

A Study on Employee Satisfaction and its Impact on Performance

Dr. R. Sankar Ganesh¹, Ajithkumar. L²

¹Associate Professor, Department of Management Studies, M. Kumarasamy College of Engineering, Karur, Tamil Nadu

² Student, Second Year MBA, M. Kumarasamy College of Engineering, Karur, Tamil Nadu

Abstract - The purpose of this study is to observe the relationship between employee satisfaction and Employee Performance. In this research paper various variables responsible for employee satisfaction has been discussed such as Organization development factors, Job security factors, Work task factors, Policies of compensation and benefit factor and opportunities which give satisfaction to employees such as Promotion and career development leadership, job satisfaction, motivation, rewards and cultural differences also has been described .This paper also deals the various ways by which one can improve employee satisfaction. The data was collected through self-administrated questionnaire which contains multiple choice questions and open-ended questions. In conclusion, it seems reasonable to believe that understanding of employee role is extremely important as it appears key factor in the success of modern organization.

Index Terms - Employee Satisfaction, Employee Welfare, Performance.

1.INTRODUCTION

EMPLOYEE SATISFACTION:

Employee satisfaction is a state where individuals are not only happy with their current profiles but also look forward towards a long term association with the organization. No individual wants to quit his/her job after every six months. But the moment monotony creeps in, people start looking for better opportunities. Most of the times, employees treat their jobs just as a mere source of earning their bread and butter. They come to office not because they enjoy their work but because they need their salaries to ensure a comfortable living.

Employees would never be satisfied with their jobs unless and until they have something interesting and challenging to work on. “Monday morning blues” is a

common term used by professionals as an excuse for not coming to work and feeling lazy on the first day of the week. I personally do not agree with this. Trust me, if you really enjoy your work, you would feel like coming to office every day. Do we ever crib when we have a holiday or are at home? NO. Why? Just because we feel comfortable at our home. Why do we then always complain at work? Understand, there is a difference between your personal and professional life. Think logically. The moment you have unrealistic expectations at workplace, problems are bound to arise and you can never be happy and contended at workplace.

Employee performance refers to how your workers behave in the workplace and how well they perform the job duties you've obligated to them. Your company typically sets performance targets for individual employees and the company as a whole in hopes that your business offers good value to customers, minimizes waste and operates efficiently.

For an individual employee, performance may refer to work effectiveness, quality and efficiency at the task level. Your salesperson, for example, may be expected to complete a certain quota of calls to potential leads per hour with a specific portion of those resulting in closed sales. On the other hand, a production worker may have performance requirements for product quality and hourly output.

1.1 Need of the Study

The need of the study is to analyse the Employee Satisfaction and Welfare facilities and opinion of the employees working in Swamy Cotton Mill, Tiruppur.

1.2 Objectives of the Study

To identify the most effective factor of employee satisfaction that has high impact on employee's performance.

To identify the impact of the welfare measure upon the workers health and productivity.

To find out the awareness among the employees about the employee welfare measures.

To give some suggestions to increase the job satisfaction and productivity of the employees.

2. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

S.Divyabharathi, R.P.Nivethigha (2017) has done their research work on Employee Welfare Schemes and its Impacts on Performance. The study has been conducted among 100 respondents in the organization. The tools used to analyze data are Percentage Analysis, Chi-Square and Weighted Average method. Muhammad Shahzad, Mushtaq Ahmad (2013) has done their research work on Impact of Employee's Job Satisfaction on Organizational Performance. The study has been conducted among 120 respondents in the organization. The tools used to analyze data are Probability, and Non-Probability.

D.Swaroopaa and B.Sudhir (2017) has done their research work on A Study on the Impact of Employee Satisfaction on Quality and Profitability of Organizations. The study has been conducted among 116 respondents in the organization. The tools used to analyze data are Percentage Analysis, Chi-Square. The organizations need to provide good working conditions for the ease of employees to be able to work in an efficient and effective manner.

