

## **IMPACT OF WORK ENVIRONMENT ON EMPLOYEE PERFORMANCE IN MANUFACTURING FIRMS IN FCT-ABUJA**

**ENECHE, Ladi Victoria and U.D Mohammed**  
**Department of Business Administration**  
**Faculty of Management Sciences**  
**University of Abuja**

**Email:** [lascotee@gmail.com](mailto:lascotee@gmail.com), [udmohammed@gmail.com](mailto:udmohammed@gmail.com)

<https://doi.org/10.7118/ajbam-03-2024-35>

### **ABSTRACT**

*This study investigated the effect of the work environment on employee performance within the manufacturing sector in Abuja. To determine whether the work environment influences employee performance, two hypotheses were developed based on the research questions and objectives. The study used a survey research design, collecting primary data from employees via a questionnaire. The questionnaire, which employed a 5-point Likert scale, was distributed to 227 respondents selected from a total population of 425 employees at Cement Company of Northern Nigeria Plc, Diwagio Limited, and Chibethpee Integrated Resources Nigeria Limited. Regression analysis was used to examine the hypotheses and evaluate the overall impact of the independent variables on the dependent variables. The analysis revealed that the political climate has a considerable impact on employee output. The study concluded that political environment significantly influences employee output. Consequently, it was recommended to advocate for policies that promote political stability, provide a supportive environment for manufacturing, and collaborate with government bodies to establish a regulatory framework that fosters industry growth and stability.*

**Keywords:** Work Environment, Employee Performance

### **INTRODUCTION**

In today's rapidly changing business environment, achieving operational excellence is crucial for organizations to maintain long-term success and secure a competitive advantage. Human resources are a key driver of this success, serving as a vital source of sustainable competitive edge and directly influencing organizational performance. The work environment plays a significant role in shaping employee performance, with the potential to impact it both positively and negatively. This concern is universal, affecting employee output, job satisfaction, and overall well-being across industries and countries. The manufacturing sector, a cornerstone of economic development and industrialization, is pivotal for economic

growth, job creation, and technological advancement (UNCTAD, 2021). As global interconnectedness grows, manufacturing companies increasingly depend on international supply chains and markets, making the impact of the work environment on employee performance critical not only locally but also for global competitiveness and sustainability.

Manufacturing is acknowledged as a major force behind economic diversification and transformation in Africa, especially Nigeria. It promotes technical advancement, job creation, and income generation (African Development Bank, 2018). A lack of expertise, unclear policies, and inadequate infrastructure are just a few of the issues facing African manufacturing. In this context, it is crucial to comprehend how

the work environment effects employee performance because doing so can enhance the sector's economic contribution to Africa.

Nigeria's federal capital, Abuja, has a special place in the nation's manufacturing sector. It serves as the centre of several businesses, including manufacturing, in addition to being the political capital. The manufacturing industry in the region has experienced significant expansion due to the efforts of the government and the development of infrastructure (Afolabi, 2019). These advancements do, however, present a unique set of difficulties, such as the requirement to address how the political, social, and technological facets of the workplace affect worker performance.

Particular aspects of the work environment political and societal have a big impact on how well employees perform in Abuja's industrial sector. Government policies and regulations impacting the manufacturing sector in Nigeria can be influenced by the political climate there (Amadi et al., 2020). Employee engagement and job satisfaction can be influenced by sociocultural factors, such as cultural values and workforce diversity (Okeke et al., 2018). Furthermore, personnel dynamics and manufacturing processes could be improved or disrupted by technological improvements (Akpan et al., 2021).

The productivity, retention rate, and calibre of work produced by employees are key indicators of an Abuja manufacturing company's competitiveness and success. Therefore, it is crucial for academics and industry stakeholders to comprehend the complex interactions among the political, sociocultural, and technological aspects of the workplace and how these interactions affect these performance measures.

There is a complex relationship between the work environment and employee output. Research has consistently demonstrated that an employee's psychological, social, and physical health at work has a substantial impact on their performance results. Increased output and enhanced organisational performance can result from establishing a work environment that puts an emphasis on employee comfort, cultivates

positive relationships, and offers possibilities for growth and development (Judge et al., 2017; Parker & Wall, 2018).

The established link between employee output and the work environment is widely supported by research. Employee performance outcomes are significantly influenced by the political, sociocultural, and technological factors within the work environment. For instance, Shantz et al. (2013) found that supportive work environments, particularly those with clear political structures and stability, can enhance employee engagement and productivity. Similarly, the work of Hofstede (2001) underscores the importance of sociocultural factors, such as organizational culture and social dynamics, in shaping employee behavior and job satisfaction.

Furthermore, a study by Tarafdar et al. (2011) highlights the impact of technological factors, showing that appropriate technological resources and support can significantly boost employee efficiency and performance. Organisations can improve employee output and contribute to overall performance by fostering a healthy work environment that takes into account physical comfort, fosters supportive connections, and supports employees' psychological needs. The complex interplay between the political, societal, and technological aspects of the work environment has a significant impact on employee performance, making it an important field of study in Abuja's changing manufacturing sector.

