

Quality of Work life in the home office in the banking sector in Brazil.

Date of Submission: 01-07-2024

Date of Acceptance: 11-07-2024

I. Introduction

Remote work, once considered an option for a privileged few, has become a global option amid the Covid-19 pandemic. With the closure of offices and the imposition of restrictions on movement, organizations found themselves compelled to adopt home office as an emergency measure to ensure the continuity of operations. In this context, the relationship between Quality of Work Life (QWL) and the remote work environment gained prominence like never before.

Therefore, this article aims to explore this intersection between home office and QWL. The focus is on the challenges faced by professionals working remotely during the pandemic, as well as the continuity of this modality today.

The urgency of this issue became evident with the rapid spread of the virus during the pandemic and the imposed confinement measures. The solution, which seemed temporary for some companies, was proving to be a definitive option. A study carried out by the Fundação Instituto de Administração (FIA) in April 2020 collected data from 139 small, medium and large companies in Brazil and showed that working from home was the strategy adopted by 46% of companies during the pandemic (Mello, 2020).

However, this transition was not without challenges. The organizational culture strongly rooted in the face-to-face model, together with the need for rapid and often improvised adaptation to teleworking, highlighted the gaps in preparation for such an abrupt change. Workers and companies were faced with the need to adjust to a new way of working, with no time for a smooth, planned transition.

As companies seek to balance the need to maintain productivity and effectiveness with ensuring the safety and well-being of their employees, the central question of this study arises: is home office really the modality that offers a satisfactory balance between quality of life for the employee and productive performance for the employer?

To answer this question, the section addressed the origin, historical evolution and classic theories of QWL, providing contextualization of the topic, aiming for greater understanding. Section 2 carried out an analysis of contemporary studies on QWL, discussing its implications today and its adaptations in times of pandemic. Section 3 detailed the methodology used in the research, while section 4 presented and discussed the results obtained, covering aspects such as satisfaction with remuneration, working hours, adaptation to working from home, mental health and promotion of QWL. Finally, the final considerations summarized the main findings of the research.

1. Quality of life at work: origin, classical theories and historical evolution

The search for QWL is a constant concern in organizations. Understanding the origin and evolution of QWL, its classic theories and impact on the work environment is fundamental. QWL aims to promote the physical, emotional and social well-being of employees, creating a healthy environment conducive to personal and professional development. This section will explore the origin, classical theories and historical evolution of QWL.

1.1. Origin and historical evolution of QWL

The concern with QWL dates back to the beginnings of humanity, with the aim of making the execution of daily tasks easier and more enjoyable. From Euclid of Alexandria's teachings on geometry to Archimedes' laws, technological innovations have always sought to optimize work and reduce human effort (Rodrigues, 2014).

In the modern era, the Industrial Revolution brought greater systematization of production methods. Adam Smith, in "The Wealth of Nations" (1776), highlighted the importance of remuneration for workers' satisfaction and productivity (Sant'Anna; Kilimnik, 2012). In the 1920s, Elton Mayo, with his studies at the Western Electric Company, demonstrated how productivity was influenced by human and environmental factors, establishing the foundations of the Human Relations school (Rodrigues, 2014; Sant'Anna; Kilimnik, 2012).

In the 1950s, Eric Trist, in London, investigated the relationship between work, individual and organization, proposing that the work environment respected the psychological requirements of workers (Sant'Anna; Kilimnik, 2012). The 1950s and 1960s had QWL standards that were quite different from those of today, with less rigorous concerns about occupational health and safety, longer working hours and less comfortable working conditions (Linero; Rocha, 2020).

The studies of Abraham Maslow, Frederick Herzberg and Douglas McGregor contributed significantly to the understanding of motivation and satisfaction at work. Maslow introduced the hierarchy of human needs; Herzberg differentiated hygiene factors from motivating factors; and McGregor developed theories X and Y, which explored different perceptions about human nature at work (Sant'Anna; Kilimnik, 2012).

In the USA, the creation of the National Commission on Productivity and the National Center for Productivity and Quality of Working Life, in the 1960s, highlighted the importance of QWL in productivity (Fernandes, 1996). In the following decades, especially in the 1990s, QWL gained global recognition, influencing discussions among academics, governments and businesspeople.

According to Corrêa (1993), the evolution of QWL can be divided into four stages: the first based on Marxist theories and social policies from the 19th century; the second with Taylor's ideas on salary incentives and administrative efficiency; the third initiated by the Human Relations school; and the fourth, from 1960 onwards, with behavioral theories focused on workers' self-realization.

