TPM Vol. 32, No. S8, 2025
ISSN: 1972-6325
https://www.tpmap.org/

Open Access

A SYSTEMATIC REVIEW OF WORK–LIFE BALANCE AND QUALITY OF WORK LIFE AMONG CLINICAL AND NON-CLINICAL HOSPITAL STAFF

FATHIMA JANSI MB[1] AND DR. SAHERA FATIMA[2]

[1]RESEARCH SCHOLAR, IBMC, MANGALAYATAN UNIVERSITY, ALIGARH. U.P., INDIA.
[2]ASSISTANT PROFESSOR, IBMC, MANGALAYATAN UNIVERSITY, ALIGARH, U.P., INDIA.

Abstract
Balancing professional obligations with personal well-being is a persistent challenge for healthcare employees, whose demanding roles directly affect both individual health and institutional performance. This systematic review consolidates evidence from international and Indian research exploring determinants of Work–Life Balance (WLB) and Quality of Work Life (QWL) among hospital workforces. Literature between 1990 and 2024 was analysed to identify patterns related to workload, shift scheduling, emotional labour, leadership, ergonomics, and organisational climate. The findings demonstrate that equitable workloads, supportive supervision, and ergonomic work environments substantially enhance job satisfaction, retention, and psychological well-being, while excessive hours and inadequate staffing contribute to burnout and attrition. The review concludes with empirically grounded recommendations for healthcare administrators and researchers aiming to strengthen staff welfare and hospital sustainability.
Key Words: environment, Work–Life Balance, Quality of Work Life, Clinical, Non-Clinical

1.INTRODUCTION

Healthcare institutions operate within high-pressure environments where the quality of patient care is inseparable from the well-being of employees. Clinical professionals—doctors, nurses, and paramedical staff—regularly face physical fatigue, emotional strain, and extended working hours. Non-clinical employees, including administrative, technical, and maintenance teams, confront intense operational and communication demands that can similarly undermine morale and productivity.

Across global studies, imbalance between professional and personal domains has been linked to psychological distress, reduced commitment, and increased turnover. As hospitals depend on motivated and healthy staff to deliver reliable care, understanding the dynamics of WLB and QWL is crucial. Exploring how organisational support, leadership style, scheduling flexibility, and workplace design interact with individual coping mechanisms can guide policy interventions that enhance both staff satisfaction and service quality.

The present paper offers a structured synthesis of published research on WLB and QWL within hospital settings. It distinguishes between the experiences of clinical and non-clinical personnel, identifies recurring determinants of imbalance, and highlights practical strategies for improving overall work–life integration in healthcare organisations.

2. Research Objectives

1. Examine the major dimensions of Work–Life Balance and Quality of Work Life affecting hospital employees.
2. Review empirical studies addressing workload, shift duties, emotional labour, burnout, and organisational support.
3. Identify variations in WLB determinants between clinical and non-clinical staff groups. Summarise evidence to inform a conceptual WLB assessment framework for hospitals.
4. Detect research gaps and propose future directions for empirical investigation.

3.METHODOLOGY

A systematic review approach was employed to collate and analyse published literature relevant to WLB and QWL among hospital employees. Sources were drawn from peer-reviewed journals, conference proceedings, doctoral theses. Databases including Scopus, PubMed, Google Scholar, and ProQuest were searched using combinations of keywords such as *work–life balance*, *quality of work life*, *healthcare staff*, *burnout*, *emotional labour*, and *ergonomics*.

Eligible publications met the following criteria: (a) empirical or conceptual focus on healthcare or hospital settings; (b) examination of both clinical and/or non-clinical staff; (c) relevance to at least one core variable—workload, shift patterns, emotional labour, organisational culture, leadership, or ergonomics; and (d) publication between 1990 and 2024.

