"A Study on Impact of Environment on Employees Performance at JK Lakshmi Cement LTD"

[1]Mittal patel, [2] Vaishali Pillai

[1] B.V Patel Institute of management, UKA Tarsadia University, Surat India
[2]Faculty B.V Patel Institute of management at UKA Tarsadia University, Surat India

Abstract: The workplace environment impacts of employee's performances, morale, productivity and engagement. The workplace in a majority of industry is unsafe and unhealthy. These includes poorly designed workstations, unsuitable furniture, lack of ventilation, inappropriate lighting, excessive noises, insufficient safety measures in fire emergencies and lack of personal protective equipment. Tues productivity is decreased due to the workplace environment. The workplace environment that most impact of employee's performance. The relationship between work, the workplace and the tools of work. The questionnaire was then field and use of survey method was employees to collect the data for conducting the study. Descriptive statistic and one- sample test have been used for analysis. Our finding that shows that employees are providing to good workplace environment, best facility provide that increased the of employee's performance. The entire factor of employees are affected that employees performance in the positive way at the organization.

Key Words: *Workplace, work environment, employee's performance, workplace factor.*

Corresponding Author:

Mittal patel, B.V Patel Institute of management, UKA Tarsadia University, Surat India

I. INTRODUCTION:

Workplace requires an environment in which the employees function properly. The employee should be able to operate results be attained as expected by the organization. It is so due to uniqueness of the area of meeting place has concerns on yield and gratification. Atmosphere reacted by combination of factors is where commerce wants staff abundantly compared to staff requiring it (Donna Wangut Thou).The physical environment as an aspect of the workplace environment has direct impact on the humans' sense and can slow change interpersonal interactions and thus productivity. Factors of workplace environment play an importation role towards the employees' performance. The factor of workplace environment gives an immense to the employees either towards the negative outcomes or the positive outcome (Mohammad sadegi) There are the key factor in the employee's workplace environment that impact greatly on their level of motivation and performance. It is not just coincidence that new programs addressing lifestyle changes, work life balance, health and fitness previously not considered key benefits – are now considerations of potential employees, and common practices among the most admired companies (Chandrasekar) In an effort to motivate workers, firms have implemented a number of practices such as performance base pay, employees' security agreements, and practices to help balance and family, as well as various forms of information sharing. In addition to motivation, workers and the skills and ability to do their job effectively. And for many firms, training the workers has become a necessary input into the physical factors. So it is difficult to provide facilities to increase their performance.

II. Review of Literature:

Authors and researcher have discussed, that is, the literature relating to Impact of workplace environment on employees performance. They also provides summary of the literature review.

Dr.K. Chandrasekr (2011) had to conduct a research on "**workplace environment and impact of organization performance and public sartor**." The objective of this study to relationship between employees and their work environment. The technique used descriptive was applied to identify data. The analysis the data mean value and rank order are applied and identify employees satisfied and not satisfied. He conclude that workplace environment plays a vital role in motivation to employees perform their assigned work. Since money is not a sufficient motivator in encouraging the workplace environment performance required in today's competitive business environment. Manager and supervisors will need to be comfortable with working is whole gamut of workplace factor that influence employees performance. **Lankeshwara P (2016)** had to conduct a research on "**A study on the impact of workplace environment on employee's performance: with reference to the Brandix intimate Apparel – A wissawella.**" The objective of this study to identify the impact of workplace environment on the employees' performance. The technique used independent sample t-test was applied. The Correlation and regression analysis have been conducted to identify workplace environment and performance of employees. He conclude under socio economics profile, education level and period of service and attitudinal concem on job aids, supervisor support and physical work environment have emerged as significant factors with employees performance, they is the three explanatory variables have been studied and among those only supervisor support and job aids have shown significant influence for the employees performance and physical work environment was insignificant with the employees performance. **Nina Munira Naharuddin Mohammad Sadeg (2013)** had to conduct a research on "**Factors of Workplace Environment that Affect Employees Performance: A Case Study of Miyazu Malaysia.**" The objective of this study was to identify whether job aid contributes towards employees performance. The technique used random sampling technique was applied. The data analysis statistical technique is Descriptive analysis for the research variable. The mean value of these variables is in between 1.o1 to 2.84.second is used reliability test based on result of the reliability test the closer the Cronbach's Alpha is to 1 the higher the internal consistency reliability .He conclude factor are affective the employees performance there is the three independent variables in this research and also study being included in two indigents variables are job aid and physical workplace environment. **Uzma Rasool Khan, Wajiha Salahuddin (2018)** had to conduct research on "**Impact of Workplace Environment on Employees performance.**" The objective of this study was impact of physical workplace factor on the job incumbents and effect of psychological workplace factor on the job incumbents. The technique used in descriptive survey design. The analysis the data using regression test to check the dependency of one variable over other variable and also test the correlation to assess the nature and the strength of the relationship between the two variables. The results of the study also divulges that majority of the respondents agreed that availability of all the required working tools is crucial for them to Performa efficiently. **Christabel Muskita and Paluku Kazimoto (2017)** to conduct researches on "**Workplace Environment and Employees Morale: A study of Selected Organization in Jakarta, Indonesia.**" The objective study was to analyze the relationship between workplace environment and employees morale. The technique used descriptive co-relation research design. The analysis data respondents agreed that physical components of workplace environments have a positive influence on their productivity. This means that employees need adequate and comfortable furniture in order to be productive in their organization. Employees are also satisfied with their jobs and working conditions. He conclude organization should create comfortable physical working environment by providing appropriate furniture , lighting and interior design, and also make efforts to minimize noises and create an atmosphere that increases employees morale and organization productivity.

