Exploring the Presence of Supervisor Support, Positive Working Environment and their Impact on Employee Performance

Abida Hafeez
Department of Economics
Division of Management and Administrative Sciences, University of Education, Lahore.
Email: abida.hafeez@ue.eud.pk

Sahar Latif Rana
UE Business School, Division of Management & Administrative Science, University of Education, Lahore.

Rashida Perveen
Department of Education, Kinnaird College for Women University, Lahore.

Abstract

The purpose of the study is to evaluate how the workplace environment affects employees' performance. This study's objectives were served via a descriptive research design. The respondents for the study were chosen using a simple random selection procedure. The sample size for this study is 300 respondents. According to the study's findings, the working environment of the organizations affects its members. The study also showed that if management addresses the issues found during the research, employee performance will increase. Physical working conditions, employee performance, supervisor support, and the use of performance feedback to encourage staff to accomplish their duties are the concerns. In conclusion, based on the study's findings, it was suggested that the organization hold regular meetings with employees to hear their complaints and function as a motivator for the staff. In order to accomplish the organization's mission and vision, management must discover effective ways to share its objectives with all levels of staff. In order to consider new working methods, organizations must go beyond their established responsibilities and comfort zones. They need to establish a work atmosphere where employees may love what they do, feel like they are accomplishing something worthwhile, take pride in their work, and realize their full potential.

Key words: Working environment, Employee Performance, Supervisor support, Management.

Introduction

The effectiveness of a company that cares about the welfare of its employees, when employees have a poor knowledge of task responsibility and safety, their performance suffers. They have different views and disregard the law, which causes more workplace accidents. Manager support, peer interactions, procedural safety and security, self-management, and sought respect are some aspects of the painting environment that affect task pride (Raziq & Maul bakhsh, 2015). In order to create a safe operating environment and a flexible operating situation for employees, the protection and safety of the activity, which are more significant parts of the living working environment, must be firmly entrenched in the place of business. Physical, social, and mental work environments were the three main components of operating environment (Jain & Kaur, 2014).

To help employees concentrate on their task and be more productive, a business might provide a pleasant work atmosphere. The physical work environment, which includes lighting, noise, temperature, fresh air, and office layout, can have an impact on employee performance. All of the irregularities point to employee health issues that have a negative impact on staff productivity. Temessek (2009) demonstrated how thoughtful interior design and décor of the workplace can improve employee satisfaction and encourage higher standards of performance. The aim of this study is to describe the connection between the working environment and employees in order to explore the relationship between supervisor support and employee performance that demonstrates the significance of the relationship between job safety and employee performance. The established hypothesis in this study is that there is a significant relationship between working environment and employee performance. The research question that has been put up in this study is that "What types of the work environments are those add towards employees' performance?" Organization The maintenance of the company's products depends in large part on employee performance. Regrettably, the majority of those working for businesses and groups responsible for maintaining the environment are now seen negatively.

According to Borman (2004), certain elements of the office environment had an impact on employee performance. According to Khamisa et al., (2015), employees can experience constant pressure when they have a poor understanding of their surroundings, thus more attention needs to be made to identifying and managing the operating environment. The approaches, structures, equipment, or conditions in a workplace that favourably or negatively affect a man's or woman's productivity are referred to as the running environment, according to Opperman (2002). The purpose of this study is to look into how the workplace environment affects employee performance. According to Opperman (2002), a person's performance can be positively or negatively impacted by the procedures, systems, structures, tools, or conditions

present at work. The policies, rules, culture, resources, working relationships, workspace, and internal and external environmental elements all have a role in the work environment and have an impact on how a person executes their job duties. This study is organized in the following way: first section contains introduction. Second section reviews literature. Third section contains theoretical background. Fourth section consists of research design. Fifth section presents discussion of results and followed by conclusion in the sixth section.

Literature Review

This writing survey endeavors to talk about the different writing connected with workplace, which affects employee performance. The conversation additionally recognizes holes left by different specialists of comparative investigations. However, this study endeavors to fill those holes so that the review can add to another group of information in the academic world. Through this survey, writing is re-bundled and investigated as an approach to carrying new experiences into the issue considered.