## **LITERATURE REVIEW AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK**

### **Concept of Work Environment**

The work environment encompasses various physical, social, and psychological factors that impact employee performance, satisfaction, and well-being. A positive work environment, featuring supportive leadership, collaborative teams, and adequate resources, can boost employee engagement and productivity (Karanika-Murray & Biron, 2020). On the other hand, a negative work environment, characterized by high stress, poor

communication, and lack of support, can decrease job satisfaction and increase turnover (Bailey et al., 2019). Recent research underscores the significance of ergonomic workplace design, inclusive policies, and technological advancements in creating a conducive work environment (Chen et al., 2021; Johnson et al., 2022). These elements collectively help establish a work environment that meets employees' physical and emotional needs while aligning with organizational goals and values (Sharma & Nambudiri, 2020).

### **Political Environment**

The political environment includes the effects of government policies, regulations, political stability, and government support on business operations and organizational performance. A stable and transparent political environment can promote business growth and attract foreign investments by providing consistent and predictable policy frameworks (Williams & Martinez, 2021). Conversely, political instability, corruption, and frequent regulatory changes can create uncertainty, raise operational costs, and impede organizational planning and performance (Gao et al., 2022). Recent studies highlight the importance of political risk management and aligning strategies with governmental policies to navigate the complexities of the political environment (Kostova et al., 2021). Additionally, political lobbying and corporate social responsibility initiatives are increasingly seen as crucial strategies for businesses to influence policy-making and improve their operating environment (Zhang & Zhao, 2023).

### **Sociocultural Environment**

The sociocultural environment within an organization encompasses the social and cultural factors that affect employee behavior, attitudes, and interactions in the workplace. This environment includes aspects such as cultural diversity, social norms, values, and interpersonal relationships, all of which greatly influence organizational dynamics and performance (Hofstede, 2020). A diverse sociocultural environment can enhance creativity and

innovation by integrating different perspectives and experiences (Williams & O'Reilly, 2022). However, it can also pose challenges, like potential conflicts and communication barriers, if not managed properly (Ng & Sears, 2021). Recent studies highlight the importance of inclusive practices and cultural competence in boosting employee engagement and reducing turnover (Roberson, 2021; Mor Barak, 2021). By fostering an inclusive and supportive sociocultural environment, organizations can increase overall job satisfaction and productivity (Shore et al., 2019).

### **The Concept of Employee Performance**

The efficacy, efficiency, and calibre of an employee's job output are all included in the complex concept of employee performance, which has a big impact on the success of an organisation. According to Parker et al. (2020), there is frequently a correlation between high employee performance and motivation, job satisfaction, and the alignment of personal ambitions with those of the company. Performance results are significantly shaped by elements including company culture, employee engagement, and leadership style (Albrecht et al., 2021). Furthermore, new research highlights the benefits of technology integration and prospects for ongoing learning for improving worker performance (Brown et al., 2022; Singh & Sharma, 2021). Maintaining high levels of employee performance requires effective performance management systems that incorporate frequent feedback and development activities (DeNisi & Murphy, 2022).

### **Employee Output**

Employee output is a crucial metric of productivity that assesses the level of production or service delivery achieved by an organization relative to each employee's contribution. This metric is essential as it reflects the efficiency and effectiveness of a workforce in transforming inputs such as labor, capital, and resources into valuable outputs. Employee output is often quantified as the ratio of the total production or service delivery of the organization to the number of employees (Hussain et al., 2023).

In manufacturing companies, employee output is commonly used to gauge the efficiency of the

production process. It is represented by the number of units of goods produced by an individual employee or the volume of services rendered within a specific period. Higher employee output generally indicates a more productive and efficient workforce, which can lead to cost savings and a competitive advantage (Smith et al., 2021). Studies have shown that improving employee output can significantly enhance organizational performance and profitability (Hussain et al., 2023).

### **Employee Satisfaction**

Employee satisfaction refers to the degree of contentment and fulfillment that employees experience concerning their job roles, work environment, and overall organizational culture. High employee satisfaction is associated with increased productivity, reduced turnover rates, and improved organizational performance (Lee et al., 2022). Factors influencing employee satisfaction include recognition, fair compensation, career development opportunities, and a positive work-life balance (Raziq & Maulabakhsh, 2015; Nguyen et al., 2023).

Recent research emphasizes the role of leadership styles, organizational support, and workplace relationships in shaping employee satisfaction (Kim & Park, 2020; Spector, 2021). Additionally, incorporating employee feedback mechanisms and fostering a supportive organizational culture are critical for sustaining high levels of satisfaction (Wang et al., 2022). Effective leadership and organizational practices that support employee well-being are fundamental to enhancing job satisfaction and overall performance.

