

A STUDY ON INFLUENCES OF WORK ENVIRONMENT FACTORS ON ORGANIZATIONAL PERFORMANCE OF RAVINDRAN INDUSTRIES, TRICHY

G. Swetha¹, Dr.K.S.Kavitha²

¹Final Year MBA Student, Department of Management Studies, Paavai Engineering College (Autonomous), Pachal, Namakkal, Tamil Nadu. Email ID: swethaanu05@gmail.com

²HOD, Department of Management Studies, Paavai Engineering College (Autonomous), Pachal, Namakkal, Tamil Nadu.

Abstract— Employees are very important assets in an organization. A good organization is one which takes care of its employees. This is often done by paying attention to their workplace environment. This is because the employees spend substantial part of the time of their lives at the workplace while carrying out their work. The problem statement is about factors affecting the performance of employees at work place in the scenario of attitude, organizational culture, personal problems and job. This study will focus on the industry to know about their performance and factors affecting them. The variables that are determined to affect the performance at work place include manager's attitude, organizational culture, personal problems, and job content and financial rewards. These variables are described in different studies that affect the performance of employees at work place. This study will find out the impact of finding and manager's attitude, organizational culture, personal problems and job content and financial rewards on the employees performance in the industry. It will also highlight how these variables affect the performance either positive or negative. Although the positive affect has been seen through the literature review but this study will determine it again.

INTRODUCTION

Employees are very important assets in an organization. A good organization is one which takes care of its employees. This is often done by paying attention to their workplace environment. This is because the employees spend substantial part of the time of their lives at the workplace while carrying out their work.

Hence, workplace environment influences their cognitive and emotional states, concentration, behavior, actions, and abilities. It plays an important role in the employees' engagement as well as in their performance. In fact, workplace environment has a big contribution for the organization in maintaining a high level of employees' productivity and hence the organizational productivity.

Workplace environment and productivity are often perceived as two opposites by the managements in some of the organizations. This is because, the managements of such organizations consider workplace environment as an extra, resource-consuming, non-productive activity, which they dislike because of the lack of production stemming from it. They believe that the productivity enhancement of the employees can be achieved by enhancing the employees' skills.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The problem statement is about factors affecting the performance of employees at work place in the scenario of attitude, organizational culture, personal problems and job. This study will focus on the industry to know about their performance and factors affecting them. The variables that are determined to affect the performance at work place include manager's attitude, organizational culture, personal problems, and job content and financial rewards. These variables are described in different studies that affect the performance of employees at work place. This study will find out the impact of finding and manager's attitude, organizational culture, personal problems and job content and financial rewards on the employees performance in the industry. It will also highlight how these variables affect the performance either positive or negative. Although the positive affect has been seen through the literature review but this study will determine it again.

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

1. To know the elements that influence the organizational performance
2. To determine the connection between organizational performance and work environment
3. To determine the contribution of performance feedback on employees performance
4. To assess the satisfaction level of factors affecting the employees attitude at workplace
5. To determine whether physical work environment has influence on employees performance
6. To examine whether supervisor support contribute towards employees performance

SCOPE OF THE STUDY

It is anticipated that the findings of the study will pave way for the authorities of the institute of finance management to accept the variable that affects employees' working environment and their performance at the organization. Such an acceptance could be utilized to improve on the working conditions of employees. It will also visualize that the findings of this study will enable the organization to know how to address issues concerning the employees and its working environment and to consider office design as an important factor in increasing employees' performance. It will therefore serve as a reference material for future researches in this area. Also, the results will throw more light on factors affecting employee's performance as far as their environments are concerned.

LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

The study has certain limitations.

- The selection of work environment factors that influence employee performance is not exhaustive.
- There may be other factors that may influence employee performance that might provide more insight on employee performance.
- The used factors might not provide a clear image of the relationship between workplace environment factors and employee performance.
- Another limitation to the study is the vast number of employee across the industry.
- The researcher would have wished to carry out the study across all employee and staffs. But that was not possible due to constraints in time, finances and other related resources.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The research methodology is scientific and systematic for pertinent information on specific topic. It is a careful investigation or inquiry especially through search for new facts in any branch of knowledge. Research is a systematized effort to gain knowledge and hence, it helps to practical knowledge in study various steps that are generated adopted by a research in studying his research problem along with the logic behind them.