R. Naga Bhavya Sree, R. Satyavathi (2017) has done their research work on Employee Job Satisfaction. The study has been conducted among 210 respondents in the organization. The tools used to analyze data are simple regression. The top management decision shall be highly rational and should be in the interest of the organization and also communicate the needs and goals of the employee. Then every decision should be explained to every employee in the corporation.

T. Dziuba, Marina Zhuravskaya (2020) has done their research work on Employees' Job Satisfaction and their Work Performance as Elements Influencing Work Safety. The study has been conducted among 47 respondents in the organization. The tools used to analyze data are Weighted Average method. In the

research the employees of chosen metallurgical company were supposed to assess their job satisfaction. Their job satisfaction results in their work safety. Happy and satisfied employee performs better his duties, becomes more responsible, feels part of the enterprise.

Abdul Wahid A. Fadlallah (2015) has done their research work on Impact of Job Satisfaction on Employees Performance. The study has been conducted among 85 respondents in the organization. The tools used to analyze data are Chi-Square and Linear Regression. Research recommends that organizations should realize the employee's needs and work for the betterment of the organization environment.

Barween Al Kurdia, Muhammad Alshurideh and Ahmad Alnaser (2020) has done their research work on Employee Welfare Schemes and its Impacts on Performance. The study has been conducted among 371 respondents in the organization. The tools used to analyze data are Partial Least Squares-Structural Equation Modeling. The relationship between employee job satisfaction and customer satisfaction is not simple as proposed as many other interrelated factors impact of the relationship between customer and employee satisfaction.

Usha Tiwari (2017) has done their research work on Employee Welfare Schemes and its Impacts on Performance. The study has been conducted among 22 respondents in the organization. The tools used to analyze data are Percentage Analysis. As per the study it is observe that VTL Rewa (M.P.) is provided various facilities to the employees and also follow the rules and regulation of state and Indian Government. The management required to provide good facilities to all employees in such way that employees become satisfied about employee welfare facilities.

Ramya.T, Bhavani shree Arepalli , Lakshmi.P (2016) has done their research work on A Study on Employee Welfare Facilities and Its Impact on Employee Satisfaction at Hotel Industry with Special Reference to Mysuru District. The study has been conducted among 100 respondents in the organization. The tools used to analyze data are correlation. In the study it is found that workers were fulfilled by the approach of employee welfare procedures taken for the workers, Operating environment has satisfactory airing but the

employee’s sense there must be adequate arrangements for fresh air wherever possible.

Almeida and Perera (2015) has done their research work on The Impact of Welfare on Job Satisfaction among Non Managerial Employees in the Apparel Industry in Sri Lanka. The study has been conducted among 130 respondents in the organization. The tools used to analyze data are Correlation analysis and simple regression analysis. According to the study it was found that welfare facilities positively correlated with job satisfaction of the employees.



Fig.,Proposed Conceptual Model

3. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The study used a convenience random sampling technique to select samples. The selected sample size was one hundred and ten (75) respondents. The questionnaire starts with the demographic profile of the respondent. The next section questions related to Employee Satisfaction and its impact on Performance. Frequency and Correlation were used to analyse the data collected. The Descriptive Research Design was adopted in this study. The variables used were qualitative and were collected based on the perceptions of respondents through Interview Method. Each question on the survey was measured using 5 point Likert Scale.

4. ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

Frequency
Gender

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Male	45	60.0	60.0	60.0

Female	30	40.0	40.0	100.0
Total	75	100.0	100.0	

INTERPRETATION:

From the table reveals that 60% of respondents belong to Male, 40% of the respondents belong to Female, Majority 60 % of the respondents belong to the Male.