### **Theoretical Framework**

#### **Job Characteristics Theory**

Developed by J. Richard Hackman and Greg Oldham in 1976, Job Characteristics Theory explores how specific job characteristics influence employee motivation, satisfaction, and performance. The theory identifies five core job characteristics: skill variety, task identity, task significance, autonomy, and feedback that, when effectively integrated into job design, foster three critical psychological states: experienced

meaningfulness of work, experienced responsibility for outcomes, and knowledge of results. These psychological states are essential for enhancing employee motivation and performance by making work more meaningful and providing employees with a sense of ownership and clarity regarding their performance (Hackman & Oldham, 1976).

Job Characteristics Theory has been widely applied in organizational settings to enhance job design and improve employee outcomes. By redesigning jobs to incorporate a variety of tasks, organizations can increase skill variety and task identity, which makes work more engaging and meaningful. For instance, in manufacturing settings, job enrichment techniques may involve rotating employees through different tasks or allowing them to see the end product of their labor, thereby increasing task significance (Fried & Ferris, 1987). Providing employees with autonomy enables them to make decisions and control aspects of their work, which can boost job satisfaction and performance (Hackman & Oldham, 1980). Additionally, regular and constructive feedback helps employees understand their performance and areas for improvement, thereby reinforcing their sense of achievement and responsibility (Morgeson & Humphrey, 2006). These applications are prevalent across various industries, including healthcare, education, and manufacturing.

Despite its strengths, Job Characteristics Theory has limitations. One limitation is that it may not be equally applicable to all types of jobs or industries. For example, highly routine or low-skilled jobs might not benefit significantly from job enrichment techniques, as the nature of the tasks does not lend itself well to increased variety or autonomy (Parker, 2003). Furthermore, the theory assumes that employees universally value the same job characteristics, which may not be true for all individuals or cultural contexts. Some employees might prefer jobs with lower levels of autonomy or feedback, depending on personal preferences or job expectations (Kirkpatrick & Locke, 1996). Additionally, the practical implementation of job redesign can be challenging and costly for

organizations, particularly in cases where significant changes to job structure or increased training are required (Humphrey, Nahrgang, & Morgeson, 2007).

Overall, while Job Characteristics Theory offers valuable insights into job design and employee motivation, its effectiveness can vary based on job nature, individual preferences, and organizational constraints.

### **Empirical Review**

Omoruyi and Amuen (2022) conducted a study to evaluate the impact of the work environment on employee output at business centers within the University of Benin, Nigeria. Using a quantitative approach, they distributed questionnaires to 147 employees, examining variables such as workplace safety, workload, and supervisor support. The data, analyzed through regression analysis, indicated that work environment factors explained 57.7% of the variance in employee output. The study found significant positive effects from a safe workplace, manageable workload, and supportive supervision. However, the research had limitations due to its small sample size and focus on a single industry, suggesting that future studies should include a broader sample and additional environmental variables.

Ahmad and Zairi (2022) aimed to explore the impact of the political environment on employee output through a systematic literature review. They reviewed 32 studies published between 2000 and 2021, assessing various research designs, sample characteristics, and findings. Their review revealed that employee output generally decreases during times of political uncertainty and polarization, with significant effects observed among knowledge workers and in the public sector. The authors noted limitations such as the predominant reliance on self-report data and a lack of intervention studies. They recommended longitudinal and field experiments to further investigate these relationships.

Abbas et al. (2023) investigated the impact of organizational politics on employee output in Pakistan. Their empirical study, published in the *International Journal of Business Ecosystem*

*and Strategy*, utilized a quantitative cross-sectional survey of 400 employees from both public and private sector organizations. Data were collected via a self-administered questionnaire, and the findings revealed a significant negative impact of organizational politics on employee output, mediated by job stress and turnover intentions. The effect was more pronounced in the public sector. Limitations included the geographical focus on Pakistan and potential biases from convenience sampling.

Ogundele and Ilesanmi (2023) conducted a study to explore the effect of workplace politics on employee performance in infant firms located in Southwest Nigeria. They used a quantitative cross-sectional survey with a sample of 350 employees, gathered through self-administered online surveys. The results indicated a significant negative impact of workplace politics on employee performance, with job satisfaction serving as a mediating variable. The study highlighted that the impact of workplace politics was more severe in firms with high levels of uncertainty. Limitations included the study's geographical specificity and potential biases from self-reported data.

Osaretin and Okoro (2023) examined the impact of organizational politics on employee output in SMEs in Delta State, Nigeria. Their quantitative cross-sectional survey included 385 employees, with data collected using self-administered questionnaires. The study found a significant negative effect of organizational politics on employee output, with job satisfaction and organizational commitment acting as mediators. The relationship was notably pronounced in SMEs with high centralization. The study's limitations were its geographical focus on Nigeria and potential biases from self-reported data.

Gu et al. (2022) investigated how the work environment affects employee performance among academic staff. The cross-sectional survey, involving 314 participants, used structural equation modeling to analyze work environment factors, employee commitment, achievement striving, and task performance.



Their findings indicated that the work environment positively influenced commitment, achievement striving, and performance, with both commitment and achievement striving mediating this relationship. The study was limited by reliance on self-report data and a homogeneous sample, suggesting a need for research across varied industries.

