A study on work social support and performance of employee in automobile industry

N.Shani, P.Divyapriya and Narayanasamy.P.S

Department of Management Studies, Karpagam University, Coimbatore.

ARTICLE INFO	ABSTRACT
	No human being is born and lives individually. Being a social animal, every individual is highly dependent to the other people around him and also the amenities at the place of living and also working. This concept has named as social support and it has defined by many researchers Social support in the workplace can come from many sources. The most commonly explored sources are supervisors and coworkers. The present study on "A Study on work social support and performance of employee in automobile industry "The main objective of the study is to understand the level of work social support an employee perceives inside the organization. The study is to find out satisfactory level of the work social support and performance in organization. The main objective of study is to analyze the sources of work social support in the organization. The primary data were collected from the questionnaire and the secondary data was collected from company catalogue, websites and books. The collected data was analyzed using simple percentage, weighted mean, regression, correlation, ANOVA. The study helps to suggest the company that the overall performance of the company was good but there is need for better motivation system. Also there should be more training programmer which helps employees to improve their productivity. The researcher hopes that the findings and the suggestions given to the company might help the organization for the betterment of its growth. Major findings shows that most of the employees are satisfied with the management practice, IR, etc. They are proud to say that they are employee of Roots industries.

Introduction

No human being is born and lives individually. Being a social animal, every individual is highly dependent to the other people around him and also the amenities at the place of living and also working.

This concept has named as social support and it has defined by many researchers. Eggert (1987) focused on emotional, instrumental, informational and appraisal support. Although there are certain distinctions among these approaches, all types of support are perceived to have an emotional component.

Work social support

Social support in the workplace can come from many sources; the most commonly explored sources are supervisors and coworkers. Both of these sources of social support are important because they indicate the potential aid that is available to an individual. Researchers have studied the effects of work social support.

Non work social support

Nonwork social support includes support from family and friends. Research has shown that social support within the nonwork category has different meanings and effects (Wan, Jaccard, and Ramey 1996). Lim (1996) found that nonwork social support moderates the relationship between job insecurity and life dissatisfaction.

Organizational social support

A Premier form of social support is organizational, which can be defined as employees' perceptions of the value that the organization places on their contributions and the organization's concern for their well-being.

This perception may be influenced by the benefits or programs offered by the organization and by a culture of supportive behavior within the organization.

Many organizations offer family-friendly benefits or programs that might lead employees to feel that the organization not only values them as workers but also as individuals with lives outside the workplace.

Peer group support

A good friendship in the workplace with peer group will help an employee feels supportive and positive. For example, the friends of an employee can adjust the employee's situations and another threat which affect the employee's performance.

Supportive work place

The supportive work place policies make employee to feel his commitment towards work. For example, the flexi time work timings, leave policies would help an employee to work even after the committed timings.

Supportive subordinates

Subordinates (i.e.) the people who are working under the particular employee will motivate an employee in his work. For eg: they can understand the boss and can work ahead with the orders with involvement.

Customers motivation

Customers, who can meet an employee for their endusing, can motivate an employee. For, example, if the target customer

Tele:
E-mail addresses: Shanipublication@rediffmail.com,
divyapriyamithu@gmail.com

are understandable and worthy definitely an employee can work hard for them.

Benefits of social support

The following are some of the organization benefits of having a positive social support:

1. Reduce absenteeism.
2. Increase the commitment towards the work.
3. Help them to think about their career planning.
4. Act as work-conflict reducer.
5. Be a constant motivator.
6. Make a person to love his work environment and people,
7. Reduce the stress at work.
8. Shape an employee's behavior towards work and organization.
9. Increase job satisfaction.
10. Make a person to become a good performer towards work.

Review of literature

Numerous studies have been made to understand the work social support

Aryee, fields & Luk (1999) tried to more fully understand the mechanisms through which work and family experiences and their cross over this influence well being. In their study, they used job conflict and job as the predictor variables pertaining to the work domain and involvement and family conflict as the predictors of the family domain.

Carlson & perrewe (1999) studied the role of social support in WFC. In this, a fuller model of WFC constituting additional antecedents like work conflict, work time demands, work time demands, work role ambiguity, work involvement, family role conflict, family time demands and family involvement, was adopted and tested.

