

WORK ENVIRONMENT AND EMPLOYEE PERFORMANCE OF COMMERCIAL BANKS IN NIGERIA

Agogbua, Stanley Ndubuisi

Department of Management Entrepreneurship Studies
Paul University, Awka, Nigeria
Mail: standago@yahoo.co.uk

Obi, Joseph O.

Department of Accountancy
Federal Polytechnic, Oko, Nigeria
Mail: obisom64@yahoo.com

Ezejiofor, Raymond A.

Department of Accountancy
Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka, Nigeria
Mail: thaddray4life@yahoo.com

Abstract

The study determined the effect of work environment on employee performance of Nigerian commercial banks. Therefore, ascertain the effect of physical work environment and space factor on employee performance of commercial banks in Nigeria. Survey research design was adopted for this study. A sample of eighty staff of commercial banks was used through purposive sampling. Data were collected from questionnaires distributed to staff of the sampled banks. Regression analysis was used to test the hypotheses. From the results, physical work environment and space factor were found to have significant effect on employee performance. The study thereby recommended that among others that firms should provide a spacious work physical environment for their staff because this boosts productivity significantly.

Keywords: Work environment, physical work environment, Space factor and Employee performance

Introduction

The environment is a person's immediate environment that can be altered to benefit their survival. Wrongful or inappropriate manipulation exposes workers to dangers that make their working conditions unsafe and reduce their productivity. As a result, the workplace reflects the atmosphere in which people conduct their work (Chapins, 1995), whereas an effective workplace is one in which the organization's management can achieve the desired goals (Mike, 2010; Shikdar 2004). Employees will always be dissatisfied if they believe their immediate surroundings are in sync with their responsibilities (Farh, 2012). According to Chandrasekar (2011), the type of workplace environment in which individuals work influences whether or not businesses succeed. Physical variables such as office structure and design, as well as psychosocial factors such as working conditions, job congruity, and social support, make up the workplace environment. Policies, which include employment conditions, are other parts of the workplace environment. Employee performance is boosted by a better physical workplace environment.

Human resources that are not properly managed will have an impact on the tasks they are assigned and, as a result, on performance. Employee contributions, both positive and bad, to achieving organizational goals are referred to as performance (Gibson, Ivancevich, and Donnelly, 2011). Employee performance, on the other hand, is the consequence of someone's work in carrying out the responsibilities that have been assigned to him based on talent, experience, and sincerity at the moment. This metric measures how well employees performed in relation to the tasks assigned to them (Hasibuan, 2006). Employee performance is critical to an organization's success, and the organization must examine the elements that can help employees perform better. According to Gibson (2011), organizational performance is largely driven by the success of its individuals. Gibson also claimed that the firm was under pressure to pay greater attention to crucial components that were determining factors in employee performance achievement. Money spent on buildings, equipment, technology, processes, and procedures is useless unless those who use them, who are part of the environment, are driven, because a firm can't operate without people. According to Puneet (2017), improvements in the physical architecture of the workplace result in a 5-10% boost in worker productivity. In general, management's new goal is to create an environment that attracts and maintains its workforce, because a pleasant working environment encourages employees and boosts their productivity and performance.

Organizational performance is one of the most important aspects in management research, and it is possibly the most important indication of organizational performance. Despite the fact that the concept of organizational performance is frequently utilized in academic literature, it has a variety of definitions. As a result, there is no universally accepted definition of this concept (Gavrea, Ilies, and Stegorean, 2011). The idea behind organizational performance is that it is a voluntary alliance of productive assets, such as human, physical, and financial resources, with the objective of attaining a common goal (Barney, 2001).

Employee performance is frequently assessed in terms of outcomes. However, it can be viewed in terms of behavior (Thompson, and Lawrence, 2010). Employee performance is measured against the company's standards (Tolbert and Hall) (2009). A multitude of characteristics can be examined when evaluating performance, including productivity, efficiency, effectiveness, quality, and profitability (Wood, & Sangster, 2002). The terms "efficiency" and "effectiveness" are not interchangeable. Efficiency refers to the ability to produce desirable results with the fewest resources possible, whereas effectiveness refers to the ability of employees to achieve the desired results.

According to the preceding, the office environment is intended to be modified by man to fit people and protect them from health-related difficulties, but this is not always the case, leading one to ask if it has nothing to do with employee productivity. Observation reveals that there are little studies on the physical work environment and productivity performance in Nigeria.

