

# WORK ATMOSPHERE DETERMINANTS AFFECTING JOB SATISFACTION

# **Prof. (Dr.) Dipin Mathur**

Faculty of Management, Pacific Academy of Higher Education & Research University, Udaipur, Rajasthan.

### Ms. Neha Shrivastav

Research Scholar, Faculty of Management, Pacific Academy of Higher Education & Research University, Udaipur, Rajasthan.

# Abstract

One of the many challenges for a business is to satisfy its employees in order to cope up with the ever changing and evolving environment and to achieve success and remain in competition. In order to increase efficiency, effectiveness, productivity and job commitment of employees, the business must satisfy the needs of its employees by providing good working conditions. The work environment describes the neighboring circumstances in which employees are working together. A satisfied, happy and hardworking employee is biggest asset of any organisation. Effective results & productivity for any organisation depends on the level of satisfaction of employees and work environment is one of the most important factors which influence the satisfaction level. The objective of this paper is to analyze the impact of working environment on employee job satisfaction.

Keywords: Work Atmosphere, Organisational Climate, Job Satisfaction, Productivity, Efficiency.

## **Preamble:**

Employee satisfaction refers to a collection of positive and/or negative feelings that an individual holds toward his or her job. Job Satisfaction is a part of life satisfaction. It is the amount of pleasure or contentment associated with a job. Job Satisfaction is an emotional response to a job. Job satisfaction is one of the most popular and widely researched topics in the field of organizational psychology (**Spector, 1997**). Locke (1976) defines job satisfaction as a pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one's job or job experiences. Job satisfaction has been studied both as a consequence of many individual and work environment characteristics and as an antecedent to many outcomes. Employees who have higher job satisfaction are usually less absent, less likely to leave, more productive, more likely to display organizational commitment, and more likely to be satisfied with their lives (Lease, 1998).

Job satisfaction refers specifically to the attitude an individual has towards his or her job. According to **Fogarty** (**1994**) job satisfaction refers to the extent to which employees gain enjoyment from their efforts at the workplace. When an employee has a high level of job satisfaction, it means that they have a positive attitude towards his or her job.

On the other hand, there are a number of factors that can affect employees' job satisfaction such as satisfaction with: supervision at work, work itself, pay and conditions, appraisal, promotion practices and co-workers (Hackman, Oldham 1980).

Aside from the job scope itself, one factor that significantly influences how employees feel about work is the environment. By work environment, it means everything that forms part of employees' involvement with the work itself, such as the relationship with co-workers and supervisors, provision for rest rooms, rest periods, performance appraisal approaches, organizational culture, room for personal development, etc.

A positive work environment makes employees feel good about coming to work, and this provides the motivation to sustain them throughout the day.

In essence, a transparent and open form of communication addresses the employee's need to feel that what they have to say has value. It is what makes employees feel that they belong in the organization. Work then becomes meaningful because the employees know that what they contribute affects the organization that they are affiliated with.

Moreover an organization which fosters a climate where employees feel connected, wanted and have healthy and open communication will promote trust in day-to-day interactions between co-workers, as well as between subordinates and supervisors. Everyone becomes more united with the organization's mission in their mind. This is when employees will not be afraid to suggest ideas to improve the work processes, thus benefiting everyone in the organization in return.

Also work environment impacts your mood, drive and performance. If employees work in a dreary office setting with unfriendly workers, they likely won't feel motivated or confident to speak up. That's why creating a productive work environment is critical to the overall success of a company.

### **Literature Review:**

Hassan et al (2013) found that compensation was the most important factor for job satisfaction whereas employee empowerment was also a significant factor for employee loyalty. Jain and Singh (2013) stated that employee attitudes reflect the values of the company. Employee satisfaction is extremely important especially in the areas of sales and *Copyright* © *2020, Scholarly Research Journal for Humanity Science & English Language* 

services as they represent the company to customers. Khare and Pandey (2012) studied the impact of job satisfaction and organisational commitment and their impact on employee loyalty and found out that there was an impact of Job satisfaction and organisational commitment on employee loyalty. Kumari and Pandey (2011) implied that job performance was comparatively high when positive beliefs and affective experiences are salient and thus predominate at a certain point in time but that their performance may be comparatively low at other times when negative beliefs and affective experiences are salient and predominate. Kabir and Parveen (2011) tested the factors affecting job satisfaction and suggested that the managers should focus on various factors that affect and enhance the employee job satisfaction for better performance of the organisation. Khuong and Tien (2013) argued that in order to achieve high employee loyalty, companies in banking industry should achieve high level of employee job satisfaction, enhance supervisor support and