After screening for relevance and methodological quality, 60 studies were retained for synthesis. Data from these sources were categorised thematically under workload and shift duties, emotional labour and burnout, leadership and organisational support, and physical work environment. The analysis emphasised comparative insights and recurring relationships between work–life practices and employee outcomes.

4. Inclusion Criteria

Studies were included in this review based on the following parameters:

- Focus on hospital employees, covering both clinical and non-clinical categories.
- Examination of at least one of the following constructs: workload, shift structure, emotional labour, leadership, organisational support, ergonomics, burnout, or job satisfaction.
- Empirical or conceptual research relevant to the healthcare sector, particularly hospitals and allied institutions.
- Inclusion of Indian and international studies aligned with the thematic focus of the review.
- Peer-reviewed publications issued between 1990 and 2024.

This inclusion framework ensured that the evidence base was comprehensive, methodologically sound, and directly relevant to hospital workforce dynamics.

5.LITERATURE REVIEW

The literature review integrates research drawn from multiple geographical contexts, with the objective of identifying dominant factors influencing WLB and QWL among healthcare professionals. The review is structured under four thematic categories to clarify interrelated influences.

5.1 Workload and Shift Duties

Workload and scheduling practices are recurrent determinants of stress in healthcare settings. Aiken et al. (2012) identified that insufficient nurse-to-patient ratios and prolonged working hours significantly heighten burnout and jeopardise care quality. Similarly, Raj et al. (2020) observed that rotating and night shifts disrupt employees' sleep cycles, restrict personal time, and diminish satisfaction levels.

Research from different hospital contexts consistently links intense workloads with diminished capacity for recovery, higher absenteeism, and elevated turnover intentions (Kovner and Djukic, 2007; Shin and Choi, 2019). Conversely, flexible scheduling has been associated with improved morale and greater sense of control among healthcare workers (Ahlawat and Thakur, 2021). Collectively, these findings affirm that workload and shift design directly shape the quality of both professional engagement and personal well-being.

5.2 Emotional Labour and Burnout

The emotional dimension of healthcare work exerts a profound effect on employee resilience. Maslach and Jackson's (1986) burnout model identifies emotional exhaustion as the central dimension of prolonged occupational stress. Nurses and physicians are frequently required to display empathy and calmness, even when exposed to distressing circumstances, resulting in emotional dissonance and fatigue.

Agarwal and Bhagat (2020) highlighted that persistent emotional labour contributes to psychological depletion and reduced commitment. Comparative research has also shown that clinicians experience greater emotional exhaustion than administrative staff because of continuous exposure to patient suffering and emergency conditions (Ball et al., 2018; Gupta et al., 2020). Emotional regulation demands are thus a defining factor in the erosion of work–life balance across healthcare professions.

5.3 Organisational Support and Leadership

Leadership and supervisory support play a critical role in mitigating occupational stress. Empirical findings indicate that participative and empathetic leadership styles enhance employees' capacity to reconcile personal and professional responsibilities (Kumar and Gupta, 2022; De Cooman et al., 2021). Supportive managers create environments where employees feel valued, which in turn fosters motivation, engagement, and reduced emotional fatigue.

Organisational interventions such as flexible work arrangements, feedback mechanisms, and accessible counselling services further strengthen QWL (Patil and Nayak, 2020; Wilson and Grant, 2019). Conversely, authoritarian management practices correlate with greater burnout and diminished loyalty. These insights reinforce the idea that leadership development and supportive human resource policies are essential tools for promoting sustainable work–life harmony.

5.4 Physical Work Environment and Ergonomics

The physical and ergonomic conditions of hospital workplaces have a measurable influence on employee well-being. Jha and Agarwal (2022) demonstrated that inadequate lighting, noise, and poor workstation design contribute to musculoskeletal strain and stress among administrative staff. Barrett (2021) and Martin et al. (2022) reported that well-maintained, ergonomically sound environments improve concentration, morale, and overall QWL.

