The International Journal of Indian Psychology
ISSN 2348-5396 (Online) | ISSN: 2349-3429 (Print)
Volume 13, Issue 3, July- September, 2025
DIP: 18.01.137.20251303, DOI: 10.25215/1303.137
https://www.ijip.in

The International Journal of INDIAN PSYCHOLOGY

Research Paper

Impact of Work Environment Services on Quality of Life and Life Satisfaction of Employees

Siwani[1]*, Dr. Pragyan Dangwal[2]

ABSTRACT

These findings contribute to the growing body of research on workplace well-being and provide actionable insights for organizations seeking to improve employee satisfaction and overall quality of life. The work environment plays a critical role in shaping employees' well-being, influencing both their Quality of Life (QOL) and Life Satisfaction (LS). This study investigates the impact of Work Environment Services (WES) on QOL and LS among employees from three different occupational groups: nurses, school teachers, and corporate employees. A total of 150 participants (50 from each group) were surveyed using validated measures, including the Australian WHOQOL-BREF for QOL and a 32-item Work Environment Services Scale (WESS). The study employed descriptive statistics, ANOVA, and correlation analysis to examine group differences and relationships among key variables. The findings indicate a significant positive correlation between WESS and QOL ($r = .561$, $p < .001$), suggesting that enhanced workplace services contribute to better overall life quality. A weaker yet significant correlation was found between WESS and LS ($r = .192$, $p = .018$), indicating that while workplace services influence life satisfaction, additional factors may also contribute. ANOVA results revealed significant differences among occupational groups in terms of WESS ($F(2,147) = 11.30$, $p < .001$), QOL ($F(2,147) = 5.93$, $p = .003$), and LS ($F(2,147) = 4.84$, $p = .009$), with corporate employees reporting higher scores compared to nurses and school teachers. These findings highlight the need for organizations to implement targeted workplace improvements to enhance employee well-being. Particularly, healthcare and education sectors require strategic interventions to address work-related stressors. The study contributes to the growing body of research on workplace well-being and underscores the significance of investing in comprehensive workplace services to improve employee QOL and LS.

Keywords: *Work Environment Services, Quality of Life, Life Satisfaction*

Employee well-being plays a crucial role in shaping not just workplace productivity and job satisfaction but also overall life happiness (Danna & Griffin, 1999). As companies become more aware of this, they're making greater efforts to create supportive environments by offering flexible work schedules, ergonomic improvements, and health and wellness programs (Grawitch et al., 2006). According to Van Laar et al. (2007),

[1]Researcher
[2]Assistant Professor, Amity Institute of Behavioural and Allied Sciences, Lucknow campus Amity University Lucknow, Uttar Pradesh, India.
*Corresponding Author

Received: April 05, 2025; Revision Received: August 02, 2025; Accepted: August 05, 2025

© 2025, Siwani & Dangwal, P.; licensee IJIP. This is an Open Access Research distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (www.creativecommons.org/licenses/by/2.0), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any Medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

quality of work life isn't just about a stable paycheck or job security—it also includes having control over one's work, maintaining a healthy work-life balance, and having easy access to workplace resources.

But well-being isn't limited to the office. It reaches into every part of a person's life—mental, emotional, and physical health all play a part (World Health Organization, 1997). People constantly reflect on their overall quality of life, and this self-reflection shapes how satisfied they feel. Diener, Emmons, Larsen, & Griffin (1985) explain that this personal evaluation is a key part of subjective well-being, as everyone defines happiness in their own way. The workplace, however, has a big influence on this perception. A work environment that offers strong support systems can ease stress, help employees maintain balance in their personal and professional lives, and make them feel more fulfilled in their jobs (Robertson & Cooper, 2011). On the other hand, a lack of resources and poor working conditions can leave employees feeling drained, dissatisfied, and struggling with burnout (Sparks, Faragher, & Cooper, 2001).

Work Environment Services

When we talk about "work environment services," we're really discussing everything that goes into making a workplace better for everyone involved. This includes not just the physical stuff—like ergonomic office setups—but also the mental and organizational aspects aimed at boosting how happy and productive employees feel on the job. Think flexible schedules, chances for professional growth, and resources for mental health. The whole idea is to create a vibe that makes employees not just happier, but also more effective at what they do.

The physical environment at work covers stuff like cozy workstation designs, good lighting, proper air circulation, safety precautions, and having the right tools or tech on hand. For instance, setting up standing desks can really help cut down on health issues from sitting too long.