The results suggested social support may be best viewed as an antecedent to perceived stressors. they examined social support as an antecedent, learning, a moderating and an independent variable in the stressors to WFC is social support using structural equation modeling.

Rotondo, Carlson & Kincaid (2003) studied the relative efficacy of four style of copying like avoidance/resignation, positive thinking, direct action and help seeking on W-F conflict. They recognized the bi-directional nature of the conflict. Using a sample of 173 working students from varying professions and organizational levels in USA, they found that higher levels of both time and strain based WFC was reported than compared with FWC. Consistent with the past researches, it was reported than compared with FWC. Consistent with the past, it was reported that women, particularly those with children living at home reported higher conflict levels.

Objectives of Study

Work social support

1. To understand the level of work social support an employee perceive inside the organization.
2. To analyze the sources of work social support in the organization which improve the performance of an employee.
3. To identify commitment level of an employee towards work inside the organization.
4. To know the social support factors influencing the performance of an employee.

Limitations of the Study

1. The study is based on the employees' attitude and opinion in which the attitude may change.
2. The result of the study depends upon the information given by the employees which may be biased.

Research Design

The researcher has adopted Descriptive research study. About 400 employees in automobile industry were considered as population during the time period of Aug 2010 –Sep 2010. The researcher has selected Simple Random Sampling. Data are the basic input to any decision-making process in a business. The processing of data gives statistics of importance of the study. Data can be classified into primary and secondary data. The primary data was collected with the help of Questionnaire and interview schedule. The secondary data was obtained from broachers, websites and from employees. After calculating the simple percentage, values are assigned to the five point scale as 5 for Weighted Average Method, One way ANOVA, Two way ANOVA and Correlation.

Hypothesis

Analysis of Variance for age factor towards Subordinates

Hypothesis 1: There is no significant difference in the mean opinion on Subordinate Understand among the age factor.

Hypothesis 2: There is no significant difference in the mean opinion on Subordinate Trust among the age factor.

Hypothesis 3: There is no significant difference in the mean opinion on Subordinate Co-operative among the age factor.

Hypothesis 4: There is no significant difference in the mean opinion on Task Completion among the age factor.

Hypothesis 5: There is no significant difference in the mean opinion on Team Powerful among the age factor.

Analysis and interpretation

Analysis of Variance for age factor towards Subordinates

Hypothesis 1: There is no significant difference in the mean opinion on Subordinate Understand among the age factor.

Hypothesis 2: There is no significant difference in the mean opinion on Subordinate Trust among the age factor.

Hypothesis 3: There is no significant difference in the mean opinion on Subordinate Co-operative among the age factor.

Hypothesis 4: There is no significant difference in the mean opinion on Task Completion among the age factor.

Hypothesis 5: There is no significant difference in the mean opinion on Team Powerful among the age factor.

Interpretation

Assuming a 5% level of significance, the null hypothesis were accepted all the variables since their level of significance more than 5%.There is no significant relation between age factor and Subordinate Trust

Analysis of Variance for years of service factor towards Subordinates

Hypothesis 1: There is no significant difference in the mean opinion on Subordinate Understand among the years of service factor.

Hypothesis 2: There is no significant difference in the mean opinion on Subordinate Trust among the years of service factor.

Hypothesis 3: There is no significant difference in the mean opinion on Subordinate Co-operative among the years of service factor.

Hypothesis 4: There is no significant difference in the mean opinion on Task Completion among the years of service factor.

Hypothesis 5: There is no significant difference in the mean opinion on Team Powerful among the years of service factor.

Interpretation

Assuming a 5% level of significance, the null hypothesis were accepted all the variables since their level of significance more than 5%. There is no significant relationship between years of service factor and Subordinates.

Analysis of Variance for gender factor towards Organizational policies/climate

Hypothesis 1: There is no significant difference in the mean opinion on Facilities among the gender factor.

Hypothesis 2: There is no significant difference in the mean opinion on Supportive Policies among the gender factor.

Hypothesis 3: There is no significant difference in the mean opinion on Work Timings among the gender factor.

Hypothesis 4: There is no significant difference in the mean opinion on Leave Policy among the gender factor. There is no significant difference in the mean opinion on Working Climate among the gender factor.

