



WORK ENVIRONMENT AND ORGANIZATIONAL SURVIVAL OF SOFT DRINKS BOTTLING COMPANIES IN PORT HARCOURT, NIGERIA

Promise, G. C.

WORK ENVIRONMENT AND ORGANIZATIONAL SURVIVAL OF SOFT DRINKS BOTTLING COMPANIES IN PORT HARCOURT, NIGERIA

Promise, G. C.

Department of Management, Faculty of Management Sciences, Rivers State University [RSU], Nkpolu-Oroworukwo, PMB 5080, Port Harcourt, Nigeria

Accepted: January 29, 2020

ABSTRACT

This study investigated the relationship between work environment and organizational survival of bottling companies in Port Harcourt. The study adopted the cross-sectional survey in its investigation of the variables. Primary data was generated through self-administered questionnaire. The population of the study was 122 employees of two (2) selected companies. The sample size of 93 was determined using the Taro Yamane's formula for sample size determination. The reliability of the instrument was achieved by the use of the Crombach Alpha coefficient with all the items scoring above 0.70. Data generated were analyzed and presented using both descriptive and inferential statistical techniques. The hypotheses were tested using the Spearman's Rank Order Correlation Statistics. The tests were carried out at a 95% confidence interval and a 0.05 level of significance. The study findings revealed that there is a significant and positive relationship between work environment and organizational survival of bottling companies in Port Harcourt. The study recommended that management of bottling companies should provide and sustain good organizational climate and healthy work environment that is conflict free should be encouraged by management to facilitate high productivity and attainment. This will be attained through good working conditions, health and safety of the employees, good pay and benefits and good supervision.

Keywords: *Work Environment, Organizational Survival, Adaptability, Flexibility*

CITATION: Promise, G. C. (2020). Work environment and organizational survival of soft drinks bottling companies in Port Harcourt, Nigeria. *The Strategic Journal of Business & Change Management*, 7(1), 273 – 287.

INTRODUCTION

Workplace environment is the sum of the interrelationships that exists within the employees and the environment in which they work (Kohun, 2002). According to Heath (2006), this environment involves the physical location as well as the immediate surroundings, behavioral procedures, policies, rules, culture, resources, working relationships, work location, all of which influence the ways employees perform their work. The quality of the workplace environment impacts on employees' performance and subsequently influences the organization competitiveness. An effective workplace environment management entails making work environment attractive, comfortable, satisfactory and motivating to employees so as to give employees a sense of pride and purpose in what they do (Humphries, 2005). Employees will and are always contented when they feel their immediate environment; both physical sensations and emotional states are in tandem with their obligations (Farh, 2012) and how well employees connect with their organization's immediate workplace environment, influences to a great extent their error rate levels, efficiency and innovativeness, collaboration with other employees, absenteeism and, ultimately their retention (Leblebici, 2012).

The type of workplace environment in which employees operate determines whether or not such organizations will prosper (Chandrasekhar, 2011). Physical workplace environment contextualizes the office layout and design while psychosocial factors include working condition, role congruity and social support from supervisors. Policies encompass employment conditions of employees derived from industrial instruments and agreements negotiated with employees and unions, along with our human resources policies. Employees spend fifty percent of

their lives within indoor environments, which greatly influence their performance capabilities (Sundstrom, 1994). Better physical workplace environment will boosts employees' performance and ultimately improve their productivity (Challenger, 2000). A healthy workplace environment makes good business sense and is characterised by respect that supports employee engagement and creates a high performance culture that encourages innovation and creativity (Kohun, 2002). Organisations deemed as a positive place to work will more likely have a competitive edge since they are in a better position to attract and retain highly skilled employees. This is a significant consideration in the current tight labour market. A positive workplace environment is likely to result in less employee turnover, fewer cases of fraud, better safety practices, easier to attract and retain qualified employees and improved employees' wellbeing (Cunnen, 2006). In almost all high performing banks, one message holds true above them all "People are an organization's most important asset (O'Neill, 2007).

This study therefore examined the relationship between work environment and organizational survival of soft drinks bottling companies in Port Harcourt, Nigeria. Furthermore, this study was guided by the following research questions:

- What is the relationship between work environment and flexibility of bottling companies in Port Harcourt?
- What is the relationship between work environment and adaptability of bottling companies in Port Harcourt?
- What is the relationship between work environment and dynamic capability of bottling companies in Port Harcourt?



