



# INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF CREATIVE RESEARCH THOUGHTS (IJCRT)

An International Open Access, Peer-reviewed, Refereed Journal

## A STUDY ON RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN JOB SATISFACTION AND EMPLOYEE PRODUCTIVITY

ABI. S,

MBA Student, School of Management Studies,

Sathyabama Institute of Science and Technology (Deemed to be University), Chennai, Tamil Nadu, India

Arockiamary.R, MBA, M.Phil, PhD, DTS.,

Assistant Professor, School of Management Studies, Sathyabama Institute of Science and Technology

(Deemed to be University), Chennai, Tamil Nadu, India

### ABSTRACT

Job satisfaction and employee productivity are closely connected in any organization. When employees feel happy and valued, they tend to perform better at work. Many factors like salary, work freedom, and recognition influence how satisfied employees feel. Understanding these factors helps organizations improve overall performance. A positive work environment also supports better productivity and employee morale. The main objective of this study is to examine the relationship between job satisfaction and employee productivity in the organization. The study further assesses employee satisfaction with salary and compensation, understands employee views on job autonomy, evaluates recognition and feedback practices, and measures overall employee productivity. A descriptive research design and convenience sampling method have been used with a sample size of 110 respondents. Primary data was collected through a structured questionnaire. Simple percentage analysis, chi-square analysis, and correlation statistical tools were applied. The study found that salary, job autonomy, and recognition are important factors influencing employee job satisfaction. Fair compensation and freedom at work strongly affect how employees feel about their jobs. The study concludes that job satisfaction depends on multiple workplace factors working together, and that higher job satisfaction leads to better productivity and employee retention.

*Keywords: Job Satisfaction, Employee Productivity, Salary and Compensation, Job Autonomy, Employee Recognition, Organizational Performance*

### 1. INTRODUCTION

Today's competitive business place recognizes human capital as the most significant asset for a business. Employee performance and productivity correlate with the satisfaction of the employee. Job satisfaction — the degree of satisfaction an employee has for their work and work environment — heavily influences employee attitudes, behaviours, and productivity. Organizations that effectively manage job satisfaction have the opportunity for sustainable growth and competitive advantage.

This study analyzes the impact of a premier HR and management consulting firm on their employees' satisfaction levels and subsequent productivity. Job satisfaction dimensions include salary/compensation, working conditions, supervisor relationships, career advancement, recognition, and work/life balance. When

employees feel dissatisfied across these dimensions, they tend to be absent, leave their jobs, and reduce productivity — negatively impacting the organization.

This study investigates how salary and compensation, job autonomy, and employee recognition and feedback relate to and influence employee productivity. By gathering primary data from 110 employees and applying statistical tools, the study provides actionable insights to management for improving human resource practices and organizational effectiveness.

## 2. OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

### Primary Objective

- To study the relationship between job satisfaction and employee productivity in the organization.

### Secondary Objectives

- To assess the satisfaction level regarding the prevailing salary and compensation for the employees.
- To understand the employees' perception towards job autonomy in the company.
- To evaluate the employee recognition and feedback practices in the company.
- To measure the employee productivity among the employees in the company.

## 3. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Many companies face challenges in maintaining employee satisfaction. Dissatisfaction can arise from low pay, lack of autonomy, lack of recognition and timely feedback — all contributing to decreased motivation, commitment, and quality of output. Dissatisfied employees tend to be more absent, less productive, and have higher turnover rates, which interfere with workflow and reduce overall productivity. This research identifies factors leading to dissatisfaction, assesses their impact on productivity, and provides evidence-based recommendations to increase satisfaction and organizational outcomes.

## 4. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

A review of existing research confirms that job satisfaction significantly affects productivity. Saeed and Waghule (2021) found a strong positive correlation between employee productivity and job satisfaction, recommending improved working conditions and compensation. Okolocha (2021) showed improving working conditions and salary positively affected academic staff performance in Nigeria. Gazi et al. (2022) confirmed job satisfaction positively correlated with job performance among sugar industry workers in Bangladesh, recommending improved wages, autonomy, and conditions. Susanto et al. (2022) found positive effects of job satisfaction on productivity in shipping, emphasizing compensation and workplace relationships.

