

3.22 the respondents were divided with slightly more than half arguments that the behavioral component of working environment facilitated their work productivity with a mean of 3.22, close to neutral. In regard to standard deviation of the average which was less than 1 (.8618) implied that the data was not relatively dispersed with exception of current office of respondent being safe and secure and work environment being quiet enough for patient confidentiality having standard deviation greater than 1.

4.3 Management's level of awareness of workplace ergonomics

The results of the study were as shown in table 4.3.

	N	Min	Max	Mean	Std. Deviation	Variance
Workplace ergonomics practiced in your facility	81	1	5	2.91	1.086	1.180
In your honest opinion does the management take into the consideration your strategic workplace ergonomics	81	1	5	2.74	1.263	1.594
Average	81	1.0	4.5	2.83	1.040	1.082

Valid N (list wise) = 81

The findings on management level of awareness of workplace ergonomics indicated that the management does not take into consideration the strategic workplace ergonomics. However the respondents were neutral on whether ergonomics were practiced in their facility. The standard deviations of all responses as shown in Table 4.8 are greater than 1,000 as can be seen from average. This implies the responses though normally distributed the data values were relatively dispersed. Interpretatively, there were some respondents who held extreme opinions in regard to management taking into consideration of strategic workplace ergonomics with a standard deviation of 1.263.

4.4 Management support on implementation of workplace ergonomics

Concerning the management support on implementation of workplace ergonomics the findings indicated that responses disagreed that their management routinely train them on workplace ergonomics which returned a mean of 2.32 (Disagree). However there was indifference in regard to management provision of appropriate working tools for effective carrying out of respondent work. With an average standard deviation of 1.170 for the data meant the data was relatively dispersed. The results of the study were as shown in table 4.4.

4.4: Management support on implementation of workplace ergonomics

	N	Min	Max	Mean	Std. Deviation	Variance
Management routinely train you on the importance of workplace ergonomics	81	1	5	2.32	1.273	1.621
The management provide appropriate working tools to effectively carry out your duties	81	1	5	3.20	1.209	1.460
Average	81	1.0	5.0	2.759	1.170	1.369

Valid N (list wise) = 81

Discussion

4.5 Relationship between physical components of working environment and employee performance.

The researcher sought to investigate whether or not the physical components of working environment contributed towards employee performance guided by the following hypothesis.

H₀: $\mu_1 = \mu_2$: The physical component of environment has no influence on performance of health care workers in Nakuru County

H₁: $\mu_1 \neq \mu_2$: The physical component of environment has influence on performance of health care workers in Nakuru County

The findings are illustrated in Table 4.10 and 4.5.

Table 4.11: Physical components of working environment test statistics

	Physical components of working environment
Chi-Square	36.222 ^a
Df	4
Asymp. Sig.	.000
a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected frequencies less than 5. The minimum expected cell frequency is 16.2.	

Results showed that the test statistic was statistically significant: $\chi^2(4) = 36.222, p < .05$. Therefore, the researcher rejected the null hypothesis and concluded that there was a statistically significant difference between physical component of working environment and employee performance. The physical working environment plays a crucial role in enhancing employee's performance in health facility and should not be ignored.

4.6 Relationship between behavioral component of working environment and employee performance

The study further objected to find out the relationship between relevance behavioral components of working environment to employee performance guided by the following hypothesis.

H₀₂: $\mu_1 = \mu_2$: The behavioral component of environment has no influence on performance of health care workers in Nakuru County

H₁₂: $\mu_1 \neq \mu_2$: The behavioral component of environment has influence on performance of health care workers in Nakuru County

The findings are as shown in Table 4.6.

Table 4.6: Behavioral component of working environment test statistics

	Behavioral component of working environment
Chi-Square	34.741 ^a
Df	4
Asymp. Sig.	.000
a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected frequencies less than 5. The minimum expected cell frequency is 16.2.	

Results in table 4.13 above showed that the test statistic was statistically significant: $\chi^2(4) = 34.741, p < .05$. Therefore, the researcher rejected the null hypothesis and concludes that there was a statistically significant difference between behavioral components of working environment to employee performance. Behaviour of employees cannot be overlooked if performances in health institutions are to be enhanced.

4.7 Relationship between management’s level of awareness of workplace ergonomics and employee performance

The researcher opted to find the relationship between management’s level of awareness of workplace ergonomics and employee performance guided by the following hypothesis.

H₀₃: $\mu_1 = \mu_2$: The management level of awareness on strategic workplace ergonomics does not affect health care workers performance in Nakuru County

H₁₃: $\mu_1 \neq \mu_2$: The management level of awareness on strategic workplace ergonomics does affect health care workers performance in Nakuru County

The findings are as shown in Table 4.7

Table 4.7: Management’s level of awareness of workplace ergonomics test statistics

	Management’s level of awareness of workplace ergonomics
Chi-Square	22.642 ^a
Df	4
Asymp. Sig.	.000
a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected frequencies less than 5. The minimum expected cell frequency is 16.2.	