In particular, research indicates a need to rebalance the focus from supervisor support alone, which is emphasized in much of the existing literature (Cropanzano et al., 2017), to employees' firm and coworker support, as well as firm performance, which is consistent in the greater extent towards social exchange theory. According to earlier studies, a favourable relationship exists between behavioural results and a supportive work environment at the individual level, for instance productivity and increased creativity (Delery and Doty, 1996; and Lepak et al., 2006). Parker, et al. (2006) stated that a supportive work environment includes coworker along with supervisor support. Also, according to Montani et al. (2012) and Prieto & Pérez-Santana (2014), company success has an impact on employees' innovative work behaviour.

There has never been a systematic examination of the roles of coworker support and management support in the firm performance as separate constructs and as separate moderators, potentially leads towards biased results and ignoring distinctive and significant influences on innovative working behaviour in firms' premis (Bishop et al., 2005; Shalley et al., 2004). According to Hashim (2010) and Prieto and Pérez-Santana (2014), a market-oriented and efficient pay scheme can aid businesses in retaining the finest workers.

The support that firms provide for individual workers' performance is likely to have an impact on employees' psychological empowerment levels, including factors like the significance of their work as well as ability to innovate. Therefore, this study examines the mild effects of both coworker and supervisor support on the relationships between environment empowerment and innovative work behaviour (Janssen, 2005; Spreitzer, 1995). For instance, supervisors who support employees' and coworkers'

dedication to innovation goals can increase the value of work to employees, resultantly, moderate the relationships of innovative work behaviour to empowerment (Janssen, 2005; Odoardi et al., 2015).

This literature has demonstrated, among other things, that employees display extra-role conduct in return for both management and coworker support (Bishop, et al., 2000; Bishop, et al., 2005). Studies based on the social exchange theory have revealed, more particularly, that employees with supportive bosses experience higher levels of psychological empowerment (Cropanzano et al., 2017; Spreitzer, 1995, 2008). Those who believe they possess the necessary abilities to successfully do their various tasks are said to be competent. Meaning is described as the task's significance to the employee and includes their own personal standards and beliefs. Impact quantifies a worker's perceived influence on the immediate workplace. Self-determination is the freedom an employee has to choose how to carry out different responsibilities (Joo & Shim, 2010; Spreitzer, 1995).

According to Janssen's (2000) work on innovative work behaviour, he describe innovative work behaviour of employees as creative suggestions made by staff members to improve production, find creative solutions to issues, or develop new procedures for specific duties (Janssen, 2000). Because innovative work behaviour does not guarantee to produce tangible products, research needs to document employees' attempts to innovate (Farr and Ford, 1990).

Similar research indicates how employee loyalty to the team can rise with coworker assistance (Bishop et al., 2000). Coworker assistance can be distinguished from management assistance (Bishop et al., 2000, 2005), is therefore probably to increase confidence of employees in skills, strengthen their sense of self-determination, along with influence how favorably they view the effects of their job.

The productivity of the company and the performance of the individual are influenced by the workplace environment. It increases employee support from coworkers. Environmental empowerment among employees is linked to performance at higher levels (Harmon et al., 2003; Spreitzer, 1995). For instance, studies have connected environmental empowerment to higher levels of worker productivity (Harmon et al., 2003; Mishra & Spreitzer, 1998). Further, there is a significant link between employee empowerment and creative workplace behaviour (Sangar & Rangnekar, 2014; Zhang & Bartol, 2010).

Theoretical Background

It has been proven that a worker's motivation has a direct impact on their performance. Since Frederick Taylor's 1911 book "The Principle of Scientific Management" and Henry Gantt's 1913 book "Works, Wages, and Profits," various management theories have supported this claim. Contemporary ways for managing employee motivation have developed through time, rendering Taylor's "differential piece rate-work" and Gantt's "task and bonus salary" systems. Modern employee motivation management techniques are employee-focused and more successful (Gardner & Lambert 1972). Based on those justifications, this study suggests that employee motivation is a key factor in every organization's performance.

