

## A STUDY ON WORKPLACE SATISFACTION IN INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY IN CHENNAI REGION

S. RafiyaBanu<sup>1</sup>

*Assistant Professor, School of Management & Commerce, Department of Commerce, Vels  
institute of science technology & advanced studies, Chennai, Tamilnadu, India.  
rafiya.syed1@gmail.com*

Dr.A.Gokulakrishnan, Dr.P.Sasikumar<sup>2</sup>

*Assistant Professor, School of Management & Commerce, Department of Commerce, Vels  
institute of science technology & advanced studies, Chennai, Tamilnadu, India.*

**Abstract:** *The main aim of this study is to spotlight the workplace satisfaction influences employee morale, productivity, and engagement - both positively and negatively. Its people that drive organizations to success or failure. People as a resource have gained paramount importance. If employees truly are of the company's assets then the corporate should look after their priorities. Many reviews acknowledged that employees working under difficult working conditions are less satisfied and results in a decrease in the performance of the workers. There are 9 independent variables are made an impact to seek out the result with the assistance of the workers of the IT Region at Chennai. 90 respondents took in 5-point Likert scale is employed to gauge and used SPSS software to seek out the results. This study finds the workers are highly qualified and conscious of their rights while working in a corporation. Most of the time employees are spending their time within the organization in order that they expect a piece of place to be positive and satisfying. Good working environment increases employee loyalty, level of commitment, efficiency & effectiveness, productivity, and also develops a way of belonging among employees which ultimately increases organizational commitment, work commitment, and employee engagement and job satisfaction. The advantages of providing an honest working environment for the workers are tremendous for both the organization and its employees.*

### Introduction

In the new people's economy, organizations cannot survive unless they have the right kind of knowledge. It is people who drive organizations to success or failure. People as a resource have gained a paramount importance. If employees truly are of company's assets then the company should care for their priorities. The satisfied employees promote continuous innovation, originality of service, leveraging all organizational capabilities. It is satisfied employees who convert knowledge into powerful activities. If you want your company to be successful understand the value of people for their operations. Organizations should respect and manage the employee's expectations.

Many organizations fail to understand the importance of workplace satisfaction of employees. A proper work environment is one of the important expectations of the employees from the employer. Employees are an essential component to achieve organizational goals and objectivities. For this, the employees require a proper work environment. If employees are satisfied with the work environment it leads to work engagement, job satisfaction, and proper work-life balance.

Workplace satisfaction influences employee morale, productivity, and engagement - both positively and negatively. It determines the employee's work engagement. The level of absenteeism and intention to quit can be reduced. The relationship between work, the workplace and the tools of work, becomes an integral part of work itself. If any organization wants to utilize the employee's ability and capacity they have to focus on personal and financial motivation and workplace satisfaction. Workplace satisfaction increases employee satisfaction on the job and commitment towards the organization and reduces turnover. Therefore the organization must develop a proper work environment.

### **Literature review**

**Work Place:** The workplace refers to the relationship between an employee and their environment that can be broken down into different dimensions like the social, technical and economic in which the work is normally viewed and designed.

Miller, Erickson & Yust (2001): the researchers in their study found out that if employees are satisfied with their work environment it provides the employees with a sense of belonging.

Baah and Amoako (2011): the researchers identified that recognition, freedom to quit, sense of belonging, career promotion, work-life balance and assigning the work as per qualification increase motivational level of employees and lead to employee engagement and satisfaction.

Catillo & Cano (2004): a study was conducted among the college faculties to know the level of job satisfaction and engagement, it found out if proper attention is given to the relationship with co-workers, recognition to employees and proper supervision will increase job satisfaction and engagement of employees with the organization.

Stephen P. Robbins (2001): the researchers found out if an organization provides a proper and comfortable physical work environment. This, in turn, will increase job satisfaction. A positive work environment leads to employee engagement.

Bakotic & Babic (2013): the study found out that employees working under difficult working conditions are less satisfied and leads to a decrease in the performance of the employees. Therefore the organization should focus on providing a proper work environment which in turn increases the overall performance of the employees.

