



iJRASET

International Journal For Research in
Applied Science and Engineering Technology



INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL FOR RESEARCH

IN APPLIED SCIENCE & ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY

Volume: 3 Issue: VII Month of publication: July 2015

DOI:

www.ijraset.com

Call: ☎ 08813907089

E-mail ID: ijraset@gmail.com

Employees Satisfaction - An Empirical Study in Private Organization

V.S.Palaniammal¹, M.Saranya², Dr.B.Saravanan³

¹Asst.Professor, Department of Management Studies, D.K.M College for Women, Vellore.

²Research Scholar, Department of Management Studies, D.K.M College for Women, Vellore.

³Associate Professor, VIT University, Vellore

Abstract: *Employee satisfaction is a measure of how happy workers are with their job and working environment. In this 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. The study helps in knowing the satisfaction of respondents at kumar's fabricators towards their firms process. The references for the study was collected from journals, books, and online websites in order to support the research work. The respondents were choosen from all the levels. The responses from the respondents were collected through direct survey. The survey questionnaire brings out the qualitative analysis over respondents knowledge. The testing of formulated hypothesis is done by chi square and ANOVA. The research study shows the findings done out of 130 respondents at kumar's fabricators and the study inferred that the success of employees satisfaction relies on the good appraiser-appraisee working relationship all through the process.*

I. LITERATURE REVIEW

According to Nancy c. morse (1997) " satisfaction is the level of fulfillment of individual's needs , wants , desires and what he gets". Employee satisfaction is measure from happy workers with their satisfied job and working environment. So employee satisfaction is affecting organizational effectiveness. Effective organization only that encourages the employee satisfaction (Bhatti&Qureshi, 2007). Good relationship with colleagues, salary, training and education opportunities, good working conditions, career developments and other benefits are increasing the employee satisfaction (Miller , 2006). Employee satisfaction is with the individual position of employment (Moyes, shao, & Newsome, 2008). Employee satisfaction is not only an individual job and its various aspects, also included their satisfaction with over all companies policies, environment, etc (Spector, 1997).

Alam sager et.al., (2012) employee motivation, goal achievement & positive employee morale in the work place are factors of employee satisfaction. Various factors also way of improving employee satisfaction such as organization development factors, job security, work task, compensation and benefit, opportunities like promotion and career development. Heskett et, al., (1994) Satisfied employees to stimulate a positive actions an improved company performance. satisfaction (Derek R. Allen &Merris wilburn, 2002). Anitha (2011) found her study is to improved welfare facilities, reward system and promotion policy, good relationship between workers and supervisors, working conditions & job security factors are to increase high level of employee satisfaction. Employees job satisfaction (EJS) is influenced by some key factors such as work place environment, reward and recognition, training and development and teamwork. Finally concluded this survey there is a strong positive relationship between teamwork and all above factors (Muhammad Rizwan et.al., 2012).

Comparative study is conducted among public and private sector banks; result is a satisfied employee made positive contributions to the organizational effectiveness study three factors such as behavioral, organizational and environmental factors. There is positive relationship between the above mentioned factors. Employee satisfaction level is increased through employees are equally, fairly treated and properly supervised.

Ekta sinha (2013) conducted his research is taken by 23 variables for survey. Among these employees are satisfied with the following five major factors such as empowerment & work environment, working relation, salary & future prospects, training & work involvement and job rotation. Welfare measures, role clarity, freedom of decision making and recognition at work with these factors are didn't influence on employee satisfaction at organization. Employee satisfaction has positive significant correlation with spiritual leadership and organizational culture. Employee satisfaction depended on these two variables (Bulent Aydin, 2009). Motivations of workers are large impact on the job satisfaction. The level of motivation has an impact on productivity and performance of business organizations. Also the employees perceptions towards nature of work and measured the overall job satisfaction (Aziri, 2011). Christen et, al., (2006) provided a model of job satisfaction factors such as role perceptions, job related

International Journal for Research in Applied Science & Engineering Technology (IJRASET)

factors, job performance and firm performance. Vanderberg (1992) proved from research is a strong level of relations between higher degree of job satisfaction and higher degree of employee loyalty. Organizational effectiveness reflects the combination and interaction of employee work behaviors. Organizational performance such as attendance, rules, compliance, and cooperation are important factors. So employee attitudes and organizational outcomes are considered of performance related outcomes (Ostroff, 1992).