Song (2023) discovered significant relationships between job satisfaction, motivation, and productivity among Chinese university faculty, recommending improved salaries and welfare. Ariani et al. (2024) found employee training and reward programs enhanced job satisfaction and productivity in mining. Gimeno et al. (2025) showed organizational commitment and job satisfaction significantly predicted productivity in Philippine higher education. Al-Enzi and Ali (2025) found workplace happiness brought by job satisfaction positively influenced job performance in Saudi Arabian government organizations. Collectively, literature confirms that compensation, autonomy, and recognition have a consistent positive relationship with productivity across diverse contexts.

## 5. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

### 5.1 Research Design

A descriptive research design was used, suitable for describing and analyzing existing relationships between job satisfaction and productivity without manipulating variables. This design provides detailed information about how employees perceive their work, productivity levels, and employment conditions.

### 5.2 Data Sources

Primary data was collected through a structured questionnaire assessing employees' perceptions of salary/compensation, job autonomy, recognition and feedback, and productivity. Secondary data sources

included company records, academic journals, books on Human Resource Management, and online industry reporting.

### 5.3 Sample Size, Sampling Method & Analysis Tools

Convenience sampling was employed for quick and relevant data collection. The sample consists of 110 respondents from various departments and designations. Statistical tools applied include simple percentage analysis, chi-square analysis, and Pearson correlation analysis.

### 5.4 Research Hypotheses

- H01: There is no significant relationship between Salary and Compensation and Employee Productivity.
- H02: There is no significant relationship between Job Autonomy and Employee Productivity.

## 6. DATA ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

### 6.1 Demographic Profile of Respondents

Gender	No. of Respondents	Percentage (%)
Male	74	67.3
Female	36	32.7
Total	110	100.0

*Table 1: Gender of Respondents*

The table shows that 67.3% of respondents are male and 32.7% are female, reflecting the workforce composition of the organization.

Age Group	No. of Respondents	Percentage (%)
Less than 30 years	43	39.1
31–40 years	31	28.2
41–50 years	16	14.5
Above 50 years	20	18.2
Total	110	100.0

*Table 2: Age of Respondents*

The majority (39.1%) belong to the age group of less than 30 years, indicating a young workforce consistent with the HR consulting industry's tendency to attract young professionals.

Experience	No. of Respondents	Percentage (%)
Less than 1 year	34	30.9
1–3 years	42	38.2
3–5 years	14	12.7
5–7 years	10	9.1
Above 7 years	10	9.1
Total	110	100.0

*Table 3: Experience of Respondents*

The majority (38.2%) have 1–3 years of experience, further confirming the relatively young and early-career workforce profile of the organization.

## 6.2 Salary and Compensation Analysis

Response	No. of Respondents	Percentage (%)
Highly Satisfied	25	22.7
Satisfied	38	34.5
Neutral	21	19.1
Dissatisfied	12	10.9
Highly Dissatisfied	14	12.7
Total	110	100.0

*Table 4: Salary and Benefits Package Competitiveness*

34.5% are satisfied with the salary and benefits package, while approximately 23.6% express dissatisfaction, pointing to opportunities for improvement in compensation structures.

Response	No. of Respondents	Percentage (%)
Highly Satisfied	45	40.9
Satisfied	32	29.1
Neutral	11	10.0
Dissatisfied	9	8.2
Highly Dissatisfied	13	11.8
Total	110	100.0

*Table 5: Satisfaction with Monetary Rewards*

A significant 40.9% are highly satisfied with monetary rewards and 29.1% are satisfied, totalling 70% positive responses, suggesting the monetary reward system broadly meets employee expectations.

## 6.3 Job Autonomy Analysis

Response	No. of Respondents	Percentage (%)
Highly Satisfied	37	33.6
Satisfied	29	26.4
Neutral	18	16.4
Dissatisfied	18	16.4
Highly Dissatisfied	8	7.3
Total	110	100.0

*Table 6: Freedom to Make Work-Related Decisions*

60% of respondents are satisfied or highly satisfied with the freedom to make decisions at work, though 23.7% express dissatisfaction, suggesting areas where greater empowerment could be extended.

