



EXPLORING THE IMPACT OF INFRASTRUCTURE, PAY INCENTIVES AND WORKPLACE ENVIRONMENT ON EMPLOYEES' PERFORMANCE (A CASE STUDY OF SARGODHA UNIVERSITY)

Saddat Hasnain Khan¹

Zarqa Azhar²

Sajida Parveen³

Farheen Naeem⁴

Malik Muhammad Sohail⁵

ABSTRACT

It is acknowledged that work systems cannot only affect commitment, competence, cost effectiveness and congruence but also have long term consequence for workers' well-being; there is some evidence to indicate that work systems designs may have effects on physical health, mental health and longevity of life itself. Conducive work environment ensures the wellbeing of employees as well as enables them to exert themselves to their roles with all vigor that may translate to higher productivity (Taiwo, 2009). This study aims to explore the impact of office facilities and workplace milieu on employees' performance in a university of Sargodha. A sample of 150 respondents of male and female employees of both teaching and non teaching category was selected. Chi-square and Gamma test were applied to interpret the findings of study.

Key Words: Infrastructure, Pay Incentives, Workplace Environment, Employees' Performance

INTRODUCTION

Infrastructure has been defined in terms of the physical facilities (roads, airports, utility supply systems, communication systems, water and waste disposal systems etc.), and the services

¹Department of Sociology, University of Sargodha, Sargodha, Pakistan.

²Department of Sociology, University of Sargodha, Sargodha, Pakistan.

³Department of Sociology, GC University, Faisalabad, Pakistan.

⁴Department of Sociology, GC University, Faisalabad, Pakistan.

⁵Department of Sociology, GC University, Faisalabad, Pakistan. E-mail: sohailmujahid@hotmail.com

(Water, sanitation, transport, energy) flowing from facilities (CIDA, 1996). According to Cascio, (2006) performance refers to the degree of achievement of the mission at work place that builds up an employee job. According to Stannack, (1996) Mostly researcher’s used the term performance to express the range of measurements of transactional efficiency and input & output efficiency.

Brenner, (2004) was of the opinion that “the ability to share knowledge throughout organizations depends on how the work environment is designed to enable organizations to utilize work environment as if it were an asset. This helps organizations to improve effectiveness and allow employees to benefit from collective knowledge. In addition, Brenner (2004) argued that work environment designed to suit employee’s satisfaction and free flow of exchange of ideas is a better medium of motivating employees towards higher productivity. Work environment when appropriately designed, motivates employees toward higher productivity. There are six factors which contribute to a toxic work environment hence contributing to low productivity of workers. The factors are: opaque management, biased boss, and company’s policies, working conditions, interpersonal relationship and pay (Taiwo, 2009).

The influence of organizational environment, which is mostly composed of several organizational, social and psychological elements, has been thoroughly examined in past two decades. In a number of studies employees’ motivation, job satisfaction, job involvement, job performance, and health are influenced by psycho-social environment of work organization (Srivastava, 1994). Although many factors that affect the employee performance, job commitment, job satisfaction, working Environment and motivation can be classified as such factors. A number of Studies, commitment referred as psychological condition which describes the employees’ relations with organization (Varol, 2010). Brill et al. (1984) ranked factors, which affect productivity according to their importance. The factors are sequenced based on the significance: furniture, noise, flexibility, comfort, communication, lighting, temperature and the air quality.

Table-1: Conceptual Framework

Background Variables	Infrastructure	Workplace Environment	Dependent Variable
Gender	Separate Office	Pay Incentives	Employees’ Performance
Education	Internet	Harassment	
Age	Facilities	Workload	
Designation			

Objectives:

- 1) To determine the impact of working environment on university employees performance.
- 2) To check the impact of pay incentives on performance of university employees.

- 3) To check the impact of infrastructure on employees performance of university of Sargodha.

Workplace environment

James (1996) concluded that the working as a team has significant impact on the satisfaction level of employees as it affects their performance. It is essential to recognize to the significance of these factors to boost the satisfaction level in the workforce. How employees perceive their work environment can affect employee's commitment, motivation, and performance and also helps organization to form a competitive edge. It is supported by research conducted by Brown et al. (1996) that a motivational and empowered work climate influences employee's attitudes toward work positively and improves work performance. 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. Following are some tools used to manage work environment to improve productivity. Noise control, contaminants and hazard control, enhancing friendly and encouraging human environment, job fit, rewards, feedback, work environment modeling, creating qualitative work life concepts and making physical working conditions favorable (Taiwo, 2009).

Workplace design needs to take into account of a wide range of issues. Creating better and higher performing workplace requires an awareness of how workplace impacts behavior and how behavior itself drives workplace performance. The relationship between work, the workplace and the tools of work, workplace becomes an essential part of work itself. Increasing workplace understanding is built on the identification that space has different characteristics: it performs different functions and there are different ways people work. People work individually and interact with others and this requires different workplace solutions (Chandrasekar, 2011). How workspace is designed and occupied affects not only how people feel, but also their work performance, their commitment to their employer, and the creation of new knowledge in the organization. These are the cornerstones of the level of research known as the environmental psychology of workspace (Vischer, 2008). According to Abdulla et al. (2010) Environmental factors represent the immediate job environment that contains skills required to perform a job, authority, autonomy, relationship with supervisors and co-workers and other working conditions.

EMPLOYEE'S PERFORMANCE

Cummings and Schwab, (1973) argue that performance is ultimately an individual phenomenon with environmental factors influencing performance mainly through their effect on the individual determinants of performance – ability and motivation. According to Collis and Montgomery, (1995) employee performance has been shown to have a significant positive effect on organizational performance. According to Adams, (1965) people are motivated to seek social equity in the rewards they receive for high performance. He suggests that the outcome from job

includes; pay recognition, promotion, social relationship and intrinsic reward. To get these rewards various inputs needs to be employed by the employees to the job as time, experience, efforts, education and loyalty. He also suggests that, people tend to view their outcomes and inputs as a ratio and then compare these ratios with others and turn to become motivated if this ratio is high. Identifying and selecting the best employees for particular jobs is an important task for organizations. High-performing workers are perfect since employee performance directly impacts the organization's bottom line. Poor performers can cost their employer money through the loss of production and in the costs of turnover and training (Cooper and Cartwright, 1994). According to Suhartini, (1995) employee performance is a combined result of effort, ability, and perception of tasks. High performance is a step towards the achievement of organizational goals and tasks. Therefore, efforts are needed to improve employee performance. Employee performance is the fundamental element of any organization and the most important factor for the success of the organization and its performance. It is true that most of the organizations are dependent on its employees, but one or two employee cannot change the organization's future. The organization's performance is the shared and combined effort of all of its employees. Performance is the key multi character factor intended to attain outcomes which has a major connection with planned objectives of the organization (Sabir et al. 2012).