Problem statement:

The workplace environment in a majority is unsafe and unhealthy. These includes poorly designed workstations, unsuitable furniture, lack of ventilation, inappropriate lighting, excessive noise, insufficient safety measures in fire emergencies and lack of protective equipment. People working in such environment are prone to occupational disease and it impacts on employee's performance. Thus productivity is decreased due to the workplace environment; employees are face to the problem in workplace and physical factor.

III. Objective of the Study:

➢ To Study the performance of workers at the job place.

➢ To Study the relationship between employees and their work environment.

➢ To analyes workplace factor affecting the employees' performance.

IV. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The research work was a descriptive research of both primary data and secondary data the research. For the purpose of the study the researcher used the simple non-random sampling method. The total population divided in to individual and the samples are collected randomly. By adopting population allocation among different departments like production, marketing, human rescores; the researcher selected the sample size. The study was done among 100 respondent and inferences are draw from them a well- designed questionnaire was used to collect primary data. The questionnaire was carefully constructed and properly setup. The changes were amended at this point to aid proper survey. The data collected through primary source were subjected to statistical techniques for analysis of used t-test. **Area of the study:** The area of the study refers to Bardoli and Palsana **Sources of data:** The study use both primary data and secondary data. For purpose of data collection of data, a detailed questionnaire has been prepared and data were collected from the respondent. **Sample Design:** For the purpose of the study, 100 questionnaires were collected from the respondent satisfied workplace environment and improved employees' performance. Non –random sampling method is administrated in this study. **Tools for Analysis:** Frequency distribution, percentage-test (One-sample t test)

V. Data Analysis

Table: 1 Respondent's Demographic characteristics'

		Frequency	Percent
Gender	Male	68	68.0
	Female	32	32.0
Age	21-30	29	29.0
	31-40	35	35.0
	41-50	35	35.0
	Above 50	1	1.0
Education	H.S.C	3	3.0
	Graduate	39	39.0
	Post Graduate	40	40.0
	Above P.G	18	18.0

Table: 1 shows that about a 68% of the respondents were male and other 32% respondents were female. Tables present the age distribution of the respondents. 29% percent of the respondents had up to 21-30 years of age, 35% percent of them 31-40 years of age, and 35% percent of them 41-50 years of age and only 1% percent of them above 50 years of age. So majority of the respondents belonged to young age group. Table visibly presents the educational level of the respondents. Table shows that only 3% percent of the respondents were H.S.C, while 35% percent of them were Graduate, 35% percent of them were post Graduate and 18% percent if the respondent were Above P.G .Above findings shows that majority of the respondent had graduate and post graduate and other level of education.

1. Satisfied with working hours.

One-sample Test

Test Value = 4					
T	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
				Lower	Upper
2.641	99	.010	.21000	.0522	.3678

Interpretation:

H0: Respondent is not satisfied with the working hours.

H1: Respondent is satisfied with the working hours in responded.

From the above table Significant P value is 0.010 which is more than 0.05 therefore null hypotheses are accepted and alternative hypotheses are rejected it means the respondent is a satisfied in working hour.

2. There is good co-operation between existing employee and new joiners' employee.

Test Value = 3					
T	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
				Lower	Upper
2.688	99	.008	.34000	.0890	.5910

INTERPRETATION

H0: Respondent is not satisfied in co-operation between existing employee and new joiner's employee.

H1: Respondent is satisfied in co-operation between existing employee and new joiner's employee.

From the above table Significant P value is 0.008 which is more than 0.05.It means null hypotheses is accepted and alternative hypotheses are rejected it means the mostly respondent is satisfied in co-operation between existing employee and new joiner's employee.

