

The Influence of Quality of Work Life on Job Satisfaction: (A Study of Government Sector Organizations in Surkhet District, Nepal)

Debendra Kumar Wagle

Assist. Prof. Surkhet Multiple Campus, Surkhet

Tribhuvan University, Nepal

Email: debenwagle@gmail.com

Abstract

Job satisfaction, which is closely linked to the quality of work life, plays a crucial role in enhancing employee well-being, motivation, productivity, and alignment with organizational goals. A positive work environment that supports employees' needs fosters loyalty, reduces turnover, and contributes to long-term organizational success. This study investigates the influence of quality of work life on job satisfaction among government sector employees in Karnali Province, Nepal. It specifically explores how factors such as working environment, compensation and benefits, interpersonal relationships, and career development opportunities serve as predictors of job satisfaction. Data was collected from 396 government sector employees in the study area using a structured questionnaire administered through convenience sampling. Pearson's correlation coefficient and regression analysis were applied to assess the relationships between the independent variables (working environment, compensation and benefits, interpersonal relationships, career development opportunities) and the dependent variable (job satisfaction) using SPSS version 25. The findings reveal that all four factors—working environment, compensation and benefits, interpersonal relationships, and career development opportunities—have a significant positive effect on job satisfaction. In conclusion, the study underscores the importance of the quality of work life in determining job satisfaction, emphasizing that factors such as a supportive work environment, adequate compensation, strong interpersonal relationships, and career growth opportunities are key to employee satisfaction. The implications of these findings suggest that government organizations in Surkhet district, and similar contexts, should prioritize improving these factors to enhance job satisfaction and improve overall organizational performance. This would lead to a more engaged, motivated, and loyal workforce, contributing to the long-term success of the organization.

Keywords: Working environment, compensation and benefits, interpersonal relationship, career development opportunities, Job Satisfaction

Introduction

The quality of work-life has been shown to be a major factor in whether an employer can build a lasting relationship with an employee (Gaur, 2018). This is because if an employee receives some sort of benefit from his or her employment (such as good working conditions, manageable workload, and opportunities to advance), he or she will likely continue to work for the company (Zamzami et al., 2022). A key aspect of this is the fact that quality of work-life affects job satisfaction and, as such, will help to retain the best

employees and increase organization productivity (Hammond et al., 2023). In addition to all of the above, since employees are highly sought after, organizations have come to realize that competing for the "best" employees is no longer the only thing to do; organizations also need to provide employees with a positive quality of work-life in order to gain a competitive advantage within their industry (Hammond et al., 2023). The Quality of Work Life (QWL) is defined as an environment where employees are able to accomplish both their personal and professional goals through their work within an organization (Maghfira et al., 2021). Factors used to assess the quality of work life include; fair pay, healthy working conditions, employee development, career advancement, socialization, and job relevance (D'Mello et al., 2018). QWL also includes job security, training, career advancement, empowerment, reward systems, and general workplace climate to enhance employee satisfaction, trust, collaboration, cooperation, recognition, and safety (Arasma et al., 2024). Therefore, organizations should make quality of work life (QWL) a priority to recruit and retain employees, since QWL is a comprehensive plan to increase employee satisfaction (Saraji & Dargahi, 2006). Quality of work life (QWL) is the interaction between an employee's role identity and the resources available to them at work (Sirgy et al., 2008). Proponents of quality work life believe that it can lead to satisfied employees, increased employee productivity, longer tenures, and ultimately higher profits for the employer, creating a mutually beneficial situation (Chinomona et al., 2013). A QWL view of employees sees employees as valuable resources rather than simply costs to the organization (Srivastava, 2014). Employees who feel satisfied with their jobs can be motivated with promotions and tasks that satisfy their needs (Alam & Asim, 2019). Job satisfaction is the favorable attitude toward one's job, expressed through feelings and perceptions (Adhikari, 2019).

Employee job satisfaction affects employee attitudes regarding their job, work, and coworkers, and is linked to employee commitment, job related stress, absenteeism, and turnover (Gazi et al., 2024). In an industrial setting, the relationship between employee job satisfaction and employee behavior can greatly impact the success of the organization (Gazi et al., 2024). Job satisfaction is the positive emotional state that results from an individual's enjoyment of his/her job, positive outlook, and emotional responses to job experiences (Yuspahrudin et al., 2020). Job satisfaction is a critical indicator of employee satisfaction and predictor of job behaviors including organizational citizenship, absenteeism (Gupta et al., 2022). Workers with job satisfaction are typically absent less often, are less likely to leave their current employer, are more productive, demonstrate organizational loyalty, and find greater fulfillment in their lives (Irahor & Okolie, 2019). Job satisfaction is very important for the success of the organization, and providing the quality of work life is very important to the success of the organization, as well as the ability of employees to perform their jobs (Muindi & Obonyo, 2015 as cited in Adhikari, 2019).

There is a link between job satisfaction and the quality of work life (QWL), as well as job satisfaction and happiness; a positive work environment and job satisfaction are influenced by human resource management practices. While there has been considerable research conducted into job satisfaction and the quality of work life (QWL), much of that research has focused on private sector companies and developed countries. However, there is a lack of research investigating the relationship between QWL and job satisfaction in the public sector, especially in developing countries like Nepal. The difference in job satisfaction for public sector employees versus private sector employees can be attributed to the different challenges faced by public sector employees, such as red tape, limited opportunities for career advancement, and resource shortages (Harris & Helfrich, 2004). Research on how QWL factors such as working environment, compensation, coworker relationships, and career development opportunities contribute to job satisfaction for public sector employees in developing regions such as Nepal is non-existent. This study attempts to

bridge the research gap by studying the relationship between QWL and job satisfaction among public sector employees in Surkhet District, Nepal.