INFRASTRUCTURE

Office environment

The office environment in which employees work and carry out most of their activities can impact on their productivity. The quality and quantity of work generated by employees are influenced by the office environment (Keeling and Kallaus, 1996). While Quible, (1996) points out those poor environmental conditions can cause inefficient worker productivity as well as reduce their job satisfaction, which in turn will impact on the financial well-being of the organization. Most people spend 50% of their lives within indoor environments, which greatly influence their mental status, actions, abilities and performance (Sundstrom, 1994). Better outcomes and increased productivity is assumed to be the result of better workplace environment. Better physical environment of office will boosts the employees and finally improve their productivity. Various literature relate to the study of multiple offices and office buildings shows that the factors such as dissatisfaction, disorderly workplaces and the physical environment, loss of employees' productivity (Carnevale, 1992; Clements- Croome, 1997).

Office environment can be divided into two components; physical and behavioral. The physical environment relate to the office occupiers' ability to physically connect with their office environment. The behavioral environment is related 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 occupant falls into two main categories office layout and office comfort, and the behavioral environment represents the two main components

namely interaction and distraction (Amir and Sahibzada, 2010). Employees in different organizations have various office designs. Every office has unique furniture and spatial arrangements, lighting and heating arrangements and different levels of noise. This study analyzes the impact of the office design factors on employees' productivity. Literature reveals that good office design has a positive effect on employees' productivity and the same assumption is being tested in this study for the offices of Saudi Aramco, project management in Saudi Arabia (Al-Anzi, 2009).

Office Furniture

Administrative office managers should be knowledgeable about office furniture. The selection improper office furniture may be carry out for a long time, as it is often difficult discarding the pre-owned furniture, which is commonly purchased rather than leased or rented. Another issue, which is important to consider in enhancing employee productivity, is by selecting and using proper furniture and equipment, the important physical factors in the office (Keeling and Kallaus, 1996; Quible et al. 1996). Selecting appropriate office furniture is an important consideration in which office managers need to pay more attention to make sure that the ergonomic environment is properly maintained. While ergonomic environment is important in increasing employee productivity, adjustable office furniture, such as desks and chairs, which can support employees in generating their work is recommended, to allow the work comfortably throughout the day (Burke, 2000).

WORKPLACE ENVIRONMENT AND EMPLOYEES PERFORMANCE

Incentives

The literature meaning of word "reward" as it is something the offer by the organization to the workers in response of their performance and contributions which are expected by the workers mostly (Agarwal, 1998). According to (Opkara, 2002) job satisfaction is an outcome of different factors like pay, promotion, the work itself, supervision, relationships with co-workers and opportunities for promotions. The pay is a very important rather than other factor. A reward can be extrinsic or intrinsic it can be a cash reward such as bounces or it can be recognition such as naming a worker employee of the month, and at other times a reward refers to a tangible incentive, reward is the thing that an organization gives to the employee in response of their performance so that the employees become motivated for future positive behavior. In a corporate environment rewards can take several forms. It includes the cash bonuses, recognition awards, free goods and free trips. It is important that the rewards have a lasting impression on the employee and it will continue to verify the employee's perception that they are valued mostly (Sheikh et al. 2010).

According to (La Belle, 2005), different individuals have different perceptions of rewards. Some individuals may consider cash as a sufficient reward for their efforts at work, while others may consider holidays and material incentives (such as a car) as more rewarding in exchange for their

work. In a study conducted by Probst and Brubaker, (2001) they concluded that the difference between job satisfaction and dissatisfaction lies in the amount and the type of rewards provided or given to the employees and the amount and the percentage and type of rewards that the employee expects he/she deserves.

Different researcher conducted studies and found that job dissatisfaction is the outcome of insecurity among employees (Ashford et al., 1989; Davy et al., 1991). Nguyen et al., (2003) investigate relationship among job satisfaction and pay was conducted and it was also found that job satisfaction is affected by the pay. According to Guest, (2004); Silla et al. (2005) important factors like low job security, working conditions and the nature of work, low wages and lack of promotion, low job autonomy have adverse affect on the level of job satisfaction of employees.

Employee's intrinsic motivation can be defined as the source of motivation which actually comes from performing a task for its own sake. Employees who are intrinsically motivated often perceive that their work gives them a sense of accomplishment and achievement or they feel that they are doing something worthy. Extrinsic motivation is the motivation that the employees perform to avoid punishment or acquire material or social rewards. In this case, employees perform not for their own sake but rather for their outcomes (George and Jones, 2005). Johnson et al. (1986) contend that by providing employees with as much rewards as possible (in proportion to their work efforts), employees are able to function more efficiently. They are also less likely to make mistakes in their work, and managers are also able to successfully boost the morale of their employees.

Khan, (2005) explained the nature of government organizations in Pakistan and studied how to motivate the performance of government employees. He suggested government organizations not give many incentives to employees on the basis of their performance; their motivation level is low as compare to private sector employees. He argued that due to job security and no fear of firing, employees are not willing to work at their full potential. He argued that because government organizations are similar to non -profit organizations, the same motivational techniques used in non-profit organizations can be used in government sectors to motivate employees. Work environment plays a key role in developing employees' attitudes and behaviors. Motivation is also dependent upon work environment.

In an incentive-based environment, incentive contracting is intended to reward personnel based on performance. An incentive is normally given by an owner or manager to subordinates to encourage them to perform better. The amount of the incentive is normally determined by the owner, and subsequently negotiated with subordinates or. Owners usually offer incentive for early project completion, high quality work delivery, or for less costly project completion. Incentive can be either financial or non-financial, and may recognize personnel contribution to the entire project process (Bubshait, 2003).

