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Abstract
Recently, it has been observed that workplace environmental factors are essential predictors of employee commitment, for achieving organizational goals and objectives. This study assessed the impact of workplace environmental factors on employee commitment in North East of Nigeria. Adopting a survey design, the research made use of primary data, collected mainly through administering a set of questionnaire to 205 management staff, supervisors and non-management staff of the selected manufacturing firms from Adamawa, Bauchi and Gombe states respectively. The findings revealed that: there is significant positive relationship between feedback and employee efficiency; incentive positively affects employees’ commitment. The study concluded that effective performance feedback is critical to employees’ efficiency and organisational growth. Incentives as key factor also contribute immensely to employee commitment in workplace. The work recommended that organisations should incorporate feedback approach into it system. In addition management should be consistent in giving incentives to workers that desire it on merit ground.
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Introduction
In the recent global business competitive environment, where organisations tend to retain high quality personnel and improve their efficiency in their respective organisations. However, workplace environmental factors are essential elements that determine and facilitate level of employees’ concentration and performance, also sustainability and further development of the business. Obviously, there is need to delve into this current issue that will enhance employee engagement in any organisation, globally. The working environment that is set in place impacts on employee morale, productivity and engagement both positively and negatively. It is not just coincidence that new programmes addressing lifestyle changes, work and life balance, health and safety previously not considered key benefits are now priority of employees, and common practices among the most managers of industries (Humphries, 2005).

Employees will and are always contented when they feel their immediate environment; both physical sensations and emotional states are in line with their obligations and how well employees connect with their organization’s immediate workplace environment, influences to a great extent their error rate levels, efficiency and innovativeness, collaboration with other employees, absenteeism and, ultimately their retention (Farh, 2012).

Effective workplace environmental factors are essential in achieving optimal employee’s performance in any well planned organisation, which is a key requirement for establishing a business organisation. Workplace environmental factors are indispensable elements that determine employee’s level of performance, organisation productivity and effectiveness. The inputs from employees are keys to the accomplishment of organisational overall objectives.

Preliminary investigations reveal that the expectation and interest of employees in manufacturing firms in Nigeria had been neglected over the years, which result in inefficiency and low quality products. These elements are not properly articulated in workplace, among them are workplace incentive, performance
feedback, role congruity and supervisor support. As workplace environmental factors play important roles in improving employee’s performance if being in place.

Consequently, these myriad of problems if left unchecked could constitute negative impact on employee’s efficiency and perhaps organisation effectiveness. Organizations that neglect appropriate workplace incentive, performance feedback, role congruity and supervisor support, well equipped, skilled and committed employees are bound not to stand the test of time in the global market to compete.

Also, in an organisation where the level of motivation is low or non-existing, employees tend to experience job dissatisfaction that will automatically lead to low performance. Thus, this study focuses on impact of workplace environmental factors on employee commitment in selected Manufacturing Firms in North East, Nigeria.

It is on this basis that this study seeks to examine how workplace environmental factors can impact positively or negatively on employees’ commitment of manufacturing firms in Nigeria. It is believed that the findings will generate strategic ideas that will ensure employees engagement in their respective assignments. However, the study aimed to achieve the under listed objectives:

i. To assess the extent of the relationship between performance feedback and employee efficiency

ii. To ascertain how workplace incentive affect employee’s commitment.

The following researcher questions are raised

I. What is the extent of the relationship between performance feedback and employee efficiency?

ii. How does incentive affect employee’s commitment?

Review of Literature and Theoretical Framework

We cannot measure the effectiveness of employee commitment without the knowledge of the working environment in which the workers operate; it is part of total picture. The factors which either contributes positively or negatively to employee productivity are temperature, humidity and air flow, noise, lighting, employee personal aspects, contaminants and hazards in the working environment, (Stoessel, 2001).