Figure 1: Conceptual Framework for the relationship work environment and organizational survival
Source: Author's Desk Research, 2019

LITERATURE REVIEW

Social Exchange Theory (SET) was adopted by the researcher as the theoretical foundation for the study. The assertion by the researcher and other authorities in the literature reviewed, is in line with the consideration of Alexander (1990) who considered social exchange theory to be a socio-psychological theory and Blau (1994) assert that social exchange is characterized by unspecified personal obligations and trust as well as intrinsic, in association with extrinsic rewards, thus occupying the middle ground between pure calculation of advantage and pure expression of love. From the assertion of Blau (1994) it is clear that social exchange is based on less formal and legalistic social relations. Social exchange theory holds that human behaviour and social interactions is basically an exchange of both tangible and intangible activities (Homans, 1961). Pfeffer (1982) noted that in social exchange theory, "behavioral compliance on the part of the individual is exchanged for something more valuable to them than is costly to the giver and vice versa (Homans, 1961).

It can thus be argued that people in organizations engage in self-interested exchange process with the owners of the organization and among themselves, strive to maximize the benefits of such an exchange process. This is the point where the theory relates best with the research topic i.e. if the management of the bottling companies, effectively strategize on

retention of employees, the employees' will reciprocate with commitment to the company which is an exchange that benefits both parties involved. The above statement by the researcher corroborates with the general statement of social exchange theory, posited by Zafirovski (2005) that social exchange is composed of actions of purposive actors that presuppose constellations of their interest and resources, since these processes are assumed to be governed by reciprocal relations. Exchange is defined as social interaction characterized by reciprocal stimuli-they would not continue in the long run if reciprocity were violated in consequence, exchange theory examines the process establishing reciprocity in social relations or the mutual gratifications between individuals.

Work Environment

Work environment is considered one of the most important factors in employee's retention. According to Hytter, (2008), work environment is generally discussed as industrial perspective, focus on aspect i.e. noise, toxic substances exposure and heavy lifts. The interactions depend on the kind of job or / and kind of business, it may be more or may be less. The interaction between employees and clients and consumers moves from physical to psychological dimension. Psychological work environment consist of work load, decision, support, stressors, latitude and decision. It is of much importance to know and recognize the emerging needs of employees and providing good work environment in order to keep

the employees committed with organization. Ramlall, (2003) posit that people strive to work and to stay in those organizations that provides good and positive work environment, where employees feel that they are valued and making difference. Proficient employees of such organizations are dragging together to push the organization forward. Organizations should focus on managing the work environment to make better use of the available human assets.

People want to work for an organization which appreciates work performance, has opportunities to grow, a friendly and cooperative environment and a feeling that the organization is second home to the employee (Ontario, 2004). Three types of environment that an employee needs in an organization are learning, supportive and work environment, (Freyermuth, 2007). Learning environment includes continuous learning and improvement of the individual, certifications and provision for higher studies. For supportive environment an organization can provide support in the form of work-life balance. Work life balance includes flexible hours, telecommuting, dependent care, alternate work schedules, vacations and wellness. However, work environment includes efficient managers, supportive co-workers, challenging work, involvement in decision making, clarity of work and responsibilities, and recognition. The absence of such environment pushes employees to look for new opportunities. The environment should be such that employees feel connected to the organization in every respect.

A study conducted by Appelbaum (2014) which targeted nurses in the United States in relations to organization environment, the nurses highlighted a number of factors which influenced their decision to resign such as unsociable workplace which lead to mocking confrontations, sexual harassment among other vises, another factor was emotional distress associated with taking care of patients, meaning the

tools of work were insufficient as the hospital used inappropriate technologies , this resulted in a lot of job frustration (Freyermuth, 2007).

Hackman and Oldhmas (1980), highlights the constructs of Quality Work Life in relation to the interaction between work environment and personal needs. The work environment that is able to fulfil employees' needs is considered to provide a positive interaction effect which will lead to an excellent Quality Work Life. They emphasized that personal needs are satisfied when rewards from the organization such as rewards or compensation promotion, recognition and development meet their expectation. Yesufu (1984) asserts that the nature of physical condition under which an employee works is important to output. Office and factories that are too hot and ill ventilated are debilitating to effort. There should be enough supply of good protective clothing, drinking water, rest rooms, toilets and first aid facilities. Both management and employees should be safety conscious at all times Adamu (1991) defines a conducive environment to that which is safe and healthy with no hazards and no undue risk. The work environment should create an opportunity to use talents effectively to acquire new skills and knowledge for advancement. Employees at all levels must have occasions to develop their capabilities through problem solving and planning. In addition the social climate of the organization should be free from prejudice and rigid classifications. The job should not take excess time and energy from other aspects of life. Asakura and Fujigaki (1993) examined the direct and the indirect effect of computerization on workers' health and well-being. Their results were similar to the study of Kaprine (2003) that higher job demand leads to higher strain work environment hence affecting employees' health and well-being more. An unstrained work environment ensures good health and psychological conditions which enable the employees to perform job and non-work related

functions without inhibitions, thus providing comfortable work life.