1.2. Classic approaches to QWL

1.2.1. Walton Model (1973)

Richard Walton's model, published in 1973, is one of the most recognized approaches to assessing QWL, serving as the basis for several subsequent research and practices. This model is made up of eight dimensions that consider both the work environment and external aspects that can directly or indirectly influence the work. The dimensions are:

1. Fair and adequate remuneration: Perception of equity and adequacy of remuneration in relation to the tasks and responsibilities performed;
2. Working conditions: Physical and environmental aspects of the workplace, such as safety, comfort, ergonomics and available resources;
3. Opportunities for growth and development: Access to training, possibilities for promotion and development of skills and competencies;
4. Job security and stability: Perception of job stability, protection against unemployment risks and safe working conditions;
5. Social integration at work: Degree of interaction, support and positive relationships between co-workers and the feeling of belonging to the group;
6. Work and space for autonomy: Possibility for employees to have control over their own work, decision making and autonomy in tasks;
7. Use and recognition of skills: Assessment of whether employees' skills and competencies are adequately recognized and used at work;
8. Meaning of work: Perception of value and meaning of the tasks performed, as well as the importance of work for employees.

These dimensions provide a comprehensive understanding of QWL, considering both aspects of the work environment and external influences (Batista; Antunes; Lizuka, 2012). Walton recognized that job dissatisfaction affected the majority of workers, regardless of the position held, and argued that management should look for ways to reduce this dissatisfaction to benefit both individuals and organizations (Batista; Antunes; Lizuka, 2012).

Each dimension of Walton's model is equally important in influencing QWL, contributing uniquely to the overall work experience. This approach provides a useful guide to understanding and improving working conditions and employee satisfaction (Barros; Silva, 2010). Despite the scope of the model, some scholars, such as Pedroso and Pilatti (2009a), consider that physiological aspects could be further explored, indicating a possible area for improvement in the model.

This model has become an important reference for the study and practice of QWL, helping organizations create a healthier and more productive work environment.

1.2.2. Hackman and Oldham model (1974)

Hackman and Oldham's (1974) approach establishes a connection between job satisfaction and the nature of the tasks performed. According to them, the fundamental elements of Quality of Life at Work (QWL) are associated with the dimensions of the task, the psychological state and personal and work results, as perceived by employees (Rezende; Silva, 2008).

Hackman and Oldham identified five key characteristics that contribute to task quality:

1. Variety of skills: Diversity of tasks and activities at work, providing challenges and opportunities for the use of different skills and knowledge;
2. Task identity: Clarity and understanding of the worker about the final result of the task, allowing him to see the final product of his work;
3. Meaning of the task: Perception of the task as important and relevant, providing a sense of purpose and value for the worker;
4. Autonomy: Level of freedom that the worker has to make decisions and have control over their own work;
5. Job feedback: Availability of clear and regular information about job performance, enabling the worker to assess their own progress and take corrective action if necessary.

These structural characteristics of tasks significantly influence workers' satisfaction and well-being, promoting positive QWL. Furthermore, secondary factors such as personal and work outcomes and the need for individual growth also play a crucial role.

Based on these elements, the Work Motivating Potential was formulated, which evaluates the motivational properties of work, indicating how significant it is, fosters responsibility and provides knowledge of results (Pedroso; Pilatti, 2010). This instrument uses a questionnaire with fifteen objective questions, the answers to which are arranged on a Likert scale of seven alternatives. The result of the motivating potential of work can vary between 1 and 343, with >125 being considered satisfactory and <125 unsatisfactory (Pedroso; Pilatti, 2009b).

1.2.3. Westley Model (1979)

William A. Westley's model adopts a sociotechnical perspective, analyzing QWL from a historical retrospective of the work environment. Westley argues that problems at work originate in four main areas: political (insecurity), economic (injustice), psychological (alienation) and sociological (anomie). He argues that each of these categories must be analyzed separately to find specific solutions (Pedroso; Pilatti, 2010).

Westley relates these problems to the evolution of industrial society, drawing an analogy between the challenges faced in the 19th century and those of the late 1970s, when he published his work. He proposes task enrichment techniques and the structuring of work groups as strategies to minimize these problems, such as job instability, salary inequality, low self-esteem and the absence of labor laws (Pedroso; Pilatti, 2010; Sant'Anna; Kilimnik, 2012).

Although Westley's model provides a valuable analysis of the historical and sociotechnical origins of QWL problems, it is criticized for its limitation in considering only the economic, political, psychological and sociological dimensions. Pedroso and Pilatti (2010) point out that this approach is fragile, as it does not take into account other multiple factors that also affect QWL, resulting in a study with a more historical focus.