3 Work environments reflect your organization.

Test Value = 2					
T	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
				Lower	Upper
3.632	99	.000	.46000	.2087	.7113

INTERPRETATION

H0: Respondent is not satisfied in Work environment reflects your employee.

H1: Respondent is satisfied in Work environment reflects your employee.

From the above tables Significant P value is 0.000 which is lesser than 0.05.therfore null hypotheses is rejected and alternative hypotheses are accepted it means the respondent is disagree in work environment reflects in organization.

4 Satisfied with the training opportunities in the organization.

Test Value = 4					
T	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
				Lower	Upper
.317	99	.752	.03000	-.1580	.2180

INTERPRETATION

H0: Respondent is not satisfied with training opportunities in the organization

H1: Respondent is satisfied with training opportunities in the organization

Form the above table Significant P value is 0.752 which is more than 0.05.therfour null hypotheses are accepted and alternative hypotheses is rejected it means the mostly respondent is

Satisfied with training opportunities in the organization.

5. How you are satisfied with hygienic condition of organization facilities.

Test Value = 3					
T	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
				Lower	Upper
2.413	99	.018	.30000	.0533	.5467

INTERPRETATION

H0: Respondent is not satisfied with hygienic condition of organization facilities.

H1: Respondent is satisfied with hygienic condition of organization facilities.

From the above table Significant P value is 0.018 which are more than 0.05 therefore null hypotheses are accepted and alternative hypotheses are rejected it means the most of respondent is satisfied with hygienic condition of organization facilities.

6 **The management of this organization is supportive of you.**

Test Value = 4					
T	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
				Lower	Upper
.000	99	1.000	.00000	-.1892	.1892

INTERPRETATION

H0: Respondent is not satisfied in organization support.

H1: Respondent is satisfied in organization support.

From the above table Significant P value is 1.000 which is more than 0.05.It therefore null hypotheses are accepted and alternative hypothesis is rejected it means the respondent is satisfied in organization support.

7 Managers take prompt and fair corrective action on employee who fails to perform their work satisfactory.

Test Value = 3					
T	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
				Lower	Upper
-1.378	99	.171	-.16000	-.3904	.0704

INTERPRETATION

H0: Respondent is not Satisfied Mangers take prompt fair correction action on employee who fails to perform their work satisfactory.

H1: Respondent is satisfied Mangers take prompt fair correction action on employee who fails to perform their work satisfactory

From the above tables Significant P value is 0 .171 which is more than 0.05.It means null hypotheses is accepted and alternative hypotheses are rejected it means the mostly respondent neutral in Mangers take prompt fair correction action on employee who fails to perform their work satisfactory.

Q-8: You're performance level affect of your salary level

Test Value = 2					
T	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
				Lower	Upper
2.704	99	.008	.37000	.0985	.6415

INTERPRETATION

H0: Respondent is not satisfied with performance level affect of salary level.

H1: respondent is satisfied with performance level affect of salary level.

From the above table Significant P value is 0.008 which is more than a 0.05.therfour null hypothesis is accepted and alternative hypotheses are rejected it means the respondent is satisfied in performance level affect of salary level.

Q-9: Satisfied with the pay and benefit you are received Form Company.

Test Value = 3					
T	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
				Lower	Upper
2.806	99	.006	.43000	.1259	.7341

INTERPRETATION

H0: Respondent is not Satisfied with pay benefit you are received the organization.

H1: Respondent is satisfied with pay and benefit you are received the organization.

From the above table Significant P value is 0.006 which is more than 0.05.therefour null hypotheses are accepted and alternative hypotheses are rejected it means the mostly respondent is satisfied in pay and benefit you are received the organization.

Q-10: You're company organization culture helping in development of good working environment

Test Value = 4					
T	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
				Lower	Upper
-2.283	99	.025	-.25000	-.4673	-.037

INTERPRETATION

H0: respondent is not satisfied with Company organization culture helping development of good working environment

H1: respondent is satisfied with Company organization culture helping development of good working environment

From the above table Significant P value is 0.025 Which is more than 0.5therefore null hypotheses is accepted and alternative hypotheses are rejected it means the mostly respondent is satisfied company organization culture helping development of good working environment

Q-11: Have you satisfy with work -life balance by working with this organization?

Test Value = 3					
T	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
				Lower	Upper
.939	99	.350	.31000	-.3452	.9652

INTERPRETATION

H0: respondent is not satisfied with work-life balance working this organization**.**

H1: respondent is satisfied with work-life balance working this organization**.**

From the above table Significant P value is 0.350 which is more than a 0.05.therefore null hypothesis is accepted and alternative hypotheses are rejected it means the mostly respondent are satisfied with work-life balance working this organization**.**

Q-12: Scarifying personal life is the way of individual can grow fast in an organization.