RESEARCH DESIGN

Research is a process in which the researcher wishes to find out the end result for a given problem and thus the solution helps in future course action. The research has been defined as "A careful investigation or enquire especially through search for new facts in any branch of knowledge". The type of research is descriptive in nature; since an attempt was made to find out inter relationship between variables

SAMPLE DESIGN

A sample is a subset from the total population. A sample is a subset from the total population. It refers to the techniques or the procedure to the research would adopt in selecting items for the sample (i.e) the size of the sample

SAMPLE SIZE

Sample size means the number of sampling units selected from the organization for investigation. The total sample size that is taken for this study is 120.

SAMPLING TECHNIQUE

A simple random sampling technique has been used in sampling. It provides information about parts of the all the area of Trichy.

SAMPLING POPULATION

There are 180 up employees are there at Ravindran Industries Pvt Ltd.

DATA DESIGN

Data is collected from both primary and secondary sources.

Primary Data

Primary data are collected through a structured questionnaire. A well-structured questionnaire has been prepared given to the respondents by the researcher.

Secondary Data

Secondary data are collected from the published data available within the company and also from the Internet and Intranet. Data was collected from web sites, going through the records of the organization, etc. It is the data which has been collected by individual or someone else for the purpose of other than those of our particular research study.

TOOLS FOR ANALYSING DATA

In order to come out with the findings of the study the following statistical tools are used by the researcher

- Simple Percentage analysis
- Chi-Square test
- Correlation
- ANOVA

DATA ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

CHI-SQUARE TEST

NULL HYPOTHESIS

H₀: There is no significance relationship between education qualification of the respondents and company provide clear path for career advancement

ALTERNATIVE HYPOTHESIS

H₁: There is a significance relationship between education qualification of the respondents and company provide clear path for career advancement

| Chi-Square Tests | | | |
|--|----------------------|----|-----------------------|
| | Value | df | Asymp. Sig. (2-sided) |
| Pearson Chi-Square | 2.741E2 ^a | 16 | .000 |
| Likelihood Ratio | 257.621 | 16 | .000 |
| Linear-by-Linear Association | 103.535 | 1 | .000 |
| N of Valid Cases | 120 | | |
| a. 14 cells (56.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.47. | | | |

| Symmetric Measures | | | | | |
|--|-------|-------|--------------------------------|------------------------|--------------|
| | | Value | Asymp. Std. Error ^a | Approx. T ^b | Approx. Sig. |
| Ordinal by Ordinal | Gamma | 1.000 | .000 | 41.636 | .000 |
| Measure of Agreement | Kappa | .156 | .054 | 3.579 | .000 |
| N of Valid Cases | | 120 | | | |
| a. Not assuming the null hypothesis. | | | | | |
| b. Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis. | | | | | |

RESULT

Since the calculated value is less than the table value. So we accept the null hypothesis. There is no relationship between education qualification of the respondents and company provide clear path for career advancement

CORRELATION

The table shows that the relationship between experience of the respondents and organization clearly communicate its goals and strategies.

| Correlations | | | |
|--|---------------------|-------------------------------|---|
| | | EXPERIENCE OF THE RESPONDENTS | ORGANIZATION CLEARLY COMMUNICATE ITS GOALS AND STRATEGIES |
| EXPERIENCE OF THE RESPONDENTS | Pearson Correlation | 1 | .925** |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | | .000 |
| | N | 120 | 120 |
| ORGANIZATION CLEARLY COMMUNICATE ITS GOALS AND STRATEGIES | Pearson Correlation | .925** | 1 |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | .000 | |
| | N | 120 | 120 |
| **. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed). | | | |