Results above showed that the test statistic was statistically significant: $\chi^2(4) = 22.642, p < .05$. Therefore, the researcher rejected the null hypothesis and concludes that there was a statistically significant difference between management’s level of awareness of workplace ergonomics and employee performance. Management need to be aware and sensitive to

workplace ergonomics as this will translate into taking actions that will enhance health workers performance.

4.8 Relationship between management support on implementation of workplace ergonomics and employee performance

The researcher sought to establish the relationship between management support on implementation of workplace ergonomics and employee performance guided by the following hypothesis.

H₀₄: $\mu_1 = \mu_2$: The managements support on implementation of workplace ergonomics does not affect health care workers performance in Nakuru County.

H₁₄: $\mu_1 \neq \mu_2$: The managements support on implementation of workplace ergonomics does affect health care workers performance in Nakuru County.

The findings are as shown in Table 4.8.

Table 4.8: Management support on implementation of workplace ergonomics test statistics

	Management support on implementation of workplace ergonomics
Chi-Square	21.284 ^a
Df	4
Asymp. Sig.	.000

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected frequencies less than 5. The minimum expected cell frequency is 16.2.

5. Summary, Conclusions & Recommendations

5.1 Summary

a) Physical component of environment and performance of health care workers

The first hypothesis was to assess the physical component of environment influence on performance of health care workers in Nakuru County. Descriptive statistics indicated that the respondents averagely held no opinion in regard to physical component of working environment with results inclined towards the mean of 3.00 (Neutral) which was depicted by average mean of 3.18 with average standard deviation for the data being above 1 meaning the opinions were relatively dispersed. Inferential statistics indicated that the test statistic was statistically significant: $\chi^2(4) = 36.222, p < .05$. Therefore, the researcher rejected the null hypothesis and concluded that there was a statistically significant difference between physical component of working environment and employee performance. The physical working environment played a crucial role in enhancing employee’s performance in health facility and should not be ignored.

b) Behavioral component of environment influence on performance of health care workers in Nakuru County

The second hypothesis was to assess extent to which the behavioral component of environment has influence on performance of health care workers in Nakuru County. Descriptive statistics indicated an average mean of 3.22 indicating the respondents were divided with slightly more than half arguments that the behavioral component of working environment facilitated their work productivity. In regard to standard deviation of the average which was less than 1 (.8618) implied that the data was not relatively dispersed with exception of current office of respondent being safe and secure and work environment being quiet enough for patient confidentiality having standard deviation greater than 1. Inferential statistics indicated the test statistic was statistically significant: $\chi^2(4) = 34.741$, $p < .05$. Therefore, the researcher rejected the null hypothesis and concluded that there was a statistically significant difference between behavioral components of working environment to employee performance. Behaviour of employees cannot be overlooked if performances in health institutions are to be enhanced.

c) Management levels of awareness on strategic workplace ergonomics effect on health care workers performance in Nakuru County

The third hypothesis was to assess the extents to which the management level of awareness on strategic workplace ergonomics, affect health care workers performance in Nakuru County. Descriptive statistics indicated the respondents were neutral on whether ergonomics were practiced in their facility. The standard deviations of all responses as shown in Table 4.8 are greater than 1.000 as can be seen from average. This implies the responses though normally distributed the data values were relatively dispersed. Interpretatively, there were some respondents who held extreme opinions in regard to management taking into consideration of strategic workplace ergonomics with a standard deviation of 1.263. Inferential statistics showed the test statistic was statistically significant: $\chi^2(4) = 22.642$, $p < .05$. Therefore, the researcher rejected the null hypothesis and concludes that there was a statistically significant difference between management's level of awareness of workplace ergonomics and employee performance. Management need to be aware and sensitive to workplace ergonomics as this will translate into taking actions that will enhance health workers performance.

d) Management support in enhancing implementation of strategic workplace ergonomics for health care workers in Nakuru County

The fourth hypothesis was to assess the extent to which the managements support enhances implementation of strategic workplace ergonomics for health care workers in Nakuru County. Descriptive statistics indicated that responses disagreed that their management routinely train them on workplace ergonomics which returned a mean of 2.32 (Disagree). However there was indifference in regard to management provision of appropriate working tools for

effective carrying out of respondent work. With an average standard deviation of 1.170 for the data meant the data was relatively dispersed. Inferential statistics showed that the test statistic was statistically significant: $\chi^2(4) = 21.284$, $p < .05$. Therefore, the researcher rejected the null hypothesis and concluded that there was a statistically significant difference between management support on implementation of workplace ergonomics and employee performance. Management support on implementation of workplace ergonomics was importance as it facilitated employee performance.

5.2 Conclusions

After incisively summarizing the study findings, the researcher was able to draw several pertinent conclusions which touched on the entire hypothesis.

a) Physical component of environment

The physical working environment played a crucial role in enhancing employee's performance in health facility and should not be ignored. All rounded physical environment acts as a source of encourage to health personnel in their dispensation of duty.