Literature Review and Hypothesis Development

Social exchange theory (SET) is a conceptual/theoretical lens to analyze reciprocal relationships and/or the psychological contracts of both the employer and employee within organizational behavior (Cropanzano & Mitchell, 2005). Social exchange theory (SET) is one of the most important frameworks used to explain the nature of the relationship of an employee to his/her employer through social exchange (Ahmad et al., 2023). Social exchange theory (SET) will be the primary theoretical framework used to explain how QWL affects job satisfaction in the government of Karnali province. Additionally, social exchange theory suggests that when employees feel that they are being fairly compensated, have positive working relationships, and have opportunities for advancement (components of QWL), employees will reciprocate with increased job satisfaction.

Working Environment and Job Satisfaction

Raziq and Maulabakhsh (2015), investigated the role of the workplace environment in affecting employee job satisfaction. They established statistically significant correlations between different elements in the workplace environment (i.e., the influence of top management, esteem needs, and work hours) and the relationship with coworkers in regards to job satisfaction and the working environment, they also confirmed the effects of these factors on job satisfaction. Maharjan and Bhandari (2022) studied the working environment and its effects on job satisfaction specifically in reference to the variables working conditions and job safety/security for school teachers in the Dullu region. This research indicated a strong and positive correlation existed between working conditions and job satisfaction. Siwalankerto (2014) studied the impact the working environment has on an employee's job satisfaction and demonstrated that the work environment has a significant effect on employee job satisfaction. Taheri et al. (2020) studied the effects of the working environment on job satisfaction in the Rural Electrification Board and Department of Agricultural Extension settings in Bangladesh. They determined that a favorable working environment increases employee job satisfaction, thus demonstrating the working environment has a significant influence on employee job satisfaction. Awoeyo, (2021) investigated the negative and positive impacts of the physical work environment on employee job satisfaction at ICS Outsourcing Ltd. It was discovered that the physical work environment has a negative effect on job satisfaction and that work/life balance and training have a positive and significant impact on employee job satisfaction. Aggarwal et al. (2023) found a significant positive correlation between a supportive work environment and increased job satisfaction among employees and concluded that working conditions significantly affect the performance of employees. Basnet (2023), found a positive correlation between the work environment and job satisfaction among employees of the Nepal Electricity Authority and suggested that improving working conditions positively enhances employee job satisfaction. Kermansaravi et al. (2014) demonstrated that a significant and positive correlation exists between job satisfaction and quality of work life for faculty members at Zahedan University of Medical Sciences and that quality of work life significantly predicts job satisfaction. Overall, the studies indicate a significant correlation between the working environment and job satisfaction. Therefore, the following hypothesis is proposed:

H_{A1}: Working environment significantly affects the job satisfaction.

Compensation and Benefits and Job Satisfaction

The present study is based on a review of relevant literature to determine if there was an association between compensation and job satisfaction among construction workers in the South African construction industry. A review of the current literature indicated that the majority of studies have identified a strong association between compensation and job satisfaction. However, some studies suggest that other variables may also be important. For example, Yen et al. (2018) found that internal and external job satisfaction were associated with compensation but that these associations could be enhanced by a perception of organizational equity. Similarly, Katabalo and Mwita (2024), Verozika (2018), Walewangko and Saufi (2021), Darma and Supriyanto (2017), Rahman et al. (2024) and Saman (2020) all reported that compensation had a direct and/or indirect association with job satisfaction and performance. Other researchers have reported similar results for the South African construction industry. For example, Mabaso and Dlamini (2017) found that compensation was a significant predictor of job satisfaction among academic staff in South African higher education institutions; however, benefits did not appear to have any significant effect. Salisu et al. (2015) used equity theory to explain how compensation affects job satisfaction in the context of Nigerian construction workers. The authors concluded that compensation has a positive effect on job satisfaction. Therefore, we expect that the following hypothesis will be supported by our data. Based on the previous research regarding compensation, the following research hypothesis is proposed:

H_{A2}: Compensation and Benefits significantly influence the Job Satisfaction

Interpersonal Relationship and Job Satisfaction

In addition to the studies already discussed, Putranto et al. (2022) also noted that leadership style and interpersonal communication have a significant effect on work effectiveness and the work effectiveness is mediated by job satisfaction. In addition, Putranto et al. (2022) noted that compensation has a positive effect on job satisfaction and job performance in the mining company which ultimately results in higher level of job satisfaction in the employees. Madhur and Ramshanker (2020) studied the relationship between interpersonal communication and job satisfaction of the employees, they stated that there exists a positive correlation between downward communication and job satisfaction. They concluded that if the management communication is efficient, it may lead to higher job satisfaction. Zuhra (2022) studied the relationship between the interpersonal relationships and the job satisfaction of the employees in the Camat Office in Samalanga District, Bireuen Regency, she stated that the interpersonal relationships indirectly affect the job satisfaction through the organization's culture.

