A Comparative Study of Work Environment and Self Esteem of Employees

URVASHI KHANNA*[1] AND KARUNA SINGH[2]
[1]Research Scholar and [2]Assistant Professor
Government Home Science College, Sector 10D, Chandigarh (U.T.) India

ABSTRACT

The present study is directed to know the relevance of work environment of employees in relation with their self esteem. One of the biggest challenges in today's scenario is to satisfy the employee so as to achieve good success and build their confidence. The objective of the paper is to analyse the impact of working environment on employees with their self esteem. The study employed a quantitative methodology. The study was carried out in the private sectors of Chandigarh on a sample of 100 adults (50 Males + 50 Females) from 1 private company which was randomly selected. The tools used in investigation were Work Environment by Rudoit H Moosand Paul N Inset and Rosenberg Self Esteem Scale by Moris. The finding revealed irrespective of caste and religion and no significant difference existed between the mean score of males and females regarding self esteem. It was also found that highly significant difference existed between the two samples with regard to physical comfort and significant difference existed between involvement, autonomy and supervisor support .Findings also showed positive correlations of physical comfort and managerial control with self esteem and negative correlation with work pressure.

Key Words : Work environment, Self esteem

INTRODUCTION

Work and workplace holds an important position in an individual's life. Work environment is used to describe the surrounding conditions in which an employee operates. Basically it is composed of many factors, which when come together form the environment of an organization. These factors are are involvement, Co worker cohesion, autonomy, task orientation, work pressure and supervisor support. All these factors together have an impact on the performance of an employee. Therefore, in order to gain better results from the employees, it becomes very essential that they should be provided with proper work environment factors. Mikkelsen and Gundersen (2001) states, that the most harmful consequences of a dangerous work environment are stress, fatigue and other such health issues.

Scand (2002) states, that there are five requirements, which should be fulfilled in order to provide physiologically fit work environment to the employees. Work should be designed in a manner that every individual is allowed to influence his work, methods and practices. This allows an individual to maintain his individuality at work. The design of the work should be self explanatory for the employee, which means that the employee should be able to understand the work process easily. The employees should be provided with opportunities to showcase all their skills. They should also be provided with opportunities to enhance and develop new skills. Organizations should take care that the employees have an environment where they get a chance to make human contacts and co-operation with other employees during their work.

Rosenberg (Owens, Sheldon, and Goodman, 2001), conceptualizes self esteem towards the positive dimension. According to him, those individuals who have high self- esteem are more keen for personal growth and development. They try to enhance personal growth

by using their capabilities. Self esteem also determine the type of work and work environment an individual chooses for himself (Owens *et al.*, 2001) because sociability is one of the strongest predictor of self esteem; it involves the connection with others at workplace and feeling of connectedness.

The concept of self-esteem is the realm of emotions as a socially built emotion representing perceptions and feelings about individuals' various self-images and self concepts which are based upon the psychosomatic need for the aspiration of authentic and efficacious functioning, belonging and acceptance within one's social group, achievement and competence in contrast to other members of individuals' group (Bruno and Njoku, 2014). The low self-esteem signs include: feeling incompetent, worthless, exaggerated perfectionism and unrealistic about our abilities, being overwhelmed with fear and negative thoughts, feeling unloved, fear of change, being unrealistic about

Objectives:
– To study the work environment of employees.
– To study the self esteem of employees.
– To find out gender difference, if any,in work environment and self esteem.
– To find out inter correlations among the variables.

METHODOLOGY

A comprehensive study was conducted in the selected Private Companies of Chandigarh (UT). A list of all Private Companies of Chandigarh was obtained. From this list, 1 Private Company was selected randomly. The selected company was Chandigarh. From each selected company, 50 Males and 50 Females were selected randomly irrespective of their caste, creed, economic status and ordinal position.

Psychological tool used:
Work Environment Scale:
The Work Environment Scale was created by Rudolf Moos. The present study investigated to measure the social environment of all types of work settings. It comprises ten subscales or dimensions, which are divided into three sets: the Relationship Dimensions, the Personal Growth or Goal Orientation dimensions, and the System Maintenance and System Change dimensions. The Work Environment Scale can be used to describe workplace social environments, contrast employees' and managers' views of their work groups, and compare actual and preferred work environments.

Rosenberg Self Esteem Scale:
The Rosenberg self-esteem scale (RSES), developed by the sociologist Morris Rosenberg is a self-esteem measure widely used in social-science research. It uses a scale of 0–30 where a score less than 15 may indicate a problematic low self esteem.

The RSES is designed similar to the social-survey questionnaires. It is a ten-item Likert-type scale with items answered on a four-point scale–from strongly agree to strongly disagree. Five of the items have positively worded statements and five have negatively worded ones. The scale measures state self-esteem by asking the respondents to reflect on their current feelings.

Statistical analysis:
The data was analyzed. To find out the difference in mean scores of various variables in males and females, t-test was used. Karl Pearson's Coefficient of Correlation was applied to find out inter correlation among various variables of the study. Regression was used to know the impact factor among the variables.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

No significant difference existed between the mean scores of males and females in self esteem (Table 1).

A glance over Table 2 indicates high significant difference existed between the mean scores of males and females with regard to physical comfort (t= 2.7, p<0.01), while significant differences existed between with regard to involvement (t=2.5, p<0.05) supervisor support (t= 2.5 , p<0.05) , autonomy (t=2.2, p<0.05) and task orientation(t=2.5, p<0.05). Females as compare to males were found to have more of involvement in work, supervisor support and autonomy.