Educational Qualification					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	<SSLC	16	21.3	21.3	21.3
	HSC	15	20.0	20.0	41.3
	Diploma	5	6.7	6.7	48.0
	UG	25	33.3	33.3	81.3
	PG	14	18.7	18.7	100.0
	Total	75	100.0	100.0	

INTERPRETATION:

From the table reveals that 21.3% of respondents belong to >SSLC, 20% of the respondents belong to HSC, 6.7% of the respondents belong to Diploma, 33.3% of the respondents belong to UG, 18.7% of respondents belong to PG, Majority 33.3% of the respondents belong to the UG.

Marital Status					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Married	41	54.7	54.7	54.7
	Unmarried	34	45.3	45.3	100.0
	Total	75	100.0	100.0	

INTERPRETATION:

From the table reveals that 54.7% of respondents belong to Married, 45.3% of the respondents belong to Unmarried, Majority 54.7% of the respondents belong to the Married.

Annual Income					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	<20000	30	40.0	40.0	40.0
	20000-30000	33	44.0	44.0	84.0
	30000-40000	7	9.3	9.3	93.3
	>40000	5	6.7	6.7	100.0
	Total	75	100.0	100.0	

Total	75	100.0	100.0	
-------	----	-------	-------	--

INTERPRETATION:

From the table reveals that 40% respondents belong to <20000, 44% respondents belong to 20000-30000, 8.3% respondents belong to 30000-40000, 8.7% respondents belong to >40000, Majority 44% of the respondents belong to the 20000-30000.

Experience					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0-1 Years	14	18.7	18.7	18.7
	1-2 Years	20	26.7	26.7	45.3
	2-3 Years	28	37.3	37.3	82.7
	>4 Years	13	17.3	17.3	100.0
	Total	75	100.0	100.0	

INTERPRETATION:

From the table reveals that 18.7% respondents belong to 0-1 Years, 26.7% respondents belong to 1-2 Years, 37.3% respondents belong to 2-3 Years, 17.3% respondents belong to >4 Years, Majority 37.3% of the respondents belong to the 2-3 Years.

Area of Residence					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Rural	30	40.0	40.0	40.0
	Semi-Urban	24	32.0	32.0	72.0
	Urban	21	28.0	28.0	100.0
	Total	75	100.0	100.0	

INTERPRETATION:

From the table reveals that 40% of respondents belong to Rural, 32% of the respondents belong to Semi-Urban, 28% of the respondents belongs to Urban, Majority 40% of the respondents belong to the Rural.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	18-25	12	16.0	16.0	16.0
	26-35	23	30.7	30.7	46.7
	36-45	24	32.0	32.0	78.7
	>45	16	21.3	21.3	100.0
	Total	75	100.0	100.0	

INTERPRETATION:

From the table reveals that 16% of respondents belong to Below 25, 30.7% of the respondents belong to 26-35, 32% of the respondents belong to 36-45, 21.3% of

the respondents belong to Above 45%, Majority 32% of the respondents belong to the 36-45.

Nature of Job					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Permanent	39	52.0	52.0	52.0
	Temporary	36	48.0	48.0	100.0
	Total	75	100.0	100.0	

INTERPRETATION:

From the table reveals that 52% of respondents belong to Permanent, 48% of the respondents belong to Temporary, Majority 52% of the respondents belong to the Permanent.

CORRELATIONS

Table 4.2.1

		WE1	WE2	WE3	WE4	WE5
WE1	Pearson Correlation	1	.302**	.343**	.121	.322**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.009	.003	.301	.005
	N	75	75	75	75	75
WE2	Pearson Correlation	.302**	1	.364**	.177	.451**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.009		.001	.129	.000
	N	75	75	75	75	75
WE3	Pearson Correlation	.343**	.364**	1	.285*	.554**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.003	.001		.013	.000
	N	75	75	75	75	75
WE4	Pearson Correlation	.121	.177	.285*	1	.400**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.301	.129	.013		.000
	N	75	75	75	75	75
WE5	Pearson Correlation	.322**	.451**	.554**	.400**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.005	.000	.000	.000	
	N	75	75	75	75	75

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

INFERENCE:

From the calculated person's statistics it can be summarized that as p-value 0.000 < 0.05 there is significant relationship between total value of Work Environment and statement of Work Environment Correlation relationship expressed by r value, r – value

is .302, .343, .121 and .322 (+ve) which shows the positive relationship.