5.3 Behavioral component of working environment

Behaviour of employees cannot be overlooked if performances in health institutions are to be enhanced. The behavioral component of working environment affects attitudes of employees that translate into productivity. Patients require to be served by jovial and friendly health care person to help alleviate their suffering.

a) Management level of awareness on strategic workplace ergonomics

Management need to be aware and sensitive to workplace ergonomics as this will translate into taking actions that will enhance health workers performance. Employers should be responsible to provide a safe and healthful workplace for their workers as this CAN HELP avoid lost workday, injury and illness hence productive health workers.

b) Managements support in implementation of strategic workplace ergonomics

Management support on implementation of workplace ergonomics was importance as it facilitated employee performance. A strong commitment by management is critical to the overall success of an ergonomic process. Management should define clear goals and objectives for the ergonomic process, discuss them with their workers, assign responsibilities to designated staff members, and communicate clearly with the workforce.

5.4 Recommendations

a) Physical component of environment

The health institution are recommended not to ignore the combined effect of physical component of environment, managements support on implementation of strategic workplace ergonomics and management level of awareness

on strategic workplace ergonomics. If this is implemented as a bundle can go a long way in enhancing productivity

Behavioral component of working environment

Health institutions are recommended to emphasize on behavioral component of working environment of employee. This significantly enhances employee's performance though not markedly large.

a) Management level of awareness on strategic workplace ergonomics

Management of health institutions are recommended to adopt a participatory ergonomic approach. Workers should be directly involved in worksite assessments, solution development and implementation is the essence of a successful ergonomic process.

b) Managements support in implementation of strategic workplace ergonomics

Health Management teams are recommended to continuously carry out Progress Evaluation. Mechanism for this should be established and a corrective action procedures put in place to periodically assess the effectiveness of the ergonomic process and to ensure its continuous improvement and long-term success are achieved.

5.5 Recommendation for Further Study

The researcher recommends future research to use time series data to compare public and private hospital ergonomics and its effect on staff performance. Time series data will enhance future researchers consider important parameters like staff experiences with time.

References

- [1] Al-Anzi, N. (2009). *Workplace Environment and its Impact on Employee performance. A Thesis Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements of open university of Malaysia.*
- [2] American, Society of Interior Designers. (1999). *Recruiting and Retaining Qualified Employees by Design.* White Paper.
- [3] Campbell, A., Converse, E., & Rodgers, L. (1979). *The Quality of American Life: Perceptions, Evaluations and Satisfaction.* New York: Rusell Sage Foundation.
- [4] Carnevale, D. G. (1992). Physical Settings of Work. *Public productivity and Management Review*, 4(15), 423-436.
- [5] 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).
- [6] Clements, D. J. (1997). Specifying indoor Climate. In *Naturally Ventillated Buildings.* Spon.
- [7] Govindarajulu, N., & Bonnie, F. (2004). Motivating Employees for Environmental Improvement. *Industrial Management and Data Systems*, 104(4), 364-372.
- [8] Hameed, A. (2009). Impact of Office Design on Employees Productivity. *Journal of Public*

Affairs, Administration and Management, Volume 3, Issue 1, 1-5.

- [9] Haynes, B. P. (2008). An Evaluation of the Impact of Office Environment on Productivity. *Journal of Facilities*, 26(5/6), 178-19.
- [10] Kitchenham, B., & Pflieger, S. (2002). Principles of Survey Research. *Populations and Samples, Software Engineering Notes*, 27(5), 17-20.
- [11] Klotz, H. (1992). *Postmodern Architecture.* London: St. Martins Press.
- [12] Knoll. (2007). *Ergonomics for Health Care Environment.* Newyork: Tim Springer.
- [13] Leaman, A., & Bordass, B. (1993). Building design, complexity and manageability. *Facilities*, 11(9), 16-27.
- [14] Mugenda, O., & Mugenda, A. (2003). *Research Methods; Quantitative and Qualitative Approaches.* Nairobi: Acts Press.
- [15] Roelofsen P. (2002). The Impact of Office Environments on Employees Performance: The design of the workplace as a strategy for productivity enhancement. *Journal of Facilities Management*., 1(3), 247-264.
- [16] Sonnentag, S. (2002). *Psychological Management of Individual Performance.* Wales: John Wiley & Sons.
- [17] Springer, T. (1986). *Improving Productivity in the Workplace.* Springer Associates Inc. IL: St. Charles.
- [18] Stoessel, J. M. (2001). *The impact of the workplace on effective employee performance in corporate America.* New Jersey: A thesis submitted in partial fulfilment of the Requirements of Seaton Hall University for the Degree of Master of Arts.
- [19] Wells, & Meredith, M. (2000). Office Clutter or Meaningful Personal Displays: The Role of Office Personalization in Employee and Organizational Well-Being. *Environmental Psychology*, 3, 239-255.

Author Profile



Evelyn Wanjiru Kahare received a degree in Bachelor of Pharmacy (University of Nairobi) in Kenya in 2011. She joined Jomo Kenyatta University of Agriculture and Technology in 2012 to pursue Masters in Business Administration (Strategic Management). She is a holder of Senior Management Course and a TOT Of Referral strategy in Kenya. Currently she is a regional pharmacist in Nakuru