Kohun (1992), characterizes working climate as a completely which involves the entirety of powers, activities and other compelling variables that are right now and, or possibly battling with the representative's exercises and execution. Working climate is the amount of the interrelationship that exists inside the representatives and the climate wherein the workers work. Brenner (2004) was of the assessment that "the capacity to share information all through associations relies heavily on how the workplace is intended to empower associations to use workplace as though it were a resource. This assists associations with further developing viability and permit workers to profit from aggregate information". Opperman (2002) characterizes working climate is a composite of three significant sub conditions: the specialized climate, the human climate and the authoritative climate. Sinha (2001) said that workers' overall performance is relying at the ability and furthermore the transparency of the personnel ion finishing their assignment. He additionally said that via having this readiness and transparency of the work force in going about their business, it can blast the representatives' efficiency which also finishes in the general execution. Stup (2003) moreover made sense of that to have a well-known performance, bosses should get the workers task to be done heading in the correct course as to achieve the company point or target. Various components that are being characterized by Stup (2003), lead towards the outcome of the faculty's execution. Franco et al (2002) depicted execution that depends on interior inspiration anyway presence of internal variables including significant skills, scholarly capacity and assets to finish the work in actuality have an effect.

Research Design

This is a cross-sectional study. Data is collected from employees of various oganisations located in Lahore. The sample size is 300. The sampling technique is random sampling. Sample selection is based on inclusion criteria in which data is collected from employees, both male and female. Under the exclusion criteria include

those who can no understand the questions, and who are not interested participate. The questionnaire is based on Likert scale (1=Strongly Agree, 2=Inclined to Agree, 3= Neither Agree nor Disagree, 4= Inclined to Disagree, 5= Strongly Disagree). The percentages and frequencies have been used through SPSS version 20 to analyze the data.

Discussion of Results

This section deals with the analysis and interpretation of the data collected through questionnaires to achieve the objectives of the study. The total number of employees is three hundred (300). The study involved gender distribution (in terms of male and female) of employees in order to achieve the aim of the study through the questionnaires. Table 1 exhibits that 60% are female and 40% are male employees, who participated in this study. The 20-30 year group constituted 60% of employees, which is highest number of employees. The age-group of 31-40 is 31.7%. The lowest percentage i.e. 8.3% of employee belongs to age-group 41-50.

In this study, the physical working environment has been taken into consideration as one of the elements influencing employees' performance as indicated by their responses to disseminated questionnaires. The majority of the workers in Table 3, or 23.7% of them, rated their physical work environment as moderate, which encouraged the employees to stay at workplace and do job comfortably. 4.0% of workers reported that the physical work environment is very uncomfortable for them; otherwise, they remain in the office and work in peace. While 32.7% of employees say their physical work environment is good, the remaining 24% of employees say their physical work environment is very good for them and allows them to work comfortably, 15.7% of employees say their physical work environment is bad for employ to stay at the workplace and perform. This demonstrates that it is the obligation of the company to create a welcoming workplace that will encourage the workers to work comfortably and complete their tasks. In this study, supervisor planning was taken into consideration as one of the factors affecting employees' performance. According to table 4, 32.7% of employees strongly agree that their boss schedules their job ahead of time, whereas just 4.0% of employees disagree. 45% of the workforce concurs with the plans of the supervisor. The other 1.0% of workers vehemently disagree.