Work place index survey conducted for steel case itemized what employees want and perceived to help their productivity in the work environment as better lighting, more elbow room, creative methods for assessing space, personalisation, more impromptu meeting for work well done and involvement in the decision that impact their day to day lives at work (Brenner, 2004). An organisation that wants to ensure employee engagement improvements will exploit those tools used for managing the work environment in which such employees work. An effective work environment management entails making work environment attractive, creative, comfortable, satisfactory and motivating to employees so as to give employees a sense of pride and purpose in what they do.

The following are some of the tools used to manage work environment to improve employee commitment: noise control, contaminants and hazard control, enhancing friendly and encouraging human environment, job fit, rewards, feedback, work environment modelling, creating qualitative work life concepts and making physical working conditions favourable. Modelling of work environment to improve employee’ effectiveness calls for management responsibilities of holding everything together, improving motivation and creating commitment in the workplace environment. He postulated the pride model, which managers can use in order to be successful in modelling the work environment (Brenner, 2004). Providing a work environment that simultaneously achieves company goals and employees’ goal involves motivating such work environment with quality of work life. This involves giving employees opportunity for their personal growth, achievement, responsibility, recognition and reward so as to get high quality productivity from employees (Cecunc, 2004).

The nature of the physical condition under which employees work is important to output (Yesufu, 1984). Offices and factories that are too hot and ill-ventilated are debilitating to effort. There should be enough
supply of good protective clothing, drinking water, rest rooms, toilets and first aids facilities. Both management and employees should be safety conscious at all times and minimum of requirement of the factories act must be respected. This push for more productivity from public sector agencies is not a new phenomenon (Christesen, 2002). These factors maybe important; yet, believing that the attitudes and management styles of mid-level managers are what really influence employee performance. One of the primary tasks of the managers is to motivate people in the organisation to perform at high levels (Steers and Porter, 2000).

It is generally agreed that the more accurately managers can answer the question of what motivates their employees, the more effective they will be at maximizing productivity, enhancing productivity, enhancing performance and advancing the notion of organisational accountability (Chernis and Kane, 2004). There have actually been a number of public sectors productivity movements. The beginning of the last century was characterized by an important productivity interest that diminished as the Second World War approached. This movement towards a more productive public sector can be categorized into four period Government by the efficient (1900 - 1940), government by administrators (1940 - 1970), government by the managers (1970 - 1980) and government by the private sector (1980 - 1990) (Public productivity and management review, 1990).

According to (Udenga, 2012) the work environment can be defined as the environment in which people work that include physical setting, job profile, culture and market condition. Each aspect is inter linked and impacts on employees overall performance and productivity. It is the quality of the employees’ workplace environment that most impacts on their level of motivation subsequently performance. Workplace environment can be thought of simply as the environment in which people work as such; it is a very broad category that encompasses the physical setting (e.g. heat, equipment), characteristics of the job itself (e.g. workload, task complexity) (Briner, 2000). He adds that it also encompasses broader organisational features (e.g. culture, history) and even aspects of the external organisational setting (e.g. local labour market conditions, industry sector, work life balance)

Employees will always be contended when they feel that their immediate environment states are in tandem with their obligations (Farh, 2012). The type of workplace environment in which employees operate determines whether or not organizations will prosper (Chandrasekar, 2011). The workplace environment consists of physical factors which include the office layout and design among other factors; while the psychosocial factors include working conditions, role congruity and social support. Other aspects of the workplace environment are the policies which include employment conditions. A better physical workplace environment boosts employees’ performance.

Employees in many organisations are encountering with working problems related to workplace environmental and physical factors. (Phua, 2012) posit that employee disengagement is increasing and it has become important to make workplaces that positively influence workforce. Employees’ comfort on the job, determined by workplace conditions and environment, has been recognized as an important factor for measuring their productivity (Leblebici, 2012). In today’s dynamic and competitive business world, a healthy workplace environment makes good business sense. Managers should not just focus on the employees’ pay packet with the assumption that it is proportionate to performance (Heath, 2006). Organizations deemed as a positive place to work will have a competitive edge over the others.