Mitrofan and Bulborea (2013) studied the relationship between professional satisfaction and interpersonal relationships in the industry, they indicated a strong relationship between interpersonal relationships and professional satisfaction, they indicated that 32% of the variation in satisfaction could be explained by superior relationships and 41% of the satisfaction is related to colleagues' relationships. Mustapha (2013) studied the positive relationship between interpersonal relationships and job satisfaction of the academic staff; he stated that enhancing the interpersonal relationships would result into increasing the trust and positive feelings. He also stated that the workload would negatively affect the job satisfaction; therefore, workload should be managed efficiently. Stangrecka and Bagieńska (2021) studied the factors affecting the job satisfaction in remote work during the COVID-19 pandemic, they indicated that the employee relationships have a significant effect on the job satisfaction; they emphasized the importance of having good relationships with employees. Dosenovic et al. (2021) studied the link between the employee satisfaction and the job satisfaction using interpersonal relationships as independent variable, they indicated

a moderate positive correlation between the two variables; they stated that the positive relationships are very important factor in determining the employee satisfaction, even when controlling for other variables such as gender, age, education, and job position. Preetha and Nethravathi (2021) studied the differences in interpersonal relationships and job satisfaction between male and female government and private secondary school teachers, they stated that there existed a significant difference in interpersonal relationships between male and female teachers, however, there was no significant difference in job satisfaction. Dalimunthe et al. (2018) studied the relationship between interpersonal relationships and job satisfaction and their effects on the employees' intention to leave, they stated that interpersonal relationships positively affected the job satisfaction, whereas role ambiguity negatively affected the job satisfaction.

The existing body of literature indicates that there is a significant association between interpersonal relationship and employee job satisfaction. Therefore, based on the established evidence from previous studies, we will propose the following research hypotheses.

H_{A3}: Interpersonal Relationships significantly influence the Job Satisfaction

Career Development Opportunities sand Job Satisfaction

Substantial amount of research has been conducted into determining job satisfaction; a number of researchers specifically looked at job satisfaction factors, such as career progression and job opportunities for professional development. Specifically, Alfansi et al., (2020), in their study examining PT. Telkom Indonesia found that career development was a significant factor in job satisfaction and served as a mediator between work life balance and employee satisfaction. Their results are similar to the findings of Thulasi (2019); and Hollar et al., (2022) which indicate a direct correlation between professional development and job satisfaction; suggesting that providing opportunities for development will be critical in keeping employees. Nava-Macali (2019) indicated that the level of success that employees perceive from these programs relate to the level of job satisfaction. Using structural equation modeling (SEM) Prasetia et al. (2022) further identified that growth opportunities and creative/innovative workplaces positively impact job satisfaction, in regional government organizations. There are different variations in this body of literature; Widodo et al. (2023) demonstrated that promotion and career development activity significantly enhances work motivation and job satisfaction; although motivation did not consistently mediate the relationship between the two variables. On the other hand, Elangovan et al. (2023), in their study at Aspiro Solutions, identified a negative relationship between job satisfaction and career development opportunities, while they noted that compensation had a positive relationship with job satisfaction. Oseanita et al. (2017) stated that compensation affects job satisfaction; however, career development has a larger effect on performance outcomes than compensation. Although many studies have documented that social dynamics including interpersonal relationships create job satisfaction, the following hypothesis is presented based upon the overall literature:

H_{A4}: Career Development Opportunitiessignificantly influence the Job Satisfaction

Conceptual Framework of the Study



Figure No: 1

Research Method

This study employed a Causal-Comparative Research methodology, using a public sector sample in the Surkhet District of Nepal, to examine how Quality of Work Life (QWL) relates to job satisfaction. This study utilized a Conceptual Model of Job Satisfaction as the dependent variable and four independent variables (working conditions, compensation package, workplace relationships, and opportunities for advancement). Each of the four independent variables examined how they impact job satisfaction. The study produced a structured questionnaire based on a literature review, expert consultations, and a five-point Likert Scale to examine respondent views and feelings toward their quality of work life and their job satisfaction.

All 396 participants who responded to the surveys were assured of anonymity and confidentiality and signed an Informed Consent prior to completing the surveys. Participants were completely briefed on the purposes of the study prior to beginning the survey. Descriptive Statistics were used to describe the demographic information of the respondents; Cronbach's Alpha was calculated to determine the internal reliability of the instrument; and Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient and Regression Analysis were utilized to assess the relationship between the individual components of QWL and job satisfaction.

Validity and Reliability

To assess the internal consistency and reliability of the measurement scales, Cronbach's alpha was calculated for each construct. This statistical measure evaluates how closely related a set of items are as a group, determining whether they consistently measure the same underlying concept.

Status of Reliability Statistics

Construct's Name	Items contained	Cronbach's Alpha
Working Environment	8	0.834
Compensation and Benefits	8	0.845
Interpersonal Relationship	8	0.816
Career Development Opportunities	8	0.879
Job Satisfaction	8	0.856

The reliability of the study is based on Cronbach's Alpha which measures internal consistency. Each of the constructs identified in table 1 had a high reliability because all of them were over .70 which is the most commonly acceptable threshold for reliability (Christmann & Van Aelst, 2006; Griethuijsen et al., 2015). For example, Working Environment ($\alpha=0.834$, 8 items), Compensation and Benefits ($\alpha=0.845$, 8 items), Interpersonal Relationship ($\alpha=0.816$, 8 items), Career Development Opportunities ($\alpha=0.879$, 8 items), and Job Satisfaction ($\alpha=0.856$, 8 items) showed an extremely high degree of internal consistency. The conclusion therefore is that the measurement instruments utilized are reliable and consistent in measuring what they intend to measure.