NONPARAMETRIC CORRELATIONS

| Correlations | | | | |
|--|---|-------------------------|-------------------------------|---|
| | | | EXPERIENCE OF THE RESPONDENTS | ORGANIZATION CLEARLY COMMUNICATE ITS GOALS AND STRATEGIES |
| Kendall's tau_b | EXPERIENCE OF THE RESPONDENTS | Correlation Coefficient | 1.000 | .870** |
| | | Sig. (2-tailed) | . | .000 |
| | | N | 120 | 120 |
| | ORGANIZATION CLEARLY COMMUNICATE ITS GOALS AND STRATEGIES | Correlation Coefficient | .870** | 1.000 |
| | | Sig. (2-tailed) | .000 | . |
| | | N | 120 | 120 |
| Spearman's rho | EXPERIENCE OF THE RESPONDENTS | Correlation Coefficient | 1.000 | .912** |
| | | Sig. (2-tailed) | . | .000 |
| | | N | 120 | 120 |
| | ORGANIZATION CLEARLY COMMUNICATE ITS GOALS AND STRATEGIES | Correlation Coefficient | .912** | 1.000 |
| | | Sig. (2-tailed) | .000 | . |
| | | N | 120 | 120 |
| **. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed). | | | | |

RESULT

This is a positive correlation. There are relationships between experience of the respondents and organization clearly communicate its goals and strategies

ANOVA

NULL HYPOTHESIS

H₀: There is no significant relationship between age of the respondents and Satisfied with the job security.

ALTERNATIVE HYPOTHESIS

H₁: There is a significant relationship between age of the respondents and Satisfied with the job security.

| Descriptives | | | | | | | | | | |
|------------------------|----------------|-----|------|----------------|------------|----------------------------------|-------------|---------|---------|----------------------------|
| AGE OF THE RESPONDENTS | | N | Mean | Std. Deviation | Std. Error | 95% Confidence Interval for Mean | | Minimum | Maximum | Between-Component Variance |
| | | | | | | Lower Bound | Upper Bound | | | |
| Highly satisfied | | 37 | 1.70 | .463 | .076 | 1.55 | 1.86 | 1 | 2 | |
| Satisfied | | 30 | 2.60 | .498 | .091 | 2.41 | 2.79 | 2 | 3 | |
| Neutral | | 28 | 3.50 | .509 | .096 | 3.30 | 3.70 | 3 | 4 | |
| Dissatisfied | | 14 | 4.00 | .000 | .000 | 4.00 | 4.00 | 4 | 4 | |
| Highly dissatisfied | | 11 | 4.91 | .302 | .091 | 4.71 | 5.11 | 4 | 5 | |
| Total | | 120 | 2.91 | 1.123 | .102 | 2.71 | 3.11 | 1 | 5 | |
| Model | Fixed Effects | | | .446 | .041 | 2.83 | 2.99 | | | |
| | Random Effects | | | | .569 | 1.33 | 4.49 | | | 1.375 |

| Test of Homogeneity of Variances | | | |
|----------------------------------|-----|-----|------|
| AGE OF THE RESPONDENTS | | | |
| Levene Statistic | df1 | df2 | Sig. |
| 43.580 | 4 | 115 | .000 |

| ANOVA | | | | | | | |
|------------------------|-------------|----------------|---------|-------------|---------|---------|------|
| AGE OF THE RESPONDENTS | | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. | |
| Between Groups | (Combined) | 127.153 | 4 | 31.788 | 160.063 | .000 | |
| | Linear Term | Unweighted | 105.878 | 1 | 105.878 | 533.127 | .000 |
| | | Weighted | 126.048 | 1 | 126.048 | 634.689 | .000 |
| | | Deviation | 1.105 | 3 | .368 | 1.854 | .141 |
| Within Groups | | 22.839 | 115 | .199 | | | |
| Total | | 149.992 | 119 | | | | |