To understand the critical importance of workplace environment in the organisation is to recognize that the human factor and the organization are synonymous (McGuire and McLarin, 2009). Changing environments provide manufacturing firms with opportunities as well as a myriad of challenges. By incorporating a balanced workplace environment, the organisation is optimizing profitability and improving the company's popularity as a workplace; projecting a modern corporate entity, which in turn can help you attract highly qualified employees. Architectural design affects the way people behave, with designers creating conditions that can hinder, discourage, guide, support or enhance users’ behavior (Gutnick, 2007).

Most establishments are beginning to reconsider how their work environment is designed and what facilities they offer to staff has far-reaching effects on their general performance. An enabling workplace environment must thus be the key feature to improving performance. Workplace environment is a concept, which has been operationalized by analyzing the extent to which employees perceive the immediate surroundings’ as
fulfilling their intrinsic, extrinsic and social needs and their reason of staying with the organization (Haynes, 2008). Heath (2006) states, the biggest goal of all the business organization are to increase their performance, thus making high profits.

The benefits of creating and maintaining a positive working environment are huge, greater productivity, happier people, employee stability, business advantage and higher profits. In twenty-first century, businesses are moving towards more strategic approach of environmental management to enhance their performance through improving and managing performance level of employees (Govindarajulu, Bonnie and Daily, 2004).

The modern physical environment is distinguished by technology, computers, machines, general furniture and furnishings which continually affect the brain and health of employees (Stoessel, 2001). Organisations must ensure that the physical layout is covering all need of employees such as communication and privacy, formality and informality, functionality and cross-disciplinarily (White, 2001).

An attractive and supportive work environment can be described as an environment that attracts individuals into an organisation, encourages them to remain in the workforce and enables them to perform effectively. The purpose of providing attractive work environments is to encourage employee stability and reduce the rate of turnover in respective place of work. In addition, supportive work environments provide conditions that enable workers to perform effectively, making best use of their knowledge, skills and competences and the available resources in order to provide high-quality services. This is the interface of the work environment and quality of care. Working environment can be divided into two components namely physical and behavioral components. The physical environment consists of elements that relate to the office occupiers’ ability to physically connect with their office environment. The behavioral environment consists of components that relate to how well the office occupiers connect with each other, and the impact the office environment can have on the behavior of the individual. The physical environment with the productivity of its occupants falls into two main categories office layout (open-plan verses cellular offices) and office comfort (matching the office environment to the work processes), and the behavioral environment represents the two main components namely interaction and distraction (Haynes, 2008).

These components can further be divided in major attributes and operationally defined in the form of different independent variables. These variables will be used for analysis of their impact on dependant variable. It is generally understood that the physical design of offices and the environmental conditions at work places are important factors in organizational performance. The empirical research by Stall has also shown that when human needs are considered in office design, employees work more efficiently. Studies have examined the effect of physical work environment on workers’ job satisfaction, performance, and organisational productivity. For example (Scott, Jusanne and Steven, 2000) reported that working conditions associates with employees’ job involvement and job satisfaction.

Social, organisational and physical context serve as the impetus for tasks and activities, and considerably influence workers’ performance (Strong, Lemyre and Corneil, 1999). Researches on quality of work life have also established the importance of safe and healthy working conditions in determining employees’ job performance.

The influence of working environment, which is mostly composed of physical, social and psychological factors, has been extensively examined in past two decades. In a number of studies, employees’ motivation, job satisfaction, job involvement, job performance, and health have been found to be markedly influenced by psycho-social environment of work organization (Udenga, 2012).