Workload

Workload refers to the intensity of job assignments. It is a source of mental stress for employees. Stress is an active state of mind in which human being faces both an opportunity and constraint. Allen, (1996) defined workload as the total amount of time a faculty member devotes to activities like teaching, research, administration, and community services etc. A study conducted by Moy, (2006) says that Clerical and Professional Workers' Association found that 65.5% of workers believed a five-day work week would help them better manage their private matters, where as half of respondents believed that this practice would allow them to spend more time with their families and improve their quality of life which helps in improving their productivity at work. Several studies have highlighted the consequences of work overload. Workload stress can be defined as unwillingness to come to work and a feeling of constant pressure accompanied by the general physiological, psychological, and behavioral stress symptoms. Numerous studies found that job stress influences the employees' job satisfaction and their overall performance in their work. Because most of the organizations now are more demanding for better job outcomes. In fact, modern times have been called as the "age of anxiety and stress" (Rehman et al. 2012). Excessive work interference with family is also associated with greater stress mostly, job burnout, increased absenteeism and higher turnover (Sutton 2000; Anderson et al., 2002). According to Jex and Beehr, (1991) strains associated with being overworked have been found to be uniformly negative across behavioral, psychological, and physiological outcome domains. According to Kirchmeyer, (1995) Researchers indicated negative links in between experience of work/nonworking conflict and organizational commitment.

Long working hours may affect the physical condition of employees. The employees facing workload have a moderate level of stress in which work to family conflict rises. Workers in stress and having work to family conflict also have intention to quit the job because they are not performing their social roles efficiently. In Pakistan, there is problem that employers are majorly concerned with less staff and as a result, the workload of employees is increasing. Mostly, employees of banks in Pakistan have increasing frustration due to heavy workload. Stress usually generates from workload and workload extends working hours on jobs which ultimately disturbs the incumbent's roles in the family and society as well, because a worker has to fulfill other roles in his life (Imam et al. 2010).

Harassment

Harassment is a type of conflict that is difficult to manage for several reasons. First, harassment is often surrounded by silence, unspoken words and allusion. Second, harassment is often a question of perception. Harassment is highly subjective and speaks more to a person's emotions than their reason, particularly because it poses a threat to their psychological integrity and identity. Third, harassment is an issue of power between individuals. In most cases, values, morality provide a framework for and "civilize" the exercise of power. At the individual level, the uncivilized exercise of power results in violence and psychological harassment. Moreover harassment is the modern-

day “big bad wolf.” Some employees tend to cry wolf every time they are the target of behavior that makes them uncomfortable, particularly when they are given an unsatisfactory performance evaluation, when they are routinely monitored in an effort to improve their work performance (Lévesque, 2007).

Workplace harassment means negative office interaction that affects the individual’s job by affecting the terms and conditions and job decisions and such actions do not fall within the boundaries of law. In a country like Pakistan, women have started working along men, side by side in the organizations, and although women are being welcomed in the organizations across the country, the traditional organizational settings are still male dominated in their setup and as a result, women tend to face resistance in getting accepted as equals in the organizations (Nazir et al. 2011). Parker and Griffin, (2002) have studied gender harassment’s negative consequences on distress and over performance demand.

According to (Lee, 2005) Psychological harassment and bullying are reduced when employers promote a fair and team-based work climate; provide sufficient job autonomy and resources to their workers so as to head-off unnecessary conflicts. When a supportive team environment exists, victims will feel greater sense of empowerment and control, on the one hand, and bullies will have fewer incentives to engage in dysfunctional, conflict-escalating behaviors, on the other. Another recent study of a diverse occupational sample of 180 workers in the Canadian prairies found that 40% reported experiencing at least 1 of 45 specific acts indicative of psychological harassment or bullying on a weekly basis for at least 6 months. An additional 10% of the sample reported experiencing 5 or more such acts on a weekly basis for at least 6 months.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

In order to investigate the research goals, a total of 150 respondents of male and female employees of both teaching and non teaching category were selected. Selected participants answered a survey questionnaire. Wimmer and Dominick, (2006) write, “Surveys are now used in all areas of life. Businesses, consumer groups, politicians, and advertisers use them in their everyday decision-making process”. Babbie, (1992) writes, “Surveys may be used for descriptive, explanatory, and exploratory purposes. They are chiefly used in studies that have individual people as the units of analysis”. The universe is set of all units that the research covers, or to which it can be generalized (Neuman, 2006).The term “units” is employed because it is not necessarily people who are being sampled-the researcher may want to sample from a universe of nations, regions, schools, etc. (Bryman, 2001).The universe of this research comprised male and female employees of both teaching and non teaching of employees of University of Sargodha. Sample was collected by convenience and selective methods. The reason for sampling rather than collecting data from the entire population, are self evident. In research investigations involving several hundreds or thousands of elements, it would be practically impossible to collect data from, or test, or examine

every element. Even if it were possible, it would be prohibitive in terms of time, cost and other human resources. That's why sampling to make a research feasible (Sekaran, 2010). Before the collection of data from the specified sample, a pre-test was taken in the selected population. It gives the researcher an opportunity to see weaknesses. The Reliability Statistics of the pre-testing was "Cronbach's Alpha-.861".

DATA ANALYSIS

Part-A (Uni-variate analysis)

Table-1: Distribution of the respondent about their socio-economic background

Gender	Frequency	Percentage
Male	75	50.0
Female	75	50.0
Age (in years)		
Up to 30 years	80	53.3
31 to 40 years	47	31.3
41 to 50 years	23	15.3
Education level		
Matric	7	4.7
Intermediate	20	13.3
Graduation	44	29.3
Master or above	79	52.7
Working position		
Teaching staff	75	50.0
Non-teaching staff	75	50.0

Table-1 shows that about a half (50.0%) of the respondents were males and other half of them were females. Table presents the age distribution of the respondents. More than a half i.e. 53.3 percent of the respondents had up to 30 years of age, little less than one-third i.e. 31.3 percent of them had 31-40 years of age and 15.3 percent of them had 41-50 years of age. So majority of the respondents belonged to young age group. Table visibly presents the educational level of the respondents. Table shows that only 4.7 percent of the respondents were matriculated, while 13.3 percent of them were intermediate, 29.3 percent of them were graduated and a majority of the respondents i.e. 52.7 percent of them had mastered or above level of education. Above findings shows that majority of the respondents had graduation and above level of education. Table shows that a half (50.0%) of the respondents was teaching staff of the Sargodha University and other 50.0 percent of them were non-teaching staff.