Content Validity was established through a comprehensive literature review to establish the research instrument's validity. Through the literature review the researchers identified the main constructs related to work stress and job satisfaction including job security, workload, compensation and benefits and working environment. These constructs provided the foundation for creating the relevant items on the questionnaire to measure work stress and employee performance. In addition to the literature review, the construct of the questionnaire was also reviewed by professionals and specialists who reviewed the accuracy and completeness of the constructs represented on the questionnaire. Although no pilot testing was completed, it would have added to the reliability and validity of the instrument by identifying issues with the

questionnaire before it was implemented on a larger scale. However, the inclusion of literature supported constructs and the reviews of expert reviewers supports the content validity of the research tool.

Results

Demographic Profile of the Respondents

Demographic information for the 2024 participant pool was gathered through detailed demographics provided by the 2024 study. Demographics of the participant pool, with respect to gender, indicated that the majority of participants (68.4%) identified as males, while females represented 31.6%. With regards to age, 56.1% of participants reported being between 26-33 years old. The remaining age groups included: 18-25 years old (11.6%), 34-41 years old (25.5%), and 42+ years old (6.8%). When asked about marital status, 79.3% of participants were married, while 20.7% of participants were single. Educationally, the 2024 study found that most of the participants had completed at least some post-secondary schooling. The majority of the participants reported having a Master's degree (40.9%), while nearly as many reported having a Bachelor's degree (38.6%). Approximately 16.7% of participants reported completing +2 levels of education and 3.8% reported having attained education above the Master's level.

A large amount of demographic information was gathered from the 2024 study to provide a full demographic picture of the participants. One of the most significant demographic characteristics of the participants was that the majority of the participants were men (68.4%) while the majority of the participants who were women comprised 31.6%. Of all the ages, the majority of the participants were between 26-33 (56.1%) years old. Next, participants reported being between 34-41 (25.5%) years old, and lastly the youngest group of participants were between 18-25 (11.6%) years old, and then the youngest of them were 42 years old (6.8%). Lastly, participants reported that they were either married (79.3%) or single (20.7%). While participants varied in their educational attainment, the majority of participants reported earning a Bachelor's degree (38.6%) than a Master's degree (40.9%). Lastly, very few participants reported completing +2 levels of education (16.7%), and very few participants reported attaining education beyond a Master's degree (3.8%). This demographic breakdown allows researchers to clearly see the demographic makeup of the participants in this study and to put the findings of this research study into perspective.

Table 2

Demographic Profile of the respondents

Demographic Profile of the Respondents

Demographics	Categories	Respondents	Percentage
Gender Status	Male	271	68.4
	Female	125	31.6
Age Status	18-25 years	46	11.6
	26-33 years	222	56.1
	34-41 years	101	25.5
	42-Above years	37	6.8
Marital Status	Married	314	79.3
	Unmarried	82	20.7
	Up to + 2	66	16.7
Educational Status	Bachelor	153	38.6
	Master	162	40.9
	Master above	15	3.8

Source: Survey Data, (2025)

Inferential Statistics

Two types of statistical tests were used in the research to assess the relationships of the variables as well as their effects. Correlations were tested to assess the relationship between a working environment, compensation and benefits, interpersonal relationships, career development opportunities and an employee's job satisfaction. In addition to testing for correlations among the variables, regression was used to determine the combined effect of the four independent variables (working environment, compensation and benefits, interpersonal relationships, career development) upon one independent variable (job satisfaction). The use of regression and correlation provided the researcher with a method to identify those variables which are significantly related to each other as well as to measure the degree that they can predict an employee's level of job satisfaction.

Table 3
Correlation Analysis

		TWE	TCB	TIR	TCDO	TJS
WE	Pearson Correlation	1				
CB	Pearson Correlation	.752**	1			
IR	Pearson Correlation	.647**	.780**	1		
CDO	Pearson Correlation	.545**	.720**	.839**	1	
JS	Pearson Correlation	.613**	.765**	.736**	.699**	1

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed), N =396 Working Environment (WE), Compensation and Benefits (CB), Interpersonal Relationship(IR), Career Development Opportunities, (CDO) and Job Satisfaction (JS),

Table 2 reveals a statistically significant ($p < .01$) and positive relationship exists between all of the major variables included in this research study. Significant, positive correlations exist for working environment; compensation & benefits; interpersonal relationships; opportunities for career development; and overall job satisfaction. Since each of the p-values in the table is less than .05 (the established alpha threshold), it can be concluded that the relationships among these variables are statistically significant. The results from this study provide evidence that enhancing performance in any of the above areas (such as working environment or career development opportunities) will likely result in an enhancement of overall job satisfaction as well as other positive work-related outcomes.

Table 4
Regression Analysis

Model Summary of Regression Analysis

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Durbin-Watson
1	.803 ^a	0.645	0.641	0.39243	1.676

a. Predictors: (Constant), CDO, WE, CB, IR

b. Dependent Variable: JS

The Regression Model as Shown in Table Three has a Very High Level of Explanatory Power with an Adjusted R² of .641; Therefore, the Four Predictor Variables Working Environment, Compensation and Benefits, Interpersonal Relationships and Career Development Opportunities Explain 64.1 Percent of the

Total Variance in Job Satisfaction and the Remaining 35.9 Percent of the Total Variance Explained by Factors Not Included in This Study.