Table 1
Gender of Employees

Employees	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Frequency
Female	180	60.0	60.0	60.0
Male	120	40.0	40.0	100.0
Total	300	100.0		

Table 2
Age of Employees

Employees	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Frequency
20-30 years	180	60.0	60.0	60.0
31-40years	95	31.7	31.7	91.7
41-50 years	25	8.3	8.3	100.0
Total	300	100.0	100.0	

Table 3
Working Environment

	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Frequency
Very Good	72	24.0	24.0	24.0
Good	98	32.7	32.7	56.7
Moderate	71	23.7	23.7	80.3
Bad	47	15.7	15.7	96.0
Very Bad	12	4.0	4.0	100.0
Total	300	100.0	100.0	

Table 4
Supervisor's Planning

	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Frequency
Strongly Agree	98	32.7	32.7	32.7
Agree	135	45.0	45.0	77.7
Neutral	52	17.3	17.3	95.0
Disagree	12	4.0	4.0	99.0
Strongly Disagree	3	1.0	1.0	100.0
Total	300	100.0	100.0	

Table 5
Impact of organizational work on Employee Performance

	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Frequency
Strongly Agree	55	18.3	18.3	18.3
Agree	155	51.7	51.7	70.0
Neutral	60	20.0	20.0	90.0
Disagree	24	8.0	8.0	98.0
Strongly Disagree	6	2.0	2.0	100.0

Total	300	100.0	100.0

Table 6
Job Assistance

	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Frequency
Strongly Agree	102	34.0	34.0	34.0
Agree	132	44.0	44.0	78.0
Neutral	40	13.3	13.3	91.3
Disagree	20	6.7	6.7	98.0
Strongly Disagree	6	2.0	2.0	100.0
Total	300	100.0	100.0	

Table 7
Employees' Effective Performance

	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Frequency
Strongly Agree	98	32.7	32.7	32.7
Agree	122	40.7	40.7	73.3
Neutral	56	18.7	18.7	92.0
Disagree	15	5.0	5.0	97.0
Strongly Disagree	9	3.0	3.0	100.0
Total	300	100.0	100.0	

From the table 5, 18.3% of employees strongly agree that the organization work have positive impact on employee performance while 8.0% of the employees disagree with organizations impact on employee performance. 51.7% of employees agree that organization have positive impact on employee performance. The other 2.0% of workers vehemently disagree. According to Table 6, 34.0% of employees strongly agree that having access to job assistance within the company will have a major impact on how well they perform at work. While 6.7% of employees disagree, 44.0% of employees believe that having work aids available will improve their ability to do their jobs. Another 2.0% of workers vehemently deny that the use of a work assistance affects their output.

Table 8
Employee Performance Feedback

	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative percentage
Strongly Agree	98	32.7	32.7	32.7
Agree	120	40.0	40.0	72.7
Neutral	46	15.3	15.3	88.0
Disagree	30	10.0	10.0	98.0
Strongly Disagree	6	2.0	2.0	100.0
Total	300	100.0	100.0	

Table 9

Management's Support

	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Frequency
Strongly Agree	80	26.7	26.7	26.7
Agree	124	41.3	41.3	68.0
Neutral	60	20.0	20.0	88.0
Disagree	30	10.0	10.0	98.0
Strongly disagree	6	2.0	2.0	100.0
Total	300	100.0	100.0	

From Table 7, 40.7% of employees agree that an organization-friendly environment increases the ability of employees to perform work effectively. 32.7% of employees also said they strongly agreed. 5.0% of employees also disagree. Another 3.0% of employees said they strongly disagreed that an organization-friendly environment increases employees' ability to perform work effectively. As shown in Table 8, 32.7% of employees strongly agree that they sometimes receive performance feedback from their supervisor, followed by 40.0% of employees who agree that they usually receive performance feedback from their supervisor. Another 10.0% said they disagree because they never get performance feedback and finally 15.3% are not sure if they get performance feedback from a supervisor. Most of the employees in Table 9, representing 41.3%, said that they agree that the management of this organization supports them, while 26.7% said that they strongly agree. 10.0% of employees said they disagreed with supportive leadership, while 20.0% said they neither agreed nor agreed with supportive leadership. 2.0% of employees, on the other hand, said they had strong management support. With the supportive management in the organization, it helps in the performance of the employees by making them work comfortably and increases the productivity of the organization.