Test Value = 3					
T	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
				Lower	Upper
.499	99	.619	.11000	-.3277	.5477

INTERPRETATION

H0: respondent is not Satisfied with Personal life is the way of individual growing fast in an organization

H1: respondent is satisfied with Personal life is the way of individual growing fast in an organization

From the above table Significant P value is 0.619 which is more than 0.05. Therefore null hypotheses is accepted and alternative hypotheses are rejected it means the mostly respondent is satisfied in Personal life is the way of individual grow fast in an organization.

Q-13: Employees are expected to put their jobs before family and personal matter.

Test Value = 3					
T	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
				Lower	Upper
-3.282	99	.001	-.39000	-.6258	-.1542

INTERPRETATION

H0: respondent is not satisfied with Employees expected to put their job before family and personal

H1: respondent is satisfied with Employees expected to put their job before family and personal

From the above table Significant P value is 0.001 which is lesser than 0.05.therefore null hypotheses are rejected and alternative hypotheses are accepted it means the responded is dissatisfied in Employees expected to put their job before family and personal.

Q-14: Your family worries or problem direct you and your work

Test Value = 2					
T	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
				Lower	Upper
3.006	99	.003	.41000	.1394	.6806

INTERPRETATION

H0: respondent is not satisfied with Family worries or problem directs you and your work.

H1: respondent is satisfied with Family worries or problem directs you and your work.

From the above table Significant P value is 0.003 which is lesser than 0.05.therefore null hypotheses is rejected and alternative hypotheses are accepted it means the respondent is dissatisfied in Family worries of problem direct you and your work.

Q-15: Your job reduces the amount of time you can spend with family.

Test Value = 3					
T	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
				Lower	Upper
-.472	99	.638	-.06000	-.3120	.1920

INTERPRETATION

H0: respondent is not Satisfied Job reduces the amount of time you can spend with family

H1: respondent is satisfied Job reduces the amount of time you can spend with family

From the above table Significant P value is 0.638 Which is more than 0.05.It means null hypotheses is accepted and alternative hypotheses are rejected it means the mostly respondent is job reduces the amount of time you can spend with family.

VI. 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. Form this study it is known that organization are providing a good workplace environment to their employees.

VVI. References:

- Nina Munira Naharuddin, Mohammad Sadegi (2013) "Factors of Workplace Environment that Affect Employees 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 Mobile Telecommunication Firms In Nairobi City County"

- Dr. K. Chandrasekar (2011) "Workplace Environment and Its Impact On Organizational Performance In Public Sector Organizations'." International Journal of Enterprise Computing and Business Systems

- Michael T Halpern, Richard Shikiar (2019) "Impact of smoking status on workplace absenteeism and productivity." http://tobaccocontrol.bmj.com

- BRAD ESTES, JIA WANG (2008) "Workplace Incivility: Impacts on Individual and Organizational Performance" hrd.sagepub.com

- Uzma Rasool Khan, Wajiha Salahuddin "Impact of Workplace Environment on Employees' Performance." (http://creativecommons.org/license s/by/4.0)

- Kevin E. Plamondon, Michelle A. Donovan (2000) "Adaptability in the Workplace: Development of Taxonomy of Adaptive Performance." Journal of Applied Psychology

- 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)

- Scott Hutton, Donna Gates (2008) "Workplace Incivility and Productivity Losses among Direct Care Staff." AAOHN Journal

- Karen Danna, Ricky W. Griffin (2007) "Health and Well-Being in the Workplace: A Review and Synthesis of the Literature" http://jom.sagepub.com

- Tony Wall, Lawrence Bellamy, (2017) "Revisiting impact in the context of workplace research: a review and possible directions." www.emeraldinsight.com/2205-2062.htm

- Karina Nielsen, Morten B. Nielsen, (2017) "Workplace resources to improve both employee well-being and performance: A systematic review and meta-analysis" http://www.tandfonline.com/loi/twst20

- Robert W. Rowden, Clyde T. Conine (2012) "The impact of workplace learning on job satisfaction in small US commercial banks." http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/13665620510597176

- Ankita Prabhakar (2016) "Analysis of high job satisfaction relationship with employee loyalty in context to workplace environment." www.allresearchjournal.com

- Neelam Bari, Uzma Arif , Almas Shoaib (2013) "Impact of Non-Financial Rewards on Employee Attitude &Performance in the workplace" A case study of Business Institutes of Karachi." http://www.ijser.org

- Gitahi Njenga Samson, Dr. Maina Waiganjo (2015) "Effect of Workplace Environment on the Performance of Commercial Banks Employees in Nakuru Town." (Online) www.arcjournals.org International Journal of Managerial Studies and Research (IJMSR)