Response	No. of Respondents	Percentage (%)
Highly Satisfied	39	35.5
Satisfied	30	27.3
Neutral	20	18.2
Dissatisfied	10	9.1
Highly Dissatisfied	11	10.0
Total	110	100.0

*Table 7: Management Valuing Employee Input in Decision-Making*

35.5% strongly agree and 27.3% agree that management values their input, totalling 62.8% positive responses, indicating a participative management culture that supports employee engagement.

#### 6.4 Employee Recognition and Feedback Analysis

Response	No. of Respondents	Percentage (%)
Highly Satisfied	30	27.3
Satisfied	27	24.5
Neutral	24	21.8
Dissatisfied	13	11.8
Highly Dissatisfied	16	14.5
Total	110	100.0

*Table 8: Recognition and Appreciation for Contributions*

51.8% are satisfied or highly satisfied with recognition and appreciation; however, 26.3% are dissatisfied, indicating that recognition practices could be strengthened to better motivate employees.

#### 6.5 Employee Productivity Analysis

Response	No. of Respondents	Percentage (%)
Strongly Agree	38	34.5
Agree	29	26.4
Neutral	26	23.6
Disagree	9	8.2
Strongly Disagree	8	7.3
Total	110	100.0

*Table 9: Assigned Tasks Completed Within Stipulated Time Frame*

60.9% agree or strongly agree that they complete assigned tasks within stipulated time frames, suggesting a generally productive workforce capable of meeting deadlines.

Response	No. of Respondents	Percentage (%)
Strongly Agree	33	30.0
Agree	23	20.9
Neutral	15	13.6
Disagree	19	17.3
Strongly Disagree	20	18.2
Total	110	100.0

*Table 10: Targets and Performance Goals Achieved Regularly*

50.9% agree or strongly agree that they regularly achieve targets, while 35.5% disagree or strongly disagree, indicating variability in goal attainment linked to satisfaction and motivational factors.

## 7. STATISTICAL ANALYSIS

### 7.1 Chi-Square Analysis: Salary and Compensation vs. Employee Productivity

To test H01, a Chi-Square analysis was conducted to determine whether a significant relationship exists between salary and compensation and employee productivity.

Statistical Test	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	169.503	156	0.217
Likelihood Ratio	135.779	156	0.877
Linear-by-Linear Association	0.243	1	0.622
N of Valid Cases	110		

*Table 11: Chi-Square Test Results — Salary & Compensation vs. Employee Productivity*

The p-value of 0.217 is greater than the significance level of 0.05. Therefore, H01 is accepted. There is no statistically significant difference in employee productivity based on salary and compensation at the 5% significance level. However, the practical positive association between compensation satisfaction and productivity remains relevant for organizational policy.

### 7.2 Correlation Analysis: Job Autonomy vs. Employee Productivity

Variables	Job Autonomy	Employee Productivity
Job Autonomy (Pearson r)	1.000	-0.027
Sig. (2-tailed)	—	0.778
N	110	110
Employee Productivity (Pearson r)	-0.027	1.000

*Table 12: Correlation Analysis — Job Autonomy vs. Employee Productivity*

The Pearson correlation coefficient between job autonomy and employee productivity is -0.027, indicating a very weak negative relationship. The significance value of 0.778 is well above 0.05, confirming the relationship is not statistically significant. Therefore, H02 is accepted. The weak negative correlation may be attributed to the specific organizational context, where employee autonomy is bounded by structured consulting processes and client delivery requirements.

## 8. FINDINGS AND SUGGESTIONS

### 8.1 Findings of the Study

- 67.3% of respondents are male, and 39.1% are less than 30 years old, indicating a predominantly young male workforce.
- Demographics are primarily early-career employees — 58.2% are single and 38.2% have 1–3 years of experience.
- 34.5% are satisfied and 40.9% are highly satisfied with monetary rewards, indicating broadly effective compensation.
- 38.2% are satisfied that compensation policies are fair, and 38.2% are satisfied with performance-based bonus opportunities.
- 33.6% are highly satisfied with decision-making freedom, and 35.5% strongly agree management values employee input.
- 67% are highly satisfied with recognition and 70% are satisfied with regular performance feedback.
- 60.9% of respondents complete tasks within stipulated timeframes, and productivity is maintained during increased workloads.
- Chi-Square analysis: H01 accepted — no statistically significant relationship between salary/compensation and productivity at the 5% level.
- Correlation analysis: H02 accepted — weak negative relationship ( $r = -0.027$ ) between job autonomy and employee productivity; not statistically significant.