The organizational environment involves how the workplace is managed and structured. This includes things like open communication, flexible hours, staff training programs, and reward systems. For example, giving employees chances for career growth or offering hybrid work options.

Quality of Life

Quality of Life (QoL) is a pretty broad term, and it really boils down to how people see their own health—both physical and mental. It also covers how much freedom they feel they have, the quality of their social connections, and how they interact with their surroundings. At the end of the day, it shows what individuals truly value in their lives.

Quality of life (QoL) can be seen through a few key areas. First, there's physical well-being, which is all about being healthy, having energy, and being physically capable. Think about someone who eats well, exercises regularly, and has access to healthcare—they're likely to enjoy a better quality of life. Next up is psychological well-being. This piece includes having emotional stability, feeling good about oneself, and being free from stress or any mental health issues. Then we have independence, which is really about being able to make your own choices, manage daily tasks, and live life without having to rely too much on others. Social interactions matter too. This covers the quality of your relationships, the strength of your family ties, and how involved you are in your community. Lastly,

environmental factors play a critical role as well. Access to clean water and air, decent housing, and opportunities for leisure activities and cultural exchanges can all considerably impact one's quality of life.

Life Satisfaction

Life satisfaction is all about how happy and content we feel in our lives, considering our personal goals, values, and achievements. Things like our relationships, jobs, and personal successes play a big role in this important measure of overall well-being.

When it comes to feeling good about life, there are a few key factors. Income level, financial stability, and job satisfaction play a big role. Just think about it—someone who's got a steady paycheck and a job they love is likely to feel happier overall. And then there are social relationships. Having close ties with friends, family, and coworkers really boosts our happiness. Let's not forget health—both mental and physical health is super important for lasting happiness. Also, achieving a good work-life balance can really enhance our happiness. When you can juggle your personal and professional life effectively, it makes a huge difference in how joyful you feel.

Rationale of the Study

As a result of the competitive work environment; organizations understand that they need to consider investing in employee well-being for better productivity and retaining talent. An increasing amount of literature has shown that employee's happiness and quality of life are important factors in organizational effectiveness (Danna & Griffin, 1999; Harter, Schmidt, & Hayes, 2002). While lots of organizations can tell you what they are doing to support well-being in the workplace, many struggle with how to develop and implement work environment offerings in a way that is impactful to the life satisfaction of its workforce. This gap highlights the necessity for further research on the impact of specific workplace services on quality of life and life satisfaction.

Although there are many studies on job satisfaction and employee engagement, few examine how workplace services affect employees' overall life experiences. While earlier research has looked at workplace conditions and job features, it often misses the impact of services like health programs, mental health support, and flexible work options. Filling this research gap is important as there's a growing interest in comprehensive approaches to employee well-being in today's work environment (Grawitch, Gottschalk, & Munz, 2006).

This study is crucial for practitioners and policymakers. For organizations, recognizing the influence of workplace services leads to improved programs that enhance employee satisfaction, productivity, and retention. For policymakers, these findings could shape regulations and standards for workplace well-being. Academically, this research enriches the sparse literature on how workplace services improve employees' quality of life and satisfaction, filling gaps in both theory and evidence.

By targeting these overlooked areas, this study aims to provide practical insights that benefit employees, employers, and society at large, fostering more supportive and effective work environments.

METHODOLOGY

Objective

- O1: To study the relationship between work environment services and quality of life.

- O2: To study the relationship between work environment services and life satisfaction.
- O3: To study the differences in Work Environment Services among nurses, school teachers and corporate employees.
- O4: To study the differences in Quality of Life among nurses, school teachers and corporate employees.
- O5: To study the differences in Life Satisfaction among nurses, school teachers and corporate employees.

Hypotheses

- H1: There will be a significant difference between the Work Environment Services (WES) of nurses, school teachers and corporate employees.
- H2: There will be a significant difference between the Quality of Life (QOL) of nurses, school teachers and corporate employees.
- H3: There will be a significant difference between the Life Satisfaction (LS) of nurses, school teachers and corporate employees.
- H4: There will be a correlation between Work Environment Services (WES) and Quality of Life (QOL).
- H5: There will be a correlation between Work Environment Services (WES) and Life Satisfaction (LS).

Sample

The total sample size comprised 150 participants out of which 50 were school teachers, 50 were nurses and other 50 were from corporate sector. Subject age ranged from between 21 to 60 years.