Bowen & Ostroff (2002) conducted on 7939 business units in 36 organizations. The researchers found positive correlation between employee satisfaction – engagement and the business unit outcomes such as productivity, profit, employee accidents, employee turnover and customer satisfaction. Judge, et al., (1993) found them survey employee satisfaction is positively correlated with job involvement, motivation, mental health, life satisfaction, organizational commitment, job performance and organizational citizenship behavior and negatively related to turn over, absenteeism & perceived stress. Highly satisfied employee is the less turn over, less absenteeism occurs Maloney, et al., (1986). He identified three components of employee satisfaction like job task factors, characteristics of the organization & personal characteristics Rousseau (1978).

II. OBJECTIVES OF STUDY

- A. To study on employees welfare facilities and training opportunities.
- B. To analysis employees satisfaction level
- C. To know about the monetary and non-monetary benefits.

III. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The primary data was collected from the respondents by using a questionnaire. A sample of 110 respondents from manufacturing industry in Chennai constituted as the sampling unit for the study. Random sampling technique was adopted to collect the primary data. The primary Data was analyzed with some statistical tools like Chisquare, Anova and percentage analysis. The scale was the five-point Likert scale.

TABLE – 1 DEMOGRAPHIC DETAIL

| FACTORS | DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES | NO OF RESPONDENTS | PERCENTAGE (%) |
|---------------|-----------------------|-------------------|----------------|
| Gender | Male | 96 | 87 |
| | Female | 14 | 13 |
| Age | 21 – 25 | 26 | 23 |
| | 26 – 30 | 44 | 40 |
| | 31 – 35 | 24 | 21 |
| | 36 – 40 | 8 | 08 |
| | 41 – 45 | 8 | 08 |
| Qualification | SSLC | 17 | 16 |
| | H.SC | 16 | 15 |
| | UG | 49 | 44 |
| | PG | 28 | 25 |
| Income | <10000 | 31 | 29 |
| | 10000 – 20000 | 32 | 30 |
| | 21000 – 30000 | 23 | 20 |
| | 31000 – 40000 | 14 | 12 |
| | 41000 – 50000 | 10 | 09 |
| Experience | < 5 years | 54 | 50 |
| | 6 – 10 yrs | 26 | 23 |
| | 11 – 15 yrs | 16 | 14 |
| | 16 – 20 yrs | 8 | 8 |
| | 21 – 25 yrs | 6 | 5 |

Source: primary data

International Journal for Research in Applied Science & Engineering Technology (IJRASET)

TABLE :2 RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN GENDER AND GOOD RELATIONSHIP WITH COLLEAGUES

| O | E | O-E | (O-E) ² | $(\frac{O-E}{E})^2$ |
|----|-------|-------|--------------------|---------------------|
| 34 | 30.22 | 3.78 | 14.2884 | 0.472 |
| 23 | 26.77 | 3.77 | 14.2129 | 0.5309 |
| 30 | 25.90 | 4.1 | 16.81 | 0.6490 |
| 7 | 11.22 | 4.22 | 17.8084 | 1.5872 |
| 1 | 0.86 | 0.14 | 0.0196 | 0.0227 |
| 1 | 4.77 | 3.77 | 14.2129 | 2.9796 |
| 8 | 4.22 | 3.78 | 14.2884 | 3.3858 |
| 0 | 4.09 | 4.09 | 16.7281 | 4.09 |
| 6 | 1.77 | 4.23 | 17.8929 | 10.1089 |
| 0 | 0.136 | 0.136 | 0.01849 | 0.1359 |
| | | | CALCULATED VALUE | 23.4311 |

Degree of Freedom=(r-1 * c-1)

$$D.F=4$$

The table value at 5% of level of significance is 9.488

The calculated value of χ^2 is 23.4311

Alternative hypothesis (H₁) is Accepted. There is a significant relationship between gender and having good relationship with colleagues.