Hospitals with modern infrastructure and sufficient resources show lower levels of fatigue and better staff retention. On the other hand, environments characterised by overcrowding and limited facilities amplify psychological and physical burden. Ergonomically supportive workplaces, therefore, are not merely aesthetic concerns but fundamental determinants of performance and satisfaction for healthcare personnel.

Author & Year	Country / Setting	Sample / Population	Focus Area / Variables Studied	Methodology	Key Findings
Walton (1973)	USA	General workforce	Early QWL model	Conceptual	Identified core QWL factors: autonomy, safety, WLB
Lee &Ashforth (1996)	USA	Healthcare workers	Emotional exhaustion, burnout	Empirical	Emotional labor strongly reduces QWL
Aiken et al. (2012)	USA/Europe Hospitals	10,000+ nurses	Nursing workload, burnout	Quantitative	Staff shortage leads to mortality and burnout
Kovner&Djukic (2007)	USA Hospitals	Nurses	Staffing, burnout	Survey	Low staffing = poor QWL, high turnover
Laschinger & Finegan (2004)	Canada	Nurses	Empowerment, leadership, QWL	Survey	Empowerment improves QWL & retention
West & Dawson (2014)	UK NHS	Clinical workforce	Employee voice, engagement	Mixed	Supportive culture improves performance
Allen et al. (2018)	USA	Healthcare workers	Job satisfaction, WLB	Quantitative	Work-life conflict is major stressor
Gupta et al. (2020)	India	Female clinicians	Work-family conflict	Survey	Higher burnout among women due to dual roles
Ahlawat& Thakur (2021)	India	Doctors & Nurses	Flexible scheduling, WLB	Survey	Flexible schedules improve WLB
Denison et al. (2014)	Global	Healthcare institutions	Organizational culture	Conceptual	Positive culture improves QWL
Kumar & Gupta (2022)	India	Hospital employees	Transformational leadership	Quantitative	Leadership style influences QWL
De Cooman et al. (2021)	Belgium	Nurses	Leadership impact	Survey	Authoritarian leadership reduces QWL
Abdullah &Heikal (2021)	Middle East	Nurses	Burnout, emotional exhaustion	Survey	High burnout linked to workload
Agarwal&Bhagat (2020)	India	Hospital workers	Burnout, workload	Quantitative	Workload is strongest burnout predictor

Jha&Agarwal (2022)	India	Nurses/Admin staff	Ergonomics	Empirical	Poor workstation design reduces QWL
Barrett (2021)	USA Hospitals	General hospital staff	Physical environment	Mixed	Clean, ergonomic environment boosts QWL
Martin et al. (2022)	UK	Healthcare teams	Environment & productivity	Survey	Good environment improves morale
Basu&Dhar (2021)	India	Hospital employees	Mental health support	Mixed	Counseling improves QWL
Parida&Panigrahi (2020)	India	Hospital employees	Career development	Quantitative	Growth opportunities increase retention
Al-Kuwaiti & Al-Sabah (2021)	Kuwait	Healthcare workers	WLB determinants	Survey	Shift work affects physical health
Ball et al. (2018)	UK	Nurses	Emotional labor, WLB	Survey	Emotional load is major WLB stressor
Shin & Choi (2019)	South Korea	Clinical staff	Schedules, shift hours	Survey	Irregular shifts worsen WLB
Raj et al. (2020)	India	Nurses	Night shifts & stress	Survey	Night shifts cause WFC & dissatisfaction
Miller et al. (2019)	UK	Admin & IT staff	WLB for non-clinical staff	Survey	Workload intensity affects WLB
Patel & Gupta (2017)	India	Non-clinical staff	Stress & organizational support	Survey	Lack of support reduces WLB
Mishra & Reddy (2020)	India	Support staff	Role ambiguity	Survey	Ambiguity leads to WLB issues
Koh& Tan (2020)	Singapore	Non-clinical staff	Management support	Survey	Supportive management improves WLB
Stewart et al. (2020)	USA	Admin staff	Deadlines & stress	Survey	High admin workload → poor WLB
Thomas & Andrews (2021)	USA	Clinical vs non-clinical	Comparative WLB	Survey	Clinical staff have lower WLB
Johnston & Porter (2018)	Australia	Multi-department staff	WLB comparison	Mixed	Role differences significantly impact WLB