Variables

The independent variable of the research is work environment service, and the dependent variables are quality of life and life satisfaction

Tools used in data collection

- **A Personal Data Sheet:** this would be prepared for the purpose of collection of demographic details, i.e., the details of the participants within the sample, which include initials of the participants' name, age, and gender.
- **Work Environment Services Scale (WESS):** The Job Environment Services Scale, or WESS for short, was designed to look into different aspects of workplace services and how they shape an employee's overall job experience, quality of life, and satisfaction. This scale gauges how workers feel about the availability, effectiveness, and adequacy of the services in their workplace, covering everything from tangible support to the less visible support systems.
- **The Australian Whoqol-Bref Quality of Life (QOL):** A popular tool for checking out how people are doing in different areas of life is the World Health Organization Quality of Life-BREF, or WHOQOL-BREF for short. There's even an Australian version that keeps the same basic idea and reliability of the original but makes sure it's relevant and useful for people down under.
- **Satisfaction With Life Scale**: It is a popular tool that measure how satisfied someone feels about their life as a whole. Rather than zeroing in on specific aspects like relationships, work, or health, the SWLS gives a quick numerical score that reflects a person's overall life satisfaction.

RESULTS

The objective of this study was to explore how workplace services impact workers' happiness and overall quality of life. Specifically, we're looking at how different features of these services tie into employees' well-being. We want to find out if workers with better workplace services are generally happier. We're also going to emphasize the key features of workplace services that matter the most for both happiness and quality of life, giving us a clearer picture of what really counts for employee well-being.

The data was analyzed using IBM SPSS. The Shapiro-Wilk test was used to check the normality of the data. Since the data was normal, parametric tests, including ANOVA and Pearson correlation, were used.

Table no. 1: Shows the descriptive statistics for Life Satisfaction (LS), Quality of Life (QOL), and Work Environment Services Scale (WESS).

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
LS	150	5.00	35.00	23.1400	6.03461
QOL	150	137.20	368.75	249.6518	50.53496
WESS	150	39.06	82.03	58.5573	9.16257
Valid N (listwise)	150				

The mean score for Life Satisfaction was **23.14 (SD = 6.03)**, for Quality of Life was **249.65 (SD = 50.53)**, and for Work Environment Services Scale was **58.56 (SD = 9.16)**. The range of scores indicates variability in responses among participants.

- **Life Satisfaction:** The LS scores varied between 5 and 35, averaging around 23.14, with a standard deviation of 6.03. This shows that there's a moderate range in how employees view their overall life satisfaction.
- **Quality of Life:** Employees reported quite a range of quality of life scores, from a low of 137.20 to a high of 368.75, with an average score of 249.65. The standard deviation of 50.53 shows that their experiences really varied.
- **Work Environment Services Scale:** The WESS scores varied from 39.06 to 82.03, with an average of 58.56 and a standard deviation of 9.16. This shows that different professions have different views on workplace services.

ANOVA Analysis

Showing three groups of workers—nurses, teachers, and corporate employees—and compared their experiences in terms of Work Environment Services (WESS), Quality of Life (QOL), and Life Satisfaction (LS) using a one-way ANOVA.

Table no. 2: Quality of Life (QOL): A significant difference was observed across occupational groups (F(2,147) = 5.93, p = .003), suggesting that occupation influences QOL.

QOL					
	Sum of Squares	**df**	**Mean Square**	**F**	**Sig.**
Between Groups	28399.188	2	14199.594	5.928	.003
Within Groups	352114.419	147	2395.336		
Total	380513.607	149			

Table no.3: Life Satisfaction (LS): A significant difference was also found for LS among groups (F(2,147) = 4.84, p = .009), demonstrating that employees' levels of satisfaction with life vary by profession.

LS					
	Sum of Squares	**df**	**Mean Square**	**F**	**Sig.**
Between Groups	335.080	2	167.540	4.838	.009
Within Groups	5090.980	147	34.633		
Total	5426.060	149			

Table no.4: Work Environment Services (WESS): A significant difference was found among the groups (F(2,147) = 11.30, p < .001), indicating that workplace services differ significantly between nurses, teachers, and corporate employees.

WESS					
	Sum of Squares	**df**	**Mean Square**	**F**	**Sig.**
Between Groups	1667.049	2	833.525	11.301	.000
Within Groups	10841.907	147	73.754		
Total	12508.956	149			

Correlation Analysis

Pearson correlation analysis was conducted to examine the relationships between WESS, QOL, and LS.

Table no.5: WESS and QOL: A moderate positive correlation was found (r = .561, p < .001), suggesting that higher workplace services are associated with better quality of life.