Heskett, Sasser and Schlesinger (1997), defines Quality Work Life as the feeling that employees have towards their jobs, colleagues and to the organizations growth and profitability. A good feeling about their jobs means that the employees feel happy doing work which leads to a productive work environment. This explanation provides an insight that the satisfying work environment is considered to provide better Quality Work Life. Brenner (2004) held that the ability of employees within an organization to share knowledge throughout the system depends on the condition of their work environment. However the survey revealed that corporate executive from various industries disclosed that do not fully leverage their physical work environment. The quality of comfort derivable from the work environment determines the level of satisfaction and productivity of workers. Workers' productivity cannot be optimal if the condition of the work environment is not favourable.

Organizational Survival

Organizational survival is the concept of how effective an organization is in achieving its goals. It is the extent to which an organization has met its stated goals and objectives and how well it performed in the process. Malik, Ghafoor and Naseer (2011) defined organizational survival as the concept that determines how effective and efficient an organization is in achieving the outcomes the organization intends to produce. According to Mott(1972) it is the ability of an organization to mobilize its centers of power for action, production and adaptation.

Studies on organizational survival have frequently distinguished between various measures of this phenomenon. In his model, Mott (1972) identifies three measures by which organization mobilizes center of power. They are: productivity, adaptability and flexibility. Ibe and Olori (2016) gave the measures

of organizational survival to include adaptability and innovation. In his assertion, Malik, Ghafoor and Naseer, (2011) argued that organizational survival is an abstract concept and is basically impossible to measure. Instead of measuring organizational survival, he suggested that an organization determines proxy measures, which will be used to represent their effectiveness. In it may be included such things as efficiency of management, performance of employees, core competencies, number of people served, types and sizes of population segments served and so on since every employee in a company contributes to organizational survival, taking into account, skills, experience, motivation and rank. Other scholars included different measures such as productivity, profits, growth, turnover, stability and cohesion.

Zheng, Sharan and Wei (2010) noted that survival determines the policy objectives of the organization or the degree to which an organization realizes its own goals. Meyer and Herscovitch (2001) analyzed organizational survival through organizational commitment. They noted that commitment in the workplace may take various forms, such as relationship between leader and staff, employee's identification with the organization, involvement in the decision making process and psychological attachment felt by an individual. Shiva and Suar (2010) agree that superior performance is possible by transforming staff attitudes towards organization from lower to a higher plane of maturity. Therefore human capital management should be closely bonded with the concepts of the organizational survival. According to Heilman and Kennedy-Phillips (2011), organizational survival helps to assess the progress towards mission fulfillment and goal achievement. To improve organizational survival, management should strive for better communication, interaction, leadership, direction, adaptability and positive environment.

Organization theory has produced a plethora of models exploring organizational survival; in fact, some scholars have stated that there are as many models as there are studies of organizational survival (Herman & Renz, 1999). Some scholars focus on internal organizational factors when defining criteria of survival, such as its goals or procedures for accomplishing these goals. The rational goal or purposive-rational model of organizational survival assumes that organizations are designed to achieve certain goals, both formally specified and implicit. It focuses on the extent to which an organization reaches its goals as the key criterion of survival (Pfeffer, 1997).

Measures of Organizational Survival

Flexibility

Flexibility has been extensively used by management theorists and practitioners because of its perceived importance to issues such as change, adaptation and survival in and of organizations. Specifically, flexibility is widely seen as a capability that affords value in uncertain and changing environment (Hitt, Keats & DeMarie 1998). It is an organization's ability to respond or adapt rapidly to unfamiliar, unpredictable and dynamic circumstances and at low cost. However, despite its wide usage and acceptance, the term 'flexibility' is often not well defined (Hill and Chambers, 1991) and the existing definitions are not uniformly accepted (Swamidass, 1988).

The organization theory sees flexibility as related to or even synonymous with the capacity for organizational change. This reflects Bateson's (2000) view of flexibility as uncommitted potentiality for change. Pugh, Hickson, Hinings, Macdonald, Turner & Lupton (1963) distinguished three main features of organizational flexibility as amount, speed, and acceleration. Amount refers to both the nature and importance of structural change. Speed represents the amount of change in a specified time period, while acceleration refers to the onset of structural change.

They also point out the organization's receptivity for ideas in the environment and its willingness and ability to absorb them, as another dimension. In conclusion, Volberda (1966) asserts that flexibility is a function of the managerial capabilities to respond to environmental change on one hand and organizational capabilities to implement timely change on the other. Strategic management researchers refer flexibility as a strategic response to unseen. (Eppink, 1978). It depicts organization's abilities to reposition themselves in a market, change their game plans, or dismantle their current strategies when the customers they serve are no longer as attractive as they once were (Harrigan, 1985). Organizations seek flexibility in order to increase the speed and extend their scope of maneuver (Evans, 1991).