Implications of the study

The exploratory investigation helps in identifying the presence of positive working environment and management support at various organizations. It also aims to find their impact on employee performance. Using an exploratory design and survey questionnaire technique the study offers an insight from various organizations located in Lahore. The findings highlight some important workplace realities. For instance, it is observed that most of the respondents believe that the working environment in their organizations are positive. It is also observed that the performance is strongly influenced by the working environment. In addition to that it also highlights that the management should provide support to the organizational members which can foster their performance.

These results offer some meaningful lessons to the management of companies. The results reveal that working environment is an important determinant of the

employee performance, and if the management intends to increase the level of employee performance the environment should be improved positively. Similarly, the management role has also be signified for its influence on employee performance. Therefore, the management can both directly and indirectly influence the performance of employees.

Theoretically, the study is descriptive in nature, but still offers some valuable insights. The foremost is the simplest approach to find the relationship of environment and employee performance. The descriptive design provides an understanding of the phenomenon under investigation in the natural way.

Limitations & future directions

The study is prone to some major limitations, the foremost is the use of descriptive design while the sophisticated and modern designs are available to be carried out. Therefore, the future researchers should go with correlational or causal designs to see the relationship among variables of interest or their impacts. The sample size is another major limitation of the current study, which is too small to provide a complete picture of the workplace realities. The future researchers should go with large, diversified and multi-sampling approaches to create a better picture of the workplace happenings. The studies should also add some other variables and approaches to carry out a sophisticated form of investigation.

Conclusion

The study revealed that the work environment of the organization had an impact on the employees. Through this study, it has been shown that employee performance is largely dependent on the presence of work aids in the organization. The workplace has a significant impact on how motivated people are to complete their given tasks. Because the kind of workplace performance needed in today's cutthroat corporate environment cannot be supported by money alone. In the highly competitive climate of today, an organization's capacity to maintain and sustain high performance is becoming increasingly crucial. At the conclusion of the study, it was discovered that employees' productivity is significantly impacted by their workspace. On the whole, it is the responsibility of the organization to ensure a friendly work environment that encourages employees to work comfortably and fulfill their duties. The study found that an organization needs to improve its physical work environment to influence employees to stay in the office, work comfortably and do their jobs. In order to consider new working methods, organisations must go beyond their established responsibilities and comfort zones. They need to establish a work atmosphere where employees may love what they do, feel like they are accomplishing something worthwhile, take pride in their work, and realise their full potential.

References

Abbas, Q. & Yaqoob, S. (2009). Effect of leadership development on employee performance in Pakistan, *Pakistan Economic and Social Review, 47,* 269-292.

Adair, J. (1988). *The effective supervisor*. London: The Industrial Society.

Agho, Cooper, C. L. and Cartwright, S**.** (1993). Determinants of employee job satisfaction: an empirical test of causal model. *Human relation*, *46*(8)

Amir, F. (2010). *Measuring the impact of office environment on performance level of employees*. Global Environment. Bhurban, Pakistan *appraisal*. Glenview: Scott, Foresman and Company.

Armstrong, M. (2008), *A Handbook of Human Resource Management* Practice.10th Edition. International Student Edition.

Best, J. W., & Kahn, J . V. (2006). *Research in education*. Hong Kong: Pearson Education Inc.

Bibangambah, J. (2002). *Corruption and debt impact on national development*.

Bishop, J. W., Scott, K. D., & Burroughs, S. M. (2000). Support, commitment, and employee outcomes in a team environment. Journal of Management, 26, 1113–1132.

Bishop, J. W., Scott, K. D., Goldsby, M. G., & Cropanzano, R. (2005). A construct validity study of commitment and perceived support variables: A multifoci approach across different team environments. Group and Organization Management, 30, 153–180.

Blau, P. (1964). *Exchange and power in social life*. New York: John Wiley.

Boles, M., Pelletier, B. & Lynch, W. (2004). The relationship between health risks and work productivity. *Journal of Occupational and Environment Medicine*, *46*(7), 737-745.

Brenner, P. (2004). *Workers physical surrounding*. Impact bottom line accounting: Smarts Pros.com.