Table-2: Distribution of the respondents about to their opinion about the infrastructure

Respondents' opinion about infrastructure	Strongly agree		Agree		Neutral		Disagree		Strongly disagree	
	F.	%	F.	%	F.	%	F.	%	F.	%
Do you think that your furniture is according to your need	16	10.7	66	44.0	21	14.0	39	26.0	8	5.3
Do you think that your furniture is comfortable enough so that you can work without getting tired	17	11.3	47	31.3	37	24.7	28	18.7	21	14.0
Do you think that office environment influences your performance	83	55.3	53	35.3	11	7.3	3	2.0	0	0.0

Table-2 presents the respondents' opinion about the infrastructure on their work place. Only 10.7 percent of the respondents were strongly agreed, a major proportion i.e. 44.0 percent of them were agreed with the thinking that their furniture is according to their need, while 14.0 percent of them were neutral, 26.0 percent of them were disagreed and remaining 5.3 percent of them were strongly disagreed with the furniture of their workplace. Just 11.3 percent of the respondents were strongly agreed, 31.3 percent of them were agreed with the thinking that their furniture is comfortable enough so that they can work without getting tired, while 24.7 percent of them were neutral, 18.7 percent of them were disagreed and remaining 14.0 percent of them were strongly disagreed with this opinion. A majority i.e. 55.3 percent of the respondents were strongly agreed, 35.3 percent of them were agreed with the thinking that office environment influences on their performance, while 7.3 percent of them were neutral and 2.0 percent of them were disagreed with this opinion.

Table-3: Distribution of the respondents about their opinion about the room environment

Respondents' opinion about room environment	Strongly agree		Agree		Neutral		Disagree		Strongly disagree	
	F.	%	F.	%	F.	%	F.	%	F.	%
Do you think that your room temperature is pleasant enough for work	17	11.3	38	25.3	21	14.0	50	33.3	24	16.0
Do you think that good room temperature increase your work performance	88	58.7	50	33.3	8	5.3	4	2.7	0	0.0
Do you think that overall temperature of your workspace is Pleasant to work easily	28	18.7	31	20.7	30	20.0	50	33.3	11	7.3

Table-3 presents the respondents' opinion about the room environment on their work place. Only 11.3 percent of the respondents were strongly agreed, about one-fourth i.e. 25.3 percent of them were agreed with the thinking that their room temperature is pleasant enough for work, while 14.0 percent of them were neutral, 33.30 percent of them were disagreed and 16.0 percent of them were

strongly disagreed with this opinion. A majority i.e. 58.7 percent of the respondents were strongly agreed, about one-third i.e. 33.3 percent of them were agreed with the thinking that good room temperature increase their work performance, while 5.3 percent of them were neutral, 2.7 percent of them were disagreed with this opinion. About 18.7 percent of the respondents were strongly agreed, 20.7 percent of them were agreed with the thinking that overall temperature of their workspace is pleasant to work easily, while 20.0 percent of them were neutral, 33.3 percent of them were disagreed and 7.3 percent of them were strongly disagreed with this opinion. So the room temperature had a good impact on the employee's performance.

Table-4: Distribution of the respondents about their own separate office

Having own separate office	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	51	34.0
No	99	66.0
Total	150	100.0

Table-4 indicates that about one-third i.e. 34.0 percent of the respondents reported that they having own separate office, while a large majority i.e. 66.0 percent of them never having a separate office.

Table-5: Distribution of the respondents about to their opinion about the separate office

Respondents' opinion about the separate office	Strongly agree		Agree		Neutral		Disagree		Strongly disagree	
	F.	%	F.	%	F.	%	F.	%	F.	%
Do you think that separate office is necessary to work effectively and efficiently	66	44.0	51	34.0	16	10.7	14	9.3	3	2.0
Do you think that separate offices can improve employees performance	67	44.7	57	38.0	16	10.7	8	5.3	2	1.3
Do you think that separate office is the need of every employee	34	22.7	50	33.3	24	16.0	28	18.7	14	9.3

Table-5 presents the respondents' opinion about the separate office. A major proportion i.e. 44.0 percent of the respondents were strongly agreed, about one-third i.e. 34.0 percent of them were agreed with the thinking that separate office is necessary to work effectively and efficiently, while 10.7 percent of them were neutral, 9.3 percent of them were disagreed and only 2.0 percent of them were strongly disagreed with this opinion. So the separate office had very effective role in the employee's performance. A major proportion i.e. 44.7 percent of the respondents were strongly agreed, more than one-third i.e. 38.0 percent of them were agreed with the opinion that separate office can improve employees performance, while 10.7 percent of them were neutral, 5.3 percent of them were disagreed and only 1.3 percent of them were strongly disagreed with this opinion. So the separate office can improve employee's performance. About 22.7 percent of the respondents were strongly agreed, about one-third i.e. 33.3 percent of them were agreed with the opinion that

separate office is the need of every employee, while 16.0 percent of them were neutral, 18.7 percent of them were disagreed and 9.3 percent of them were strongly disagreed with this opinion.

Table-6: Distribution of the respondents about their opinion about the internet facility

Respondents' opinion about the internet facility	Strongly agree		Agree		Neutral		Disagree		Strongly disagree	
	F.	%	F.	%	F.	%	F.	%	F.	%
Do you have access to internet facility at work place	53	35.3	66	44.0	7	4.7	18	12.0	6	4.0
Do you think that internet help you to work in efficient way	73	48.7	59	39.3	12	8.0	6	4.0	0	0.0
Do you think that favorable environmental conditions (internet facilities, comfortable temperature, separate offices etc) in the work place help you to complete your work task in time	10	66.7	46	30.7	3	2.0	1	0.7	0	0.0

Table-6 presents the respondents' opinion about the internet facility. More than one-third i.e. 35.3 percent of the respondents were strongly agreed and a major proportion i.e. 44.0 percent of them were agreed that they have access to internet facility at work place, while 4.7 percent of them were neutral, 12.0 percent of them were disagreed and only 4.0 percent of them were strongly disagreed with this facility. Little less than a half i.e. 48.7 percent of the respondents were strongly agreed, 39.3 percent of them were agreed with the thinking that internet help them to work in efficient way, while 8.0 percent of them were neutral, 4.0 percent of them were disagreed with this opinion. So a huge majority of them had opinion that the internet helps them to work in efficient way. A significant majority i.e. 66.7 percent of the respondents were strongly agreed, 30.7 percent of them were agreed with the thinking that favorable environmental conditions (internet facilities, comfortable temperature, separate offices etc) in the work place help them to complete their work task in time, while only 2.0 percent of them were neutral and only one respondent was disagreed with this opinion.

Table-7 presents the respondents' opinion about the incentives. More than one-third i.e. 37.3 percent of the respondents were strongly agreed and a major proportion i.e. 40.0 percent of them were agreed with the thinking that employees are recognized as valuable work assets, while 20.7 percent of them were neutral, 2.0 percent of them were disagreed with this opinion. So majority of them had thinking that employees are recognized as valuable work assets. About one-fourth i.e. 26.0 percent of the respondents were strongly agreed and 30.0 percent of them were agreed with the opinion that have an opportunity for career advancement in their current organization.