1.2.4. Werther and Davis model (1983)

According to William B. Werther and Keith Davis (1983), several factors influence QWL, such as salary, management, working conditions and benefits. However, they highlight that the most stimulating aspect for employees is the position they occupy. This means that, even with a high salary and competent management, an employee may not feel satisfied if they are not engaged in the activities they perform and feel bored. Therefore, it is essential that workers are positively challenged in their roles (Rodrigues, 2011).

Werther and Davis also highlight the importance of anticipating negative changes in the work environment to minimize their adverse effects. To ensure the satisfaction of all parties involved, it is necessary to balance the company's demands with a fair job development project.

Werther and Davis' approach emphasizes that job content and opportunities for growth and development are crucial factors for QWL. Employees must feel motivated and challenged in their roles, while being provided with fair and equitable opportunities for professional advancement. By considering these aspects, organizations can promote a more satisfactory work environment, where employees feel valued and engaged in their activities (Walton, 1973; Davis; Werther, 1983).

1.2.5. Nadler and Lawler model (1983)

David A. Nadler and Edward E. Lawler analyzed QWL from an evolutionary perspective. In the 1960s and 1970s, QWL was the object of study by several researchers, acquiring different meanings and interpretations. In the early 1980s, when the Nadler and Lawler model was developed, QWL was no longer new and, in the authors' opinion, managers began to pay less attention to the practice, which would be a big mistake, leading organizations losing added value (Pedroso; Pilatti, 2009c).

To avoid this loss of value, Nadler and Lawler argued that QWL should be clearly defined, covering all its aspects, grouping its meaning, the results and benefits it can generate, in addition to the pre-existing conditions for success. Based on this basis, they created a model that covers these dimensions (Pedroso; Pilatti, 2010). Nadler and Lawler analyzed the period from 1959 to 1982 and divided the evolution of QWL into six different contexts, as shown in Table 2:

Table 2 – Evolution of the QWL concept

Evolutionary conception of QWL	Description
1- QWL as a variable (1959-1972)	Research on how to improve QWL targeting the individual
2- QWL as an approach (1969-1974)	In addition to focusing on the individual, it also sought improvements that would benefit management
3- QWL as a method (1972-1975)	Set of techniques that made the work environment more productive/satisfactory, with QVT being synonymous with autonomy and integration
4- QWL as a movement (1975-1980)	An ideology about how relationships should take place in the workplace and between workers and the organization
5- QWL like everything (1979-1982)	Way to solve problems in the globalization scenario, such as foreign competition, quality problems, low productivity, etc.
6- QWL like nothing (future)	If QWL application methods fail, it will be classified as obsolete

Fernandes, 1996.

Nadler and Lawler observed that, even with advances in QWL research and practice, the concept still remained confusing, without a clear definition. They warned that this lack of clarity could lead to the failure of QWL programs and the demotivation of managers, which would render all research carried out so far in vain (Pedroso; Pilatti, 2009c).

1.3. The continued importance of QWL

Despite Nadler and Lawler's concerns about the future of QWL, the prediction that QWL would become irrelevant did not come to pass. QWL has become an important organizational element, with real possibilities of transcending simple fads (Pedroso; Pilatti, 2010).

By exploring the origin, classical theories and historical evolution of QWL, it is possible to understand the importance of this concept over time and its impact on organizations. Theories of renowned scholars such as Maslow, Taylor, Walton, Hackman and Oldham provided solid foundations for the development and understanding of this approach. However, as we move into the contemporary era, new challenges and demands have emerged, requiring an update of definitions and practices related to QWL.

In the next section, the analysis will focus on more contemporary aspects, exploring updated definitions and addressing relevant issues, such as working from home and the importance of remuneration and benefits. By examining these topics, you have the opportunity to understand current limitations, as well as best practices that can be adopted to promote an even more effective and comprehensive quality of work life.

II. Analysis of Contemporary Studies on Quality of Life at Work

QWL has been a topic of great relevance in contemporary organizations, given its direct influence on the performance and well-being of employees, encompassing the conditions in which they carry out their work activities and seeking to promote physical, mental and social well-being. Thus, it covers aspects such as the work environment, work-life balance, and skills development.

For Simon and researchers (2020), the globalized and competitive market requires that organizations seeking success identify the variables responsible for maintaining optimal levels of satisfaction among their employees. Success is directly related to the importance that each organization attaches to helping employees develop, valuing their work and contribution to the organization in the best possible way, in addition to identifying employee dissatisfactions that can be improved.

Medeiros and Ferreira (2011) highlight that global changes and technological advances have generated precarious work, through changes in labor laws and the restructuring of the production process. This scenario raises the need to account for what generates efficiency for the company with the well-being of the worker, which may be possible through the discussion on QWL.