Brill M (1990). Workspace design and productivity. *Journal of Healthcare Forum*, *35*(5), 51-3.

Brill, M. (1992). How design affects productivity in settings where office-like work is done. *Journal of Health Care Design*, *4*, 11–16.

Carnevale, D.G., (1992). *Physical Settings of Work*. Public productivity and management Review.

Cassar, V. (1999). Can leader direction and employee participation co-Exist? Investigating interaction effects between participation and favorable work related attitudes among maltese middle-managers, *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, *14*, 57-68.

Cavanaugh, T. B. (2004*). The new spectrum of support: Reclassifying human performance technology*. Performance Improvement, *43*(4), 28-32.

Chandrasekar K. (2011). Workplace Environment and its Impact on Organizational Performance in Public Sector Organizations*, International Journal of Enterprise Computing and Business Systems, 1*(1)*.

Clements-Croome, D. J., (1997). *Specifying Indoor Climate in book Naturally Ventilated Buildings*. Spon.

Cooper, C., & Dewe, P. (2004). *Stress, a brief history*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

Creswell, J. W (2005). *Research Design: A qualitative, quantitative and mixed method approaches.* London: Sage Publication Inc.

Cropanzano, R., Anthony, E. L., Daniels, S. R., & Hall, A. V. (2017). Social exchange theory: A critical review with theoretical remedies. *Academy of management annals*, *11*(1), 479-516

Cummings, L. L. and Schwab, D. P. (1973*). Performance in organizations: determinants and appraisal*. Glenview: Scott, Foresman and Company.

Delery, J. E., & Doty, D. H. (1996). Modes of theorizing in strategic human resource management: Tests of universalistic, contingency, and configurational performance predictions. *Academy of management Journal*, *39*(4), 802-835

Dorgan, C. E. (1994). The *Productivity Link to indoor environment.* Proceedings of Health Buildings.

Duncan, C. S. (1985). *Job aid really can work*. Performance and Instruction, *24*(4), 1-4.

Elangovan, A. R., & Karakowsky, L. (1999). The role of trainee and environmental factors in transfer of training: An.

Emery, R. E., & Trist, E. L. (1960). *Socio-technical* Management science models and techniques (Vol. 2, pp. 83-97). Elmsford, NY: Pergamon Press.

Erez, M. Earley, P. C. and Hulin, C. L. (1985). The impact of participation on goal acceptance and performance: A two-step model. *Academy of Management Journal, 28, 50-66.*

Evans, G. W., & Cohen, S. (1987). *Environmental stress*. Vol. 1, Wiley: New York, pp. 571-610. exploratory framework. *Leadership and Organization Development Journal, 20, 268-275.*

Farr, J. L., & Ford, C. M. (1990). Individual innovation. In M. West & J. Farr (Eds.), Innovation and creativity at work: Psychological and organizational strategies (63–80). Chichester: Wiley.

Franco, L. M., Bennett, S., Kanfer, R., & Stubblebine, P. (2000). *Health Worker* Motivation in

Gardner and Lambert (1972). *Attitudes and Motivation in Second Language Learning*. Newbury House Publisher,

Govindarajulu N, Bonnie, F. Daily. (2004). *Motivating Employees for Environmental Improvement*. Industrial Management and Data Systems, *104*(4), 364-372.

Harris, R., Simon, M., & Bone, J. (2000). *Re thinking the role of workplace trainer*,

Harter, J. K., Schmidt, F. L., & Hayes, T. L. (2002). Business-unit level relationship between employee satisfaction, employee engagement, and business outcomes: *A meta-analysis. Journal of Applied Psychology, 87, 268-279.*

Hashim, J. (2010). Human resource management practices on organizational commitment: The Islamic perspective. Personnel Review, *39*,785–799.

Hasun, F. M. & Makhbul Z. M. (2005). *An overview of workplace environment and selected demographic factors towards individual's health and performance enhancement.* Synergizing OSH for Business Competitive, 45-53.