TABLE: 3 RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN GENDER AND FAIR PROMOTION, INCREMENT POLICIES ARE IMPLEMENTED IN THE ORGANIZATION

| O | E | O-E | (O-E) ² | $(\frac{O-E}{E})^2$ |
|----|-------|------|--------------------|---------------------|
| 24 | 20.72 | 3.28 | 10.758 | 0.5 |
| 22 | 21.59 | 0.41 | 0.168 | 0.007 |
| 35 | 39.72 | 4.72 | 22.278 | 0.55 |
| 14 | 12.95 | 1.05 | 1.1025 | 0.08 |
| 0 | 3.27 | 3.27 | 10.6929 | 7.42 |

International Journal for Research in Applied Science & Engineering Technology (IJRASET)

| | | | | |
|----|------|------|------------------|-------|
| 0 | 3.27 | 3.27 | 10.6929 | 3.26 |
| 3 | 3.40 | 0.4 | 0.16 | 0.04 |
| 11 | 6.27 | 4.73 | 22.3729 | 3.56 |
| 1 | 2.04 | 1.04 | 1.0816 | 0.53 |
| | | | CALCULATED VALUE | 14.95 |

Degree of Freedom=(r-1 * c-1)

$$D.F=4$$

The table value at 5% of level of significance is 9.488

The calculated value of χ^2 is 14.95

Alternative hypothesis (H1) is Accepted. There is a significant relationship between gender with fair promotion and increment policies are implemented in the organisation.

TABLE: 4 RELATIONSHIPS WITH AGE AND STRESS IN WORK

| X_1 | X_1^2 | X_2 | X_2^2 | X_3 | X_3^2 | X_4 | X_4^2 | X_5 | X_5^2 |
|-------|---------|-------|---------|-------|---------|-------|---------|-------|---------|
| 6 | 36 | 2 | 4 | 14 | 196 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 4 |
| 5 | 25 | 6 | 36 | 30 | 900 | 4 | 16 | 1 | 1 |
| 2 | 4 | 10 | 100 | 9 | 81 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 16 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 3 | 9 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| 16 | 74 | 21 | 145 | 60 | 1202 | 7 | 19 | 6 | 8 |

| Source of variation | Sum of squares | Degrees of freedom | Mean square | F – ratio | 5% F-limit(from the f-table) |
|---------------------|----------------|--------------------|-------------|--------------------------|------------------------------|
| Between samples | 365.57 | C-1 5-1=4 | 91.3925 | $\frac{91.3925}{30.908}$ | F(4,18) |
| Within samples | 556.35 | N-C 23-5=18 | 30.903 | | |
| Total | 921.92 | 22 | 122.2955 | 2.9569 | 2.93 |

Since the calculated value is higher than the table value. Alternative hypothesis is accepted (H1). Therefore there is significant relationship between age and stress in work.

International Journal for Research in Applied Science & Engineering Technology (IJRASET)

TABLE – 5 RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN AGE AND OVERALL SATISFACTION ABOUT WORKING ENVIRONMENT

| X_1 | X_1^2 | X_2 | X_2^2 | X_3 | X_3^2 | X_4 | X_4^2 |
|-------|---------|-------|---------|-------|---------|-------|---------|
| 12 | 144 | 1 | 1 | 9 | 81 | 1 | 1 |
| 10 | 100 | 1 | 1 | 30 | 900 | 4 | 16 |
| 12 | 144 | 1 | 1 | 8 | 64 | 4 | 16 |
| 2 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 36 | 0 | 0 |
| 4 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 9 | 1 | 1 |
| 40 | 408 | 4 | 4 | 56 | 1090 | 10 | 34 |

| Source of variation | Sum of squares | Degrees of freedom | Mean square | F – ratio | 5% F-limit(from the f-table) |
|---------------------|----------------|--------------------|-------------|-----------------------|------------------------------|
| Between samples | 304.2 | C-1 4-1=3 | 101.4 | $\frac{101.4}{55.96}$ | F(3,14) |
| Within samples | 559.6 | N-C 18-4=14 | 55.96 | | |
| Total | 863.8 | 13 | 157.36 | 1.812 | 3.34 |

Since the calculated value is lesser than the table value. Null hypothesis is (H_0) is accepted. Therefore there is no significant relationship between age and overall satisfaction about working environment.