Physical Factors of Workplace Environment
The ability of the physical workplace environment to influence behaviors and to create an image is particularly apparent for businesses. Spatial layout refers to the ways in which machinery, equipment, and furnishings are arranged, the size and shape of those items, and the spatial relationships among them. Functionality refers to the ability of the same items to facilitate performance and the accomplishment of goals. How performance is achieved will be affected by how well people fit with their physical workspace and physical work environment (Srivastava, 2008).
In a broader perspective, the physical workplace environment; include but not limited to the comfort level, ventilation, heating, natural lighting and artificial lighting. The above features assist on the functional and aesthetic side, the décor, and design of the workplace environment that ultimately helps improve the employees experience and necessitate better performance (Temessek, 2009). He emphasizes that organizations “must insist on the utility and the role of environmental information, facilitating employees’ engagement with better space management, and the automation of certain tasks”. Similarly, if the tasks to be performed are very complex, efficiency of layout and functionality will be more important than when the tasks are mundane or simple.

Office layout and design impressions suggest that certain dimension serves a symbolic function by connoting meanings and images about organisations. Based on these affordances, it is suggested that employees will tend to identify more with these features which enhance performance. Informal seating arrangements, such as chairs placed at a right angle facilitate social interaction, whereas formal seating arrangements, such as chairs placed back-to-back discourage social interaction (Doman, 2008). This also helps explain how style of furnishings and other physical symbols may come to serve a symbolic function.

**Office Layout and Design Factors**

Increased personal control and comfort needs of employees triggered the concern among organisations to provide them with an environment and office design, which fulfils the employees’ needs and helps to boost their productivity. Office buildings represent considerable value as being fixed assets for all organisations. The primary purpose of an office building is to facilitate the provision of a workplace and working environment for information and knowledge processing activities such as filing, planning, designing, supervising, analyzing, deciding and communicating.

Office layout and design in the company environments are different from one organisation to another. These differences have been expressed differently through time, in terms of the kind of location and the immediate physical work environment (Smith, 2011). In order to compare the influence of different office environments on employees, it is necessary to categorize them. Office environments have traditionally been defined either by spatial organisation or by work organisation. Only using one method has its limitation as both factors influence the office employees. The most dominant architectural feature is the spatial organisation of an environment. The functional features are based on the actual work taking place in the office (Kepner, 2002).

Small-scale attributes such as workstation lighting, size of individual work surfaces, office privacy, and noise account for incremental variance in employees’ performance with their work environment above and beyond office design alone (Becker, 2002). This could mean that providing employees’ with attributes that counter the overall effect of an open plan office space, such as privacy and an adequate workspace, could serve to increase performance levels in spite of the overarching feelings of dissatisfaction towards the open plan office space as a whole. Employees will and are always contented when they feel their immediate environment; both physical sensations and emotional states are in tandem with their obligations (Farh, 2012).

**Employee Commitment**

No organization could ever achieve its goals without having committed human resources (Srivastava, 2008). Employee commitment is therefore an issue of great significance to an organization as it is concerned with an employee’s eagerness to work beyond the call of duty while performing his or her tasks and it also about the employees desire to retain membership with an organization. Like a strong magnetic force attracting metallic objects to another, it is a measure of the employee’s willingness to remain with an organization in the future (Doman, 2008). Employees can therefore be said to be committed to an organization if they continue with their association with the firm out of their own free will and also exert a lot of effort towards the achievement of an organization’s objectives. Committed employees exhibit the most positive work behaviour and job performance (Leblebici, 2012). Positive outcomes of organizational commitment include low turnover rates, higher work motivation, less tardiness and absenteeism, higher task performance, adherence to company rules and greater organizational citizenship behaviour Kyko, (2005). Further, there is
an improvement in customer service and satisfaction because long-tenure employees have better knowledge of work practices, and customers like the familiarity of doing business with the same employees, they make referrals resulting in new customers and even pay a premium price (Doman, 2008). Costs associated with high turnover and absenteeism rate are avoided when employees are committed to their organization. The model of organizational commitment developed by Meyer and Herscovitch, (2001) includes three levels of commitment and it is possible that an employee can exhibit aspects of all of these types of commitment in the organization that they are working. These three levels of commitment include affective, normative and continuance commitment. Affective commitment is one’s desire to belong to the organization Kyko, (2005) and they stay out of their own free will. In normative commitment, workers feel they have to remain in the organization which means that they feel they are trapped in the organization. It basically reflects a sense of responsibilities on the part of the employee to maintain membership in the organization Bagrain and Hime, (2007). Continuance commitment is based on Becker’s (2002) side bet theory which posits that as individuals remain an organization for longer periods, they accumulate investments which become costly to loose. Continuance commitment therefore refers to the employee’s recognition of the costs associated if he or she leaves the employment or job Bagrain and Hime, (2007).