Interpretation

Assuming a 5% level of significance, the null hypothesis were accepted all the variables since their level of significance more than 5%. There is no significant relationship between years of service factor and Subordinates.

Analysis of Variance for gender factor towards Organizational policies/climate

Hypothesis 1: There is no significant difference in the mean opinion on Facilities among the gender factor.

Hypothesis 2: There is no significant difference in the mean opinion on Supportive Policies among the gender factor.

Hypothesis 3: There is no significant difference in the mean opinion on Work Timings among the gender factor.

Hypothesis 4: There is no significant difference in the mean opinion on Leave Policy among the gender factor. There is no significant difference in the mean opinion on Working Climate among the gender factor.

Interpretation

Assuming a 5% level of significance, the null hypothesis were accepted all the variables since their level of significance more than 5%. There is no significant relationship between gender factor and Organization Policies/Climate.

Two-way analysis of variance between the Age and Years of Service and Subordinates

Hypothesis 1: There is no significant difference between the Subordinates and age.

Hypothesis 2: There is no significant difference between the Subordinates and Years of Service.

Hypothesis 3: There is no significant difference between the Subordinates with regard to Age and Years of Service.

Interpretation

Assuming a 5% level of significance, the null hypothesis 1, 2 and 3 were accepted since their level of significance are 14.3%, 32.2% and 29.1%. Hence it was inferred that,There is no significant relationship between the Subordinates and Age and years of service and Subordinates.

Two-way analysis of variance between the Gender and Years of Service and Organization policies/climate

Hypothesis 1 : There is no significant difference between the Organization policies/climate and gender.

Hypothesis 2 : There is no significant difference between the Organization policies/climate and Years of Service.

Hypothesis 3 : There is no significant difference between the Organization policies/climate with regard to gender and Years of Service.

Interpretation

Assuming a 5% level of significance, the null hypothesis 1, 2 and 3 were accepted since their level of significance are 23.1%, 36.9% and 67.6%. Hence it was inferred that, There is

no significant relationship between the Organization policies/climate and gender and years of service

Weighted points:

strongly Agree : 5, Agree: 4, Neither agree nor disagree:3, Strongly Agree : 2, Strongly disagree:1

Interpretation

It can be inferred from the above table that a weighted average of 4.46 for better status in the society shows that the respondents are Agree, 4.51 Feel proud to work shows that the respondents are agree, 4.53 for good among the public shows that the respondents are Agree, 4.44 for growth of the organization shows that the respondents are Agree, 4.59 for Goodwill shows that the respondents are Agree.

Findings

• There is no significant relation between age factor and Subordinate Trust

• There is no significant relationship between years of service factor and Subordinates.

• There is no significant relationship between gender factor and Organization Policies/Climate.

• There is no significant relationship between the Subordinates and Age and years of service and Subordinates

• There is no significant relationship between the Organization policies/climate and gender and years of service

• There is a significant relationship between the Performance with regard to Years of Service and Educational Qualification.

• There is a significant relationship between age factor and Work Social Support.

• There is a significant relationship between age factor and Subordinate

• There is a significant relationship between year of service factor towards Organizational policies/climate.

• There is a significant relationship between age factor towards Image of the organization

Suggestions

1. The work place social support given to each employee is too good, and the researcher suggesting to handle out the same in forth coming days.

2. The sources can be enhanced and updated with the technology.

3. The supportive factors and the performance of an employee is highly related, so that the supportive aspects can be focused on the employees performance.

4. The satisfaction among employees related to the supportive measures also too good and can be maintained in an effective manner.

Conclusion

This study helps to analyze the new concept in the corporate. The western countries have been working on the particular concept and now days the globalization impacts this to the developing country like India.

The Social Support to the employees in the working place is the significant aspect to improve the morale of the employees.

The high satisfaction and the morale increase the productivity of an employee.

Every organization is focusing on the productivity which is the main corporate objective.

For getting in to that the organization needs fully engaged and highly performed workers.

This study proves that the Social support which provided in the work place will increase the performance of the employees.

Reference:

C.B Memoria, 1997 "Personnel Management" Himalaya Publisher, New Delhi

C.R. Kothari 1990, "Research Methodology-Methods and Techniques" II Edition, Wishawa Prakash, New Delhi.

Gary Dessler, Human resource management, seventh edition, Tata McGrew hill publication, New Delhi.

