Sport, 26* (2), pp. 241-250.
- Progep/Fia. (2016). *Database of the 2013 Best Companies to Work for Report*. São Paulo.

- Sant'Anna, A.S., Kilimnik, Z.M., & Moraes, L.F. (2011). *Background, origins and evolution of the movement around quality of life at work*. Chap. 1. In: SANT'ANNA, A.S.; KILIMNIK, Z.M.; MORAES, L.F. *Quality of life at work: approaches and fundamentals*. Rio de Janeiro: Elsevier; Belo Horizonte/MG: Dom Cabral Foundation.
- Severino, A. J. *Methodology of Scientific Work*. 23 ed. Sao Paulo: Cortez.
- Slack, R. E., Corlett, S., & Morris, R. (2015). Exploring Employee Engagement with (Corporate) Social Responsibility: A Social Exchange Perspective on Organisational Participation. *J Bus Ethics*, 127, pp. 537–548.
- Suchitra, P. (2014). Quality of Work Life at LIC of India Ltd. Kurnool. *International Journal of Innovative Research & Development*, 3 (3), mar.
- Tannhauser, C.L. (1994). *Quality of Life at Work: contributions to the role of the organizational psychologist*. Porto Alegre: UFRGS/PPGA, 1994. Dissertation (Master's in Administration), Faculty of Economic Sciences, Postgraduate Program in Administration, Federal University of Rio Grande do Sul.
- Vasconcelos, I.F.F.G., ALVES, M.A., & PESQUEUX, Y. (2012). Corporate Social Responsibility and Sustainable Development: Habermasian Perspectives. *RAE*, 52 (2), Mar. /Apr.
- Verma P., & Monga O. P. (2014). Attitudinal Study of Quality of Work Life at an Electronics Company. *European Academic Research*, II (6), set.
- Vieira, D.F.V.B. (1993). *Quality of Work Life of Nurses in a Teaching Hospital*. Porto Alegre: UFRGS/PPGA, 1993. Dissertation (Master in Administration), Faculty of Economic Sciences, Postgraduate Program in Administration, Federal University of Rio Grande do Sul.
- Yeo, R. K., & LI, J. (2013). In Pursuit of Learning: Sensemaking the Quality of Work Life. *European Journal of Training and Development*, 37 (2), pp. 136-160.
- Yin, R.K. (2016). *Qualitative Research: from start to finish*. Porto Alegre: Artmed/Penso.
- Walton, R.E. (1973). Quality of Working Life: what is this? *Sloan Management Review*, 15(1), pp.11-21.
- Westley, W.A. (1979). *Quality of Life at Work: problems and solutions*. Rio de Janeiro: Incised.