Workplace Environmental Factors and Employee Commitment

Training and Employee Commitment

Induction is an important aspect of welcoming new employees to the organization. It needs to be properly implemented. Empirical review revealed that orientation was not conducted to all employees. Training enhance employees with the required skills to deal with challenges that come with the assigned job, also, training was not regularly conducted in the organization which negatively affected employee’s efficiencies. Results from training are essential keys to identifying areas that employees require improvement. Training contributes to employee’s commitment if conducted on regularly. Training is of significant important when it’s conducted to all employees in the organization.

Motivation and Employee Commitment

Contractual agreements are evidence of employee’s commitment to the organization obligations. Remuneration is a basic key employee motivator; previous studies established that employees were not properly remunerated which led to low levels of worker’s commitment. Employee’s involvement, consultations and participation in decision making were fundamental methods to motivate employees.

Physical Element and Employee Commitment

Physical elements are those variables in workplace environment that either decline or increase employee commitment (physical condition of work). Kyko, (2005) believes that working conditions that constitute toxic environment includes hot and noisy environment, unsafe work conditions, polluted work environment, insufficient resources and archaic technology. It is the physical work condition that is of interest in this research. The working conditions in relation to employees’ commitment have not really enjoyed much empirical attention in the literature. Whereas, McGuire and McLaren, (2007) believes that an organization’s physical environment especially its design and layout can affect employee attitude in the workplace. They therefore investigated the mediating role of employee well-being in the relationship between physical work environment and employee commitment in Call Centres (McGuire and McLaren, 2007). They not only found strong evidence of a mediation effect evidencing the essential of both physical environment and employee well-being to employee commitment, but also established that there exists a strong positive relationship between physical environment and employee commitment.

Teamwork and Employee Commitment

Workplace synergy and teamwork are emerging area of study in labour and employment relationship and empirical research on it is seriously lacking particularly when it has to be in connection with worker’s commitment. Workplace employee collaboration encompasses office politicking, level of interpersonal relationship among workers, back stabbing, empire building, rumour mongering, alienation, trust or mistrust and sabotage (Kyko, 2005). Within organisations, there are at least two possible foci for the teamwork relationship: the superior-subordinate and the co-workers relationship. There are certain researchers that attempted studying some of the elements in workplace teamwork relationship. For instance the trust level of employees at work towards their supervisor and co-worker was studied by Bagrain and Hime, (2007) and its relationship with affective employee commitment to organization. The results showed that trust in
supervisor and co-workers was significantly related to affective commitment in supervisor and explained significant variance in affective commitment in supervisor.

Theoretical Framework
(i) Elton Mayo's Hawthorne Effect
Hawthorne set the individual in a social context, establishing that the effectiveness of employees is influenced by their surroundings and by the people that they are working with as much as by their own innate capacities. The original purpose of the experiments was to study the effects of physical conditions on productivity and performance. In addition, the aptitudes of individuals are imperfect predictors of job performance but the amount produced is strongly influenced by social variables. The studies also showed that the relations that supervisors develop with workers tend to influence the manner in which the workers carry out directives (Mayo, 1987). The theory is relevant to this study since it helps identify the physical environmental variables in the environments which relate with employees’ commitment.