POST HOC

| Multiple Comparisons | | | | | | | |
|--|------------------|-----------------------|------------|------|-------------------------|-------------|-------|
| Dependent Variable: age of the respondents | | | | | | | |
| (I) satisfied with the job security | | Mean Difference (I-J) | Std. Error | Sig. | 95% Confidence Interval | | |
| (J) satisfied with the job security | | | | | Lower Bound | Upper Bound | |
| LSD | Highly satisfied | Satisfied | -.897* | .109 | .000 | -1.11 | -.68 |
| | | Neutral | -1.797* | .112 | .000 | -2.02 | -1.58 |
| | | Dissatisfied | -2.297* | .140 | .000 | -2.57 | -2.02 |
| | | Highly dissatisfied | -3.206* | .153 | .000 | -3.51 | -2.90 |
| | Satisfied | Highly satisfied | .897* | .109 | .000 | .68 | 1.11 |
| | | Neutral | -.900* | .117 | .000 | -1.13 | -.67 |
| | | Dissatisfied | -1.400* | .144 | .000 | -1.69 | -1.11 |
| | | Highly dissatisfied | -2.309* | .157 | .000 | -2.62 | -2.00 |
| | Neutral | Highly satisfied | 1.797* | .112 | .000 | 1.58 | 2.02 |
| | | Satisfied | .900* | .117 | .000 | .67 | 1.13 |
| | | Dissatisfied | -.500* | .146 | .001 | -.79 | -.21 |
| | | Highly dissatisfied | -1.409* | .159 | .000 | -1.72 | -1.09 |
| | Dissatisfied | Highly satisfied | 2.297* | .140 | .000 | 2.02 | 2.57 |
| | | Satisfied | 1.400* | .144 | .000 | 1.11 | 1.69 |
| | | Neutral | .500* | .146 | .001 | .21 | .79 |
| | | Highly dissatisfied | -.909* | .180 | .000 | -1.26 | -.55 |
| Highly dissatisfied | Highly satisfied | 3.206* | .153 | .000 | 2.90 | 3.51 | |
| | Satisfied | 2.309* | .157 | .000 | 2.00 | 2.62 | |
| | Neutral | 1.409* | .159 | .000 | 1.09 | 1.72 | |
| | Dissatisfied | .909* | .180 | .000 | .55 | 1.26 | |
| Tamhane | Highly satisfied | Satisfied | -.897* | .119 | .000 | -1.24 | -.55 |
| | | Neutral | -1.797* | .123 | .000 | -2.16 | -1.44 |
| | | Dissatisfied | -2.297* | .076 | .000 | -2.52 | -2.07 |
| | | Highly dissatisfied | -3.206* | .119 | .000 | -3.57 | -2.84 |