Andrade (2012) states that the dynamic of productivity versus personal satisfaction is essential to achieving quality of personal, family and work life at the same time.

Modern technologies increase efficiency and enable remote work, but they can cause overload and make it difficult to separate work and personal life. Lima and Silva (2019) suggest that the balanced adoption of technology, with digital disconnection policies, improves QWL.

Home office, amplified by the Covid-19 pandemic, brought flexibility and challenges such as isolation and the difficulty of separating professional and personal life. Silva and Rodrigues (2021) recommend routines, specific work spaces and virtual social interactions to improve QWL when working remotely.

Fair pay and attractive benefits are crucial, but satisfaction goes beyond salary. Benefits such as health plans, well-being programs, professional development and recognition are fundamental for a positive QWL (Ferreira; Almeida, 2020).

2.1. What does QWL mean in contemporary times?

In contemporary times, QWL encompasses the creation, maintenance and improvement of the physical, psychological and social work environment. Effective QWL management optimizes human potential, resulting in greater motivation, productivity and lower turnover. Several authors conceptualize QWL in a broad and multidisciplinary way, influenced by diverse views such as ecology, economics and health. Essentially, QWL aims to humanize work, increase well-being and promote worker participation in organizational decisions (Rodrigues, 2011; Medeiros; Ferreira, 2011).

Guest's (1979) definition highlights QWL as a process that involves realizing the creative potential of employees, focusing on both efficiency and self-realization. Vieira and Hanashiro (1990) advise that QWL must improve working conditions in all its dimensions, aligning with human resources policies to harmonize the interests of the employee and the organization.

Recently, adequate remuneration, attractive benefits and profit sharing have stood out as essential components of QWL, especially during the pandemic, with the increase in remote work. The adaptation of remuneration and benefits policies to the home office has become crucial, ensuring equity and recognition for employees in a new work context (Boas; Batista, 2004; Gatti et al., 2018).

2.2. Limitations of studies on QWL

Studies on QWL face several limitations that impact their understanding and application in organizations. Oliveira and Figueiredo (2021) highlight that the lack of consensus in the definition of QWL makes it difficult to compare studies and generalize results. Many studies focus only on objective variables such as remuneration, leaving aside subjective aspects such as social support and autonomy, while Sant'Anna and Kilimnik (2012) point out the scarcity of studies focused on the perspective of workers.

Furthermore, the tendency to study specific samples and the absence of longitudinal studies make it difficult to generalize the results. Fernandes (1996) highlights the discrepancy between theory and practice, where working conditions often do not correspond to the ideas propagated in studies on QWL.

Another critical limitation is the lack of research into the determinants of QWL, focusing more on measuring quality of life levels at work. This limited approach prevents the understanding of organizational processes that directly influence workers' experience (Sant'Anna; Kilimnik, 2012).

Finally, Caldas (1998) discusses the phenomenon of workaholism and its negative impacts, pointing out the need for balance between professional and personal life. Overcoming these limitations requires a more holistic approach, considering mixed methods, longitudinal studies and the multidimensional complexity of QWL to develop practices that are more effective and adaptable to the contemporary work environment.

2.3. QVT and home office: Adaptations in times of pandemic

The Covid-19 pandemic has profoundly altered the global professional landscape, leading many companies to adopt remote work as a preventive measure. This context highlighted the importance of QWL, especially given the new demands imposed on employees.

Initially seen as a flexible option, working from home has become mandatory for many, bringing unique challenges to QWL. While some adapted easily, others faced difficulties in establishing boundaries between work and personal life, dealing with loneliness or maintaining productivity (Machado; Miranda; Andrade, 2022).

A critical aspect to guarantee a good QWL in the home office is adequate infrastructure. Companies must provide resources such as work equipment, secure network access and efficient communication tools, in addition to offering technical support and training (Machado; Miranda; Andrade, 2022).

Flexibility in working hours is also essential in the context of working from home during the pandemic. Allowing employees to have autonomy in defining their schedules contributes to the balance between professional and personal life, given the new daily routines and domestic responsibilities.

However, it is crucial to recognize that working from home is not viable for all roles and sectors. For those who require physical presence, safety measures must be implemented to protect workers' health (Gatti et al., 2018).

The pandemic has also highlighted the importance of mental health in the workplace. Social isolation and stress resulting from the health crisis significantly impacted employees, requiring companies to provide psychological support such as emotional support programs and access to specialized professionals (Sebrae, 2023).