Table-7: Distribution of the respondents about their opinion about the incentives

Respondents' opinion about the incentives	Strongly agree		Agree		Neutral		Disagree		Strongly disagree	
	F.	%	F.	%	F.	%	F.	%	F.	%
	Do you think that employees are recognized as valuable work assets	56	37.3	60	40.0	31	20.7	3	2.0	0
Do you have an opportunity for career advancement in your current organization	39	26.0	45	30.0	44	29.3	17	11.3	5	3.3
Do you have good opportunities to improve your skills here	41	27.3	69	46.0	24	16.0	10	6.7	6	4.0
Do you think that your job is secure	42	28.0	63	42.0	23	15.3	17	11.3	5	3.3
Do you think that your job status is satisfied	30	20.0	61	40.7	29	19.3	22	14.7	8	5.3
Do you think that your salary is appropriate to your work load	23	15.3	38	25.3	28	18.7	51	34.0	10	6.7
Do you think that promotions are made fairly on the basis of performance	16	10.7	32	21.3	41	27.3	30	20.0	31	20.7
Do you received recognition for your job accomplishment	19	12.7	56	37.3	38	25.3	27	18.0	10	6.7
Do you think that recognition improve your job performance	64	42.7	66	44.0	14	9.3	2	1.3	4	2.7
Do you think that rewards that you receive are less than job accomplishment	24	16.0	61	40.7	22	14.7	35	23.3	8	5.3
Do you think that better incentives can improve employees' performance	86	57.3	48	32.0	8	5.3	6	4.0	2	1.3
Do you think that bonuses increase the employees performance	95	63.3	45	30.0	7	4.7	2	1.3	1	0.7
Do you think that extrinsic rewards are more important than intrinsic rewards	37	24.7	31	20.7	30	20.0	21	14.0	31	20.7

More than one-fourth i.e. 27.3 percent of the respondents were strongly agreed and a major proportion i.e. 46.0 percent of them were agreed with the opinion that have good opportunity to improve their skills here, while 16.0 percent of them were neutral, 6.7 percent of them were disagreed and 4.0 percent of them were strongly disagreed with this opinion. More than one-fourth i.e. 28.0 percent of the respondents were strongly agreed and a major proportion i.e. 42.0 percent of them were agreed that their job is secure, while 15.3 percent of them were neutral, 11.3 percent of them were disagreed and 3.3 percent of them were strongly disagreed with this opinion. About 40.7 percent were agreed with their thinking that their job status is satisfied, while 14.7 percent of them

were disagreed with this opinion. About 15.3 percent of the respondents were strongly agreed that their salary is appropriate to their work load, while 34.0 percent of them were disagreed and 6.7 percent of them were strongly disagreed with this opinion. About 10.7 percent of the respondents were strongly agreed and 21.3 percent were them were agreed with their thinking that promotions are made fairly on the basis of performance. About 12.7 percent of the respondents were strongly agreed and more than one-third i.e. 37.3 percent were them were agreed with the opinion that they received recognition for their job accomplishment, while 25.3 percent of them were neutral, 18.0 percent of them were disagreed and 6.7 percent of them were strongly disagreed with this opinion. About 42.7 percent of the respondents were strongly agreed and a major proportion i.e. 44.0 percent of them were agreed with the thinking that recognition improve their job performance, while 9.3 percent of them were neutral, 1.3 percent of them were disagreed and 2.7 percent of them were strongly disagreed with this opinion.

About 16.0 percent of the respondents were strongly agreed and a major proportion i.e. 40.7 percent of them were agreed with the thinking that rewards they received are less than job accomplishment, while 14.7 percent of them were neutral, 23.3 percent of them were disagreed and 5.3 percent of them were strongly disagreed with this opinion. Majorities i.e. 57.3 percent of the respondents were strongly agreed and 32.0 percent of them were agreed with the thinking that better incentives can improve employees' performance, while 5.3 percent of them were neutral, 4.0 percent of them were disagreed and 1.3 percent of them were strongly disagreed with this opinion. Large majorities i.e. 63.3 percent of the respondents were strongly agreed and 30.0 percent of them were agreed with the thinking that bonuses increase the employee's performance, while 4.7 percent of them were neutral, 1.3 percent of them were disagreed and 0.7 percent of them were strongly disagreed with this opinion. About one-fourth i.e. 24.7 percent of the respondents were strongly agreed and 20.7 percent of them were agreed with the thinking that extrinsic rewards are more important than intrinsic reward, while 20.0 percent of them were neutral, 14.0 percent of them were disagreed and 20.7 percent of them were strongly disagreed with this opinion.

Table-8: Distribution of the respondents about offering any bonus to them in last year

Offering any bonus to them in previous year	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	56	37.3
No	94	62.7
Total	150	100.0

Table-8 shows that more than one-third i.e. 37.3 percent of the respondents reported that their institutions were offering any bonus to them in previous year, while a large majority i.e. 62.7 percent of them were replied negatively.

Table-9: Distribution of the respondents about their opinion about harassment

Respondents' opinion about harassment	Strongly agree		Agree		Neutral		Disagree		Strongly disagree	
	F.	%	F.	%	F.	%	F.	%	F.	%
	Do you ever observed or experienced harassment at workplace.	18	12.0	36	24.0	25	16.7	39	26.0	32
Do you think that Harassment is a big obstacle in the way of efficient work	63	42.0	59	39.3	22	14.7	4	2.7	2	1.3
Do you think that harassment is a big obstacle in the way of your promotion	50	33.3	49	32.7	27	18.0	21	14.0	3	2.0
Do you think that office Environment is suitable for female employees	36	24.0	51	34.0	35	23.3	19	12.7	9	6.0
Do you think that male officers make unfair use of their authority	26	17.3	36	24.0	36	24.0	33	22.0	19	12.7
Do you think that female employees have to face more harassment than male employees	44	29.3	62	41.3	12	8.0	21	14.0	11	7.3
Do you think that things like harassment create a stress full environment at workplace	84	56.0	46	30.7	11	7.3	7	4.7	2	1.3

Table-9 presents the respondents' opinion about harassment. 12.0 percent of the respondents were strongly agreed and about one-fourth i.e. 24.0 percent of them were agreed that they ever observed or experienced harassment at workplace, while 16.7 percent of them were neutral, 26.0 percent of them were disagreed and 21.3 percent of them were strongly disagreed with this opinion. So majority of them had thinking that sampled employed had no harassment at their workplace. A major proportion i.e. 42.0 percent of the respondents were strongly agreed and 39.3 percent of them were agreed with the thinking that harassment is a big obstacle in the way of efficient work, while 14.7 percent of them were neutral, 2.7 percent of them were disagreed and 1.3 percent of them were strongly disagreed with this opinion. It is clear from the above findings that the harassment is a big obstacle in the way of efficient work.