### 8.2 Suggestions

- Provide salaries and benefits competitive with those in the industry; review and adjust salaries regularly.
- Communicate a transparent compensation policy perceived as fair, and reward high performers with bonuses and incentives.
- Give employees more control over work-related decisions and engage them in decision-making through structured channels.
- Enhance recognition and appreciation programs and create regular, constructive performance feedback processes.
- Provide workload management, mentoring guidance, and time management training to help employees achieve their targets efficiently.

## 9. CONCLUSION

The link between employee productivity and job satisfaction was explored at the organization with a focus on salary and compensation, job autonomy, and employee recognition and feedback. Overall, employees have positive views about compensation fairness, autonomy at work, and recognition systems, but several areas require further development.

Statistical analysis indicates that while the relationship between compensation/salary and productivity does not reach statistical significance at the 5% level based on this sample, both salary/compensation and job autonomy positively contribute to overall employee satisfaction and organizational effectiveness. The majority of employees display positive behaviors contributing to high productivity — completing tasks on time, achieving goals, and performing efficiently.

Job satisfaction depends on numerous workplace factors working together. Organizations that emphasize fairness in compensation, provide meaningful job autonomy, and create a culture of recognition and feedback are more likely to maintain a highly satisfied and productive workforce. Satisfied employees provide positive contributions to productivity, effectiveness, and employee retention. It is therefore imperative for the

organization to continually address these dimensions to enhance employee satisfaction and sustain long-term organizational growth.

## REFERENCES

1. Al-Enzi, K. A., & Ali, A. H. (2025). The impact of happiness at work on improving job performance in government agencies in Saudi Arabia. *Journal of Humanities & Social Sciences*, 9(11), 29–60.
2. Ariani, M., Tamara, D., Rosviliana Malik, A., & Darma, D. C. (2024). With job satisfaction or not? The role of job satisfaction in the relationship between training and rewards on employee productivity. *Economics Research Journal*, 12(3), 293–320.
3. Aswathappa, K. (2008). *Human Resource Management* (5th ed.). Tata McGraw-Hill Publishing Ltd.
4. Gazi, M. A. I., Islam, M. A., Shaturaev, J., & Dhar, B. K. (2022). Effects of job satisfaction on job performance of sugar industrial workers: Empirical evidence from Bangladesh. *Sustainability*, 14(21), 14156.
5. Gimeno, D. B., Geroy, C. A., & Prado, N. I. (2025). Employee engagement, job satisfaction, organizational commitment on productivity of employees in higher education setting. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science*, 9(3s), 2285–2292.
6. Okolocha, C. B. (2021). Job satisfaction and employee productivity: Evidence from selected universities in South-East, Nigeria. *Global Journal of Human Resource Management*, 9(1), 58–73.
7. Saeed, O. A., & Waghule, S. N. (2021). Exploring the association between job satisfaction and productivity: Empirical evidence from India. *Studies in Economics and Business Relations*, 2(1), 60–71.
8. Song, X. (2023). Employee motivation, job satisfaction and employee engagement: Inputs to job productivity. *International Journal of Research Studies in Management*, 11(4), 27–38.
9. Susanto, P. C., Sawitri, N. N., Ali, H., & Tussoleha Rony, Z. (2022). Employee productivity: Analysis of job satisfaction and work engagement in industry shipping line. *International Journal of Global Sustainable Research*.
10. Ariani *et al.* (2024); Budiman (2024); Gupta (2001); Nneji & Enudi (2023); Pinandita *et al.* (2024); Pinheiro *et al.* (2025); Pushpakumari (2021); Rajak (2025); Sakarji *et al.* (2022); Sarwar *et al.* (2023); Shariat Ullah *et al.* (2024); Taskin & Taskin (2021) — full citations available in the original manuscript.