### **Factors of work place satisfaction:**

- Happy at work place
- There is a clear understanding of my career/ promotion path
- work – life balance
- Freedom to quit
- Refer someone to work in this organization
- Convenient working environment
- Proper relationship with colleagues
- Assigning of work according to education qualification
- Feel valued at work

### **Methodology:**

### **Population and Sample size:**

The objective of the study is the workplace satisfaction of employees. The data is collected from the employees of the IT region at Chennai. 90 respondents were chosen for the study.

### Data analysis and interpretation:

A 5-point Likert scale is used to evaluate answers ranging from Rating Scale not at all, to a little extent, to some extent, to a great extent, to a very great extent. Statistical analysis is performed through the help of software "Statistical Package for Social Sciences" (SPSS).

**Table Showing Frequency Distribution of Gender of Employee**

Gender	Frequency	Percent
Male	54	60.0
Female	36	40.0
Total	90	100.0

From the above table, 60.0% of respondents are male, 40.0% of respondents are female. It shows a competitive no of females is also working in Information Technology Region at Chennai.

**Ho: There is no significance difference between male and female with regard to work place satisfaction.**

**Table showing t test for significant difference between male and female**

Factors of work place satisfaction	MALE		FEMALE		t Value	P Value
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
I am Happy at work place	2.87	.391	2.94	.232	4.458	0.263
There is a clear understanding of my career/ promotion path	3.46	.862	3.64	.593	7.467	0.255
Rate your work – life balance	3.02	.961	3.14	.593	3.116	0.504
There is Freedom to quit	2.70	.903	2.92	.806	0.743	0.256
I will Refer someone to work here	2.72	1.036	2.69	.889	0.449	0.895
Amenities provided	3.28	.979	3.69	.577	5.937	0.013*
Convenient working environment	3.43	.860	3.64	.593	4.396	0.168
There is Proper relationship with colleagues	3.56	1.040	3.92	.732	8.555	0.057
The Assigning of work according to education qualification	3.72	.878	3.64	.683	1.129	0.632
I Feel valued at work	3.26	.975	3.31	.624	3.701	0.801
work place satisfaction total	32.02	6.326	33.53	4.306	4.137	0.182

\*denotes significant at 5% level

**Interpretation:**

Since the p-value is less than 0.05 the null hypothesis is rejected at a 5% level with regard to amenities provided. Hence there is a significant difference between males and females with respect to amenities provided. Based on the mean score female employees have a better opinion on amenities provided than male employees.

There is no significant difference between male and female employees with respect to I am happy at the workplace, there is a clear understanding of my career/ promotion path, work-life balance, Freedom to quit, Refer someone to work here, Convenient working environment, There is Proper relationship with colleagues, The Assigning of work according to education qualification, I feel valued at work, since the p-value is greater than 0.05. Hence the null hypothesis is accepted at a 5% level of significance.

**H0: There is no significant difference among age group with respect to work place satisfaction.**

Table showing Anova for significant difference among age group with respect to work place satisfaction

Work place satisfaction	Age Below 30 years	31-40 years	41-50 years	F Value	P Value
Iam Happy at work place	2.84 (.374)	2.90 (.364)	3.00 (.000)	0.698	0.556
There is a clear understanding of my career/ promotion path	3.52 (.770)	3.48 (.789)	3.79 (.699)	0.742	0.530
Rate your work – life balance	3.28 (.792)	2.94 (.890)	3.14 (.663)	0.975	0.409
There is Freedom to quit	3.04 (.978)	2.72 (.858)	2.57 (.646)	1.121	0.345
I will Refer someone to work here	3.16 (1.028)	2.52 (.974)	2.57 (.646)	2.679	0.052
Amenities provided	3.60 (.707)	3.30 (.995)	3.71 (.469)	1.296	0.281
Convenient working environment	3.40 (.764)	3.48 (.814)	3.86 (.535)	1.310	0.276
There is Proper relationship with colleagues	3.72 (.843)	3.54 (.994)	4.29 (.726)	2.609	0.057
The Assigning of work according to education qualification	3.84 (.850)	3.58 (.785)	3.86 (.770)	1.056	0.372
I Feel valued at work	3.36 (.860)	3.14 (.881)	3.64 (.633)	1.439	0.232

**Note:** the value within the brackets refers to SD.

**Interpretation:**

There is no significant difference among age group with respect to I am happy at the workplace, there is a clear understanding of my career/ promotion path, work-life balance,

Freedom to quit, Refer someone to work here, Convenient working environment, There is Proper relationship with colleagues, The Assigning of work according to education qualification, I feel valued at work, and amenities provided since the p-value is greater than 0.05. Hence the null hypothesis is accepted at a 5% level of significance.