TABLE - 6 RELATIONSHIPS WITH QUALIFICATION AND COMFORTABILITY OF JOB

| X_1 | X_1^2 | X_2 | X_2^2 | X_3 | X_3^2 | X_4 | X_4^2 | X_5 | X_5^2 |
|---------------------|----------------|--------------------|-------------|--------------------------|---------|------------------------------|---------|-------|---------|
| 7 | 49 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 9 | 4 | 16 | 0 | 0 |
| 5 | 25 | 1 | 1 | 10 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| 10 | 100 | 4 | 16 | 29 | 841 | 5 | 25 | 0 | 0 |
| 4 | 16 | 15 | 225 | 7 | 49 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| 2 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 28 | 194 | 21 | 243 | 50 | 1000 | 9 | 41 | 2 | 2 |
| Source of variation | Sum of squares | Degrees of freedom | Mean square | F – ratio | | 5% F-limit(from the f-table) | | | |
| Between samples | 374.17 | C-1 5-1=4 | 93.5425 | $\frac{93.5425}{33.356}$ | | F(4,13) | | | |
| Within samples | 433.63 | N-C 18-5=13 | 33.356 | | | | | | |
| Total | 807.8 | 17 | 126.8985 | 2.8043 | | 3.18 | | | |

Since the calculated value is lesser than the table value. Null hypothesis is (H_0) is accepted. Therefore there is no significant

International Journal for Research in Applied Science & Engineering Technology (IJRASET)

relationship between qualification and comfort ability of job.

TABLE : 7 RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN EXPERIENCE AND FAIR PROMOTION , INCREMENT POLICIES ARE IMPLEMENTED IN THE ORGANISATION

| X_1 | X_1^2 | X_2 | X_2^2 | X_3 | X_3^2 | X_4 | X_4^2 |
|-------|---------|-------|---------|-------|---------|-------|---------|
| 5 | 25 | 5 | 25 | 34 | 1156 | 9 | 81 |
| 11 | 121 | 14 | 196 | 3 | 9 | 0 | 0 |
| 4 | 16 | 4 | 16 | 6 | 36 | 2 | 4 |
| 2 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 3 |
| 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 9 |
| 23 | 167 | 26 | 242 | 47 | 1209 | 14 | 94 |

| Source of variation | Sum of squares | Degrees of freedom | Mean square | F – ratio | 5% F-limit(from the f-table) |
|---------------------|----------------|--------------------|-------------|-------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Between samples | 75.91 | C-1 4-1=3 | 25.303 | $\frac{68.792}{25.303}$ | F(3,14) |
| Within samples | 963.09 | N-C 18-4=14 | 68.792 | | |
| Total | 1039 | 17 | 94.095 | 2.187 | 3.34 |

Since the calculated value is lesser than the table value. Null hypothesis (H_0) is accepted. Therefore there is no significant relationship between experience and fair promotion , increment policies are implemented in the organization

Table 8: RELATIONSHIP WITH EXPERIENCE AND EMPLOYEE ACCIDENT RATIO IS DECREASED

| X_1 | X_1^2 | X_2 | X_2^2 | X_3 | X_3^2 | X_4 | X_4^2 | X_5 | X_5^2 |
|-------|---------|-------|---------|-------|---------|-------|---------|-------|---------|
| 26 | 676 | 12 | 144 | 13 | 169 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 9 | 81 | 10 | 100 | 6 | 36 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 1 |
| 4 | 16 | 9 | 81 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 4 | 16 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2 | 4 | 3 | 9 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 41 | 777 | 38 | 350 | 24 | 214 | 5 | 9 | 2 | 2 |

International Journal for Research in Applied Science & Engineering Technology (IJRASET)

| Source of variation | Sum of squares | Degrees of freedom | Mean square | F – ratio | 5% F-limit(from the f-table) |
|---------------------|----------------|--------------------|-------------|---------------------------|------------------------------|
| Between samples | 197.73 | C-1 5-1=4 | 49.4325 | $\frac{49.4325}{36.9585}$ | F(4,14) |
| Within samples | 517.42 | N-C 19-5=14 | 36.9585 | | |
| Total | 715.15 | 18 | 86391 | 1.3375 | 3.11 |

Since the calculated value is lesser than the table value, H_0 is accepted. Therefore there is no significant relationship between experience and employee accident ratio is decreased.