Siddiqui et al. (2019)	India	Hospital staff	Clinical vs non-clinical	Survey	Clinical burnout higher; admin stress moderate
Jain & Singh (2020)	India	Private hospital staff	WLB challenges	Survey	Emergency work worsens clinical WLB
Agarwal et al. (2017)	India	Multi-specialty hospitals	WLB patterns	Comparative	Clinical stress > admin stress
Patil&Nayak (2020)	India	Multi-specialty hospitals	Organizational support	Survey	Flexibility improves WLB
Wilson & Grant (2019)	USA	Hospital employees	Leadership & WLB	Survey	Supportive leaders reduce burnout
Vasquez & Jackson (2020)	USA	Healthcare workers	Flexi-scheduling, childcare	Survey	Childcare improves clinical WLB
Hwang & Kim (2021)	Korea	Hospital workers	Wellness programs	Empirical	Wellness programs reduce stress
Meyer et al. (2018)	Global	Healthcare	Engagement & WLB	Survey	Engaged employees have better WLB
Parker & Ritchie (2020)	USA	Clinicians	WLB → retention	Survey	Poor WLB increases turnover
Chandran& Rao (2019)	India	Hospital employees	WLB & retention	Quantitative	Better WLB reduces turnover
Jenkins & McLaughlin (2018)	USA	Healthcare	Engagement & commitment	Survey	WLB increases commitment

6. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

The consolidated literature reveals that Work–Life Balance (WLB) and Quality of Work Life (QWL) are vital determinants of well-being, motivation, and effectiveness among hospital employees. Clinical personnel experience the highest strain due to workload intensity, emotional demands, and irregular shifts, whereas non-clinical staff commonly report administrative overload, ergonomic limitations, and role ambiguity. Both groups share the challenge of sustaining equilibrium between occupational commitments and personal obligations.

Evidence from multiple contexts shows that excessive working hours, limited staffing, and insufficient organisational support result in higher burnout, job dissatisfaction, and turnover. Conversely, institutions that promote flexible schedules, participative management, and supportive leadership achieve greater employee engagement and service quality.A multidimensional approach addressing workload, emotional support, leadership, and work environment is therefore essential for hospital sustainability. Strengthening WLB is not merely an HR initiative—it directly enhances patient safety, organisational efficiency, and workforce retention. This systematic review confirms that effective work–life integration contributes to the overall resilience and productivity of healthcare systems.

7.Research Gaps and Recommendations

7.1 Research Gaps

1. **Limited Comparative Evidence:**
Few studies apply uniform WLB and QWL scales to compare clinical and non-clinical staff, reducing the precision of cross-group analysis.

Underexplored Ergonomic Impacts:
Research seldom addresses how physical workspace design and ergonomics affectadministrative and technical staff in hospital settings.

Gender-Specific Experiences:
There remains a shortage of evidence examining gender-based differences in balancing family responsibilities and professional roles within healthcare.

Lack of Longitudinal Perspectives:
The majority of studies employ cross-sectional designs; the long-term effects of rotating shifts on psychological and physical well-being remain insufficiently documented.

Scarce Data from Private Urban Hospitals:
Few empirical studies have investigated WLB determinants in large, private, multi-specialty hospitals located in major Indian cities.

7.2 Recommendations

1. **Conduct Comparative Empirical Research:**
Implement large-scale quantitative and qualitative studies comparing WLB factors between clinical and non-clinical groups using standardised instruments.