Haynes B. P. (2008). An Evaluation impact of the Office Environment on Productivity.

Huang, Y. H., Robertson, M. M., and Chang, K. I. (2004). *The role of environmental control on environmental satisfaction, communication, and psychological*

Hussin, A. (2011). *The Relationship between Job satisfaction and Job Performance among Employees in Trade winds Group of Companies*. Malaysia: Open University Malaysia.

Inayatullah, A., & Jahangir, P. (2012). Teachers Job Performance: The Role of Motivation. *Abasyn Journal of social science, 5*(2), *78-99.*

Janssen, O. (2005). The joint impact of perceived influence and supervisor supportiveness on employee innovative behaviour. *Journal of occupational and organizational psychology*, *78*(4), 573-579

Joo, B.-K. B., & Shim, J. H. (2010). Psychological empowerment and organizational commitment: The moderating effect of organizational learning culture. Human Resource Development International, *13*, 425–441.

Jordan and Georgia: A Synthesis of the Results, Major Applied Research 5, Technical Paper 3 Bethesda, Maryland: Partnership for Health Reform Project. *Journal of Facilities.*

Kiesler, S. (1978). *Interpersonal Processes in Groups and Organizations*, AHM Publishing, Arlington Heights, IL

Kohun, S. (1992). *Business environment*. Ibadan: University Press.

Kothari, C. K. (2004). *Research Methodology, Methods & Techniques*, New Age International, New Delhi.

Kotter, J. P. (1988). The leadership factor. New York: The Free Press.

Latham, G. P. & Yukl, G. A. (1975). Assigned versus participative goal setting with educated and uneducated wood workers. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 60, 299-302.*

Lepak, D. P., Liao, H., Chung, Y., & Harden, E. E. (2006). A conceptual review of human resource management systems in strategic human resource management research. *Research in personnel and human resources management*.

Likert, R. L. (1961). *The human organization*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Maritz, D. (1995). Leadership and Mobilising potential, Human Resource Management, *10*, 8-16.

McGregor, D. (1960). *The human side of enterprise*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Mohr, R. (1996). *Office Space is a Revenue Enhancer, Not an Expense*. National Real Estate Investor, 38(7), 46-47.

Montani, F., Odoardi, C., & Battistelli, A. (2012). Explaining the relationships among supervisor support, affective commitment to change, and innovative work behavior: The moderating role of coworker support. *BPA-Applied Psychology Bulletin (Bollettino di Psicologia Applicata)*, (264).

Morrisey, G. L. (1977). *Management by objectives and results for Business and Industry*. Addison-Wesley Reading, MA.

NCVER, Adelaide. Retrieved from http://www.ncver.edu.au/publications/471.html. 13th June, 2014.

Ngimbudzi, F.W (2009). *Job satisfaction among secondary school teachers in Tanzania*: the case of Njombe district.

Nijman, D. J. J. (2004). *Differential effects of supervisor support on transfer of training*. Enchede: University of Twente.

Noble, A. (2009). Building health promotional work setting: identifying the relationship work characteristics and occupational stress. *Promotional international journal, 18*(4)*, 351-359.*

Odoardi, C., Montani, F., Boudrias, J.-S., & Battistelli, A. (2015). Linking managerial practices and leadership style to innovative work behaviour: The role of group and psychological processes. Leadership & Organization Development, *36*, 545–569.

Opperman, C. S. (2002). *Tropical business issues*. Partner Price Water House Coopers. International Business Review.

Prieto, I. M., & Pérez-Santana, M. P. (2014). Managing innovative work behavior: the role of human resource practices. *Personnel Review*, *43*(2), 184-208

Shalley, C. E., Zhou, J., & Oldham, G. R. (2004). The effects of personal and contextual characteristics on creativity: Where should we go from here? Journal of Management, 30, 933 958.

Spreitzer, G. M. (1995). Psychological empowerment in the workplace: Dimensions, measurement, and validation. *The Academy of Management Journal, 38*, 1442–1465.