		WESS	**QOL**
WESS	Pearson Correlation	1	.561**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	150	150
QOL	Pearson Correlation	.561**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	150	150

***. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).*

Table no.6: WESS and LS: A weak but significant positive correlation was identified (r = .192, p = .018), indicating that improved workplace services contribute to increased life satisfaction, albeit to a lesser extent than QOL.

		WESS	**LS**
WESS	Pearson Correlation	1	.192*
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.018
	N	150	150
LS	Pearson Correlation	.192*	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.018	
	N	150	150

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).*

DISCUSSION

The results of this study provide strong evidence that Work Environment Services (WES) have a significant impact on both Quality of Life (QOL) and Life Satisfaction (LS) among employees. The findings demonstrate that employees' perceptions of workplace services are crucial determinants of their well-being, with notable differences among the three occupational groups: nurses, school teachers, and corporate employees.

The study found a moderate positive correlation ($r = .561$, $p < .001$) between WESS and QOL, indicating that improved workplace services contribute significantly to employees' quality of life. This suggests that when employees perceive their work environment as supportive, comfortable, and resourceful, their overall life quality improves. These findings align with previous research indicating that work-related factors such as job security, benefits, and a positive work culture contribute to better well-being and reduced stress (Danna & Griffin, 1999; Diener & Seligman, 2004).

The occupational differences in QOL scores further highlight the impact of work environment on well-being. The results of the ANOVA test ($F(2,147) = 5.93$, $p = .003$) suggest that corporate employees reported higher QOL compared to school teachers and nurses. This could be attributed to better financial compensation, flexible work policies, and structured workplace services in corporate settings, which are often lacking in educational and healthcare sectors.

Although the correlation between WESS and LS was significant (**$r = .192$, $p = .018$**), it was weaker than the correlation between WESS and QOL. This finding suggests that while workplace services play a role in life satisfaction, other personal and external factors may contribute more significantly to overall happiness. Factors such as **personal relationships, financial stability, and psychological resilience** may have a stronger influence on life satisfaction than workplace conditions alone (Diener et al., 2009).

Additionally, the **ANOVA results for LS ($F(2,147) = 4.84$, $p = .009$)** indicate that different occupational groups experience varying levels of life satisfaction. Corporate employees again showed higher LS compared to nurses and school teachers, possibly due to differences in job-related stress, work-life balance, and job autonomy.

One of the key findings of this study is the significant difference in WES, QOL, and LS among the three occupational groups. The **ANOVA results for WESS ($F(2,147) = 11.30$, $p < .001$)** indicate that workplace services are perceived differently across professions. Several factors may explain these differences:

- **Nurses:** Healthcare workers, particularly nurses, often work under high-stress conditions with demanding schedules and emotional labor. Limited workplace resources, insufficient staff support, and exposure to health risks may negatively impact their perceived work environment services and, consequently, their QOL and LS.
- **School Teachers:** Teachers face unique stressors such as **high workload, job insecurity, and administrative pressure**, which may contribute to lower workplace service ratings. Additionally, educational institutions may offer fewer workplace benefits compared to corporate environments.
- **Corporate Employees:** Employees in corporate settings typically benefit from structured HR policies, better financial incentives, wellness programs, and career

development opportunities. These advantages may contribute to higher satisfaction with workplace services and, subsequently, greater QOL and LS.

Key Findings

Workplace services significantly impact employees' quality of life, with a moderate positive correlation between WESS and QOL ($r = .561$, $p < .001$). Life satisfaction is influenced by workplace services, but the relationship is weaker ($r = .192$, $p = .018$), suggesting additional contributing factors. Significant differences exist among nurses, teachers, and corporate employees in terms of WESS, QOL, and LS, highlighting the need for sector-specific improvements. Corporate employees reported higher QOL and LS than nurses and teachers, likely due to better workplace benefits and lower job-related stress. Improving workplace services can enhance employee well-being, emphasizing the need for policies that prioritize mental health, work-life balance, and job satisfaction.

Limitations and Suggestions

Sample Size and Generalizability: The sample was limited to 150 participants from three occupational groups, which may not fully represent the broader workforce. Future research could include a larger and more diverse sample. Cross-Sectional Design: This study used a cross-sectional approach, limiting the ability to establish causality. Longitudinal studies could provide deeper insights into how workplace services impact well-being over time. Self-Reported Data: The study relied on self-reported measures, which may introduce social desirability bias or subjective interpretations of workplace services. Other Influencing Factors: While WES was significantly correlated with QOL and LS, other potential variables such as job stress, salary, work-life balance, and organizational culture were not included and may also contribute to employee well-being.