Other conceptualization of flexibility in strategic context exist. Kogut and Kulatilaka (1994) call the ability of multinational corporations to shift production across borders between sub units located in different countries operating flexibility. In operations management, flexibility is used to describe characteristics of manufacturing or operations systems that allow these systems to deal with environmental uncertainty (Gerwin, 1993). Examples of the use of this capacity include switching between or recombining in different ways aspects of the production process. Consequently, Swamidass (1988) defines manufacturing flexibility as "the capacity of a manufacturing system to adapt successfully to changing environmental conditions and process requirements. It refers to the ability of the production system to cope with the instability induced by the environment. Manufacturing flexibility enables companies to "introduce modified or new products at minimal cost and lead time (Garud & Kotha, 1994) with the aim of gaining a competitive advantage over others.

Consequently, the flexibility of the sub components of the organization for example the human resources,

contributes to the overall system flexibility (Swamidass, 1988). It entails an employee adjusting his/her feelings, thoughts and behaviour to changing situations and conditions in the organization. Flexible people are agile, synergistic and capable of reacting to change without rigidity. These people are able to change their minds when evidence suggests that they are mistaken. They are generally open to and tolerant of different ideas, orientations, ways and practices (Bar-On, 1997).

Flexibility, similar to adaptability, involves changes in routinized organizational processes. However, flexibility is conceptually different from adaptability because it involves temporary and unpredictable changes in environment, for example, dealing with emergencies. Flexible actions are coping strategies rather than lasting changes in organizational processes because the organizational changes that result from meeting emergencies are usually temporary, and the organization returns to its pre-emergency structure (Mott, 1972). According to Mott (1972) the construct of productivity is couched in the tradition of bureaucratic theory. It assumes that the arrangement of roles, responsibilities, power, authority, and other devices of routinized formal organizational structure are related to productivity: quantity, quality, and efficiency. These are instrumental functions.

Adaptability

Adaptability involves changes in organizational routine in response to environmental change. (Mott, 1972). He considered adaptability to be both symbolic and behavioral; that is, the plan to change and the change itself. This factor relates primarily to change management i.e., how we cope with and adapt to personal and interpersonal change as well as change in our immediate environment. It determines how successfully we are able to cope with daily demands by effectively 'sizing up' and dealing with problematic situations. People who have a high capacity for adaptability are typically flexible, realistic

and effective in understanding problematic situations and competent at arriving at adequate solutions. These people can generally find good ways of dealing with everyday difficulties. Success in this area means that we can grasp problems and devise effective solutions, deal with and resolve various issues as they arise at home, with friends and in the workplace (Bar-On, 1997)

Dalziell and McManus (2004) define adaptive capacity as the ability of the system to respond to changes in its external environment, and to recover from damage to internal structures within the system that affect its ability to achieve its purpose. Starr, Newfrock, & Delurey (2003b) discuss the importance of adaptation and note that the aim is to create advantages over less adaptive competitors. This suggests that adaptive capacity is also linked to competitiveness. Adaptive capacity was also later defined as the measure of the culture of the organization that allows it to make decisions in a timely and appropriate manner both in day to day business and also in crises periods (McManus, 2007). Adaptive capacity considers aspects of an organization such as the leadership and decision making structures, the flow of information and knowledge and the degree of creativity and flexibility that the organization promotes or tolerates. Therefore, the rapidity and swiftness with which organizations operate can be attributed as a function of its adaptability.

An organization's ability to adapt is at the heart of their ability to display resilient characteristics. Starr, *et al* (2003) discusses the importance of adaptation and notes that the aim is to create advantages over less adaptive competitors. This suggests that adaptability is also linked to competitiveness. Dalziell and Mc Manus (2004) define adaptability as the engagement and involvement of organizational staff so that they are responsible, accountable and occupied with developing the organization's resilience through their work because they

understand the links between the organization's resilience and its long term success. It is the ability of the system to respond to the changes in its external environment and to recover from damage of internal structures with the system that affect its ability to achieve its purpose.

Dynamic Capability

Dynamic capacity is the dynamic ability to change or reconfigure the routines of existing substantive capabilities and resources in the manner intended and considered appropriate by the main decision-makers of the company (Zahra, Sapienza & Davidsson, 2006). According to Eisenhardt and Martin (2000) with dynamic capacity, companies can create new configurations of resources as markets emerge, collide, divide, evolve and die. The possession of dynamic capabilities alone does not necessarily provide any substantial advantage to companies, but being able to manage dynamic capabilities to achieve their strategic objectives provides performance related benefits for companies.