Lita (2016) discovered that management style has an impact on employee performance. Firstie and Madina (2017) have research findings that indicate how suitable leadership styles can boost employee performance inside agencies. According to Indah (2013), management style has no effect on employee performance because employee work quality, not work performance, determines employee performance. Internal control and leadership style are examples of organizational environmental factors that have the power to influence employee performance in the above presentation. This is corroborated by Sarita's (2012) research, which demonstrated that both internal control and leadership style influence employee performance. This study sought out to assess the effect of work environment on employee performance in Nigerian banks, based on the uncertainty of earlier data. Therefore, ascertain the effect of physical work environment and space factor on employee performance of commercial banks in Nigeria.

Literature Review

Work Environment

The phrase "work environment" is used to describe the overall settings in which employees work. Physical conditions such as workplace temperature, equipment/instruments, computers, work processes or procedures, and so on make up the work environment. The nature of the building has an impact on the work environment (Saidu, Onyeaghala and Eke, 2021). Poor ventilation or off-gassing of chemicals used during construction, as well as the accumulation of molds and mildew, can all contribute to poor building syndrome. According to Tripathi (2014), the work environment is defined as the physical setting, job profile, culture, and market conditions in which individuals operate. Each factor is intertwined and has an impact on the overall performance and productivity of employees. The quality of an employee's work environment has the greatest impact on their motivation and, as a result, their performance. Work environment can simply be defined as "the environment in which people work" (Briner, 2000); it is a broad category that includes the physical setting (e.g., heat, equipment), as well as job-specific qualities (e.g. workload, task complexity). He goes on to say that it also includes larger organizational characteristics (such as culture and history) as well as aspects of the external organizational environment (e.g. local labor market conditions, industry sector, work life balance) According to Ismail and Mohammed (2010), the physical work environment has an impact on employees' functions and will confirm their well-being. The layout, comfort level, ventilation and heating/temperature, lighting (both artificial and natural), furniture and fixtures all contribute to the physical work environment. Others include the aesthetic aspect, decoration, and style. The design (closed office plan that gives room for each employee to have a separate office of their own or a few people in each office, allows employees a greater amount of privacy than open plan office layout). It allows employees to work in silence, allowing them to concentrate on their tasks without being distracted. Employees will be able to think freely and creatively as a result of this. Physical aspects play a crucial part in the development of a company's network and relationships. Vischer (2008) stressed that for the fact that a conducive workplace environment provides support to the employees in carrying out their jobs, it should be conducive enough.

Organizations that are regarded as attractive places to work are more likely to have a competitive edge because they can better attract and retain highly qualified and competent people. This is an important aspect in the current labor market, which is constrained by COVID-19's problems. Less employee turnover, decreased levels of fraud, greater safety standards, easy acquisition and retention of competent and qualified individuals, and improved employee overall wellbeing are all possible outcomes of a good workplace environment (Abdulla, Baker and Vlastic, 2010).

The most important aspects of the physical office environment that might influence employees include ambient characteristics, spatial arrangements, and architectural design, to name a few. Ambient aspects in the office environments, such as sufficient ventilation and can influence employee's perspectives, actions, satisfaction, performance and productivity levels (Cunneen 2006).

Physical Work Environment and Employee Performance

The physical environment has an impact on how personnel are led, collaborate, and complete tasks in a company. As a subset of the work environment, the physical environment has had a direct impact on interpersonal connections and, as a result, productivity. This is due to the fact that the characteristics of a work environment, office space, or meeting space have an impact on employee happiness and productivity levels (Nzewi Augustine, Mohammed and Godson, 2018). The modern workplace is dynamic, varied, and ever-changing. In today's business sector, the workplace atmosphere is claimed to be the most important component in keeping employees happy (Amir, 2010).

An ergonomic workplace is another term for a physical work environment. Research into the workplace environment is required in order to provide an ergonomic workplace for all employees. Employees will be less likely to suffer from nerve injuries if they have this ergonomic physical workplace at work (Cooper & Dewe, 2004).

Furthermore, according to McCoy and Evans (2005), the features of the working environment must be appropriate so that employees are not stressed while completing their tasks. They also claimed in their essay that the physical factor plays a vital part in the development of the network and relationships at work. According to Amir (2010), the physical environment can be divided into two categories: office layout and workplace comfort. He also stated that the physical environment is and should be designed to help the organization achieve its objectives. A physical work environment might influence whether or not an employee fits in the job. According to Temessek (2009), physical work environment characteristics aid on the practical and aesthetic side in that the décor and setup of the office environment helps enhance the employees experience and facilitate better performance. Several academics, including Vischer (2007), conclude that the physical work environment has a substantial impact on staff performance, ensuring employee productivity (Rorong, 2016). Similarly Kurniawan and Heryanto (2019), indicates that the work environment plays a significant role in enhancing employee performance in organizations.