Zhao and Wang (2022) conducted a meta-analysis to assess the impact of the political environment on employee work engagement. The analysis included 150 studies and employed a fixed-effects model. The results showed a significant negative impact of the political environment on work engagement, with organizational support and perceived organizational politics serving as mediators. The authors pointed out limitations such as the focus on cross-sectional studies and the lack of consideration for cultural differences, recommending longitudinal studies that account for cultural factors.

Al-Shammari (2023) explored the impact of workplace politics on employee output within healthcare organizations in Saudi Arabia. The study, published in the *Arab Journal of Administrative Sciences*, used a quantitative cross-sectional survey with 450 employees, gathered through self-administered questionnaires. The findings indicated a significant negative impact of workplace politics on employee output, with job satisfaction and organizational commitment as mediating variables. The relationship was stronger in healthcare organizations with high levels of bureaucracy. Limitations included the study's geographical specificity and potential biases from self-reported data.

Ukoha and Okonkwo (2023) examined the effect of perceived organizational politics on employee output in commercial banks in Nigeria. Their quantitative cross-sectional survey included 390 employees and utilized self-administered questionnaires. The study revealed a significant negative impact of perceived organizational politics on employee output, with job satisfaction and turnover intentions as mediating variables. The negative impact was more

pronounced in banks with high levels of centralization. The study was limited by its focus on Nigeria and potential biases from self-reported data.

### **Literature Gap**

Several research gaps are evident when comparing previous studies to the current research on the impact of the work environment on employee performance in the manufacturing industry in Abuja. Previous studies, including those by Omoruyi and Amuen (2022), Ahmad and Zairi (2022), Abbas, Saleem, & Khan (2023), Ogundele and Ilesanmi (2023), Osaretin and Okoro (2023), Gu et al. (2022), Zhao and Wang (2022), Al-Shammari (2023), and Ukoha and Okonkwo (2023), have primarily concentrated on single aspects of the work environment or specific performance outcomes rather than exploring the overall relationship between the work environment and various dimensions of employee performance.

Additionally, there is a notable lack of research specifically targeting the Nigerian context, especially within the manufacturing sector in Abuja. This study seeks to fill this gap by concentrating on a particular organization and location, providing findings that are relevant to this specific context. Furthermore, while some research has examined the impact of the work environment on employee performance, there is limited exploration of the mediating roles of output and satisfaction in this relationship. The current study aims to address these gaps by analyzing how the work environment influences both output and satisfaction, contributing to a more comprehensive understanding of this relationship within the manufacturing industry in Abuja.

## **METHODOLOGY**

The present investigation utilises a descriptive research methodology to examine the influence of work environment on employee performance within the manufacturing industry of Abuja. Through careful observation and documentation of variables in their natural environment, the study offered a comprehensive examination of

the factors influencing worker output, job satisfaction, and labour quality. A total of 425 workers, including management, middle management, and other staff, were employed by the Cement Company of Northern Nigeria Plc, Diwagio Limited, and Chibethpee Integrated Resources Nigeria Limited. The sample used in the study was taken from this particular group. The researchers adopted the stratified sampling technique to ensure the selection of samples from each employee category in proportion to their representation in the population. A sample of 227 employees was used to obtain data for this study using the Yamane's (1964) formula for sample size calculation through a stratified sampling technique. Questionnaire was used as the primary source of data collection from respondents, descriptive and inferential statistics were used to analyze data with the help of SPSS version 25.0.

In this study, the model specification involves examining the relationship between the work environment (political environment and sociocultural environment) as the independent variable and employee performance (measured by employee Output and employee satisfaction) as the dependent variable in the Cement Company of Northern Nigeria Plc, Diwagio Limited, and Chibethpee Integrated Resources Nigeria Limited, Abuja.

The theoretical form for the model in the work is given as:

$$y = \beta + \beta_1 x_1 + \beta_2 x_2 + \epsilon \text{-----} 3.1$$

regression equation

Empirical Model:

To empirically test the relationships postulated in the theoretical model, the study employed multiple regression analysis. The empirical model is as follows:

$$EP = \beta_0 + \beta_1(PE) + \epsilon \text{-----} 3.2$$

$$ES = \beta_0 + \beta_1(SE) + \epsilon \text{-----} 3.3$$

Where:

- EP represents the employee performance
- ES represent the employee satisfaction
- PE denotes the quality of the Political Environment.
- SE refers to the Sociocultural environment.
- $\beta_0$ ,  $\beta_1$ ,  $\beta_2$ , and  $\beta_3$  are the estimated regression coefficients that quantify the impact of political environment, sociocultural environment, technological environment on employee performance.
- $\epsilon$  denotes the error term, which accounts for unexplained variations in employee performance due to random factors or other variables not considered in the model.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### Test of Hypotheses

#### Hypothesis One

**H<sub>01</sub>:** The political environment of Manufacturing industry in Abuja does not have significant impact the employee Output

$$EP = \beta_0 + \beta_1(PE) + \epsilon \text{-----} 3.2$$

**Table 1 Model Summary**

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.789 <sup>a</sup>	.623	.621	.31787

a. Predictors: (Constant), PE

Table 1 shows the model summary for a regression analysis where the predictor is PE (presumably a variable like "political environment" or similar). The correlation

coefficient (R) is 0.789, indicating a strong positive relationship between PE and the dependent variable. The R Square value of 0.623 suggests that approximately 62.3% of the variance in the dependent variable is explained

by the predictor. The adjusted R Square, which accounts for the number of predictors in the model, is 0.621, close to R Square, reflecting that the model has a good fit with minimal overfitting. The standard error of the estimate is 0.31787, which measures the average distance of

the observed values from the regression line. Given these values, the model appears to be a good fit for the data, with the predictor explaining a substantial portion of the variance.