Having dynamic capabilities to redeploy or configure those substantive capabilities in accordance with strategic objectives will help companies grow and survive as they face changes in the internal and external environment (Zahra, *et al*, 2006). The dynamic capacity can be distinguished from the operating capacity, which is adjusted to the current operations of the organization. On the contrary, dynamic capabilities refer to the capacity of an organization to deliberately create, extend or modify its resource base (Helfat, Finkelstein, Mitchell, Peteraf, Singh, Teece & Winter, 2007).

Relationship between Work Environment and Organizational Survival

A study conducted by Appelbaum (2014) which targeted nurses in the United States in relations to organization environment, the nurses highlighted a number of factors which influenced their decision to resign such as unsociable workplace which lead to mocking confrontations, sexual harassment among

other vices, another factor was emotional distress associated with taking care of patients, meaning the tools of work were insufficient as the hospital used inappropriate technologies, this resulted in a lot of job frustration (Freyermuth, 2007).

By incorporating a balanced workplace environment, the organisation is optimising profitability and improving the company's popularity as a workplace; projecting a modern corporate entity, which in turn can help you attract highly qualified employees. Architectural design affects the way people behave, with designers creating conditions that can hinder, discourage, guide, support or enhance users' behaviour (Gutnick, 2007). Most banks are beginning to reconsider how their work environment is designed and what facilities they offer to staff has far-reaching effects on their general performance. An enabling workplace environment must thus be the key feature to improving performance and subsequently sustained returns (Abdulla, 2010). Workplace environment is a concept, which has been operationalized by analyzing the extent to which employees perceive the immediate surroundings" as fulfilling their intrinsic, extrinsic and social needs and their reason of staying with the organization (Haynes, 2008). He further adds that environment is a key determinant of the quality of their work and their level of performance. Heath (2006) states, the biggest goal of all the business organization are to increase their performance, thus making high profits.

From the foregoing discussion, the study hereby hypothesized that:

Ho₁: There is no significant relationship between work environment and flexibility of soft drinks bottling companies in Port Harcourt.

Ho₂: There is no significant relationship between work environment and adaptability of soft drinks bottling companies in Port Harcourt.

Ho₃: There is no significant relationship between work environment and dynamic capability of soft drinks bottling companies in Port Harcourt.

METHODOLOGY

The study adopted the cross-sectional survey in its investigation of the variables. Primary data was generated through self-administered questionnaire. The population of the study was 122 employees of two (2) selected companies. The sample size of 93 was determined using the Taro Yamane’s formula for sample size determination. The reliability of the instrument was achieved by the use of the Crombach Alpha coefficient with all the items scoring above 0.70. Data generated were analyzed and presented using both descriptive and inferential statistical techniques. The hypotheses were tested using the Spearman’s Rank Order Correlation Statistics. The tests were carried out at a 95% confidence interval and a 0.05 level of significance.

DATA ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

Bivariate Analysis

The Spearman Rank Order Correlation coefficient is calculated using the SPSS 21.0 version to establish the relationship among the empirical referents of the predictor variable and the measures of the criterion variable. Correlation coefficient can range from -1.00 to +1.00. The value of -1.00 represents a perfect negative correlation while the value of +1.00 represents a perfect positive correlation. A value of 0.00 represents a lack of correlation. In testing hypotheses one to nine, the following rules were upheld in accepting or rejecting our alternate hypotheses: all the coefficient values that indicate levels of significance (* or **) as calculated using SPSS were accepted and therefore our alternate hypotheses rejected; when no significance is indicated in the coefficient r value, we reject our alternate hypotheses. Our confidence interval was set at the 0.05 (two tailed) level of significance to test the statistical significance of the data in this study.

Table1: Correlations for Work Environment and the Measures of Organizational Survival

			Work Environment	Flexibility	Adaptability	Dynamic Capability
Spearman's rho	Work Environment	Correlation Coefficient	1.000	.735**	.833**	.873**
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.000	.000	.000
		N	93	93	93	93
	Flexibility	Correlation Coefficient	.835**	1.000	.761**	.858**
Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.	.000	.000	
N		93	93	93	93	
Adaptability	Correlation Coefficient	.833**	.761**	1.000	.691**	
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.	.000	
	N	93	93	93	93	
Dynamic capability	Correlation Coefficient	.873**	.858**	.691**	1.000	
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.	
	N	93	93	93	93	

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Source: Research Data 2019, (SPSS output version 23.0)

Table 1 illustrated the test for the two previously postulated bivariate hypothetical statements. The results show that for

Ho₁: *There is no significant relationship between work environment and flexibility of soft drinks bottling companies in Port Harcourt.*

The correlation coefficient (r) shows that there is a significant and positive relationship between work environment and flexibility. The *rho* value 0.735 indicates this relationship and it is significant at $p < 0.000 < 0.05$. The correlation coefficient represents a high correlation indicating a strong relationship. Therefore, based on empirical findings the null hypothesis earlier stated is hereby rejected and the alternate upheld. Thus, there is a significant relationship between work environment and flexibility of soft drinks bottling companies in Port Harcourt.