Table 4.2.2

		EW1	EW2	EW3	EW4	EW5
EW1	Pearson Correlation	1	.255*	.121	.142	.290*
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.027	.300	.224	.012
	N	75	75	75	75	75
EW2	Pearson Correlation	.255*	1	.132	.143	.176
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.027		.258	.223	.130
	N	75	75	75	75	75
EW3	Pearson Correlation	.121	.132	1	.164	.465**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.300	.258		.158	.000
	N	75	75	75	75	75
EW4	Pearson Correlation	.142	.143	.164	1	.209
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.224	.223	.158		.071
	N	75	75	75	75	75
EW5	Pearson Correlation	.290*	.176	.465**	.209	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.012	.130	.000	.071	
	N	75	75	75	75	75

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

INFERENCE:

From the calculated person’s statistics it can be summarized that as p-value 0.000 < 0.05 there is significant relationship between total values of Employee Welfare and statement of Employee Welfare Correlation relationship expressed by r value, r – value is .255, .121, .142 and .290 (+ve) which shows the positive relationship.

Table 4.2.3

		HS1	HA2	HS3	HS4	HS5
HS1	Pearson Correlation	1	.317**	.265*	.153	-.002
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.006	.021	.189	.983
	N	75	75	75	75	75
HA2	Pearson Correlation	.317**	1	.312**	.599**	.110
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.006		.007	.000	.347
	N	75	75	75	75	75

HS3	Pearson Correlation	.265*	.312**	1	.281*	-.042
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.021	.007		.015	.718
	N	75	75	75	75	75
HS4	Pearson Correlation	.153	.599**	.281*	1	.358**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.189	.000	.015		.002
	N	75	75	75	75	75
HS5	Pearson Correlation	-.002	.110	-.042	.358**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.983	.347	.718	.002	
	N	75	75	75	75	75

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

INFERENCE:

From the calculated person’s statistics it can be summarized that as p-value 0.000 < 0.05 there is significant relationship between total values of Health and Safety Measures and statement of Health and Safety Measures Correlation relationship expressed by r value, r – value is .317, .265, .153 and -.002 (+ve) which shows the positive relationship.

Table 4.2.4

		ES1	ES2	ES3	ES4	ES5
ES1	Pearson Correlation	1	.157	.212	.199	.263*
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.179	.067	.087	.023
	N	75	75	75	75	75
ES2	Pearson Correlation	.157	1	.235*	.523**	.014
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.179		.043	.000	.903
	N	75	75	75	75	75
ES3	Pearson Correlation	.212	.235*	1	.478**	.215
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.067	.043		.000	.063
	N	75	75	75	75	75
ES4	Pearson Correlation	.199	.523**	.478**	1	.041
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.087	.000	.000		.725
	N	75	75	75	75	75
ES5	Pearson Correlation	.263*	.014	.215	.041	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.023	.903	.063	.725	
	N	75	75	75	75	75

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

INFERENCE:

From the calculated person’s statistics it can be summarized that as p-value $0.000 < 0.05$ there is significant relationship between total values of Employee Satisfaction and statement of Employee Satisfaction Correlation relationship expressed by r value, r – value is .157, .212, .199 and .263 (+ve) which shows the positive relationship.