Table 9 RELATIONSHIPS WITH EXPERIENCE AND SATISFACTION WITH REWARDS & RECOGNITION ACCORDING TO PERFORMANCE.

| X_1 | X_1^2 | X_2 | X_2^2 | X_3 | X_3^2 | X_4 | X_4^2 |
|-------|---------|-------|---------|-------|---------|-------|---------|
| 5 | 25 | 20 | 400 | 5 | 25 | 23 | 529 |
| 7 | 49 | 5 | 25 | 13 | 169 | 3 | 9 |
| 1 | 1 | 8 | 64 | 6 | 36 | 1 | 1 |
| 5 | 25 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 16 | 0 | 0 |
| 20 | 104 | 35 | 491 | 28 | 246 | 27 | 538 |

| Source of variation | Sum of squares | Degrees of freedom | Mean square | F – ratio | 5% F-limit(from the f-table) |
|---------------------|----------------|--------------------|-------------|------------------------|------------------------------|
| Between samples | 52.23 | C-1 4-1=3 | 17.433 | $\frac{51.25}{17.433}$ | F(3,12) |
| Within samples | 615 | N-C 17-4=12 | 51.25 | | |
| Total | 667.23 | 15 | 68.683 | 2.939 | 3.49 |

Since the calculated value is lesser than the table value. Null hypothesis (H_0) is accepted. Therefore there is no significant relationship between experience with rewards and recognition according to performance.

Table 10 RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN EXPERIENCE WITH ORGANISATION SUPPORT AND ENCOURAGES TO EMPLOYEES.

| X_1 | X_1^2 | X_2 | X_2^2 | X_3 | X_3^2 | X_4 | X_4^2 | X_5 | X_5^2 |
|-------|---------|-------|---------|-------|---------|-------|---------|-------|---------|
| 5 | 25 | 7 | 49 | 28 | 784 | 7 | 49 | 6 | 36 |
| 5 | 25 | 17 | 289 | 5 | 25 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 5 | 25 | 8 | 64 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 8 | 0 | 0 |
| 3 | 9 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| 4 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 22 | 100 | 34 | 406 | 36 | 814 | 11 | 55 | 7 | 37 |

International Journal for Research in Applied Science & Engineering Technology (IJRASET)

| Source of variation | Sum of squares | Degrees of freedom | Mean square | F – ratio | 5% F-limit(from the f-table) |
|---------------------|----------------|--------------------|-------------|--------------------------|------------------------------|
| Between samples | 92.47 | C-1 5-1=4 | 23.1025 | $\frac{49.797}{23.1025}$ | F(4,13) |
| Within samples | 647.37 | N-C 18-5=13 | 49.797 | | |
| Total | 739.84 | 17 | 72.8715 | 2.1542 | 3.18 |

F – Test =3.18

$V_1 = 4$

$V_2 = 13$

$(C.V < T.V) = 2.1542 < 3.18$

Conclusion: Since the calculated value is lesser than the table value, H_0 is accepted. Therefore is no there significant relationship between experience with organization support and encourages to employees.

Table 11 RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN EXPERIENCE WITH MEDICAL AND TREATMENT FACILITIES IN THE CAMPUS OR NEAR TO THE ORGANISATION.

| X_1 | X_1^2 | X_2 | X_2^2 | X_3 | X_3^2 |
|-------|---------|-------|---------|-------|---------|
| 7 | 49 | 37 | 1369 | 9 | 81 |
| 14 | 196 | 10 | 100 | 4 | 16 |
| 13 | 169 | 3 | 9 | 0 | 0 |
| 4 | 16 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 0 |
| 4 | 16 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 4 |
| 42 | 446 | 53 | 1483 | 15 | 101 |

Sample Calculation:

The sum of all items of various samples $(T)^2 = \Sigma x_1 + \Sigma x_2 + \Sigma x_3 +$

$$= 42+53+15$$

$$=110$$

$$\text{Correction factors} = \frac{T^2}{N} = \frac{12100}{13} = 930.76$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{The sum of squares} &= \Sigma x_1^2 + \Sigma x_2^2 + \Sigma x_3^2 - \frac{T^2}{N} \\ &= 446+14833+101 -930.76 \\ &= 2030-930.76 \\ &=1099.24 \end{aligned}$$