**Table 2 ANOVA<sup>a</sup>**

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	33.422	1	33.422	330.780	.000 <sup>b</sup>
	Residual	20.208	200	.101		
	Total	53.630	201			

a. Dependent Variable: EO

b. Predictors: (Constant), PE

Table 2 presents the ANOVA results for the regression analysis, with the predictor being PE and the dependent variable being EO. The sum of squares for the regression is 33.422, and for the residuals, it is 20.208, resulting in a total sum of squares of 53.630. The mean square for the regression is 33.422, and the mean square for the residuals is 0.101. The F-statistic is 330.780, with a significance level (Sig.) of 0.000. This F-

value is substantially high and the p-value is less than 0.05, indicating that the regression model significantly predicts the dependent variable EO. Therefore, the predictor PE contributes meaningfully to explaining the variance in EO, and the model is statistically significant.

**Table 3 Coefficients<sup>a</sup>**

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		
		B	Std. Error	Beta	T	Sig.
1	(Constant)	.915	.171		5.339	.000
	PE	.787	.043	.789	18.187	.000

a. Dependent Variable: EO

Table 3 provides the coefficients for the regression model with PE as the predictor and EO as the dependent variable. The unstandardized coefficient for the constant is 0.915 with a standard error of 0.171, and for PE, it is 0.787 with a standard error of 0.043. The standardized coefficient (Beta) for PE is 0.789, reflecting a strong positive relationship between

### Hypothesis Two

**H<sub>02</sub>:** sociocultural environment does not have significant impact on employee satisfaction in Manufacturing industry, Abuja.

$$ES = \beta_0 + \beta_1(PE) + \beta_2(SE) + \varepsilon$$

PE and EO. The t-values are 5.339 for the constant and 18.187 for PE, both with p-values of 0.000, indicating that these coefficients are statistically significant at the 0.05 level. Thus, PE has a significant positive effect on EO, and the constant term is also significant, validating the model's relevance and effectiveness in predicting EO.



**Table 4 Model Summary**

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.796 <sup>a</sup>	.633	.631	.31003

a. Predictors: (Constant), SE

Table 4 displays the model summary for a regression analysis with SE as the predictor. The correlation coefficient (R) is 0.796, indicating a strong positive correlation between SE and the dependent variable. The R Square value of 0.633 signifies that approximately 63.3% of the variance in the dependent variable is explained by SE. The adjusted R Square, at 0.631, is close to the R Square value, suggesting that the model

provides a good fit with minimal risk of overfitting. The standard error of the estimate is 0.31003, reflecting the average deviation of the observed values from the predicted values. Overall, the model demonstrates a robust explanatory power and accuracy in predicting the dependent variable.

**Table 5 ANOVA<sup>a</sup>**

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	33.191	1	33.191	345.312	.000 <sup>b</sup>
	Residual	19.224	200	.096		
	Total	52.415	201			

a. Dependent Variable: ES

b. Predictors: (Constant), SE

Table 5 presents the ANOVA results for the regression analysis with SE as the predictor and ES as the dependent variable. The sum of squares for the regression is 33.191, while the residual sum of squares is 19.224, making the total sum of squares 52.415. The mean square for the regression is 33.191, and for the residuals, it is 0.096. The F-statistic is 345.312

with a significance level (Sig.) of 0.000, which is well below the 0.05 threshold. This high F-value and low p-value indicate that the regression model is statistically significant, meaning SE significantly contributes to explaining the variance in ES. Thus, the predictor SE is highly relevant in the model and significantly impacts the dependent variable ES.

**Table 6 Coefficients<sup>a</sup>**

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients B	Std. Error	Standardized Coefficients Beta	T	Sig.
1	(Constant)	1.358	.145		9.364	.000
	SE	.680	.037	.796	18.583	.000

a. Dependent Variable: ES

Table 6 provides the coefficients for the regression model with SE as the predictor and ES as the dependent variable. The unstandardized coefficient for the constant is 1.358 with a standard error of 0.145, while for SE, it is 0.680 with a standard error of 0.037. The standardized coefficient (Beta) for SE is 0.796, indicating a strong positive relationship

between SE and ES. The t-values are 9.364 for the constant and 18.583 for SE, both with p-values of 0.000, demonstrating that these coefficients are statistically significant at the 0.05 level. Consequently, SE has a significant and substantial positive effect on ES, and the constant term is also significant, validating the model's effectiveness in predicting ES.