Table 4.2.5

		P1	P2	P3	P4	P5
P1	Pearson Correlation	1	.447**	.348**	.404**	.098
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.002	.000	.401
	N	75	75	75	75	75
P2	Pearson Correlation	.447**	1	.276*	.395**	.301**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.017	.000	.009
	N	75	75	75	75	75
P3	Pearson Correlation	.348**	.276*	1	.586**	.291*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.002	.017		.000	.011
	N	75	75	75	75	75
P4	Pearson Correlation	.404**	.395**	.586**	1	.154
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000		.187
	N	75	75	75	75	75
P5	Pearson Correlation	.098	.301**	.291*	.154	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.401	.009	.011	.187	
	N	75	75	75	75	75

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

INFERENCE:

From the calculated person’s statistics it can be summarized that as p-value $0.000 < 0.05$ there is significant relationship between total values of Employee Performance and statement of Employee Performance Correlation relationship expressed by r value, r – value is .447, .348, .404 and .098 (+ve) which shows the positive relationship.

6. FINDINGS

- It is found that 60% of the respondents are between Male.
- It is found that 33.3% of the respondents educational qualification are UG.

- It is found that 54.7% of the respondents are Married.
- It is found that 44% of the respondents salaries are between 20000-30000.
- It is found that 37.3% of the respondents are experience between 2-3 Years.
- It is found that 40% of the respondents are between Rural.
- It is found that 32% of the respondents are between 36-45 age.
- It is found that 52% of the respondents jobs are Permanent.
- It is found that 50% of the respondents satisfied with their Working Environment.
- It is found that 50% of the respondents satisfied with their work.
- It is found that 40% of the respondents satisfied with receiving the constructive feedback.
- It is found that 45% of the respondents satisfied with the canteen service.
- It is found that 42% of the respondents satisfied with the lunchroom facilities.
- It is found that 60% of the respondents to know the welfare facilities provided by the company.

7. DISCUSSIONS

Emotional Intelligence and Work Performance of employees has been assessed with a self-assessed questionnaire. In line with theoretical predictions, Emotional Intelligence was associated with Employee Performance and Organisational Productivity. It is proposed that organizations must make efforts to know the emotional intelligence level of employee because it helps to realize the required individual and organizational outcomes. It is recommended that organizations develop training programs so as to develop the emotional competencies of the employers and employees. The variables are significant to everyone.

8. LIMITATIONS

The sample obtained from 110 employees of textile industry. So, this cannot be a full proof one. This study is confined to the employees working in various textiles located in Karur only. So, this study cannot be generalized to rest of the industries. As the scope is limited to specific industry in specific district, the

future studies can be the increased scope including various industries and variety of workers.

9. CONCLUSION

Employee satisfaction is the terminology used to describe whether employees are happy and comfortable and accomplishing their desires and needs at work. Employee satisfaction can also be based on the effect of an individual's experience of work, or the quality of their working life. Employee satisfaction can be well understood in terms of its connection with some key factors, such as well-being, stress at work, control at work, working condition etc. employee satisfaction is based on how the organization treats them, effective employee satisfaction for individuals reflects from the emotional feeling they have about their job.

REFERENCES

- [1] Dr. Usha Tiwari (2014): A Study on Employee Welfare Facilities and its impact on Employee Efficiency. Abinav International Monthly Refereed Journal of Research in Management & Technology. Volume 3, Issue11, ISSN-2320-0073
- [2] S. Dhivyabharathi (2017) Employee Welfare Schemes and Its Implication on Performance. IOSR Journal of Business and Management. Volume 19, Issue5, ISSN: 2278-487X
- [3] S. Jayanthi and Dr. K. Bangovan (2019): A Study on Awareness and Satisfaction towards Employee Welfare Measures. International Journal of Engineering and Management Research. Volume9, Issue-4, ISSN-2250-0758
- [4] Aruna.S (2019): Employee Welfare Measures: Importance, Statutory Provisions and Various Agencies Protecting the Welfare of Employees, Volume7, Issue2, ISSN-2320-4168
- [5] . G. Purushothaman, K. Krishnamurthy (2014): A Study on Employees Welfare Measures. Journal of Human Resource Management and Development. Volume4, Issue1, ISSN: 22777-4742
- [6] Poonam Salaria, Sumit Salaria (2013): Employee Welfare Measures in Auto Sector. International Journal of Business and Management Invention. Volume2, Issue3, ISSN-2319-801X