Maintaining clear and transparent communication between managers and teams also proved to be crucial. Regularly reporting on the measures adopted by the company in response to the pandemic and listening to employees' concerns strengthens the organizational culture and promotes a healthy work environment, even remotely.

In short, the pandemic has transformed the way organizations and their employees perceive remote work, highlighting the importance of ensuring adequate infrastructure, flexibility, mental health care and effective communication. QWL continues to be fundamental for well-being and productivity, even in challenging times, demonstrating the need for investment in this aspect for organizational success and care for people.

III. Methodology

For the work methodology, Minayo (2002) defines qualitative research as exploring non-quantifiable realities, focusing on meanings, motives, aspirations and values. Pizzolatti and Rocha (2004) highlight that the method guides the study so as not to deviate from the initial proposal. The study began with exploratory bibliographical research, following Pinsonneault and Kraemer (1993) in identifying and determining concepts to be measured. Prodanov and Freitas (2013) add that this approach aims to familiarize oneself with the problem, using material from accessible sources and verifying the veracity of the data.

In the second part, a qualitative case study was carried out, according to Lakatos and Marconi (1999), aiming to obtain information about a specific problem or new phenomena. This study was conducted with individual interviews at a bank branch in Brazil, where the researcher, also an employee, had easy access. The interviews explored employees' perception of QWL, especially during the period of working from home after the pandemic, conducted in 2023 with 24 essay and objective questions to preserve the participants' anonymity.

IV. Presentation and Discussion of Research Results

In this section, the results of research on quality of work life in a company are presented. The interviews were conducted with 7 employees, including members from different areas and hierarchical levels, as well as leaders. The 18 questions addressed the implementation and effectiveness of quality of life practices, with 6 additional questions about the profile of the interviewees, as shown in Appendix A. The responses were analyzed and categorized into themes to facilitate understanding.

The patterns identified revealed that the majority of employees value a healthy balance between work and personal life. They highlighted the importance of flexible working hours policies, wellbeing programs and mental health support as essential to improving quality of life at work. The company was concerned about implementing measures that benefit both the organization and its employees. However, the need for an adaptive and continuous approach that considers employees' individual expectations and needs is emphasized.

4.1. Satisfaction with remuneration, benefits and profit sharing

The results of the interviews indicated that 71.4% of those interviewed were neutral in relation to satisfaction with remuneration, benefits and participation in the company's results. This suggests that there is room for improvements in compensation and benefits policies, aiming to increase employee satisfaction and financial recognition. The neutrality expressed by the interviewees indicates that they are not dissatisfied, but also not enthusiastic about these aspects. The company can benefit from reviewing salary equity, attractive benefits packages and clear profit sharing policies that truly motivate and reward employee performance. This is crucial, as remuneration, benefits and profit sharing are essential for the motivation and engagement of employees, directly influencing the quality of work life and productivity.

4.2. Working hours and main activity performed by employees

During the interviews, 85.7% of employees demonstrated satisfaction with both the weekly working hours and the main activity performed. This indicates that the company is providing an appropriate work-life balance and offering challenging and meaningful activities. Satisfaction with the working day reflects the company's ability to allow employees to combine personal and professional responsibilities, contributing to their general well-being. Furthermore, satisfaction with core activities highlights an environment where employees feel engaged and fulfilled, which can increase productivity and creativity. These positive aspects indicate good management of roles and responsibilities, as well as an organizational culture that values balance and development within the company. It is crucial that the company maintains open communication with employees to adapt to their constantly evolving needs, thus ensuring a healthy and motivating work environment.

4.3. Performance evaluation and development opportunities

During the interviews, there was a diversity of responses regarding the last performance evaluation and opportunities for development and career growth. While 42.9% of employees reported satisfaction, others (57.1%)

expressed dissatisfaction or neutrality. This variety of insights suggests that the company could improve its performance review processes and offer more clear opportunities for professional growth.

Performance evaluation is crucial to promoting continuous improvement and employee recognition, as long as it is carried out fairly and transparently. Receiving employee feedback on these processes can help identify areas for improvement, such as communication and alignment of expectations.

Furthermore, it is essential that the company offers clear development opportunities, such as training, qualification and mentoring programs. Investing in employee growth not only increases motivation and engagement, but also strengthens the organizational culture of continuous learning.

In summary, improving performance evaluation and providing clear development opportunities are important steps to increasing employee satisfaction and engagement, contributing to a more stimulating and motivating work environment.

4.4. Adapting to working from home during the pandemic

During the interviews, approximately 42.9% of employees reported having easily adapted to working from home during the pandemic, valuing the flexibility and comfort that this modality provides. However, some mentioned challenges, such as difficulty maintaining the focus and discipline necessary for task efficiency, as well as a lack of personal contact with colleagues and clients.