| | | | | | | | |
|-------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|------|------|-------|-------|
| | Satisfied | Highly satisfied | .897 [*] | .119 | .000 | .55 | 1.24 |
| | | Neutral | -.900 [*] | .132 | .000 | -1.29 | -.51 |
| | | Dissatisfied | -1.400 [*] | .091 | .000 | -1.68 | -1.12 |
| | | Highly dissatisfied | -2.309 [*] | .129 | .000 | -2.70 | -1.92 |
| | Neutral | Highly satisfied | 1.797 [*] | .123 | .000 | 1.44 | 2.16 |
| | | Satisfied | .900 [*] | .132 | .000 | .51 | 1.29 |
| | | Dissatisfied | -.500 [*] | .096 | .000 | -.79 | -.21 |
| | | Highly dissatisfied | -1.409 [*] | .132 | .000 | -1.81 | -1.01 |
| | Dissatisfied | Highly satisfied | 2.297 [*] | .076 | .000 | 2.07 | 2.52 |
| | | Satisfied | 1.400 [*] | .091 | .000 | 1.12 | 1.68 |
| | | Neutral | .500 [*] | .096 | .000 | .21 | .79 |
| | | Highly dissatisfied | -.909 [*] | .091 | .000 | -1.23 | -.58 |
| | Highly dissatisfied | Highly satisfied | 3.206 [*] | .119 | .000 | 2.84 | 3.57 |
| | | Satisfied | 2.309 [*] | .129 | .000 | 1.92 | 2.70 |
| | | Neutral | 1.409 [*] | .132 | .000 | 1.01 | 1.81 |
| | | Dissatisfied | .909 [*] | .091 | .000 | .58 | 1.23 |
| Dunnnett T3 | Highly satisfied | Satisfied | -.897 [*] | .119 | .000 | -1.24 | -.55 |
| | | Neutral | -1.797 [*] | .123 | .000 | -2.15 | -1.44 |
| | | Dissatisfied | -2.297 [*] | .076 | .000 | -2.52 | -2.07 |
| | | Highly dissatisfied | -3.206 [*] | .119 | .000 | -3.57 | -2.85 |
| | Satisfied | Highly satisfied | .897 [*] | .119 | .000 | .55 | 1.24 |
| | | Neutral | -.900 [*] | .132 | .000 | -1.29 | -.51 |
| | | Dissatisfied | -1.400 [*] | .091 | .000 | -1.67 | -1.13 |
| | | Highly dissatisfied | -2.309 [*] | .129 | .000 | -2.70 | -1.92 |
| | Neutral | Highly satisfied | 1.797 [*] | .123 | .000 | 1.44 | 2.15 |
| | | Satisfied | .900 [*] | .132 | .000 | .51 | 1.29 |
| | | Dissatisfied | -.500 [*] | .096 | .000 | -.79 | -.21 |
| | | Highly dissatisfied | -1.409 [*] | .132 | .000 | -1.81 | -1.01 |
| | Dissatisfied | Highly satisfied | 2.297 [*] | .076 | .000 | 2.07 | 2.52 |
| | | Satisfied | 1.400 [*] | .091 | .000 | 1.13 | 1.67 |

| | | | | | | | |
|--|---------------------|---------------------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | Neutral | .500* | .096 | .000 | .21 | .79 |
| | | Highly dissatisfied | -.909* | .091 | .000 | -1.22 | -.59 |
| | Highly dissatisfied | Highly satisfied | 3.206* | .119 | .000 | 2.85 | 3.57 |
| | | Satisfied | 2.309* | .129 | .000 | 1.92 | 2.70 |
| | | Neutral | 1.409* | .132 | .000 | 1.01 | 1.81 |
| | | Dissatisfied | .909* | .091 | .000 | .59 | 1.22 |

*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

HOMOGENEOUS

| AGE OF THE RESPONDENTS | | | | | | | |
|--|---------------------|----|-------------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Satisfied with the job security | | N | Subset for alpha = 0.05 | | | | |
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Student-Newman-Keuls ^a | Highly satisfied | 37 | 1.70 | | | | |
| | Satisfied | 30 | | 2.60 | | | |
| | Neutral | 28 | | | 3.50 | | |
| | Dissatisfied | 14 | | | | 4.00 | |
| | Highly dissatisfied | 11 | | | | | 4.91 |
| | Sig. | | | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 |
| Means for groups in homogeneous subsets are displayed. | | | | | | | |

a. Uses Harmonic Mean Sample Size = 19.349

RESULT

From the above analysis, we find that calculated value of the F-value is a positive 160.063value, so H1 accept. Since the P value 0.000 is less than < 0.05 regarding there is a significant relationship betweenage of the respondents and Satisfied with the job security. The results are significant at 4% level

FINDINGS

1. Majority 55.8% of the respondents are male.
2. Majority 31.7% of the respondents are age group between 25-30 years.
3. Majority 30.0% of the respondents are UG qualification.
4. Majority 30.8% of the respondents areemployee
5. Majority 30.8% of the respondents are experienced in 2-3 years
6. Majority 30.0% of the respondents are earning Rs.20,000-25,000
7. Majority 36.7% of the respondents are probably referring a friend to apply for a job.
8. Majority 35.8% of the respondents are agree with overall office environment can complete daily tasks easily
9. Majority 35.0% of the respondents are agree with company provide job requirements are clear