Ho₂: *There is no significant relationship between work environment and adaptability of soft drinks bottling companies in Port Harcourt.*

The correlation coefficient (r) shows that there is a significant and positive relationship between work environment and adaptability. The *rho* value 0.833 indicates this relationship and it is significant at $p < 0.000 < 0.05$. The correlation coefficient represents a high correlation indicating a very strong relationship. Therefore, based on empirical findings the null hypothesis earlier stated is hereby rejected and the alternate upheld. Thus, there is a significant relationship between work environment and adaptability of soft drinks bottling companies in Port Harcourt.

Ho₃: *There is no significant relationship between work environment and dynamic capability of soft drinks bottling companies in Port Harcourt.*

The correlation coefficient (r) shows that there is a significant and positive relationship between work environment and dynamic capability. The *rho* value 0.873 indicates this relationship and it is significant at $p < 0.000 < 0.05$. The correlation coefficient represents a high correlation indicating a very strong relationship. Therefore, based on empirical findings the null hypothesis earlier stated is hereby rejected and the alternate upheld. Thus, there is a significant relationship between work environment and dynamic capability of soft drinks bottling companies in Port Harcourt.

DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

The test of hypotheses shows that there is a significant positive relationship between work environment and organizational survival. This finding is in line with the views of Ramlall (2003) who posited that people strive to work and to stay in those organizations that provides good and positive work environment, where employees feel that they are valued and making difference. Proficient employees of such organizations are dragging together to push the organization forward. Organizations should focus on managing the work environment to make better use of the available human assets. People want to work for an organization which appreciates work performance, has opportunities to grow, a friendly and cooperative environment and a feeling that the organization is second home to the employee (Ontario, 2004).

The current study finding agrees also with A study conducted by Appelbaum (2014) which targeted nurses in the United States in relations to organization environment, the nurses highlighted a number of factors which influenced their decision to resign such as unsociable workplace which lead to mocking confrontations, sexual harassment among other vises, another factor was emotional distress associated with taking care of patients, meaning the tools of work were insufficient as the hospital used

inappropriate technologies , this resulted in a lot of job frustration (Freyermuth, 2007).

Hackman and Oldham (1980) highlights the constructs of quality work life in relation to the interaction between work environment and personal needs. The work environment that is able to fulfill employees' needs is considered to provide a positive interaction effect which will lead to an excellent Quality Work Life. They emphasized that personal needs are satisfied when rewards from the organization such as rewards or compensation promotion, recognition and development meet their expectation. Yesufu (1984) asserts that the nature of physical condition under which an employee works is important to output. Office and factories that are too hot and ill ventilated are debilitating to effort. There should be enough supply of good protective clothing, drinking water, rest rooms, toilets and first aid facilities. Both management and employees should be safety conscious at all times Adamu (1991) defines a conducive environment to that which is safe and healthy with no hazards and no undue risk. The work environment should create an opportunity to use talents effectively to acquire new skills and knowledge for advancement. Employees at all levels must have occasions to develop their capabilities through problem solving and planning. In addition the social climate of the organization should be free from

prejudice and rigid classifications. The job should not take excess time and energy from other aspects of life. Asakura and Fujigaki (1993) examined the direct and the indirect effect of computerization on workers' health and well-being. Their results were similar to the study of Kaprine (2003) that higher job demand leads to higher strain work environment hence affecting employees' health and well-being more. An unstrained work environment ensures good health and psychological conditions which enable the employees to perform job and non-work related functions without inhibitions, thus providing comfortable work life.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the findings, this study concludes that work environment significantly influences organizational survival of bottling companies in Port Harcourt.

As a result of the foregoing, the study that management of bottling companies should provide and sustain good organizational climate and healthy work environment that is conflict free should be encouraged by management to facilitate high productivity and attainment. This will be attained through good working conditions, health and safety of the employees, good pay and benefits and good supervision.

REFERENCES

- Adamu S. O. (1991). Productivity data and nation building. London: Croner. *Advanced Management Journal*, 55(2), 17-22.
- Abdulla, J. Baker, S.; Vlastic, B. (2010). Environmental performance In a Banking Perspective. *Journal on Finance and Banking*, 33(1) 22-33.
- Alexander, J. (1990). Structure, value, action. *American Sociological Review*, 55,339-45.
- Appelbaum, E. (2014). Business as Usual: New Jersey Employers' Experiences with Family Leave Insurance. Center for Economic and Policy Research Publication.
- Argyris, C. (1964). *Integrating the Individual and the Organization*. New York: Wiley.