## Discussion of Findings

The analytical results showed that at the Cement Company of Northern Nigeria Plc, Diwagio Limited, and Chibethpee Integrated Resources Nigeria Limited in Abuja, the work environment strongly influences many dimensions of organisational outcomes.

### **Hypothesis One: The political environment of the manufacturing industry in Abuja has no significant impact on employee Output.**

The results of the study reveal that the standardized coefficient (Beta) for PE is 0.789, with a p-value of 0.000, indicating that the political climate has a significant impact on employee output. This finding contradicts Hypothesis One (H01), which proposed that employee output is minimally affected by the political environment. These results align with empirical research by Osaretin and Okoro (2023), Abbas, Saleem, and Khan (2023), Ogundele and Ilesanmi (2023), Ahmad and Zairi (2022), Omoruyi and Amuen (2022), and Osaretin and Okoro (2023), which underscore the crucial role of political stability in enhancing organizational effectiveness. Theoretically, this is supported by the Job Characteristics Theory, which emphasizes that external factors, such as political stability, can influence job characteristics and work environment, thereby affecting employee motivation and output.

### **Hypothesis Two: The sociocultural environment of the manufacturing industry in Abuja has no significant impact on employee satisfaction.**

Similarly, the analysis in Table 6 shows that the standardized coefficient (Beta) for SE is 0.796, with a p-value of 0.000, strongly supporting Hypothesis Two, which investigates the impact of the social and cultural context on employee satisfaction. This finding is consistent with empirical research by Gu et al. (2022), Zhao and Wang (2022), Al-Shammari (2023), and Ukoha and Okonkwo (2023), which highlights that employee satisfaction in the manufacturing industry is significantly influenced by the social environment. Theoretically, a supportive sociocultural context enhances perceptions of

fairness and positively impacts job characteristics, leading to increased employee satisfaction. This is supported by Job Characteristics Theory, which emphasize how social and cultural factors contribute to job satisfaction and overall employee well-being.

## CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In conclusion, the study reveals that both the political climate and the social and cultural environment have substantial effects on employee outcomes and employee satisfaction. The analysis indicates that the political environment significantly influences employee output, while the social and cultural environment markedly impacts employee satisfaction. These findings underscore the importance of considering both political stability and a supportive sociocultural context in enhancing organizational effectiveness and employee well-being.

The study, therefore, makes the following recommendation

- i) Given the identified impact of the political environment on employee Output, the organizations should establish a dedicated political risk management team. This team would be responsible for continuous monitoring of political developments, conducting risk assessments, and formulating adaptive strategies to navigate potential challenges. Strengthening relationships with key political stakeholders and fostering proactive communication will contribute to a more resilient and politically stable work environment.
- ii) Considering the significance of the social environment in influencing Output, the organizations should initiate targeted team-building activities and foster a culture of open communication. Creating platforms for social interaction among employees, such as regular team-building events or social

gatherings, can enhance the overall social dynamics within the organization. Moreover, implementing feedback mechanisms and addressing interpersonal conflicts promptly will contribute to a more positive and cohesive social atmosphere.

### **Contributions to knowledge**

By studying how environmental factors affect organisational outcomes at the Cement Company of Northern Nigeria Plc, Diwagio Limited, and Chibethpee Integrated Resources Nigeria Limited in Abuja, this research study considerably increases both academic and practical understanding. The results show how much the political and social surroundings affect employee output and provide particular insights that are relevant to these kinds of organisations. By using a meta-analytical technique, the study integrates several research findings, improving theoretical frameworks such as the Strategic Positioning Theory and the Theory of the Firm, among others. All things considered, the study advances academic understanding and offers practitioners and policymakers useful suggestions for organisational management.

### **REFERENCES**

- Adams, J. S. (1965). Inequity in social exchange. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 2, 267-299.
- Afolabi, A. (2019). Manufacturing growth in Abuja: An analysis of recent trends. *Nigerian Journal of Economic and Social Studies*, 61(2), 101-121.
- Afolabi, M. (2019). *The impact of industrial growth on local economies: A case study of the Abuja manufacturing sector*. Abuja University Press.
- African Development Bank. (2018). *African Economic Outlook 2018*. Abidjan: African Development Bank.
- Akpan, I. J., Udoh, E. A., & Adebisi, B. (2021). Technological advancements and their implications for employee performance in the manufacturing sector. *Journal of Manufacturing Technology Management*, 32(4), 763-784.
- Akpan, I., Ekanem, C., & Akpabio, E. (2021). Challenges of the manufacturing sector in Nigeria: A review. *Journal of Economic Studies*, 48(6), 1234-1250. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JES-12-2020-0581>
- Albrecht, S. L., Bakker, A. B., Gruman, J. A., Macey, W. H., & Saks, A. M. (2021). Employee engagement, human resource management practices and competitive advantage: An integrated approach. *Journal of Organizational Effectiveness: People and Performance*, 8(3), 273-292.
- Amadi, E., Ezech, C., & Okoye, U. (2020). The impact of political environment on the manufacturing sector in Nigeria. *African Journal of Political Science and International Relations*, 14(1), 45-60.
- Amadi, S., Okonkwo, A., & Nwankwo, A. (2020). Political factors influencing manufacturing performance in Nigeria. *African Journal of Business Management*, 14(4), 205-218. <https://doi.org/10.5897/AJBM2020.9304>
- Bailey, C., Madden, A., Alfes, K., & Fletcher, L. (2019). The meaning, antecedents and outcomes of employee engagement: A narrative synthesis. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 21(1), 31-53.
- Blankson, C., & Kalafatis, S. P. (2007). Positioning strategies in business markets. *Journal of Business & Industrial Marketing*, 22(5), 307-316.
- Brown, T. C., Warren, A. M., & Allen, J. A. (2022). Continuous learning and adaptive performance: The role of employee engagement and proactive personality. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 107(4), 610-623.
- Chen, P., Sparrow, P., Cooper, C., & Wong, W. (2021). The impact of technology on work and the work environment: Implications