About one-third respondents were strongly agreed and 32.7 percent of them were agreed that harassment is a big obstacle in the way of their promotion. While 18.0 percent of them were neutral, 14.0 percent of them were disagreed and 2.0 percent of them were strongly disagreed with this opinion. It is clear from the above findings that the harassment is a big obstacle in the way of promotion. About one-fourth i.e. 24.0 percent of the respondents were strongly agreed and 34.0 percent of them were agreed with the thinking that office environment is suitable for female

employees, while 23.3 percent of them were neutral, 12.7 percent of them were disagreed and 6.0 percent of them were strongly disagreed with this opinion.

About 17.3 percent of the respondents were strongly agreed and 24.0 percent of them were agreed with the thinking that male officers make unfair use of their authority, while another 24.0 percent of them were neutral, 22.0 percent of them were disagreed and 12.7 percent of them were strongly disagreed with this opinion. About 29.3 percent of the respondents were strongly agreed and 41.3 percent of them were agreed with the thinking that female employees have to face more harassment than male employees, while 8.0 percent of them were neutral, 14.0 percent of them were disagreed and 7.3 percent of them were strongly disagreed with this opinion. So a large majority of the respondents had female employees have to face more harassment than male employees. Majorities i.e. 56.0 percent of the respondents were strongly agreed and 30.7 percent of them were agreed with the thinking that things like harassment create a stressful environment at workplace, while 7.3 percent of them were neutral, 4.7 percent of them were disagreed and 1.3 percent of them were strongly disagreed with this opinion. So harassment creates a stressful environment at workplace.

Table-10: Distribution of the respondents about their opinion about workload

Respondents' opinion about workload	Strongly agree		Agree		Neutral		Disagree		Strongly disagree	
	F.	%	F.	%	F.	%	F.	%	F.	%
	Do you think your workload disturb your social life	36	24.0	60	40.0	18	12.0	25	16.7	11
Do you think that your workload is effects your health	40	26.7	57	38.0	18	12.0	25	16.7	10	6.7
Do you think that your workload force you to do over time work	30	20.0	49	32.7	31	20.7	28	18.7	12	8.0
Do you think too much workload creates stress	57	38.0	64	42.7	16	10.7	11	7.3	2	1.3
Do you think that too much workload negatively affect your performance	41	27.3	64	42.7	20	13.3	20	13.3	5	3.3
Do you think that comfortable environment can help you to complete your daily tasks easily	70	46.7	64	42.7	13	8.7	2	1.3	1	0.7
Do you think that challenging task improve your performance	63	42.0	62	41.3	18	12.0	6	4.0	1	0.7
Do you able to complete your work task in given time	57	38.0	66	44.0	18	12.0	6	4.0	3	2.0

Table-10 presents the respondents' opinion about workload. 24.0 percent of the respondents were strongly agreed and a major proportion i.e. 40.0 percent of them were agreed with the thinking that

their workload disturbed their social life, while 12.0 percent of them were neutral, 16.7 percent of them were disagreed and 7.3 percent of them were strongly disagreed with this opinion. So majority of them had thinking that workload disturbed their social life. More than one-fourth i.e. 26.7 percent of the respondents were strongly agreed and 38.0 percent of them were agreed with the thinking that their workload is effects their health, while 12.0 percent of them were neutral, 16.7 percent of them were disagreed and 6.7 percent of them were strongly disagreed with this opinion.

More than one-fifth i.e. 20.0 percent of the respondents were strongly agreed and 32.7 percent of them were agreed with the thinking that their workload force them do over time work, while 20.7 percent of them were neutral, 18.7 percent of them were disagreed and 8.0 percent of them were strongly disagreed with this opinion. About 38.0 percent of the respondents were strongly agreed and 42.7 percent of them were agreed with the thinking that too much workload create stress, while 10.7 percent of them were neutral, 7.3 percent of them were disagreed and only 1.3 percent of them were strongly disagreed with this opinion. So a huge majority of the respondents had thinking that too much workload creates stress.

About 27.3 percent of the respondents were strongly agreed and 42.7 percent of them were agreed with the thinking that too much workload negatively affect their performance, 13.3 percent of them were neutral and another 13.3 percent of them were disagreed and 3.3 percent of them were strongly disagreed with this opinion. A major proportion i.e. 46.7 percent of the respondents were strongly agreed and 42.7 percent of them were agreed with the thinking that comfortable environment can help them to complete their daily tasks easily, 8.7 percent of them were neutral and 1.3 percent of them were disagreed and 0.7 percent of them were strongly disagreed with this opinion.

A major proportion i.e. 40.0 percent of the respondents were strongly agreed and 41.3 percent of them were agreed with the thinking that challenging task improve their performance, 12.0 percent of them were neutral, 4.0 percent of them were disagreed and 0.7 percent of them were strongly disagreed with this opinion. About 38.0 percent of the respondents were strongly agreed and 44.0 percent of them were agreed with the thinking that challenging task improve their performance, 12.0 percent of them were neutral, 4.0 percent of them were disagreed and 0.7 percent of them were strongly disagreed with this opinion. The indexation is pasted in Table-11.

Table-12 presents the association between infrastructure and employees performance. Chi-square value shows a non-significant association between infrastructure of work place and employee's performance. Gamma value also shows no relationship between the variables. It means infrastructure of work place had no impact on employee's performance. So the hypothesis "It is more likely that better infrastructure have positive impact on employees performance of university of Sargodha" is rejected.