Also, The Durbin-Watson Statistic of 1.676 Indicates There Is No Autocorrelation Among Residuals and This Validates the Assumption That the Errors Were Independent Which Reinforces the Reliability of the Results Obtained from This Study. These Findings Indicate That the Model Was Statistically Validated and the Predictors Significantly Affect Job Satisfaction.

Table 5
ANOVA^a

Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	109.291	4	27.323	177.423	.000 ^b
	Residual	60.214	391	.154		
	Total	169.505	395			

The ANOVA results shown in Table 5 indicate a statistically significant relationship exists among the independent variables (workplace factors), and dependent variable (job satisfaction), as revealed by the results of the regression analysis. A strong predictive relationship was found between job satisfaction and the combined effects of the workplace factors, i.e., working environment, compensation and benefits, interpersonal relationships, and career development opportunities; this is indicated by the large F-value of 177.423, and highly significant p-value (less than .0001). These results demonstrate that the total amount of explained variance (109.291/169.505) of the independent variable job satisfaction by the regression model is a considerable amount. In addition, the extremely low p-value indicates that there is strong support for the alternative hypothesis (that the workplace factors significantly influence job satisfaction), and therefore a strong rejection of the null hypothesis. These findings have very practical implications as they suggest that improving job satisfaction through focused organizational improvement efforts in these four areas will be successful, and thus provide an opportunity for employees to report improved job satisfaction. The p-values less than .0001 also give assurance that the reported relationships are real and are not due to chance, and therefore the regression model can be used with reasonable confidence to predict job satisfaction based on these workplace factors.

Table 6
Results of Linear Regression Analysis

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Collinearity Statistics	
	B	Std. Error	Beta			Tolerance	VIF
	(Constant)	.077	.165		.466	.642	
	WE	0.71	.060	.055	1.173	.242	0.420 2.382
1	CB	.493	.067	.423	7.322	.000	0.272 3.672
	IR	.225	.065	.222	3.483	.001	0.224 4.456
	CDO	.168	.054	.178	3.138	.002	0.281 3.554

Note: Working Environment (WE), Compensation and Benefits (CB), Interpersonal Relationship (IR), Career Development Opportunities (CDO)

Source: Survey Data, (2025)

The linear regression data shown in Table 6 is an important factor in determining the level of influence of the different aspects of your workplace that affect your job satisfaction. CB was found to have the greatest influence on job satisfaction ($\beta = 0.423$, $p < 0.000$). IR had the second most influential role ($\beta = 0.222$, $p = 0.001$) and CDO was third ($\beta = 0.178$, $p = 0.002$). WE had a positive relationship with job satisfaction ($\beta = 0.055$) but it was not statistically significant ($p = 0.242$). There were no differences in job satisfaction when all of the predictors were at zero ($p = 0.642$) for the constant.

The co-linearity statistics showed that there were low levels of multicollinearity between the predictors; as indicated by the tolerance values for all being $> .20$ and the VIF values for all being < 5 . This suggests that each of the predictors will contribute uniquely to the model's ability to explain the variance in job satisfaction. The standardized beta coefficients allowed for a direct comparison of the effect size of each of the predictors. Compensation and Benefits appeared to have twice the effect on job satisfaction than did Interpersonal Relationships and Career Development Opportunities. These findings suggest that employees are particularly satisfied with their jobs when they perceive they are being fairly compensated and have positive workplace relationships. Additionally, these findings suggest that the effects of physical characteristics of the work environment may be mediated by one or more of the factors not included in this study. Overall, these results support the notion that job satisfaction is a multi-dimensional construct which includes both the tangible rewards received by employees (i.e., compensation) and the interactions with others within the workplace.

Table 7

Summary of Hypothesis

Hypothesis No.	Results of Hypothesis	Accept or Reject Decision
H _{A1}	Working environment significantly influences the job satisfaction performance.	Rejected
H _{A2}	Compensation and benefits significantly influence the job satisfaction	Accepted
H _{A3}	Interpersonal relationship significantly influences the employee performance	Accepted
H _{A4}	Carrier development opportunities significantly influence the employee performance	Accepted

Discussion

This study examined the effect of Quality of Work Life (QWL) aspects on job satisfaction of Nepalese Public Sector Employees in Karnali Province. Four independent variables were used in this analysis: the workplace environment, compensation/benefits, interpersonal relationships and opportunity for career advancement. Using linear regression model, the study identified significant correlations among those independent variables and employee job satisfaction as measured by a number of other studies.

It was determined that there is no statistically significant correlation between working environment and employee job satisfaction ($b = 0.055$, $p = .242$), thus hypothesis HA1 was rejected. Although, studies by Maharjan & Bhandari (2022), and Basnet (2023), have shown the positive effects of various elements of the workplace such as comfortable workspace, available resources and safe working conditions. The unexpected result indicates that organizations should assess the effectiveness of investments made at the workplace to promote job satisfaction in their own organization.

Statistically significant positive correlation was demonstrated between compensation/benefits and job satisfaction ($b = .423, p < .000$), thus hypothesis HA2 was supported. Studies by Katabalo & Mwita (2024), and Walewangko & Saufi (2021) also demonstrated that employees are motivated by fair compensation. As compensation is a basic need met by an organization, it enhances employee commitment and productivity when employees receive fair compensation, meet their financial obligations and meet their expectation.