(ii). Affective Events Theory
Affective events theory (AET) is a model developed by organisational psychologists Howard M. Weiss (Purdue University) and Russell Cropanzano (University of Colorado) to explain how emotions and moods influence employee commitment and job satisfaction. The model explains the linkages between employees' internal influences (e.g., cognitions, emotions, mental states) and their reactions to incidents that occur in their work environment that affect their performance, organisational effectiveness and job satisfaction. The theory proposes that affective work behaviours are explained by employee mood and emotions, while cognitive-based behaviours are the best predictors of job satisfaction. The theory proposes that positive-inducing (e.g., uplifts) as well as negative-inducing (e.g., hassles) emotional incidents at work are distinguishable and have a significant psychological effect upon workers' job satisfaction. This results in lasting internal (e.g., cognition, emotions, mental states) and external affective reactions exhibited through job performance, job satisfaction, and organisational commitment. The Affective Events Theory explains the link between employees’ internal influences and their reactions to incidents that occur in their work environment that affect their performance, organisational commitment and job satisfaction (Phua, 2012). It proposes that positive-inducing as well as negative emotional incidents at work have significant psychological effect on employees’ job satisfaction. The impact results into lasting reactions exhibited through job satisfaction, organisational commitment and job performance. This theory confirm the fact that working condition influence employee commitment.

(iii) Theory of Work Adjustment
The Theory of Work Adjustment (TWA) developed by Dawes and Lofquist in the University of Minnesota in 1984, the aim was to provide theoretical framework that will describe the relationship among individuals at work and their workplace environment. Work is therefore perceived and conceptualized as an interaction between an individual and a workplace. This work environment requires that certain jobs are performed, and the individual brings up the needed skills to perform the duties. As an exchange relationship between the employee and it workplace, the individual also requires certain compensation for work performance and related conditions, such as a safety and comfortable place to carry out his or her task effectively. For the interrelationship to be maintained and job to continue, the workplace environment and the individual must continue to meet each other’s obligations (Dawes & Lofquist, 1984). The degree to which the requirements of both parties are met is called correspondence. This is why Theory of Work Adjustment is called Person–Environment Correspondence Theory.

Methodology
The research employs survey method and design. The area of this study consists of Adamawa, Bauchi and Gombe states, Nigeria. The states were selected because they have well functional manufacturing firms in the North-East region, Nigeria. The population of the research consists of the staff of selected three manufacturing firms which were selected purposively. The populations of this staff were 435. The researcher determined the size of the sample, a total of 205 samples were derived from the study population with the use of Trek formula (Trek, 1994). Data for the work were collected mainly from primary source through questionnaire that were self-administered. The answer options for the questionnaire were developed
using five-point Likert scale with SA – Strongly Agree, A – Agree, U – Uncertain, D – Disagree and SD – Strongly Disagree.

Table 1: The population studies are the staff of the three key selected manufacturing sectors. The populations of this staff are:

| No | Manufacturing firms                                      | Population | Sample |
|----|----------------------------------------------------------|------------|--------|
| 1. | Savannah Sugar Nigeria Limited, Yola, Adamawa State      | 136        | 64.09  |
| 2. | Nigeria Asbestos Limited, Bauchi, Bauchi State.          | 152        | 71.63  |
| 3. | Ashaka Cement PLC., Gombe, Gombe State.                 | 147        | 69.28  |
| Total |                                                      | 435        | 205    |

SOURCE: Managers, Human Resources Departments of the selected firms, (2018)

Analysis, Results & Discussion
Out of the two hundred and five (205) questionnaires administered, only one hundred and ninety-seven (197) representing 96.1% were returned and found good for the data analysis. The biographical information of the respondents from the analysis revealed that many of the respondents of the selected three manufacturing firms were male (71.6%). Also, majority of the respondents in the organizations were of middle and low level managerial positions (90.9%) which definitely give the work more meaningful responses since the issues relating to employees commitment affect these management cadres most. Furthermore, most of the respondents (72.1%) were unskilled employees. This is a pointer that the findings would give reliable results since the works majorly emanate from the concern for the unskilled workers. Finally, our respondents come mostly from marketing (37.6%) and operation (29.4%) departments. These give us a true representation to justify the fundamental roles of workplace environmental factors on employee’s commitment.