It is crucial that the company understands these different points of view and offers appropriate support to employees. Strategies such as productivity and time management training, as well as the use of effective communication tools, can help overcome these challenges. Furthermore, it is important to hold regular virtual meetings to assess the well-being and needs of employees working from home.

Promoting a culture that balances work and personal life, encouraging clear boundaries between both, flexible schedules and self-care practices, is also essential for the well-being of employees in this work format.

By recognizing the challenges and offering the necessary support, the company can facilitate a smooth transition to working from home, enjoying its benefits while maintaining a productive and collaborative work environment.

4.5. Mental health and job demands

During the interviews, approximately 42.9% of employees reported negative impacts on their mental health during the pandemic, mainly due to anxiety related to uncertainties and changes in context. Furthermore, 57.1% mentioned a decrease in work demands, which also influenced these impacts.

In this sense, it is essential that the company recognizes the importance of employee mental health and promotes a healthy work environment. This can be achieved through different strategies, such as (Lima, 2013; Sebrae, 2023):

- **Open communication:** Establish clear and transparent communication, providing up-to-date information and health and safety policies to reduce uncertainty and promote trust;
- **Flexibility and balance:** Offer flexibility in working hours, regular breaks and encourage self-care to balance work and personal life;
- **Emotional support:** Provide resources such as psychological counseling and create support networks among employees to strengthen social support;
- **Training and awareness:** Promote training on mental health, anxiety and stress management to enable employees to adopt healthy coping strategies;
- **Individualized monitoring:** Hold individual meetings to assess employee well-being, identify problems related to mental health and offer specific support, such as adjustments to work responsibilities.

By adopting these measures, the company demonstrates its commitment to the health and well-being of employees, creating a healthier and more resilient work environment. Furthermore, by offering adequate support during challenging situations, such as the pandemic, the company strengthens bonds with employees and promotes talent retention, contributing to the long-term success of the organization.

4.6. QWL training and promotion

During the interviews, it was observed that 57.1% of employees expressed dissatisfaction with the training offered by the company for working from home. They mentioned that they did not receive adequate support, which can affect both the productivity and well-being of employees in this modality. However, there was positive recognition of the measures adopted by the company to allow employees with comorbidities to work from home, demonstrating sensitivity and concern for the health of employees.

To improve the effectiveness and satisfaction of employees when working remotely, the company must evaluate and adjust its training programs. This includes offering specific training on the use of online communication tools, time management and establishing boundaries between personal and professional life.

Additionally, the company may consider comprehensive QWL initiatives such as flexible work hours to promote a healthy work-life balance, implementing physical and mental wellness programs, establishing clear recognition and rewards policies, and promoting open and participatory communication between employees.

By adopting these initiatives, the company not only promotes a healthier and more productive work environment, but also increases employee satisfaction, engagement and retention, contributing to the long-term success of the organization.

4.7. Preference over in-person work

During the interviews, a general preference among employees for in-person work was identified. They value direct contact with clients and colleagues, in addition to perceiving better opportunities for professional development in this modality. However, benefits of working from home were also mentioned, such as flexibility, reduced travel time and better work-life balance.

Given these divergent perspectives, the company may consider adopting a hybrid work model. This model combines in-person work and home office, allowing employees to enjoy the benefits of both modalities. This can increase employee satisfaction and motivation, as well as promote a better balance between work and personal life.

It is crucial that the company carefully evaluates the specific needs of each function and department when implementing hybrid work. Not all activities are suitable for remote work, therefore, it is important to carry out this assessment to ensure the effectiveness of the adopted model.

Additionally, the company must be open to receiving ongoing feedback from employees during the hybrid work implementation process. This allows adjustments as necessary, ensuring that the working model is efficient and meets the expectations of both the organization and employees.

Adopting a hybrid work model can not only satisfy employees' varied preferences, but also strengthen organizational culture and contribute to the company's long-term success.

4.8. General analysis of the results

Based on the analysis of the data collected, there are several important conclusions and recommendations to improve QWL in the company:

- **Compensation and benefits policies:** It is essential to review compensation and benefits policies to ensure they are aligned with employee expectations. This may include reviewing salary packages, additional benefits such as health plans and incentive programs that recognize and value employees' work;
- **Performance evaluation and professional development:** Improving performance evaluation processes is essential to providing constructive and fair feedback to employees. Furthermore, offering clear opportunities for professional development and growth, such as specific training and mentoring programs, can increase motivation and engagement;
- **Home office work:** Adapting to home office work has brought both benefits and challenges. The company should provide additional support, such as training in digital skills, time management and remote work well-being. Implementing policies that balance the flexibility of working from home with the need for personal interaction can help maximize the benefits of this type of work;
- **Mental health and well-being:** It is crucial to promote a healthy work environment that includes measures to support employee mental health. This may involve implementing wellness programs that encourage healthy practices such as physical activity, stress management, and psychological support through counseling or therapy;
- **Hybrid work model:** Given employees' preference for face-to-face work, the company may consider adopting a hybrid work model. This would allow employees flexibility, combining the best of both worlds and meeting the specific needs of each role.