10. Majority 35.0% of the respondents are strongly agree with company provide clear path for career advancement
11. Majority 40.8% of the respondents are agree with organization clearly communicate its goals and strategies
12. Majority 29.2% of the respondents are feeling good with office building space influence to stay in office and work comfortably.
13. Majority 35.8% of the respondents are feeling very good relationship with fellow workers and working condition
14. Majority 30.0% of the respondents are feeling very good with feedback that receives from supervisor
15. Majority 30.8% of the respondents are highly satisfied with the job security
16. Majority 31.7% of the respondents are agree with cordial relationship with superiors at the workplace
17. Majority 30.8% of the respondents are neutral with treating everyone equally at the work place
18. Majority 34.2% of the respondents are agree with environmental factors are conducive to work
19. Majority 40.0% of the respondents are satisfied with shift & overtime duty
20. Majority 40.8% of the respondents are influenced by office space can improve employee's performance
21. Majority 36.7% of the respondents are strongly agree with friendly and helpful co-workers
22. Majority 34.2% of the respondents are feeling excellent about communication and y good about directing and coordinating
23. Majority 38.3% of the respondents are strongly agree with external factors

SUGGESTIONS

From the above study, it is concluded that work environment is a major epitome of the employee's performance, which plays an important role in motivating the employees to perform their assigned task.

The employees are the important asset of the organization. Most of the employees spend their time in generating the activities in the office. The ability to attract and motivate the employees for high performance is becoming essential in nowadays-competitive working environments.

The factors like job aid, goalsetting, supervisor support, workplace incentives, performance feedback, defined processes, physicals factors, social factors, and environmental factors play a vital role in employee's performance. The employee's performance will improve only when they would be credited by paying more attention to the work environment.

The organizations should create conducive workplace so that the employee feels that they are well cared. Therefore, it is the responsibility of the management to furnish a favorable working environment which will influence the employees to work prosperously and will encourage them to increase their performance.

CONCLUSION

Workplace environment plays a vital role in motivating employees to perform their assigned work. Money is a not a sufficient motivator in encouraging the workplace performance required in today's competitive business environment. Managers and supervisors will need to be comfortable with working with the whole gamut of workplace factors that influence employee's motivation. Time and energy will also need to be given to providing relevant performance incentives, managing processes, providing adequate resources and workplace coaching. Paramount here is the human-to-human in interaction through providing individualized support and encouragement to each and every employee. From this study it is known that organization are providing a good workplace environment to their employees, for better organizational performance.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Nina MuniraNaharuddin, Mohammad Sadegi (2013) "Factors of workplace environment that affect employee's performance: A Case Study of Miyazu Malaysia." *International Journal of Independent Research and Studies – IJIRS*
- Cynthia Nanzushi (2015) "The effect of workplace environment on employee performance in the firms in Nairobi city county"

A Study on Influences of Work Environment Factors on Organizational Performance of Ravindran Industries, Trichy

UzmaRasool Khan, WajihaSalahuddin “Impact of workplace environment on employees’ performance.” (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>)

Adeoye K. Funminiyi (2018) “Impact of workplace environmental factors on employee commitment: evidence from North East Nigeria.” *International Journal of Scientific Research and Management*

Lankeshwara P (2016)“A study on the impact of workplace environment on employee’s performance: with reference to the Brandix Intimate Apparel – Awissawella.” *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Studies (IJMS)*

GitahiNjenga Samson, Dr. MainaWaiganjo (2015) “Effect of workplace environment on the performance of the employees in Nakuru Town.” (Online) www.arcjournals.org *International Journal of Managerial Studies and Research (IJMSR)*

BOOKS

Ching, F. D., & Binggeli, C. (2012). *Interior design illustrated* (2nd ed.). John Wiley & Sons.

Karasek, R., and Theorell, T. (1990). *Health work: Stress, productivity and the reconstruction of working life*. New York: Basic Books.

Maxwell, L. E. (2001). Noise in the office workplace. *Facility Planning and Management Notes*, 1(11).

Gifford, R. (1996). *Environmental psychology: principles and practice*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