Testing of Hypotheses
Two hypotheses were formulated and are tested as follow using ANOVA and chi-square. Hypothesis one was tested with One-way ANOVA and hypothesis two was tested with chi-square test. SPSS was used to analyze the various tests.

Hypothesis one:
HO: there is no significant relationship between feedback and employee efficiency
HA: there is significant positive relationship between feedback and employee efficiency.

Table 2: One-Way ANOVA
Feedback and Employee efficiency

| Sum of Squares | Df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
|----------------|----|-------------|---|------|
| Between Groups | 2154.300 | 4 | 1233.825 | .766 | .002 |
| Within Groups  | 2113.500 | 15 | 143.411 |  |  |
| Total          | 4267.800 | 19 |  |  |  |

Source: SPSS analysis of field data 2018

Hypothesis two:
HO: incentive has no effect on employees’ commitment.
HA: incentive positively affects employees’ commitment.

Table 3: Chi-Square Test Statistics.
Incentive and employees’ commitment

| Incentive | Employees commitment |
|-----------|----------------------|
| Chi-Square| 23.72                |
| Df        | 196                  |
| Asymp. Sig.| 7.89                |
|           | 7.89 *               |
|           | 12                  |
|           | 1.000               |

Source: SPSS analysis of The chi-square is computed at 0.05 level of significant field data 2018
Relationship between performance feedback and employee efficiency

Data for the test of this hypothesis were obtained from responses through questionnaire. The one-way ANOVA was used to test the extent of the relationship between performance feedback and employee efficiency. Tables 2 reveals that while the f-distribution result shows the existence of relationship result on the variables (F = 0.766 at p< 0.05). The significant level is 0.002, and due to this we reject the null hypothesis and accept the alternate one which states that there is significant positive relationship between feedback and employee efficiency.

The effect of workplace incentives on employee’s commitment

Having analyzed the second hypothesis on table 3 with chi-square (x2), we found out that the calculated figure is greater than the tabulated figure (x2Calc=23.72 > x2Tab=7.89), we reject the null hypothesis and accept the alternate which signifies that incentive positively affects employees’ commitment.

Conclusion and Recommendations

This work identifies the determinant of employees’ commitment of manufacturing sectors by reviewing their workplace environmental factors and by finding how the independent variables affect the dependent variables. Although previous studies shows multifaceted results workers efficiency in the aspect of performance feedback, this work revealed that effective performance feedback is critical to employees’ efficiency and organisational growth.

Apparently, performance feedback centre on generating specific information that is relevant to solve practical problems pertaining to the organisation. These information are noticeable issues that caused actual deviation from original targeted goals, which can also serve as a control measure. This established the fact that the variable is a determinant that is of special significance to employee’s productivity.

Besides, workplace environmental factors are basic elements that control and subsequently activate the activities of employees in their respective organisations. The factors understudy affects virtually all operations in organisations. Incentives as key factor also contribute immensely to employee commitment in workplace. Therefore, employees should be rewarded as a result of committed to duty and contribution to organisational development; this will encourage them to continue to put in their best and enable organisations to be at the edge of their competitors.

In line with the actual study findings and conclusions drawn, the following recommendations were suggested:

1. Organisations should incorporate feedback approach into it system. This will enable them to assess useful information that can be used to solve or analyse current and future problems. Issues that are relevance to workplace, particularly in the area of employees’ inefficiency and low productivity.
2. Feedback is a management tool that revealed to employee his or her level of commitment to responsibilities, this recommendation will encourage potential and visionary employees to apply more effort that will facilitate them to add values to the company and peradventure enable organisations to play her basic roles in economic development.
3. In addition, incentives play fundamental roles in employees’ commitment. Therefore, management should be consistent in giving incentives to workers that desire it on merit ground. The nature of compensation shouldcommensurate with what had been delivered by employee respectively.
4. Workplace environmental factors are antidotes that ammonise employee with their environment. In that regard, it must be meticulously and systematically integrated and harness by managements to ascertain their specific objectives and compete favourably in global market.
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