teamwork among employees, and provide good working environment. Abugre and Sarwar (2013) identified that the reward system in an organisation plays a significant role in increasing the job satisfaction of employees, higher rewards and satisfied employees at work results in higher productivity of Business organizations. Adjetey and Prako (2013) revealed that there were significant linear correlations among employee loyalty, engagement and performance. They also found out significant positive correlations of human relation, leadership style, job content, personal development, creativity and their effect on employee loyalty. Bauer (2004) showed that

higher involvement of workers in high performance workplace organisations is associated with high level of job satisfaction. This positive effect is dominated by worker's involvement in flexible work system, workers particularly associated with opportunities in the organisation regarding functional autonomy and coordination among workers.

#### **Research Methodology:**

#### **Data Collection and Measurement Scale**

The Study was based on employees of private banks in Udaipur city. The main purpose of the study was to see the impact of organisation's work atmosphere on job satisfaction of employees of Private banking sector. For this purpose data was collected from the employees working in various private banking institutions in Udaipur city. The research was based on primary data. The instrument for data collection was a self-designed questionnaire which was administered personally to the employees working in Private banking Sector to collect data.

The questionnaire was based on 5-point (Likert) scale ranging from 1= Strongly Disagree to 5= strongly agree. In this study, Judgmental (non-probability) sampling technique was used. A sample of 100 employees was selected for the purpose of this study.

### **Data Analysis and Interpretation**

Statistical Software SPSS version 22 has been used for data analysis. Item to total correlation was used to establish the internal consistency of the questionnaire; Cronbach's alpha was used to measure the reliability of the measurement scale. Factor analysis was used to find out the factors underlying overall work atmosphere of the organization and Job satisfaction. Regression Analysis was applied to find out the impact of overall work atmosphere (independent variable) on job satisfaction (dependent variable).

### **Result & Discussion:**

#### **Overall Atmosphere of Work Life**

| Descriptive Statistics         |        |                |     |  |  |  |  |
|--------------------------------|--------|----------------|-----|--|--|--|--|
|                                | Mean   | Std. Deviation | Ν   |  |  |  |  |
| Overall_satisfaction           | 2.3800 | 1.19876        | 100 |  |  |  |  |
| Provision of Rest Period       | 2.6050 | 1.06306        | 100 |  |  |  |  |
| (W_L_Q_8)                      |        |                |     |  |  |  |  |
| Provisions of Rest Room &      | 2.2300 | 1.02379        | 100 |  |  |  |  |
| Lunch Area (W_L_Q_26)          |        |                |     |  |  |  |  |
| Health care measures of the    | 2.2350 | .98526         | 100 |  |  |  |  |
| organisation (W_L_Q_38)        |        |                |     |  |  |  |  |
| Basis of Performance Appraisal | 3.3150 | 1.16496        | 100 |  |  |  |  |
| Criteria (W_L_Q_39)            |        |                |     |  |  |  |  |

 Table 1.1: Regression analysis for overall atmosphere

| Correlation            | 18                   |              |           | Provisions |              |             |
|------------------------|----------------------|--------------|-----------|------------|--------------|-------------|
|                        |                      |              |           | of Rest    | Health care  | Basis of    |
|                        |                      |              | Provision | Room &     | measures of  | Performance |
|                        |                      | Overall_     | of Rest   | Lunch      | the          | Appraisal   |
|                        |                      | satisfaction | Period    | Area       | organisation | Criteria    |
| Pearson<br>Correlation | Overall_satisfaction | 1.000        | 008       | .018       | 008          | .086        |
| 001101011011           | W_L_Q_8              | 008          | 1.000     | .125       | 012          | .109        |
|                        | W_L_Q_26             | .018         | .125      | 1.000      | .080         | 069         |
|                        | W_L_Q_38             | 008          | 012       | .080       | 1.000        | 069         |
| _                      | W_L_Q_39             | .086         | .109      | 069        | 069          | 1.000       |
| Sig. (1-<br>tailed)    | Overall_satisfaction | •            | .403      | .280       | .402         | .003        |
|                        | W_L_Q_8              | .403         | •         | .000       | .357         | .000        |
|                        | W_L_Q_26             | .280         | .000      | •          | .006         | .014        |
|                        | W_L_Q_38             | .402         | .357      | .006       | •            | .015        |
|                        | W_L_Q_39             | .003         | .000      | .014       | .015         |             |