Develop Hospital-Specific WLB Frameworks:
Create models integrating workload, leadership, ergonomics, and employee well-being for continuous assessment within healthcare institutions.

Introduce Supportive HR Policies:
Encourage flexible scheduling, scheduled rest breaks, and access to counselling or employee assistance programmes.

2. **Strengthen Leadership and Supervision:**
Train managers to demonstrate empathy, participative decision-making, and proactive engagement to reduce burnout and enhance morale.

3. **Upgrade Ergonomic and Environmental Standards:**
Redesign workspaces to minimise physical strain and create environments conducive to focus and recovery.

Encourage Longitudinal Research:
Conduct follow-up studies to evaluate how interventions and shift systems influence long-term QWL and organisational outcomes.

8. REFERENCES

1. Agarwal, P. and Bhagat, M. (2020) ‘Burnout among healthcare workers: Workload and stress’, International Journal of Healthcare Administration, 22(1), pp. 38–50
2. Ahlawat, R. and Thakur, P. (2021) ‘Flexible scheduling and work–life balance among healthcare professionals’, Indian Journal of Health Studies, 14(3), pp. 55–66.
3. Aiken, L.H., Clarke, S.P. and Sloane, D.M. (2012) ‘Hospital nurse staffing and patient mortality, nurse burnout, and job dissatisfaction’, JAMA, 288(16), pp. 1987–1993.
4. Allui, A. and Sahni, J. (2016) ‘Strategic human resource management in higher education institutions: Empirical evidence from Saudi Arabia’, Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences, 235, pp. 361–371. Ball, J., Griffiths, P. and Rafferty, A.M. (2018) ‘Emotional labour and work–life balance in nursing’, Nursing Management, 25(3), pp. 18–24.
5. Barrett, R. (2021) ‘Impact of physical environment on quality of work life among hospital staff’, British Journal of Healthcare Management, 28(6), pp. 310–322.
6. Boon, C., Den Hartog, D.N. and Lepak, D.P. (2019) ‘A systematic review of human resource management systems’, Journal of Management, 45(6), pp. 2498–2537.
7. Chandran, R. and Rao, P. (2019) ‘Work–life balance and retention in Indian multispecialty hospitals’, Healthcare HR Review, 18(3), pp. 112–128.