A statistically significant positive correlation was demonstrated between interpersonal relationships and job satisfaction ($b = .222, p = .001$), thus hypothesis HA3 was supported. Interpersonal relationships in the workplace support the findings of studies by Putranto et al., (2022) and Stangrecka & Bagienska (2021). Positive interpersonal relationships in the workplace contribute to increased employee satisfaction; quality relationships in the workplace support employee engagement and overall well-being. Therefore, organizations should place emphasis on developing strong, positive interpersonal relationships between employees and management to increase employee satisfaction.

Lastly, a statistically significant positive correlation was demonstrated between career development opportunities and job satisfaction ($b = .178, p = .002$), thus hypothesis HA4 was supported. Studies by Elangovan et al., (2023), and Hollar et al., (2022), along with many others, demonstrate that the opportunity for career development has a direct impact on employee satisfaction. By providing clear career path development, training opportunities and career advancement opportunities, employees will be more committed and engaged in their job. Results of this study indicate that organizations should establish formalized career development programs to support employee satisfaction and retention.

Conclusion and Implications

This study assessed the influences of 4 critical elements in the workplace (working environment; compensation and benefits; interpersonal relationships; and career development opportunities) with respect to job satisfaction in employees. Results found that there were statistically significant positive associations among job satisfaction and compensation and benefits; interpersonal relationships; and career development opportunities as well as support for hypotheses HA2, HA3, and HA4. Conversely, contrary to hypothesis HA1, a statistically significant association was not observed between the working environment and job satisfaction which was an unexpected divergence from previous research. In essence, these results indicate that although employees are highly satisfied when they feel fairly compensated, other aspects of the workplace including positive employee relationships and career growth opportunities can significantly impact job satisfaction. Moreover, the absence of a statistically significant association between the working environment and job satisfaction suggests that the influence of the working environment is likely to be dependent upon the context or otherwise mediated by other factors.

These results provide several important suggestions for organizations wishing to increase the job satisfaction of their employees and the quality of their employees' work-life. Organizations should create/encourage and support employee relationship building efforts and develop formalized career development programs to improve job satisfaction. Authority figures in organizations should prioritize providing competitive salaries, creating supportive work environments where teamwork is encouraged, and provide opportunities for professional growth to satisfy and retain employees. Future studies could examine industry specific variations and the long-term impacts of the various elements of the workplace on job satisfaction.

References

- Adhikari, P. R. (2019a). Determinants of job satisfaction and its impact on employee performance in nepalese commercial banks. *The Journal of Economic Concerns*, 10(1), 74–81.
- Adhikari, P. R. (2019b). Quality of work-life for job satisfaction in nepalese commercial banks. *Management Dynamics*, 22(1), 79–88. <https://doi.org/10.3126/md.v22i1.30240>
- Aggarwal, A., Sharma, D., Vohra, P., Sharma, S., & Sharma, V. (2023). Work environment and job satisfaction among employees. *The International Journal of Indian Psychology*, 11(1), 1247–1254. <https://doi.org/10.25215/1101.126>
- Ahmad, R., Nawaz, M. R., Ishaq, M. I., Khan, M. M., & Ashraf, H. A. (2023). Social exchange theory: Systematic review and future directions. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13, 1015921. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.1015921>
- Alam, A., & Asim, M. (2019). Relationship between job satisfaction and turnover intention. *International Journal of Human Resource Studies*, 9(2), 163. <https://doi.org/10.5296/ijhrs.v9i2.14618>
- Alfansi, L., Susetyo, S., Praningrum, Nasution, Bahri, S., & Seranika, N. (2020). The impact of career development on employee job satisfaction and work life balance as a mediator at PT. Telkom indonesia (persero) bengkulu area. *Proceedings of the 5th Sriwijaya Economics, Accounting, and Business Conference (SEABC 2019)*, 142, 101–107. <https://doi.org/10.2991/aebmr.k.200520.018>
- Arasma, B., Fahmy, R., & Yuliharsi. (2024). The influence of quality of work life on work life balance which is mediated by job stress, job satisfaction and job commitment (study on employees PT nindya karya project indonesia). *Journal of Economics, Finance And Management Studies*, 07(06), 3095–3110. <https://doi.org/10.47191/jefms/v7-i6-07>
- Awoeyo, O. (2021). *Effect of work environment on employee job satisfaction: A study of ics outsourcing ltd.* 2–26. <https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.15754.85443>
- Basnet, D. (2023). Effect of working environment on job satisfaction of employees in nepal electricity authority. *PRAGYAN A Peer Reviewed Multidisciplinary Journal*, 4(1), 16–28. <https://doi.org/10.3126/pprmj.v4i1.67617>
- Bulińska-Stangrecka, H., & Bagieńska, A. (2021). The role of employee relations in shaping job satisfaction as an element promoting positive mental health at work in the era of COVID-19. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 18(4), 1903. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph18041903>
- Chinomona, R., Chinomona, E., & Roy Dhurup, R. (2013). *The influence of quality of work life on employee job satisfaction, job commitment and tenure intention in the small and medium enterprise sector.* 16(4), 1–31. <http://dx.doi.org/10.4102/sajems.v17i4.296>
- Cropanzano, R., & Mitchell, M. S. (2005). Social exchange theory: An interdisciplinary review. *Journal of Management*, 31(6), 874–900. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206305279602>
- Dalimunthe, I., Absah, Dr. Y., & Salim, Dr. S. R. A. (2018). The effect of interpersonal relationships and role ambiguity on job satisfaction and its impact toward employees' intention to leave in event organizer services provider in medan. *Proceedings of the 1st Economics and Business International Conference 2017 (EBIC 2017)*, 46. <https://doi.org/10.2991/ebic-17.2018.53>
- Darma, P. S., & Supriyanto, A. S. (2017). The effect of compensation on satisfaction and employee performance. *Management and Economics Journal (MEC-J)*, 1(1), 66. <https://doi.org/10.18860/mec-j.v1i1.4524>