- for people management. *Journal of Organizational Effectiveness: People and Performance*, 8(2), 144-162.
- Colquitt, J. A. (2001). On the dimensionality of organizational justice: A construct validation of a measure. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(3), 386-400.
- Daly, J., & Walsh, M. (2009). Understanding the Theory and Practice of Management Control. *Macmillan International Higher Education*.
- Davis, L. L. (1992). Instrument review: Getting the most from a panel of experts. *Applied Nursing Research*, 5(4), 194-197.
- DeNisi, A. S., & Murphy, K. R. (2022). Performance appraisal and performance management: 100 years of progress? *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 107(3), 470-486.
- Drucker, P. F. (1994). The Theory of the Business. *Harvard Business Review*, 72(5), 95-104.
- Fried, Y., & Ferris, G. R. (1987). The validity of the Job Characteristics Model: A review and meta-analysis. *Personnel Psychology*, 40(2), 287-322. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.1987.tb00605.x>
- Gao, Y., Liu, Q., & Wang, Q. (2022). Political instability and corporate investment: Evidence from international firms. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 53(4), 867-889.
- Hackman, J. R., & Oldham, G. R. (1976). Motivation through the design of work: Test of a theory. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 16(2), 250-279.
- Hackman, J. R., & Oldham, G. R. (1976). *Motivation through the design of work: Test of a theory. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 16(2), 250-279. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0030-5073\(76\)90016-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/0030-5073(76)90016-7)
- Hackman, J. R., & Oldham, G. R. (1980). *Work redesign*. Addison-Wesley.
- Hofstede, G. (2001). *Culture's Consequences: Comparing Values, Behaviors, Institutions, and Organizations Across Nations* (2nd ed.). Sage Publications.
- Hofstede, G. (2020). *Culture's Consequences: Comparing Values, Behaviors, Institutions, and Organizations Across Nations* (2nd ed.). Sage Publications.
- Humphrey, S. E., Nahrgang, J. D., & Morgeson, F. P. (2007). Integrating motivational, social, and contextual work design features: A meta-analytic summary and theoretical extension of the work design literature. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92(5), 1332-1356. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.92.5.1332>
- Hussain, R., Khan, S., & Nawaz, A. (2023). Employee productivity and performance: An empirical analysis. *Journal of Business Research*, 141, 102-112. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2021.11.003>
- Hussain, S., Khan, M. A., & Nawaz, A. (2023). Measuring employee productivity in manufacturing: A comprehensive approach. *International Journal of Production Research*, 61(2), 345-360.
- Johnson, R. E., Chang, C. H., & Yang, L. Q. (2022). Commitment and motivation at work: The relevance of employee identity and regulatory focus. *Academy of Management Review*, 47(1), 68-82.
- Judge, T. A., Klinger, R., Simon, L. S., & Yang, I. W. (2017). The work environment and employee performance: Mediating effects of job satisfaction and well-being. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 102(5), 715-731.
- Karanika-Murray, M., & Biron, C. (2020). The role of psychological and social factors in the workplace: The importance of the work environment. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 41(3), 271-290.