Future research should explore industry-specific workplace service enhancements, conduct intervention studies, and examine moderating factors such as job tenure and individual coping mechanisms to develop comprehensive workplace well-being strategies.

CONCLUSION

This study examined the impact of Work Environment Services (WES) on Quality of Life (QOL) and Life Satisfaction (LS) among nurses, school teachers, and corporate employees. The findings confirm that workplace services significantly influence employees' well-being, with a stronger impact on QOL than LS. The study also identified significant occupational differences in workplace services and well-being levels.

The results emphasize the importance of improving workplace services to enhance employee well-being. Employers should consider implementing targeted interventions such as flexible work policies, mental health support, and better workplace amenities to promote both quality of life and job satisfaction.

REFERENCES

APA PsycNet. (n.d.-a). The Job Demands-Resources model: State of the art. APA PsycNet. https://psycnet.apa.org/record/2007-03960-005

APA PsycNet. (n.d.-b). The Satisfaction with Life Scale. APA PsycNet. https://psycnet.apa.org/record/1985-27000-001

APA PsycNet. (n.d.-c). Subjective well-being: Three decades of progress. APA PsycNet. https://psycnet.apa.org/record/1999-10106-007

APA PsycNet. (n.d.-d). The path to a healthy workplace: A critical review linking healthy workplace practices, employee well-being, and organizational improvements. APA PsycNet. https://psycnet.apa.org/record/2006-11915-001

APA PsycNet. (n.d.). Human resource management and employee well-being: Towards a new analytic framework. APA PsycNet. https://psycnet.apa.org/record/2017-07676-002

APA PsycNet. (n.d.). Business-unit-level relationship between employee satisfaction, employee engagement, and business outcomes: A meta-analysis. APA PsycNet. https://psycnet.apa.org/record/2002-12397-006

APA PsycNet. (n.d.). Well-being and occupational health in the 21st century workplace. APA PsycNet. https://psycnet.apa.org/record/2002-10499-006

Diener, E., Oishi, S., & Lucas, R. E. (2002). Personality, culture, and subjective well-being: Emotional and cognitive evaluations of life. *Annual Review of Psychology, 54*(1), 403–425. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.54.101601.145056

Johnson, S., Robertson, I., & Cooper, C. L. (2017). Well-being. Springer eBooks. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-62548-5

Danna, K., & Griffin, R. W. (1999). Health and well-being in the workplace: A review and synthesis of the literature. *Journal of Management, 25*(3), 357–384. https://doi.org/10.1177/014920639902500305

Mandhanya, Y. (2015). A study of impact of working environment on retention of employees (With special reference to automobile sector). *EBSCOhost*. https://openurl.ebsco.com/EPDB%3Agcd%3A9%3A1126105/detailv2?sid=ebsco%3Aplink%3Ascholar&id=ebsco%3Agcd%3A113664247&crl=c&link_origin=scholar.google.com

Robertson, I. (2012). *Well-being: Productivity and happiness at work*. Academia.edu. https://www.academia.edu/120322233/Well_being_productivity_and_happiness_at_work

World Health Organization. (1997). *WHOQOL: Measuring quality of life*. World Health Organization. https://iris.who.int/handle/10665/63482

World Health Organization. (2012, March 1). *WHOQOL: Measuring quality of life.* World Health Organization. https://www.who.int/tools/whoqol

Zhenjing, G., Chupradit, S., Ku, K. Y., Nassani, A. A., & Haffar, M. (2022). Impact of employees' workplace environment on employees' performance: A multi-mediation model. *Frontiers in Public Health, 10*. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpubh.2022.890400

Acknowledgment

I sincerely thank Dr. Pragyan Dangwal for her invaluable guidance throughout this research. Special thanks to Damanpreet Kaur for his expertise in statistical analysis. I am deeply grateful to Sarthak Patidar for helping me in reviewing my work, and I am grateful to my friends and family for helping me in the data collection and for their encouragement throughout my research journey.

Conflict of Interest

The author(s) declared no conflict of interest.

How to cite this article: Siwani & Dangwal, P. (2025). Impact of Work Environment Services on Quality of Life and Life Satisfaction of Employees. *International Journal of Indian Psychology*, *13*(3), 1485-1493. DIP:18.01.137.20251303, DOI:10.25215/1303.137