- D'Mello, L., Monteiro, M., & Pinto, N. (2018). The quality of work life and job satisfaction of private sector employees. *International Journal of Management, Technology, and Social Sciences*, 11–17. <https://doi.org/10.47992/IJMTS.2581.6012.0032>
- Došenović, D., Poljašević, B. Z., & Todorović, M. (2021). Interpersonal relationship as a factor of job satisfaction. *STED JOURNAL*, 3(1). <https://doi.org/10.7251/STED2101021Z>
- Elangovan, S., Suppramaniam, S., & Dada, M. (2023). Factors influencing job satisfaction among employees in aspiro solutions sdn.bhd. *Electronic Journal of Business and Management*, 8(1), 40–53.
- Gaur, A. K. (2018). The impact of quality of work life (QWL) on employee satisfaction. *International Journal of Creative Research Thoughts (IJCRT)*, 6(1), 54–58.
- Gazi, Md. A. I., Yusof, M. F., Islam, Md. A., Amin, M. B., & Senathirajah, A. R. B. S. (2024). Analyzing the impact of employee job satisfaction on their job behavior in the industrial setting: An analysis from the perspective of job performance. *Journal of Open Innovation: Technology, Market, and Complexity*, 10(4), 100427. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.joitmc.2024.100427>
- Gupta, S., Garg, M., & Ahuja, K. (2022). Quality of life as predicted by job satisfaction among employees. *Indian Journal of Mental Health*, 9(1), 53–57. <https://doi.org/10.30877/IJMH.9.1.2022.53-57>
- Hammond, M., Owusu, N. O., Nunoo, E. K., Boampong, G., Osman, A., Panin, A., Nyametso, J. K., & Essen, B. (2023). How quality of work-life influence employee job satisfaction in a gas processing plant in Ghana. *Discover Sustainability*, 4(1), 10. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s43621-023-00127-9>
- Hollar, N., Kuchinka, D., & Feinberg, J. (2022). Professional development opportunities and job satisfaction: A systematic review of research. *Journal of International Management Studies*, 22(1), 10–19. <https://doi.org/10.18374/JIMS-22-1.2>
- Irabor, I. E., & Okolie, U. C. (2019). A review of employees' job satisfaction and its affect on their retention. *Annals of Spiru Haret University. Economic Series*, 19(2), 93–114. <https://doi.org/10.26458/1924>
- Katabalo, C. V., & Mwita, K. M. (2024). The Role of Compensation on Job Satisfaction, Employee Performance and Organisational Performance. *SCIENCE MUNDI*, 4(1), 137–148. <https://doi.org/10.51867/scimundi.4.1.12>
- Kermansaravi, F., Navidian, A., Navabi Rigi, S., & Yaghoubinia, F. (2014). The relationship between quality of work life and job satisfaction of faculty members in zahedan university of medical sciences. *Global Journal of Health Science*, 7(2), p228. <https://doi.org/10.5539/gjhs.v7n2p228>
- Mabaso, C. M., & Dlamini, B. I. (2017). Impact of compensation and benefits on job satisfaction. *Research Journal of Business Management*, 11(2), 80–90. <https://doi.org/10.3923/rjbm.2017.80.90>
- Madhur, P., & Ramshanker, S. (2020). Interpersonal communication & its impact on job satisfaction. *International Journal of Advanced Engineering and Nano Technology*, 4(3), 1–5. <https://doi.org/10.35940/ijaent.B0447.044220>
- Maghfira, G. A., Fakhri, M., S, S., Nurnida, I., & Kurnia, B. (2021). The effect of quality of work life and job stress toward organizational culture. *Proceedings of the International Conference on Industrial Engineering and Operations Management*, 2939–2947. <https://doi.org/10.46254/SA02.20210822>
- Maharjan, R., & Bhandari, D. R. (2022). Impact of work environment on job satisfaction: A case of school teachers. *Nepalese Journal of Business and Management Studies*, 1(1), 93–104. <https://doi.org/10.3126/njbms.v1i1.66176>