International Journal for Research in Applied Science & Engineering Technology (IJRASET)

$$\begin{aligned}
 \text{Sum of Squares between samples} &= \frac{(\sum x_1)^2}{N} + \frac{(\sum x_2)^2}{N} + \frac{(\sum x_3)^2}{N} - \frac{T^2}{N} \\
 &= \frac{42^2}{5} + \frac{53^2}{5} + \frac{15^2}{3} - 930.76 \\
 &= 352.8 + 561.8 + 75 - 930.76 \\
 &= 989.67 - 930.76 \\
 &= 58.84
 \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 \text{Sum of Squares with in samples variance} &= \text{total sum of square} - \text{Sum of square between samples} \\
 &= 1099 - 58.84 \\
 &= 1040.4
 \end{aligned}$$

| Source of variation | Sum of squares | Degrees of freedom | Mean square | F – ratio | 5% F-limit(from the f-table) |
|---------------------|----------------|--------------------|-------------|-------------------------|------------------------------|
| Between samples | 58.84 | C-1 3-1=2 | 29.42 | $\frac{104.04}{94.581}$ | F(2,10) |
| Within samples | 1040.4 | N-C 13-3=10 | 104.04 | | |
| Total | 1099.24 | 12 | 133.46 | 1.1000 | 4.10 |

F – Test = 4.10

$$V_1 = 2$$

$$V_2 = 10$$

$$(C.V < T.V) = 1.1000 < 4.10$$

Conclusion: Since the calculated value is lesser than the table value, H_0 is accepted. Therefore there is no significant relationship between experience with medical and treatment facilities in the campus or near to the organization.

A. Findings

- 1) There is a significant relationship between gender and relationship with colleagues.
- 2) There is a significant relationship between gender and fair promotion.
- 3) There is a significance relationship between age and no stress in work.
- 4) There is no significant relationship between age and overall satisfaction.
- 5) There is no significant relationship between qualification and comfort ability of job.
- 6) There is no significant relationship between experience and fair promotion and increment policies.
- 7) There is no significant relationship between experience and turnover productivity is increased.
- 8) There is no significant relationship between experience and accident ratio is decreased.
- 9) There is no significant relationship between experience and satisfaction with rewards and recognition.
- 10) There is no significant relationship between experience and organisation support.
- 11) There is no significant relationship between experience and with medical treatment facilities.

International Journal for Research in Applied Science & Engineering Technology (IJRASET)

B. Suggestions

- 1) The participative planning should exercise at the firms during decision-making.
- 2) The firms have to work on equal treatment of employees during assessment period to gain the employees satisfaction.
- 3) The administrative decisions as to variable pay should be fair enough to gain the belongingness of the employees.
- 4) Arranging more stress busters would reduce the performance evaluation stress and work pressure of the employees
- 5) The participative leadership would assists in making administrative decisions over promotion, demotion, succession planning and so on.
- 6) Providing counselling after feedback review may enhance the retention of the employee.
- 7) Training is essential for employees to execute their skill but comparatively training program quality also increased.
- 8) The firm had achieved the employee goal with satisfactory level and they are also highly involved with job.
- 9) By fulfilling the employee satisfaction organization can gain efficient process of work.

IV. CONCLUSION

The study has attempted to educate about the employees satisfaction practice recently at kumar's fabricators. The level of employees thought of individuals can be a success only with the cooperation of the individuals as a team member and as employee of the firm as well. From personal conversations with few respondents, during the research period was very informative about the satisfaction of the employees towards their firms evaluation. While conversing many has agreed that the variable pay and stress buster are keeping them settle with the same firm for a long period. On another hand, few respondents appear to be disappointed with the favouritism shown by the appraisers during assessment period. Employees are positively correlated with the following factors such as salary, good relationship with colleagues and supervisors, motivation, career development, job involvement, productivity, rewards & recognition, accident ratio, job security, medical & children educational facilities. Organization should improve for following factors like working environment, training programmes, stress management, promotion & increments policies and bonus, incentives.