By effectively addressing these areas of opportunity, the company not only improves QWL, but also strengthens organizational culture, increases employee satisfaction and engagement, and promotes a healthier and more productive work environment. These measures not only benefit individual employees, but also contribute significantly to the company's long-term success and competitiveness.

Final considerations

The analysis revealed that there are positive points in QWL in the company, such as general satisfaction with the journey and main activities. However, areas of opportunity have been identified, especially related to remuneration, benefits and profit sharing, where there is a need for review to increase financial recognition and employee satisfaction.

The management of roles and responsibilities was well evaluated, but the performance evaluation and development opportunities presented divergent perceptions, indicating the need for improvements in processes to ensure fairness and transparency.

Adapting to working from home during the pandemic stood out, with perceived advantages such as flexibility, but also challenges such as discipline. The company can benefit from offering more support, such as specific training. Employee mental health has emerged as a relevant concern, with anxiety a hot spot during the pandemic. Well-being initiatives and psychological support are recommended to promote a healthy work environment.

The preference for in-person work was evident, but there is recognition of the benefits of working from home. A hybrid working model could be explored to balance these preferences and needs.

In short, by addressing these areas of opportunity with more equitable policies, professional development support, and a flexible and adaptable work model, the company can improve QWL, increase employee satisfaction and retention, and strengthen its organizational performance over the long term.