- Mitrofan, N., & Bulborea, A. (2013). Professional satisfaction and interpersonal relationships in the bank organizational environment. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 78, 130–134. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2013.04.265>
- Mustapha, N. (2013). Measuring job satisfaction from the perspective of interpersonal relationship and faculty workload among academic staff at public universities in kelantan, malaysia. *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, 4(15), 120–142.
- Nava-Macali, J. (2019). Effectiveness of career development program on job satisfaction and retention of employees in a private university in the philippines. *Archives of Business Research*, 7(7), 301-310. <https://doi.org//10.14738%2Fabr.77.6730>
- Oseanita, W., Utami, H. N., & Prasetya, A. (2017). Impact of compensation and career development on job satisfaction and employees performance. *Russian Journal of Agricultural and Socio-Economic Sciences*, 64(4), 113–119. <https://doi.org/10.18551/rjoas.2017-04.15>
- Prasetya, F. N., Nurdasila, & Nizam, A. (2022). The effect of growth opportunity and innovation on job satisfaction through employee engagement in sabang city regional secretariat. *International Journal of Scientific and Management Research*, 05(05), 44–52. <https://doi.org/10.37502/IJSMR.2022.5505>
- Preetha, & Nethravathi. (2021). Interpersonal relationship and job satisfaction among government and private secondary school teachers. *The International Journal of Indian Psychology*, 9(1), 1702–1708. <https://doi.org/10.25215/0901.180>
- Putranto, T. F., Susita, D., & Handaru, A. W. (2022). The influence of leadership style and interpersonal communication on work effectiveness with job satisfaction as mediation variables. *Journal of Business and Management Review*, 3(2), 174–190. <https://doi.org/10.47153/jbmr32.2972022>
- Rahman, A., Asnawi, A., & Nurlaelah, S. (2024). Analysis of the effect of compensation, work motivation, and job satisfaction on employee productivity: A case study of a frozen food company in poultry processing. *Journal of Global Innovations in Agricultural Sciences*, 13(10), 1179–1185. <https://doi.org/10.22194/JGIAS/25.1467>
- Raziq, A., & Maulabakhsh, R. (2015). Impact of working environment on job satisfaction. *Procedia Economics and Finance*, 23, 717–725. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S2212-5671\(15\)00524-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2212-5671(15)00524-9)
- Salisu, J. B., Chinyio, E., & Suresh, S. (2015). The impact of compensation on the job satisfaction of public sector construction workers of jigawa state of Nigeria. *The Business and Management Review*, 6(4), 282–296.
- Saman, A. (2020). Effect of compensation on employee satisfaction and employee performance. *International Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting Research (IJEBAR)*, 4(01). <https://doi.org/10.29040/ijebar.v4i01.947>
- Saraji, G. N., & Dargahi, H. (2006). Study of Quality of Work Life (QWL). *Iranian J Publ Health*, 35(4), 8–14.
- Sirgy, M. J., Reilly, N. P., Wu, J., & Efraty, D. (2008). A Work-Life Identity Model of Well-Being: Towards a Research Agenda Linking Quality-of-Work-Life (QWL) Programs with Quality of Life (QOL). *Applied Research in Quality of Life*, 3(3), 181–202. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11482-008-9054-6>
- Siwalankerto, J. (2014). *The impact of working environment towards employee job satisfaction: A case study in pt. X*. 2(1).
- Srivastava, S. (2014). A study on quality of work life: Key elements & it's implications. *IOSR Journal of Business and Management*, 16(3), 54–59. <https://doi.org/10.9790/487X-16315459>

- Taheri, R. H., Miah, Md. S., & Kamaruzzaman, Md. (2020). Impact of Working Environment on Job Satisfaction. *European Journal of Business and Management Research*, 5(6). <https://doi.org/10.24018/ejbmr.2020.5.6.643>
- Thulasi, M. B. (2019). Impact of career development on employee satisfaction in private banking sector in tiruchirappalli. *Journal of Emerging Technologies and Innovative Research*, 6(5), 141–148.
- Verozika, A. (2018). The impact of compensation and job motivation on employee performance with job satisfaction as mediating variable: A study at bali regional offices of directorate general of taxes. *Russian Journal of Agricultural and Socio-Economic Sciences*, 73(1), 92–97. <https://doi.org/10.18551/rjoas.2018-01.12>
- WalewangkoP, C. N. F., & SaufiP, A. (2021). The effect of compensation on job satisfaction and employees performance at tvri station west nusa tenggara. *International Journal of Innovative Science, Engineering & Technology*, 8(6), 480–489.
- Widodo, B., Rostina, C. F., & . S. (2023). The influence of position promotion and career development on job satisfaction with motivation work as an intervening variable (case study: Department of labuhan batu). *International Journal of Research and Review*, 10(2), 643–652. <https://doi.org/10.52403/ijrr.20230277>
- Yen, J.-Y., Chen, H.-H., & Liu, W.-C. (2018). The impact of compensation system on job satisfaction from the perspective of equity theory. *International Review of Management and Business Research*, 7(4), 777–786. [https://doi.org/10.30543/7-4\(2018\)-1](https://doi.org/10.30543/7-4(2018)-1)
- Yuspahrudin, A., Eliyana, A., Buchdadi, A. D., Sariwulan, T., & Muhaziroh, K. (2020). The effect of employee involvement on job satisfaction. *Systematic Reviews in Pharmacy*, 11(7), 490–498.
- Zamzami, N., Susita, D., & Nurjanah, S. (2022). Effect of quality of work life on work motivation and job satisfaction and their impact on turnover intention on outsource employees. *Journal of Business and Management Review*, 3(7), 437–452. <https://doi.org/10.47153/jbmr37.2042022>
- Zuhra, F. (2022). The effect of interpersonal relationships on job satisfaction through organizational culture at the camat office, samalanga district, bireuen regency. *International Journal of Economics (IJEC)*, 1(2), 396–404. <https://doi.org/10.55299/ijec.v1i2.274>