# 10098

|  |                 |   | 100                | 10              | )0        | 100                | 10                              | 0         | 10          | 0        |
|--|-----------------|---|--------------------|-----------------|-----------|--------------------|---------------------------------|-----------|-------------|----------|
| Variab                                 | les Ent         | tered/Re  | moved <sup>a</sup> |                 |           |                    |                                 |           |             |          |
|  | Variat          | oles V  | ariables           |                 |           |                    |                                 |           |             |          |
| Model                                  |                 |   |                    | Method          |           |                    |                                 |           |             |          |
|  |                 |   | emoveu             |                 |           | ·                  |                                 |           |             |          |
| 1                                      | W_L_            | Q_39 .  |                    | Stepw18         | e (Crite  | rıa: Pr            | obability-                      | ot-F-to   | -enter <    | <=       |
|  |                 |   |                    | .050, Pr        | obability | y-of-F-            | to-remove                       | e >= .10  | )0).        |          |
| a. Depe                                | ndent '         | Variable:                                       | Overall            | _satisfact      | ion       |                    |                                 |           |             |          |
| Model Sur                              | nmary           | 7   |                    |                 |           |                    |                                 |           |             |          |
| model bui                              | iiiiai y        |   |                    | Std.            | Change    | e Statis           | tics                            |           |             |          |
|  |                 |   |                    | Error of        |           |                    |                                 |           |             |          |
| Model P                                | R               |   | ljusted (          | the<br>Estimate | R Squa    |                    | ongo dfl                        | df2       | Sig.        | F        |
| $\frac{\text{Model } R}{1 \qquad .08}$ |                 |   |                    | 1.19490         | .007      | <u>- Cn</u><br>7.4 | ange df1<br>76 1                | <u>98</u> | Cha<br>.006 |          |
| a. Predictor                           |                 |   |                    |                 | .007      | 7.1                | 70 1                            | 70        | .000        |          |
|  |                 |   |                    |                 |           |                    |                                 |           |             |          |
| ANOVA <sup>b</sup>                     |                 |   |                    |                 |           |                    |                                 |           |             | <u> </u> |
|  |                 | Sui   | n                  | of              |           |                    |                                 |           |             |          |
| Model                                  |                 |   | lares              | df              |           | Mean S             | ·                               |           | Sig.        |          |
|  | gressi          |   | 674                | 1               |           | 0.674              | 7.                              | 476       | .006ª       |          |
|  | esidual<br>otal |   | 24.926<br>35.600   | <u>98</u><br>99 | 1         | .428               |                                 |           |             |          |
| a. Predicto                            |                 |   |                    |                 |           |                    |                                 |           |             |          |
| b. Depende                             |                 |   |                    |                 | 1         |                    |                                 |           |             |          |
|  |                 |   |                    |                 |           |                    |                                 |           |             |          |
| Coefficients                           | I               |   |                    |                 |           |                    |                                 |           |             |          |
|  |                 |   | Stand              |                 |           |                    |                                 |           |             |          |
|  | Unat            | andardiz  | dized<br>e Coeff   |                 |           |                    |                                 |           | Colline     | ority    |
|  |                 | efficient                                       |                    | ICI             |           | Corre              | lations                         |           | Statisti    | -        |
|  | <u></u>         | Std.  | •                  |                 |           | Zero-              |                                 |           | Tole        | •••      |
| Model                                  | В               | Error   | Beta               | t               | Sig.      | order              | Partial                         | Part      | rance       | VIF      |
| 1 (Constant)                           | 2.080           | 5 .114  |                    | 18.29           | .000      |                    |                                 |           |             |          |
| W_L_Q_3                                | 080             | .032  | .086               | 4 2.734         | 4 .006    | .086               | .086                            | .086      | 1.000       | 1.000    |
| ₩_L_Q_3<br>9                           | .009            | .032  | .000               | 2.134           | r .000    | .000               | .000                            | .000      | 1.000       | 1.000    |
| a. Dependent                           | Varial          | ole: Over                                       | all_satis          | faction         |           |                    |                                 |           |             |          |
| a. Dependent                           |                 |   |                    |                 |           |                    |                                 |           |             |          |
| a. Dependent                           |                 |   |                    |                 |           |                    |                                 |           |             |          |
| a. Dependent                           |                 |   |                    |                 |           |                    |                                 |           |             |          |
| Excluded                               | ariab           | les <sup>b</sup>                                |                    |                 |           |                    |                                 |           |             |          |
|  | ariab           | les <sup>b</sup>                                |                    |                 |           | (                  | Collinearit                     | y Statis  |             |          |
| Excluded V                             | /ariab          |   |                    | <u> </u>        | Partial   |                    |                                 | -         | Minii       |          |
|  |                 | les <sup>b</sup><br>Beta In<br>017 <sup>a</sup> | t<br>547           | Sig.<br>.585    |           | ation 7            | Collinearit<br>Colerance<br>988 | -         |             |          |