- Asakura, R. & Fujigaki, Y (1993). *The impact of computer technology on job characteristics and worker health*, Elsevier, 982-987.
- Bar On, R. (1997). *Bar-On Emotional Quotient Inventory: User's manual*. Toronto: Multi-Health Systems.
- Blau, P.M. (1964). *Exchange and Power in Social Life*. New York: Wiley. 1977. *Inequality and Heterogeneity*. New York: Free Press. 1985. *Contrasting Theoretical Perspectives*. Department of Sociology, Columbia University.
- Brenner, P. (2004). *Workers physical surrounding. Impact bottom line accounting*: Smarts Pros.com
- Cameron, K. & Whetten, D. (Eds.) (1983). *Organizational effectiveness: a comparison of multiple models*. New York: Academic Press
- Challenger, J.A. (2000). 24 Trends reshaping the workplace. *The Futurist*, 35-41 Swamidass, P.M. (1988). *Manufacturing flexibility. Monograph no.2*, O.M.A., Waco, TX
- Coetzee, M. (2005). *The relationship between personality preferences, self-esteem and emotional competence*. Unpublished doctoral thesis, University of South Africa, Pretoria.
- Cunneen, P. (2006). How to improve performance management. *People Management*, 12(1), 42
- Dalziell, E., & McManus, S. (2004). *Resilience, vulnerability and adaptive capacity: Implications for system performance*. Paper presented at the International Forum for Engineering Decision Making.
- Eisenhardt, K. & Martin, J. (2000). Dynamic capabilities: what are they? *Strategic Management Journal*, 21 (10/11), 1105-1121.
- Eppink, D.J. (1978). *Planning for strategic flexibility*. *Long Range Planning*, 11(4), 9-15.
- Evans, J.S. (1991). Strategic flexibility for high technology manoeuvres: A conceptual framework. *The Journal of Management Studies*, 28(1), 69-89.
- Farh, C. C., & Seo, Tesluk (2012). Emotional intelligence, teamwork effectiveness, & job performance: The moderating role of job context. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Pp. 890–900. doi:10.1037/a0027377
- Freyermuth, T. (2007). Retaining employees in a tightening labor market, RSM McGladrey, Website: www.cfo.com/whitepapers/index.cfm/displaywhitepaper/10308654?topic_id=10240327 – 22k –
- Garud, R., Kotha, S., 1994. Using the brain as a metaphor to model flexible productive units. *Academy of Management Review*, 19 (4), 671–698
- Gaertner, G. H., & Ramnarayan, S. (1983). Organizational effectiveness: An alternative perspective. *Academy of Management Review*, 8(1), 97-107
- Georgopoulos, B. S., & Tannenbaum, A. S. (1957). The study of organization effectiveness. *American Sociological Review*, 22, 534-540.
- Gerwin, D., (1993). *Manufacturing flexibility strategic perspective*. *Manage. Sci.*, 39: 395-410.
- Gordon J P., & Meredith, H. P. (2001). Creating and using a model to monitor managerial talent. *Business horizons journal*.

- Gutnick, L. (2007). A workplace design that reduces employee stress and increases employee productivity using environmentally responsible materials. An unpublished Thesis Eastern Michigan University.
- Hackman J. R., & Oldham G. R. (1980) *Work Redesign*. Addison- Wesley
- Harrigan K.R. (1985). *Strategic flexibility: the economics of strategic planning*. Lexington, Massachusetts, Lexington Books
- Haynes, B.P. (2008). The Impact of office comfort on productivity. *Journal of Facilities Management*, 6 (1), 37-51.
- Heilman, S., & Kennedy-Phillips, L. (2011). Making assessment easier with the organizational effectiveness model describe a comprehensive, step-by-step, mixed-methods assessment model. Published online by American College Personnel Association and Wiley Periodicals, Inc. Volume 15 (6) 29–32.
- Helfat, C.E., Finkelstein, S., Mitchell, W., Peteraf, M.A., Singh, H., Teece, D.J. & Winter, S.G. (2007). *Dynamic Capabilities: Understanding Strategic Change and Organizations*, London: Blackwell Publishing Company.
- Herman, R. D., &Renz, D. O. (1999). Theses on Nonprofit Organizational Effectiveness. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 28, 107-126
- Heath, B. (2006). Effect of perceived work environment on employee's job behaviour and organizational effectiveness. *Journal of Applied Psychology* Banarashindu, University, Varanasi.
- Heskett J.L, Jones T.O, Loveman G.W, Sasser W.E Jr. & Schlesinger L.A (1994). Putting service- profit chain at work. *Harvard Business Review*, 164- 174.
- Hill, T. & Chambers, S. (1991). Flexibility- A Manufacturing Conundrum, *International Journal of Operations and Production Management Review*,39, 80-105
- Hitt, M.A., Keats, B.W., & De Marie, S. (1998). Navigating in the new competitive landscape: Building strategic flexibility and competitive advantage in the 21st century. *Academy of Management Executive*, 12(4), 22–42.
- Homans, G. (1961). *Social behavior*. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World.
- Humphries, M. (2005). Quantifying occupant comfort: Are combined indices of the indoor environment practicable? *Building Research and Information*, 33(4), 317-325.
- Hytter, A. (2008). *Retention strategies in France and Sweden*. *The Irish Journal of Management*, 28(1), 59-79.
- Ibe, M.K., &Olori, W.O. (2016). Employee work attitudes and organizational survival in selected fast food companies in Port Harcourt, Nigeria. *International Journal of Advanced Academic Research | Social & Management Sciences*, 2(6), 24-34.
- Kohun, (2002). Workplace Environment and its impact on organizational performance in Public sector organizations. *International Journal of Enterprise Computing and Business System International Systems*, 1(1).
- Kogut, B., &Kulatilaka, N. 1994. Operating flexibility, global manufacturing, and the option value of a multinational network. *Management Science*, 40,123–139.