REFERENCES

- [1]. ANDRADE, J. de A. **Qualidade de vida no trabalho**. Belo Horizonte: Newton Paiva – Unidade de Educação à Distância, 2012.
- [2]. BARROS, A. M.; SILVA, J. R. G. Percepções dos indivíduos sobre as consequências do teletrabalho na configuração home office: estudo de caso na Shell Brasil. **Cadernos EBAPE**, Rio de Janeiro, v.8, n. 1, artigo 5, mar. 2010.
- [3]. BATISTA, M. B.; ANTUNES, L. C.; LIZUKA, E. S. Qualidade de vida no trabalho e a produção acadêmica: visita aos Anais dos ENANPAD's de 2001 a 2011. In: **ENCONTRO DA ANPAD**, 36, Rio de Janeiro: ANPAD, 2012.
- [4]. BOAS, A. A. V.; BATISTA, L. G. As metodologias de remuneração variável adotadas pelas empresas brasileiras e sua influência na mudança organizacional. **Revista Eletrônica de Ciência Administrativa**, v. 3, n. 1, p. 1-11, 2004.
- [5]. CALDAS, M. P. O Fascínio do Stress e a Modernidade do Workaholic. In: Encontro Internacional de Gestão de Competências em Qualidade de Vida no Trabalho, 1º, **Anais**, São Paulo: FEA/USP, FIA, PROPEG, p. 31-34, 1998.
- [6]. CORRÊA, R. A. A. Qualidade de vida, qualidade do trabalho, qualidade do atendimento público e competitividade. **Revista de Administração Pública**, Rio de Janeiro, ano 27, n. 1, 1993.
- [7]. FERNANDES, E. **Qualidade de vida no trabalho**: Como medir para melhorar. Salvador: Casa da Qualidade Editora Ltda., 1996.
- [8]. GATTI, D. P.; TERRA, G. de S.; PORTUGAL, N. dos S.; SOUZA, W. G. de; JUNIOR, P. dos S. P.; SILVA, S. W. Home office: vantagens, desvantagens e desafios para empresas e funcionários. **Revista de Administração do UNIFATEA**, v. 16, n. 16, 2018.
- [9]. LAKATOS, E. M.; MARCONI, M. de A. **Técnicas de pesquisas**: planejamento e execução de pesquisas, amostragens e técnicas de pesquisas, elaboração, análise e interpretação de dados. 4ª edição. São Paulo: Atlas, 1999.
- [10]. LIMA, M. E. A. Saúde mental e trabalho: Limites, desafios, obstáculos e perspectivas. **Cadernos de Psicologia Social do Trabalho**, v. 16, n. spe1, p. 91-98, 2013.
- [11]. LINERO, C.; ROCHA, L. M. Os desafios na manutenção do regime de teletrabalho no Brasil após a pandemia da Covid-19. **Revista da Escola Judicial do TRT4**, v. 2, n. 4, p. 125-148, dezembro de 2020.
- [12]. MACHADO, F.; MIRANDA, J. L.; ANDRADE, M. A. Home office em Tempos de Pandemia de Covid-19 e as Implicações sobre a Ergonomia no Trabalho Administrativo. **Revista Processos Químicos**, v. 16, n. 30, p. 69-80, 2022.
- [13]. MEDEIROS, L. F. R. de; FERREIRA, M. C. Qualidade de Vida no Trabalho: uma revisão da produção científica de 1995-2009. **Gestão Contemporânea**, Porto Alegre, ano 8, n. 9, p. 9-34, janeiro/junho de 2011.
- [14]. MELLO, D. Home office foi adotado por 46% das empresas durante a pandemia. **AgênciaBrasil**, Rio de Janeiro, julho de 2020. Disponível em: <https://agenciabrasil.ebc.com.br/economia/noticia/2020-07/homeoffice-foi-adotado-por-46-das-empresas-durante-pandemia>. Acesso em: 21 de julho de 2022.
- [15]. MINAYO, M. C. de S. et al. (Org.). **Pesquisa social**: teoria, método e criatividade. 21. ed. Petrópolis: Vozes, 2002.
- [16]. OLIVEIRA, M. A.; FIGUEIREDO, M. F. Qualidade de vida no trabalho. **Revista Gestão & Sustentabilidade**, v. 3, n. 1, p. 133-143, 2021.
- [17]. PEDROSO, B.; PILATTI, L. A. Notas sobre o modelo de qualidade de vida no trabalho de Walton: uma revisão literária. **Revista da Faculdade de Educação Física da UNICAMP**, Campinas, v. 7, n. 3, p. 29-43, setembro/dezembro de 2009a.
- [18]. PEDROSO, B.; PILATTI, L. Motivação e trabalho: análise do modelo de qualidade de vida no trabalho de Hackman e Oldham. **Revista Brasileira de Qualidade de Vida**, Ponta Grossa, v. 1, n. 2, p. 8-15, julho/dezembro de 2009b.
- [19]. PEDROSO, B.; PILATTI, L. Um olhar crítico sobre o modelo de qualidade de vida no trabalho de Nadler e Lawler. **Revista Digital**, Buenos Aires – Argentina, ano 14, n. 139, dezembro de 2009c.
- [20]. PEDROSO, B.; PILATTI, L. Revisão literária dos modelos clássicos de avaliação da qualidade de vida no Trabalho: um debate necessário. In: VILARTA, Roberto; GUTIERREZ, Gustavo Luis; MONTEIRO, Maria Inês. **Qualidade de vida**: evolução dos conceitos e práticas no século XXI. Campinas: Ipês, 2010.
- [21]. PINSONNEAULT, A.; KRAEMER, K. L. Survey research in management information systems: An assessment. **Journal of Management Information System**, 1993.
- [22]. PIZZOLATTI, R. L.; ROCHA, F. G. A importância e difícil opção por um método na pesquisa. **Caminhos de Geografia**, v. 13, n. 4, p. 56-64, outubro de 2004.
- [23]. PRODANOV, C. C.; FREITAS, E. C. de. **Metodologia do trabalho científico**: método e técnicas de pesquisa e do trabalho acadêmico. 2ª edição. Novo Hamburgo: Feevale, 2013.
- [24]. RODRIGUES, M. V. **Qualidade de vida no trabalho**: Evolução e análise no nível gerencial. 15ª edição. Petrópolis: Editora Vozes, 2014.
- [25]. SANT'ANNA, A.; KILIMNIK, Z. **Qualidade de vida no trabalho**: fundamentos e abordagens. 2ª edição. Rio de Janeiro: Elsevier, 2012.
- [26]. SAÚDE mental no Brasil e o impacto para as empresas. **Sebrae**, 2023. Disponível em: <https://www.sebrae.com.br/sites/PortalSebrae/artigos/saude-mental-no-brasil-e-o-impacto-para-as-empresas,40d1419305b15810VgnVCM100000d701210aRCRD>. Acesso em: 10 de maio de 2023.
- [27]. SIMON, A.; MOZER, D.; COSTA, D.; CARLETTI, E. O desafio na contemporaneidade das organizações em manter seus colaboradores satisfeitos. **Revista Ambiente Acadêmico**, v. 6, n. 2, p. 148-166, 2020.
- [28]. VIEIRA, D. F. V. B.; HANASHIRO, D. M. M. Visão introdutória de qualidade de vida no