|       | $W_L_Q_{26} .025^a$                              | .775 | .438 | .025 | .995 | 1.005 | .995 |  |  |
|-------|--|------|------|------|------|-------|------|--|--|
| _     | W_L_Q_38002 <sup>a</sup>                         | 062  | .951 | 002  | .995 | 1.005 | .995 |  |  |
| a. Pr | a. Predictors in the Model: (Constant), W_L_Q_39 |      |      |      |      |       |      |  |  |
| 1 D   | 1 . 11 . 11 . 0                                  | 11   |      |      |      |       |      |  |  |

b. Dependent Variable: Overall\_satisfaction

| Collinearity Diagnostics <sup>a</sup>       |           |            |                 |            |          |  |  |  |
|---|-----------|------------|-----------------|------------|----------|--|--|--|
| Variance Proportions                        |           |            |                 |            |          |  |  |  |
| Model                                       | Dimension | Eigenvalue | Condition Index | (Constant) | W_L_Q_39 |  |  |  |
| 1   | 1         | 1.943      | 1.000           | .03        | .03      |  |  |  |
|   | 2         | .057       | 5.865           | .97        | .97      |  |  |  |
| a. Dependent Variable: Overall_satisfaction |           |            |                 |            |          |  |  |  |

The regression results show that:

R= .007

Adjusted R square=.006

Dependent Variable= Overall\_satisfaction

 $Predictors = W_L_Q_39$ 

Model fit ANOVA=7.476

Significant=0.000

Result: model is fit to predict factor.

As per the above result points it can be revealed that variable "Basis of Performance Appraisal Criteria" is predicting the satisfaction towards Overall atmosphere of work life in private sector banking. Therefore hypothesis can be accepted and this factor can be added to the final model for predicting work life imbalance in private sector banks.

### **Conclusion:**

It can be convincingly concluded that the job satisfaction is a critical issue in terms of employee motivation for any organization. In fact it can be stated as one of the potent factor to achieve effective and conducive work environment. The above study has also proved that the organisations can fairly well accomplish the state of job satisfaction with the intervention of various components of work environment viz: Provision of Rest Period, Provisions of Rest Room & Lunch Area, Health care measures of the organization, Basis of Performance Appraisal Criteria etc. But it is significantly seen that the variable "Basis of Performance Appraisal Criteria" is predicting the satisfaction towards Overall atmosphere of work life in private sector banking.

#### References

- Fogarty, T. 1994. Public Accounting Experience: The Influence of Demographic and Organisational Attributes, Managerial Auditing Journal 9(7): 12–20. doi:10.1108/02686909410067552
- Hackman, J.; Oldham, G. 1980. Work Redesign. Reading, Ma: Addison Wesley.
- Lease, S. H. (1998). Annual review, 1993–1997: Work attitudes and outcomes. Journal of Vocational Behaviour, Vol. 53(2): 154–183.
- Locke, E.A. (1976) "The nature and Causes of Job-satisfaction", in M.D. Dunnette, Hand book of Industrial and Organizational psychology, Chicago; Rand Mc Nally, p.1300.
- Spector, P. E. (1997). Job satisfaction: application, assessment, cause and consequences. Thousand Oaks', CA: Sage Publications, inc. Retrieved from http://books.google.com/ books?Id=nckxmzjs0xcc&printsec.