Space factor

When it comes to boosting staff productivity, the physical architecture of a workplace is quite crucial. In contrast to fully enclosed private offices, today's work environments support new ways of working and flexible workplaces that display ease of communication and interpersonal access, and this shift to an open plan office has increased employee productivity in a similar way to closed office spaces (Becker, 2002). Stress, pressure, and other psychological effects will result from a crowded and confined individual workstation.

Individual employees may experience insecurity and a lack of independence and motivation, which can lead to a high-stress atmosphere and lower job performance quality in the short term. Employees that require supervisory-professional and privacy are dissatisfied with an open-plan workplace, according to Gifford (1996). When spatial arrangements are incorrect, employees adapt to a less than pleasant work environment, and they may not even recognize their surroundings could be better.

According to Sehgal (2012), space components such as office furniture, which includes desks, chairs, file systems, shelves, and drawers, have an important role in employee productivity and efficiency, as well as the proper operation of any business. Also, whether or not the workplace furniture is ergonomic is one of the most important things to ensure. Ergonomic office furniture ensures that every employee is comfortable with his or her surroundings, including chairs, workstations, computer setup, and even environmental elements.

Employee performance

Employee performance, according to Platt and Sobotka (2010), is a combination of effort, ability, and job perception. Motivation, ability, and participation opportunities are all aspects that influence individual achievement (Armstrong, 2009). Performance, he believes, is a product of both ability and motivation. Employee performance is influenced by a variety of elements, the most significant of which is the office environment, which influences their motivation and thus their performance. According to Stup (2003), there are various aspects that contribute to the success of an employee's performance. Physical environment, equipment, meaningful work, performance expectation, performance feedback, and a terrible system are only a few of these elements. He goes on to say that in order to attain standard performance, employers must ensure that employees' tasks are completed on time in order to meet the organization's objectives (Nanzushi, 2015).

Individuals who are members of the organization are, of course, driving organizations to attain organizational goals. Individuals or employees play a critical role, hence monitoring employee performance is critical. Employee performance refers to a person's ability to complete duties entrusted to him based on skill, experience, seriousness, and time constraints (Hasibuan, 2008). Employee performance can also be defined as the size of an employee's contribution to the organization, which includes output quality, quantity, duration of output, attendance at work, and cooperative attitude (Mathis and Jackson 2006).

Furthermore, an incentive system based on employee performance should be developed. This is done to encourage people to work harder on their jobs. According to Stup (2003), there are various aspects that contribute to the success of an employee's performance. Physical work environment, equipment, meaningful work, performance expectation, performance feedback, reward for good or bad system, standard operating procedures, knowledge, skills, and attitudes are some of the elements. Internal motivation is characterized by Franco, Bennett, Kanfer, and Stubblebine (2000), although external elements such as requisite skills, intellectual capacity, and resources to execute the task certainly have an impact. As a result, businesses are required to provide proper working conditions in order to ensure the safety of their employees.

Empirical Studies

Shimelis and Mahesh (2021) investigated the impact of the working environment on the organizational performance of the Arjo Dedessa Sugar Factory (ADSF) and Finchaa Sugar Factory (FSF) in Ethiopia, including the physical working environment, work-related risks