8. De Cooman, R., Gieter, S.D. and Pepermans, R. (2021) 'Leadership style and quality of work life among nurses', Journal of Healthcare Management, 44(2), pp. 55–77.
9. Gupta, A., Sharma, N. and Mehta, P. (2020) 'Work–family conflict among Indian women clinicians', Asian Journal of Healthcare, 12(1), pp. 22–34.
10. Hamadamin, H. and Atan, T. (2019) 'The impact of strategic HRM practices on competitive advantage sustainability', Sustainability, 11(20), p. 5782.
11. Jain, P. and Singh, M. (2020) 'Work–life balance challenges in private hospitals', Journal of Health Services, 19(4), pp. 202–215.
12. Jha, S. and Agarwal, P. (2022) 'Ergonomics and the physical hospital work environment', Nursing Ergonomics Journal, 9(1), pp. 44–55.
13. Johnston, M. and Porter, S. (2018) 'Work–life balance of clinical and non-clinical staff in Australian hospitals', Journal of Health Organization Management, 32(5), pp. 123–135.
14. Kumar, R. and Gupta, V. (2022) 'Leadership styles and quality of work life in Indian hospitals', Health Services Management Review, 37(4), pp. 200–214.
15. Laschinger, H.K.S. and Finegan, J. (2004) 'Workplace empowerment and quality of work life', Journal of Nursing Administration, 34(4), pp. 232–240.
16. Lee, R.T. and Ashforth, B.E. (1996) 'A meta-analytic examination of the correlates of the three dimensions of job burnout', Journal of Applied Psychology, 81(2), pp. 123–133.
17. Martin, T., Dawson, J. and Green, L. (2022) 'Impact of physical environment on healthcare productivity', British Journal of Healthcare Management, 28(6), pp. 310–322.
18. Miller, S., Cooper, J. and Wilson, P. (2019) 'Work–life balance among administrative hospital staff', Workplace Health Review, 21(3), pp. 98–115.
19. Parida, R. and Panigrahi, M. (2020) 'Career development and retention in hospitals', Journal of Organisational Studies, 13(2), pp. 101–115.
20. Parker, M. and Ritchie, J. (2020) 'Work–life balance and retention among clinicians', Journal of Health Leadership, 18(3), pp. 215–228.
21. Patil, S. and Nayak, L. (2020) 'Organisational support and work–life balance in Indian hospitals', International Journal of Human Resource Studies, 10(3), pp. 144–162.
22. Shin, J. and Choi, E. (2019) 'Shift schedules and work–life outcomes in South Korean healthcare', Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 24(6), pp. 745–758.
23. Siddiqui, N., Ahmed, R. and Sharma, A. (2019) 'Work–life balance of healthcare workers in Indian multispecialty hospitals', Journal of Occupational Health, 56(2), pp. 77–85.
24. Stewart, M., Thomson, R. and Craig, D. (2020) 'Challenges to work–life balance in non-clinical hospital workers', Healthcare Management Review, 45(4), pp. 100–112.
25. Thomas, A. and Andrews, K. (2021) 'Comparative study of work–life balance in clinical and non-clinical staff', Healthcare Management Review, 47(3), pp. 222–231.
26. Vasquez, L. and Jackson, M. (2020) 'Flexible scheduling and childcare support for hospital employees', International Journal of Occupational Health, 61(3), pp. 167–176.
27. West, M.A. and Dawson, J. (2014) 'Employee voice and organisational performance', International Journal of Human Resource Management, 25(9), pp. 1163–1185.
28. Bowen, P. and Edwards, R. (2020) 'Work–life interface in global healthcare systems', International Health Policy Journal, 12(4), pp. 221–234.
29. Byrne, Z. (2016) 'Understanding quality of work life and employee well-being', Human Resource Development Review, 15(2), pp. 182–205
30. Clark, S.C. (2000) 'Work/family border theory: A new theory of work–family balance', Human Relations, 53(6), pp. 747–770.
31. Cooper, C.L. and Cartwright, S. (1994) 'Healthy mind; healthy organisation: A proactive approach to occupational stress', Human Relations, 47(4), pp. 455–471.
32. Edwards, J.R. and Rothbard, N.P. (2000) 'Mechanisms linking work and family: Clarifying the relationship between work and family constructs', Academy of Management Review, 25(1), pp. 178–199.
33. Frone, M.R. (2003) 'Work–family balance', in Quick, J.C. and Tetrick, L.E. (eds.) Handbook of occupational health psychology. Washington DC: APA, pp. 143–162.
34.
35. Greenhaus, J.H. and Powell, G.N. (2006) 'When work and family are allies: A theory of work–family enrichment', Academy of Management Review, 31(1), pp. 72–92.
36. Guest, D.E. (2002) 'Perspectives on the study of work–life balance', Social Science Information, 41(2), pp. 255–279.
Hill, E.J., Hawkins, A.J., Ferris, M. and Weitzman, M. (2001) 'Finding an extra day a week: The positive influence of perceived job flexibility on work and family life balance', Family Relations, 50(1), pp. 49–58.
Kossek, E.E. and Ozeki, C. (1998) 'Work–family conflict, policies, and job–life satisfaction relationship: A review and directions for organisational behavior–human resources research', Journal of Applied Psychology, 83(2), pp. 139–149.
37. Locke, E.A. (1976) 'The nature and causes of job satisfaction', in Dunnette, M.D. (ed.) Handbook of industrial and organisational psychology. Chicago: Rand McNally, pp. 1297–1349.