Table 1 : Significance of Mean Difference between Scores of Males and Females (N=100)					
Component	Sex	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	t-value
Rosenberg Self- Esteem	Male	50	21.56	4.01	2.337
Scale	Female	50	19.68	4.03	

Table 2 : Significance of Mean Difference between Scores of Males and Females (N=100)						
Component	Sex	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	t-value	p-value
Involvement	Male	50	4.64	1.55	2.559	.012*
	Female	50	5.42	1.50		
Coworker Cohesion	Male	50	4.58	1.58	.947	.346
	Female	50	4.86	1.37		
Supervisor Support	Male	50	4.92	1.68	2.151	.034*
	Female	50	5.62	1.58		
Autonomy	Male	50	5.10	1.40	2.200	.030*
	Female	50	5.72	1.41		
Task Orientation	Male	50	5.62	1.84	2.581	.011*
	Female	50	4.72	1.64		
Work Pressure	Male	50	4.60	1.83	.796	.428
	Female	50	4.88	1.69		
Clarity	Male	50	4.86	1.47	.066	.947
	Female	50	4.88	1.55		
Managerial Control	Male	50	5.32	1.95	.500	.618
	Female	50	5.14	1.63		
Innovation	Male	50	4.92	1.47	1.029	.306
	Female	50	5.26	1.82		
Physical Comfort	Male	50	5.76	1.79	2.720	.008**
	Female	50	4.88	1.42		
Work Environment Scale	Male	50	50.32	6.98	.758	.450
	Female	50	51.38	7.00		

*Significance at 0.05 level
** Significance at 0.01 level

The present results showing higher involvement, autonomy, supervisor support more in females than males are in the lines of Schroffel (1999). The supervisors' availability at time of need, ability to interlink employees, stimulate creative thinking and knowledge of worth of open mindedness in view of workers, and ability to communicate with employees, are the basic supervision traits. Results revealed that with good and effective supervision, employees' satisfaction level was high whereas with poorer communication ability, dissatisfaction level among employees was high.

Inter - correlation among various variables of the study:

In order to find out the inter- correlations among various variables of the study of total sample, Karl Pearson's Coefficient of Correlations was used and the coefficient have been furnished in Table 3.

It is clear from Table 3 state that there exists a positive high significant co relation of physical comfort and managerial control with self esteem where as significant correlation with innovation. It can also state that negative co relation of work environment with self esteem which depicts that when the scores of work pressure increases than the self esteem decreases.

According to Menon (2001), managers believe that empowerment gives decision-making power to the individuals. Empowerment means to help people improve their self-confidence, cope with their powerlessness, helplessness and have the enthusiasm and intrinsic motivation to perform the tasks. Empowerment is granting more authority to the staff to take the necessary decisions without the approval of the higher authorities (Noresah, 2002). Many organizations have found that in increasingly competitive condition, they must continuously improve their customer service. This means that they must first know what the customer wants and then try to improve it. Organizations need the empowered people and give physical comfort so that they can improve the services and productivity (Shauna *et al.*, 2008).

Conclusion:

Working environment has a positive impact on the self esteem of employees. Bad working conditions restrict

Table 3 : Inter - correlation among Various Variables of the Study

Work Environment		Rosenberg Self- Esteem Scale
Involvement	Pearson Correlation	-.095
	p-value	.346
Coworker Cohesion	Pearson Correlation	.128
	p-value	.204
Supervisor Support	Pearson Correlation	-.105
	p-value	.300
Autonomy	Pearson Correlation	.096
	p-value	.340
Task Orientation	Pearson Correlation	.027
	p-value	.790
Work Pressure	Pearson Correlation	-.489**
	p-value	.000
Clarity	Pearson Correlation	.102
	p-value	.314
Managerial Control	Pearson Correlation	.371**
	p-value	.000
Innovation	Pearson Correlation	.256*
	p-value	.010
Physical Comfort	Pearson Correlation	.325**
	p-value	.001
Work Environment Scale	Pearson Correlation	.140
	p-value	.164

*Significance at 0.05 level
** Significance at 0.01 level.

employees to portray their capabilities and attain full potential. This research paper contributes towards the welfare of society as the results create awareness about the importance of good working environment for employee and positive self esteem. The study impacts upon the future performance of private company by taking working environment more seriously within their organizations to increase the motivation and commitment level of their employees. This way their work force can achieve better results.

Suggestion and recommendation:
– Organisation should adapt virtuous strategies for overcome with the problem related to fatigue and boredom.
– Organisation should divide the work equally for workload or else appoint more employees. As workload stimulus stress, so company has to take some action.
– Attitude towards the subordinate and colleagues should smooth and positive for effective results.

REFERENCES

Bruno, U.D. and Njoku, J. (2014). The Role of the Teacher in Improving Students Self Esteem. *Internat. J. Academic Res. Progressive Education & Development,* 3 (1) : 47-53.

Essays, UK. (November 2018). Literature Review on the Workplace Environment. Retrieved from https://www.ukessays.com/dissertation/literature-review/employment/literature-review-on-the-workplace-environment.php

Owens, T.J., Sheldon, S. and Goodman, N. (2001). Extending self esteem theory and research. Cambridge University Press.

Scand *et al.* (2002). Literature Review on the Workplace Environment. Retrieved from https://www.ukessays.com/dissertation/literature-review/employment/literature-review-on-the-workplace-environment.php

Schroffel, A. (1999). How Does Clinical Supervision Affect Job Satisfaction? *The Clinical Supervisor*, **18**(2).

****