Table-11: Indexation

Variable	No. of items in Matrix Question	No. of categories in Index variable	Min. Score	Max. Score	Mean Score	SD	Alpha value
Employees performance	19	5	41	71	56.58	4.59	.7826
Infrastructure	2	5	2	10	5.56	2.23	.8704
Workplace environment	8	5	7	25	15.65	3.66	.7309
Incentives	5	5	6	21	12.78	2.64	.6801
Harassment	6	5	8	26	14.64	3.46	.6826
Workload	6	5	6	22	12.82	4.04	.7071

PART-B (Bivariate Analysis)**Testing Of Hypotheses**

Hypothesis 1: Better infrastructure has positive impact on employees' performance

Table-12: Association between infrastructure and employees performance

Infrastructure	Employees performance			Total
	Low	Medium	High	
Low	11 19.3%	33 57.9%	13 22.8%	57 100.0%
Medium	14 24.6%	26 45.6%	17 29.8%	57 100.0%
High	4 11.1%	22 61.1%	10 27.8%	36 100.0%
Total	29 19.3%	81 54.0%	40 26.7%	150 100.0%

Chi-square = 8.85 d.f = 4 significance = 0.426^{NS} Gamma = 0.096 NS= non-significant

Hypothesis 2: Better incentives for employees at workplace can improve the employees' performance

Table-13 presents the association between incentive and employees' performance. Chi-square value shows a significant association between incentives and employee's performance. Gamma value also shows positive relationship between the variables. It means incentives had positive impact on employee's performance. So the hypothesis "It is more likely that better incentives for employees at workplace can improve the employees' performance" is accepted.

Table-13: Association between incentives place environment and employees performance

Incentives	Employees performance			Total
	Low	Medium	High	
Low	10	12	5	27
	37.0%	44.4%	18.5%	100.0%
Medium	15	64	23	102
	14.7%	62.7%	22.5%	100.0%
High	4	5	12	21
	19.0%	23.8%	57.1%	100.0%
Total	29	81	40	150
	19.3%	54.0%	26.7%	100.0%

Chi-square = 9.58 d.f = 4 significance = 0.042 *Gamma = 0.314* = Significant

Hypothesis-3: Workload affects the employee's performance negatively

Table-14: Association between workload and employees performance

Workload	Employees performance			Total
	Low	Medium	High	
Low	7	27	9	43
	16.3%	62.8%	20.9%	100.0%
Medium	18	36	23	77
	23.4%	46.8%	29.9%	100.0%
High	4	18	8	30
	13.3%	60.0%	26.7%	100.0%
Total	29	81	40	150
	19.3%	54.0%	26.7%	100.0%

Chi-square = 3.80 d.f = 4 Significance = 0.433^{NS} Gamma = 0.063 NS= non-significant

Table-14 presents the association between workload and employees' performance. Chi-square value shows a non-significant association between workload and employee's performance. Gamma value also shows no relationship between the variables. It means workload also had no impact on employees' performance. So the hypothesis "It is more likely that too much workload affects the employees performance negatively" is rejected.

Hypothesis-4: female employees have to face more harassment at workplace than male

Table-15 presents the association between gender and facing harassment. Chi-square value shows a non-significant association between gender and harassment. Gamma value also shows no relationship between the variables. It means gender discrimination was not found between the employees of Sargodha University. So the hypothesis "It is more likely that female employees have to face more harassment at workplace than male employees" is rejected.

Table-15: Association between gender and harassment

Gender	Harassment			Total
	Low	Medium	High	
Male	33 44.0%	30 40.0%	12 16.0%	75 100.0%
Female	30 40.0%	35 46.7%	10 13.3%	75 100.0%
Total	63 42.0%	65 43.3%	22 14.7%	150 100.0%

Chi-square = 0.70 d.f = 2 significance = 0.701^{NS} Gamma = 0.030 NS= non-significant

CONCLUSION

The research investigates the impact of workplace environment and infrastructure on employee's performance. Analysis and interpretation of the data have empirically demonstrated that infrastructure at workplace had no significant impact on employees performance. The results of impact of incentives at workplace had a positive impact on employee's performance of university of Sargodha. The results of high workload on affects the employees performance negatively is rejected. The hypothesis "Attitude of the head of the department will be associated with the employees' performance" is accepted. One of the finding of the study is very impressive in which the results of the hypothesis "female employees have to face more harassment at workplace than male employees" is rejected. The finding shows that workplace environment is suitable for female employees.

REFERENCES

- Abdulla, J., Djebarni, R. and Mellahi, K. (2010)** Determinants of job satisfaction in the uae-a case study of the Dubai Police, Vol. 40, pp.126-146.
- Adams, J. S. (1965)** Inequity in social exchange. In I. Berkowitz (ed.), advances in experimental social psychology. New York: academic press.
- Agarwal, N. C. (1998)** Reward systems: emerging trends and issues. Canadian psychology, Vol.39, pp. 60-70.
- Allen, H. I. (1996)** Faculty workload and productivity in the 1990s: preliminary findings, 1996 almanac of higher education.
- Allen, T. D., Herst, C., Bruck, S. and Sutton, M. (2000)** Consequences associated with work-to-family conflict: a review and agenda for future research, Journal of occupational health psychology, Vol. 5, pp.278-308.
- Al-anzi, N. M (2009)** Workplace environment and its impacts on employee's performance: a study, submitted to project management department in Saudiaranco, Open University of Malaysia.
- Amir, F. and Sahibzada, S. A. (2010)** Measuring the impact of office environment on performance level of employees in the private sector of Pakistan, Faculty of management sciences, Shaheed Zulfiqar Ali Bhutto Institute of Science and Technology, Islamabad, Pakistan.