### Findings and conclusion:

- 60.0% of respondents are male, 40.0% of respondents are female.
- There is significant difference between male and female with respect to amenities provided.
- There is no significant difference among age group with respect to factors of work place satisfaction.

In the modern era, the management of a satisfied workforce has become more difficult because employees are highly qualified and aware of their rights while working in an organization. Most of the time employees are spending their time in the organization so they expect a workplace to be positive and satisfying. Therefore, it is important that the organizations should identify the needs and expectations of their employees and satisfy them to ensure effective accomplishment of its goals and objectives. Good working environment increases employee loyalty, level of commitment, efficiency & effectiveness, productivity, and also develops a sense of belonging among employees which ultimately increases organizational commitment, work commitment, and employee engagement and job satisfaction. This, in turn, leads to a reduction in the intention to quit and absenteeism. It also ensures that the employees of the organization will have the ease of working in a relaxed and free environment without burden or pressure that would cause their performance to decline. The progress that will be achieved in the business will directly help the economy of a country as developmental efforts will increase. In such conditions, the country will be able to handle the minor problems prevailing as it will be in a strong state to deal with them. The benefits of providing a good working environment for the employees are tremendous for both the organization and its employees.

### References:

- Akinsanya A. O. & Oludeyi O. S. (2013). Dialectics of staff unionism and university management;critical discourse for effective educational service delivery. *National Association of Science, Humanities and Educational Research Journal*, 11 (2), 65-72
- Akintayo, D. (2012). Working environment, workers' morale and perceived productivity in industrial organizations in Nigeria. *Education Research Journal*, 2 (3), 87-93, retrieved from <http://resjournals.com/ERJ/Pdf/2012/Mar/Akintayo.pdf>
- Akinyele S. T. (2010). The influence of work environment on workers' productivity: A case study of selected oil and gas industry in Lagos, Nigeria. *African Journal on Business Management*, 4(3), 299–307.
- Akinyele, S. T. (2007). A critical assessment of environmental impact on workers' productivity in Nigeria. *Research Journal on Business Management*, 1(1), 50-61.
- Ali Yassin S. A., Abdiaziz A. A. & Abdiqani A. A. (2013), Working conditions and employees' productivity in manufacturing companies in Sub-Saharan African context: case of Somalia. *Educational Research International*, 2 (2)
- Lane, K., Esser, J., Holte, B., & Anne, M. M. (2010). A study of nurse faculty job satisfaction in community colleges in Florida. *Teaching and Learning in Nursing*, 5(1), 16-26.

- Lee, S. Y., & Brand, J. L. (2005). Effects of control over office workspace on perceptions of the workenvironment and work outcomes. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 25, 323-333.
- Petterson, I. a. (1998). *Psychological stressors and well-being in health careworkers: the impact of an intervention program* (Vols. 47(11):1763–72). Social Science and Medicine.
- Rafiq, M., Javed, M., Khan, M., & Ahmed, M. (2012, May). Effect of Rewards on Job Satisfaction Evidence From Pakistan. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Contemporary Research in Business*, 4(1).
- Schroffel, A. (1999). How Does Clinical Supervision Affect Job Satisfaction? *The Clinical Supervisor*, 18(2).
- Sell, L., & Bryan, C. (2011). Job Satisfaction, Work Environment, and Rewards: Motivational Theory Revisitedlabr. *LABOUR*, 25(1), 1-23.
- Skalli, A., Theodossiou, I., & Vasileiou, E. (2008, october). Jobs as Lancaster Goods: Facets of Job Satisfaction and Overall Job Satisfaction. *The Journal of Socio-Economics*, 37(5), 1906–1920.
- Sousa-Poza, A., & Sousa-Poza, A. (2000, May). Taking Another Look at the Gender/Job-Satisfaction Paradox. *Kyklos; International Review of Social Science*, 53(2), 135-152.
- Spector, P. (1997). *Job satisfaction: Application, assessment, causes and consequences*, Thousand Oaks, CA,, Inc (Vol. 3). Sage Publications.