- Leblebici, D. (2012). Impact of workplace quality on employee's productivity. *Journal of Business, Economics and Finance*, 1(1), 38-40.
- Malik, M. E., Ghafoor, M.M., &Naseer, S. (2011). Organizational effectiveness: A case study of telecommunication and banking Sector of Pakistan, *Far East Journal of Psychology and Business*, 2(1), 37-48.
- McManus, S. (2007). *Organisational resilience in New Zealand*. Unpublished doctor of philosophy thesis, University of Canterbury, Christchurch.
- Meyer J.P., &Herscovitch L. (2001). Commitment in the workplace: toward a general model. *Human Resources Management Review*, 11(3), 299-326. Available [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S1053-4822\(00\)00053-X](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S1053-4822(00)00053-X)
- Mott, P. E. (1972). *The characteristics of effective organization*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Mutsuddi, I., &Mutsuddi, I. (2007). [Innovative Strategy and its Welfare Implications](#). *The IUP Journal of Financial Economics*, 0(2), 76-86.
- Ontario, R.N. (2004). Human resource management and firm performance. *Journal of Management*, 21 (71), 1-738.
- O'Neill, M.J. (2007). *Measuring workplace performance*. New York: Taylor and Francis
- Pfeffer, J. (1997). *The human equation: Building profits by putting people first*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business Scholl Press.
- Philips, J.J., & Edward, L. (2008). *Managing talent retention: An ROI Approach*.
- Pugh, D. S., Hickson, D. J., Hinings, C. R., Macdonald, K. M., Turner, C., & Lupton, T. (1963). A conceptual scheme for organizational analysis. *Administrative Science Quarterly* 8, 289-3
- Ramlall S. (2003). Managing employee retention as a strategy for increasing organizational competitive. *Applied HRM Research*, 8(2), 63-72.
- Scullion, H. &Collings, D. G. (2010). Global talent management. *Journal of World Business*, 45, 105-108.
- Shiva M.S.A. & Suar, D. (2010). Leadership, LMX, commitment and NGO effectiveness : transformational leadership, leader-member exchange, organizational commitment, organizational effectiveness and programme outcomes in non-governmental organizations. *International Journal of Rural Management*, 6(1), 2010: 117–150. DOI: 10.1177/097300521100600106
- Starr, R., Newfrock, J., &Delurey, M. (2003b). Enterprise resilience: Managing risk in the networked economy. *Strategy and Business*, 3 (30), 2-10.
- Sundstrom, E. & Sundstrom, G.M (1994). *Work places: The Psychology of the Physical Environment in Office*. Cambridge University Press. New York.
- Volberda H.W. (1996). towards the flexible form: how to remain vitalin hypercompetitive environments. *Organization Science*, 7(4), 359-387.
- Yesufu, T. M. (1984). *The dynamics of industrial relations*. Ibadan University Press

- Zafirovski, M. (2005). *Social exchange theory under scrutiny: A positive critique of its economic-behaviorist formulations. Electronic Journal of Sociology* 2 (2), 1-40.
- Zahra, S. A., Sapienza, H., &Davidsson, P. (2006). Entrepreneurship and dynamic capabilities: A review, model and research agenda. *Journal of Management Studies*, 43 (4), 911-955.
- Zheng, W., Sharan, K. & Wei, J. (2010). New Development of Organizational Commitment: A Critical Review (1960-2009). *African Journal of Business Management*, 4(1), Pp. 12-20.