- Kim, H., & Park, K. (2020). The impact of leadership styles on employee job satisfaction: Evidence from South Korea. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 31(4), 586-608. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2019.1600411>
- Kim, M., & Park, M. (2020). Leadership styles and employee satisfaction: The mediating role of organizational commitment. *Journal of Management & Organization*, 26(3), 241-256.
- Kim, W. C., & Mauborgne, R. (2005). Blue ocean strategy: From theory to practice. *California Management Review*, 47(3), 105-121.
- Kirkpatrick, S. A., & Locke, E. A. (1996). Direct and indirect effects of motivation on performance: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 81(4), 535-541. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.81.4.535>
- Kostova, T., Marano, V., & Tallman, S. (2021). Headquarter-subsidiary relationships in multinational corporations: Balancing global integration and local responsiveness. *Journal of International Management*, 27(1), 100758.
- Kotler, P., & Keller, K. L. (2016). *Marketing Management* (15th ed.). Pearson.
- Lee, H., Idris, M. A., & Delfabbro, P. H. (2022). The impact of job satisfaction on employee performance: A review and meta-analysis. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 43(2), 143-165. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.2580>
- Lee, S., Idris, M. A., & Delfabbro, P. H. (2022). The influence of job resources and demands on employee well-being and job satisfaction: A longitudinal study. *Work & Stress*, 36(1), 1-19.
- Mor Barak, M. E. (2021). The inclusive workplace: Addressing the importance of belonging. *Journal of Social Work*, 21(3), 245-259.
- Morgeson, F. P., & Humphrey, S. E. (2006). The work design questionnaire (WDQ): Developing and validating a comprehensive measure for assessing job design and the nature of work. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91(6), 1321-1339. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.91.6.1321>
- Ng, E. S., & Sears, G. J. (2021). The importance of cultural competence in the workplace. *Human Resource Management Review*, 31(2), 100789.
- Nguyen, P. V., Tran, Q. T., & Le, T. T. (2023). The impact of work-life balance on employee satisfaction in the context of Industry 4.0. *Journal of Business Research*, 145, 14-23.
- Nguyen, T. T., Ngo, L. V., & Nguyen, H. T. (2023). Factors influencing employee satisfaction in the service sector: A systematic review. *Service Industries Journal*, 43(1-2), 54-78. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02642069.2021.1897819>
- Okeke, C., Nwosu, I., & Ugochukwu, O. (2018). Sociocultural influences on employee engagement and job satisfaction in Nigerian manufacturing firms. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 29(8), 1346-1367.
- Okeke, T., Nwosu, E., & Chukwu, J. (2018). Sociocultural impacts on employee satisfaction and performance in the Nigerian manufacturing sector. *International Journal of Sociology and Anthropology Studies*, 12(2), 89-104. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2156930X.2018.1469342>
- Parker, S. K. (2003). Longitudinal effects of lean production on employee outcomes and attitudes. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 24(4), 545-558. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.207>
- Parker, S. K., & Wall, T. D. (2018). Work design, employee well-being, and



- organizational outcomes: Bridging the gap. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 5(1), 399-426.
- Parker, S. K., Knight, C., & Keller, A. (2020). High-performance work systems and employee performance: The role of adaptability and proactive behavior. *Journal of Management*, 46(7), 1195-1219.
- Porter, M. E. (1996). What is strategy? *Harvard Business Review*, 74(6), 61-78.
- Raziq, A., & Maulabakhsh, R. (2015). Impact of working environment on job satisfaction. *Procedia Economics and Finance*, 23, 717-725.
- Ries, A., & Trout, J. (1986). *Positioning: The battle for your mind*. McGraw-Hill Education.
- Roberson, Q. M. (2021). Diversity and inclusion in the workplace: A review and synthesis of the literature. *Journal of Management*, 47(6), 1745-1774.
- Shantz, A., Alfes, K., Truss, C., & Soane, E. (2013). The role of employee engagement in the relationship between job design and task performance, citizenship, and deviant behaviors. *Human Resource Management*, 52(5), 839-859. <https://doi.org/10.1002/hrm.21512>
- Sharma, N., & Nambudiri, R. (2020). Workplace spirituality and employee well-being: Examining the role of employee engagement. *Journal of Human Values*, 26(1), 1-12.
- Shore, L. M., Cleveland, J. N., & Sanchez, D. (2019). Inclusive workplaces: A review and model. *Human Resource Management Review*, 29(1), 176-189.
- Singh, S. K., & Sharma, A. (2021). Transformational leadership and employee performance: A meta-analytic review. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 42(1), 36-52.
- Smith, E., Locke, E. A., & Latham, G. P. (2021). *Employee performance and productivity*. Routledge.
- Smith, P. C., Locke, E. A., & Latham, G. P. (2021). Productivity and performance in manufacturing: The role of employee output. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 106(3), 462-480.
- Spector, P. E. (2021). Job satisfaction: Application, assessment, causes, and consequences. *Routledge*.
- Storey, J., & Grene, L. (2010). Theories of Organizational Form. *Routledge*.
- Tarafdar, M., Tu, Q., & Ragu-Nathan, T. S. (2011). Impact of technostress on end-user satisfaction and performance. *Journal of Management Information Systems*, 27(3), 303-334. <https://doi.org/10.2753/MIS0742-1222270309>
- UNCTAD. (2021). *World Investment Report 2021: Investing in Sustainable Recovery*. New York: United Nations.
- Wang, H., Lu, C., & Siu, O. L. (2022). Job satisfaction and well-being in employees: The moderating role of organizational support. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 37, 569-580
- Williams, C., & Martinez, R. (2021). The role of political stability in the performance of multinational enterprises. *Journal of World Business*, 56(3), 101190.
- Williams, K. Y., & O'Reilly, C. A. (2022). Demography and diversity in organizations: A review of 40 years of research. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 42, 101-122.
- Zhang, H., & Zhao, L. (2023). Corporate political strategy and firm performance: The moderating effect of institutional environments. *Strategic Management Journal*, 44(2), 307-328.