Cheney, P. H., and Dickson, G. W. Organizational characteristics and information systems: an exploratory investigation. Academy of Management Journal, 25,1 (March 1982).

Cheney, P. H., and Scarpello, V. Job satisfaction and IS research. Journal of Management Information Systems. Cohen, S. After-effects of stress on human performance and social behavior: a review of research and theory. Psychological Bulletin, 88 (1980), 82-108.

Table: 1 Analysis of Variance for age factor towards Subordinates

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Subordinate Understand	Between Groups	1.838	3	.613	2.550	.061
	Within Groups	20.662	86	.240		
	Total	22.500	89			
Subordinate Trust	Between Groups	1.951	3	.650	2.267	.086
	Within Groups	24.671	86	.287		
	Total	26.622	89			
Subordinate Co-operative	Between Groups	1.433	3	.478	1.496	.221
	Within Groups	27.467	86	.319		
	Total	28.900	89			
Task Completion	Between Groups	.201	3	.067	.218	.884
	Within Groups	26.421	86	.307		
	Total	26.622	89			
Team Powerful	Between Groups	.909	3	.303	.984	.404
	Within Groups	26.480	86	.308		
	Total	27.389	89			

Table: 2 Analysis of Variance for years of service factor towards Subordinates

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Subordinate Understand	Between Groups	.427	3	.142	.555	.646
	Within Groups	22.073	86	.257		
	Total	22.500	89			
Subordinate Trust	Between Groups	.069	3	.023	.075	.973
	Within Groups	26.553	86	.309		
	Total	26.622	89			
Subordinate Co-operative	Between Groups	.870	3	.290	.890	.450
	Within Groups	28.030	86	.326		
	Total	28.900	89			
Task Completion	Between Groups	1.002	3	.334	1.121	.345
	Within Groups	25.620	86	.298		
	Total	26.622	89			
Team Powerful	Between Groups	2.234	3	.745	2.546	.061
	Within Groups	25.154	86	.292		
	Total	27.389	89			

Table: 3 Analysis of Variance for gender factor towards Organizational policies/climate

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Facilities	Between Groups	.217	1	.217	.736	.393
	Within Groups	25.883	88	.294		
	Total	26.100	89			
Supportive Policies	Between Groups	.020	1	.020	.066	.799
	Within Groups	27.135	88	.308		
	Total	27.156	89			
Work Timings	Between Groups	.020	1	.020	.069	.793
	Within Groups	25.635	88	.291		
	Total	25.656	89			
Leave Policy	Between Groups	.104	1	.104	.329	.568
	Within Groups	27.951	88	.318		
	Total	28.056	89			
Working Climate	Between Groups	.295	1	.295	1.054	.307
	Within Groups	24.605	88	.280		
	Total	24.900	89			

Table: 4 Two-way analysis of variance between the Age and Years of Service and Subordinates

Source		Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Intercept	Hypothesis	45.692	1	45.692	409.626	.000
	Error	.572	5.132	.112(a)		
Age	Hypothesis	.413	3	.138	2.359	.143
	Error	.499	8.553	.058(b)		
Year of service	Hypothesis	.301	3	.100	1.592	.322
	Error	.258	4.094	.063(c)		
Age * Year of service	Hypothesis	.253	4	.063	1.264	.291
	Error	3.956	79	.050(d)		

Table: 5 Two-way analysis of variance between the Gender and Years of Service and Organization policies/climate

Source		Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Intercept	Hypothesis	432.135	1	432.135	7558.684	.003
	Error	.070	1.220	.057(a)		
gender	Hypothesis	.049	1	.049	1.597	.231
	Error	.367	11.907	.031(b)		
Years of service	Hypothesis	.106	3	.035	1.523	.369
	Error	.070	3	.023(c)		
gender * Years of service	Hypothesis	.070	3	.023	.511	.676
	Error	3.720	82	.045(d)		

Table: 6 Weighted Average

Table showing the image of the organization respondents towards various factors:

Factors	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Weighted Average
Better Status	46	39	5	0	0	4.46
Feel Proud	47	42	1	0	0	4.51
Organisations product	50	38	2	0	0	4.53
Growth	45	40	5	0	0	4.44
Goodwill	54	35	1	0	0	4.59