REFERENCES

- [1] Bhatti, K., & Qureshi, T. (2007). Impact of employee participation on job satisfaction, employee commitment and employee productivity. *International Review of Business Research Papers*, 3(2), 54 – 68.
- [2] Bowen, D. E., & Ostroff, C. (2004). Understanding HRM-firm performance linkages: The role of "strength" of the HR system. *Academy of Management Review*, 29, 203-221
- [3] Derek R. Allen, Merris Wilburn, (2002) –Linking customer and employee satisfaction to the bottom line, ASQ quality press publications cat log, Milwaukee, WI.
- [4] Harter, J. K., Schmidt, F. L., & Hayes, T. L. (2002). Business-unit level relationship between employee satisfaction, employee engagement, and business outcomes: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87, 268-279.
- [5] Heskett, J. L., T. O. Jones, G. W. Loveman, W. E. Jr. Sasser, L. A. Schlesinger. 1994. Putting the service-profit chain to work. *Harvard Business Review* 72 (2)
- [6] Judge, T.A., Hulin, C.L. (1993), "Job satisfaction as a reflection of a disposition: amultiple source causal analysis", *Organizational Behavior and Human Decisions Processes*, Vol. 56, pp. 388-421.
- [7] Maloney, W.F., & McFillen, J.M. (1986). Motivational implications of constructionwork. *Journal of Construction Engineering and Management*, March 1986, 137-151.
- [8] Miller, J. L. (2006). *Coach Yourself to Succeed @ Work: How to Achieve Optimal Performance and Job Satisfaction*. CA Dorrance Publishing Co.
- [9] Moyes, G. D., & Shao, L. P., Newsome, M. (2008). Comparative analysis of employee job satisfaction in the accounting profession. *Journal of Business & Economics Research*, 6(2), 65-81
- [10] Nancy C. Morse , (1977)–Satisfactions in the white-collar job, Ayer publishing.
- [11] Rousseau, D. (1978), "Characteristics of departments, positions, and individuals:Contexts for attitudes and behaviors", *Administrative Science Quarterly*,;Vol. 23, pp. 521–540.
- [12] Spector, P.E. (1997). *Job Satisfaction: Application, Assessment, Causes, and Consequences*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- [13] Alam sager, Sameena Rafat, Puja Agarwal (sep- oct.2012). Identification of variables affecting employee satisfaction and their impact on the organization, *IOSR Journal of business and management*, volume 5, Issue 1, pp 32-39.
- [14]. Anitha.R (sep 2011). A study on job satisfaction of paper mill employees with special reference to udumalpet and palani taluk, *Journal of management and science*, vol.1, No. 1,p.No : 36 – 47.
- [15]. Muhammad Rizwan et.al (2012). Empirical syudy of employee job satisfaction, *IOSR Journal of business and management*, pp: 29-35.
- [16]. Meena M.L and Dangayach G.S.,(2012). "Analysis of employee satisfaction in banking sector", *International Journal of Humanities And Applied Sciences (IJHAS)*, vol. 1, No. 2.
- [17]. Wadhwa singh Daljeet, Verghese Manoj & Wadhwa singh Dalvinder (sep 2011). "A study on Factors influencing Employee Job satisfaction – A study in cement Industry of Chhattisgarh", *International Journal of Management & Business studies*, vol. 1, Issue 3.
- [18]. Ekta sinha Jan- Feb (2013). A research work on employee satisfaction measurement with special reference to KRIBHCO, surat, *International Journal of Modern*

International Journal for Research in Applied Science & Engineering Technology (IJRASET)

Engineering Research, vol.3, Issue 1, pp 523 – 529.

[19]. Bulent Aydin & Adnan ceylan (Mar 2009), A research analysis on employee satisfaction in terms of organizational culture and spiritual Leadership, International Journal of Business And Management, vol. 4, No.3, p.no : 159 – 168.

[20]. Aziri . B (2011), “Job satisfaction : A Literature Review”, Management Research And Practice, vol . 3, Iss 4, pp: 77 – 86.

[21]. Christen ,M., Iyer, G & Soberman, D. (2006), Job satisfaction, Job performance and Effort: A Re-examination using Agency Theory, Journal of marketing, vol. 70, pp. 137 – 150.

[22]. Vanderberg, R.J and Lance, Ch.E.(1992), Examining the causal order of job satisfaction and organizational commitment, Journal of Management, vol. 18, No . 1, pp. 153 – 167.

[23]. Ostroff, C. (1992), The Relationship Between satisfaction, attitudes and performance : An organizational Level analysis, Journal of Applied Psychology, pp. 964 – 974.



10.22214/IJRASET



45.98



IMPACT FACTOR:
7.129



IMPACT FACTOR:
7.429



INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL FOR RESEARCH

IN APPLIED SCIENCE & ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY

Call : 08813907089  (24*7 Support on Whatsapp)