- Anderson, S. E. (2002)** Formal organizational initiatives and informal workplace practices: links to work-family conflict and job-related outcomes. *Journal of management*, Vol. 28, pp.787-810
- Ashford, S., Lee, C. and Bobko, P. (1989)** Content, causes, and consequences of job insecurity: a theory-based measure and substantive test. *Academy Management Journal*, Vol. 32, pp. 803-829.
- Babbie, E. (1992)** The practice of social research (6th edition). Wadsworth group: a division of Thomson learning, inc, California.
- Billings, A. G. and Moos, R. S. (1982)** Work stress and the stress-buffering roles of work and family resources, *Journal of Occupational Behavior*, Vol. 3, pp. 215-232.
- Brenner, P. (2004)** Workers physical surrounding, impact bottom line accounting: smarts pros.com.
- Brill, M., Margulis, S. and Konar, E. B. (1984)** Using office design to increase productivity. *Workplace Design and Productivity*. buildings/iaq, pp.495-500.
- Brown, S. P. and Leigh, T. W. (1996)** A new look at psychological climate and its relationship to job involvement, effort, and performance, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 81, pp. 358-368.
- Bryman, A. (2001)** Social research methods. Oxford university press.
- Bubshait, A. A. (2003)** Incentives/disincentives contracts and its effects on industrial projects. *International Journal of Project Management*, Vol. 21, pp. 63-70.
- Burke, A. (2000)** The challenge of seating selection. *Ergonomic supplement*, Vol. 69, pp. 70-72.
- Carnevale, D. G. (1992)** Physical settings of work, *Public Productivity and Management Review*, Vol. 15, pp. 423-436.
- Cascio, W. F. (2006)** Managing human resources: productivity, quality of life, profits. McGraw-Hillirwin.
- Chandrasekar, K. (2011)** Workplace environment and its impact on organizational performance in public sector organizations, *International Journal of Enterprise Computing and Business Systems*, Vol. 7, pp. 17-18.
- Clements-Croome, D. J. (1997)** Specifying indoor climate, in book naturally ventilated buildings.
- Collis, D. J. and Montgomery, C. A. (1995)** Competing on resources, *Harvard business review*, Vol. 73, pp.118-128.
- Cooper, C. L. and Cartwright, S. (1994)** Healthy mind, healthy organization: a proactive approach to occupational stress. *Human Relations*, Vol. 47, pp. 455-471.
- Cummings, I. I. and Schwab, D. P. (1973)** Performance in organizations: determinants and appraisal. Glenview: Scott, Foresman and Company.
- Davy, J., Kinicki, A., Scheck, C. (1991)** Developing and testing a model of survivor responses to layoffs. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, Vol. 38, pp. 302-317.
- Deci, E. and Ryan, R. (2000)** The and why of goal pursuits: human needs and the self-determination of behavior. *Psychological Inquiry*, Vol. 4, pp.227-269.
- George, J. M. and Jones, G. R. (2005)** Understanding and managing organizational behavior 4th edition. New jersey. Pearson prestige hall.

- Guest, D. E. (2004)** Flexible employment contracts, the psychological contract and employee outcomes. an analysis and review of the evidence. *International Journal of Management and Review*, Vol. 5/6, pp.1-19.
- Imam, H., Qureshi, T. M. and Khan, M. A. (2011)** The retrenchment effect on job performance with mediating effect of work life balance, *African Journal of Business Management*, Vol. 5, pp. 8642-8648.
- James, D. (1996)** Forget downsizing, now its participative redesign, and bus. *Review Weekly*, Vol.18, pp. 70-72.
- Jex, S. M. and Beehr, T. A. (1991)** Emerging theoretical and methodological issues in the study of work-related stress. In k. M. Rowland & g. R. Ferris (eds.), *research in personnel and human resources management*, Vol. 9, pp. 311–365.
- Johnson, R. A., Neelankavil, J.P. and Jadhav, A. (1986)** Developing the executive resource. *Business horizons*, pp. 29–33.
- Katz, D, K. (1978)** *The social psychology of organizations*. New York.
- Keeling, B. I. and Kallaus, N. F. (1996)** *Administrative office management*. 11th. ed., International Thompson Publishing, Ohio.
- Khan, S. A. (2005)** How to motivate good performance among government employees, *Pakistan Journal of Social Sciences*, Vol.3, pp. 1138-1143.
- Kirchmeyer, C. (1995)** Managing the work-nonwork boundary: an assessment of organizational responses, *Human Relations*, Vol. 48, pp.515-536.
- Lee, R. T. (2005)** *Dealing with workplace harassment and bullying: some recommendations for employment standards of Manitoba*. University of Manitoba.
- Lévesque, G. (2007)** A relational model for managing employee performance in difficult situations while preventing harassment. Gilles.levesque@videotron.qc.ca
- Miller, L. L. (1997)** Not just weapons of the weak: gender harassment as a form of protest for army men. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, Vol. 60, pp. 32-51.
- Moy, P. (2006)** 80 pc of worker support five-day week, *South China Morning Post*, HongKong.
- Neuman, W. I. (2006)** *Social research method: qualitative and quantitative approaches*. Dorling Kindersley, Pvt Ltd.
- Nguyen, A., Taylor, J. and Bradley, S. (2003)** Relative pay and job satisfaction. some new evidence, MPRA paper no 1382.
- Opkarajo, J. O. (2002)** The impact of salary differential on managerial job satisfaction.A study of the gender gap and its implications for management education and practice in a developing economy, *Journal of Business and Development of Nation*, pp. 65-92.
- Parker, S. K. and Griffin, M. A. (2002)** What is so bad about a little name-calling? negative consequences of gender harassment for over performance demands and distress, *Journal of Occupational and Health Psychology*, Vol. 7, pp. 195-210.
- Quible, Z. K. (1996)** *Administrative office management: an introduction*. 7th. Ed., Prentice-Hall, New Jersey.

- Rehman, M., Irum, R., Tahir, N., Ijaz, A., Noor, U. and Salma, U. (2012)** The impact of job stress on employee job satisfaction: a study on private colleges of Pakistan, *Journal of Business Studies Quarterly*, Vol. 3, pp. 50-56.
- Sabir, M. S., Iqbal, J. J., Rehman, K., Shah, K. A. and Yameen, M. (2012)** Impact of corporate ethical values on ethical leadership and employee Performance, *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, Vol. 3, pp. 163-171.
- Sekaran. U. R. B. (2010)** Research methods for business.
- CIDA, (1996)** promoting sustainable livelihoods, Stockholm: Swedish international co-operation development agency.
- Silla, I., Gracia, F, Peirojm. (2005) Job insecurity and health-related outcomes among different types of temporary workers. *Economic and Industrial Democracy*, Vol. 26, pp. 89–117.
- Srivastava, A. K. (2008)** Effect of perceived work environment on employees job behavior and organizational effectiveness, *Journal of Applied Psychology Banarashindu, University, Varanasi*.
- Stannack, P. (1996)** Perspective on employees performance, *Management research news*, Vol. 119, pp. 38-40.
- Sundstrom, E. (1994) office noise, satisfaction, and performance, *Environment and Behavior*, Vol.26, pp. 195-222.
- Taiwo, A. S. (2009)** The influence of work environment on workers’ productivity: a case of selected oil and gas industry in Lagos, Nigeria, *African Journal of Business Management*, Vol. 4, pp. 299-307.
- Tehrani, N. (2002)** Managing organizational stress, www.cipd.co.uk.
- Varol, F. (2010)** The effect of organizational commitment and job satisfaction and employee turnover intentions: an application of Konya province on the pharmaceutical sector employees. Master thesis, Selcuk University, Konya, Turkey.
- Vischer, J. C. (2008)** Towards a user-centered theory of the built environment. *Building Research and Information*, Vol. 36, pp.231-240.
- Wimmer, R. D. and Dominick, J. R. (2006)** Mass media research. Wadsworth group: a division of Thomson Learning, California.