and injuries, as well as the psychological and social working environments. The two sectors have a total of 867 and 2824 employees, respectively. Using Pearson's correlation and linear regression analysis, the statistical program SPSS V 23.0 was used to examine and determine the relationship between the dependent and independent variables. According to the findings, ADSF employees have a more modest social work environment than FSF employees, while both firms' physical work environments contribute the least. The physical working conditions of both the ADSF and the FSF had a statistically significant impact on performance. Employees' psychological health has been suggested to be improved by changes in the social environment. ADSF organization performance = $0.173 + 0.250$ physical work environment + 0.304 administrative work environment is the end result. Organizational Performance of the FSF = $0.157 + 0.355$ Working in a social environment. Saidu, Onyeaghala, and Eke (2021) wanted to know how the physical environment of the workplace affects employee productivity. The study used a case study approach, with the Central Bank of Nigeria's Jalingo Branch serving as the research site. To create a sample frame of 60, the probability sampling technique was used to select pieces from each cadre. The data collection instrument was a questionnaire that has been verified and evaluated for reliability. Data was collected and presented in frequency and percentage tables, which served as the foundation for data analysis. The hypotheses were investigated using SPSS version 23 and the Chi-Square statistical tool. Employee productivity is increased in a large physical work area, according to the findings. Employee productivity rises in a work setting where appropriate equipment is available. Afolabi, Abiola, Olaiya, and Emeje (2020) used academic staff at Federal Polytechnic Offa in Kwara State to investigate the impact of work environment on employee performance. The data was collected from the polytechnic's academic personnel using a survey research design and a questionnaire. Inferential statistics (regression and correlation matrix) were used to analyze the data, and the results revealed that the polytechnic work environment has a considerable impact on academic staff teaching efficacy and research output. It was determined that academic staff's teaching ability and research output are both lacking. According to the findings, the polytechnic work environment does not foster effective teaching or high-quality research. Agaba, Ssebagala, Micheal, Pastor, and Osunsan (2020) investigated the impact of the workplace environment on employee performance among Health Care Providers, with a particular focus on Fort Portal Regional Referral Hospital. The study's specific goals were to determine the effects of the physical environment, psychological environment, and work-life balance on employee performance among Fort Portal Referral Hospital's health care providers. The data on the study variables were collected at the same time in the study, which was done using a cross sectional research methodology. The study featured 324 health care providers at Uganda's Fort Portal Regional Referral Hospital, of whom 140 were considered for the study but only 122 replied. Administrative employees, doctors, nurses, lab officers, and pharmacists were among them. In Fort Portal Regional Referral Hospital, however, the study discovered that the work environment has a substantial impact on employee performance ($R^2 = 0.11$, $p < 0.05$). Internal control and leadership style were examined by Christina, Brahmana, and Febrianti (2020) as organizational environmental elements that are suspected of generating ineffective employee performance. Employees of the regional secretariat of the Kuningan Regency made up the study population. Purposive sampling was used to select 116 employees for this investigation. Employee performance can be influenced by the organizational environment in the form of internal control and leadership style, according to the results of data processing using multiple regressions. Hope, Arachie, Ibrahim, and Okoli (2018) investigated the nature of the relationship between physical working environment and employee performance in a sample of Anambra State breweries. The study used a survey research method. The study's population was 550 people, and the sample size was 233. The sample size was calculated

using the Taro Yamane formula, and the questionnaire was distributed using Bowley's proportion allocation formula. The hypotheses were tested using Pearson's Product Moment Correlation statistics. The findings revealed that among the companies analyzed, there is a significant link between ergonomics and job satisfaction. Khaled and Haneen (2017) look into the impact of the workplace on job performance. With a sample size of 85 employees, an engineering firm was used as a case study. In addition to the literature analysis, a quantitative methodology involving a cross-sectional survey was utilized to meet the study objectives. Noise, temperature, air, light and color, space, and the happiness of employers were all investigated in relation to work environment issues. The information gathered was examined using (SPSS, Version 22). The findings revealed that situational constraints, which include characteristics like noise, office furniture, ventilation, and light, are the most significant work environment conditions that negatively affect job performance and should be given greater attention. Using Edo City Transport Service, Chika and Dominic (2017) evaluated the impact of work environment on employee productivity. The goal was to see if the nature of the workplace contributed to low productivity, absenteeism, and tardiness among employees. According to the findings of the study, a positive work environment can help boost employee morale and productivity. Employees will experience a feeling of belonging if the office is clean, quiet, well-organized, well-lit, and ventilated. This will motivate them to work efficiently and productively. Nanzushi (2015) investigates the impact of the workplace environment on employee performance in Nairobi City County's mobile telecommunication enterprises. All personnel at the headquarters of Airtel Networks Kenya Limited, Safaricom Limited, and Telkom Kenya Limited were targeted. There were 250 Airtel customers, 976 Safaricom customers, and 400 Telkom customers in total. A total of 164 employees were included in the sample size. The study was conducted using a descriptive research design. The researcher employed stratified random sampling. The study relied on primary data gathered through the use of a semi-structured questionnaire. Descriptive statistics such as frequencies, mean scores, standard deviation, and percentages were used to examine the data. The study concluded that physical environment characteristics, reward, management / leadership style, training and development, and work-life balance were all work environment aspects that influenced employee performance. Employees were dissatisfied with their firms' management style and promotions, according to the data. Akinyele (2014) investigated the impact of the workplace on worker productivity: a case study of the oil and gas industry in Lagos, Nigeria. The respondents were chosen at random from four different oil and gas industries in Lagos. Primary data used for this study were collected with the aid of a close ended structured questionnaire. T-test was used to test the research hypotheses. The results of T-test indicate that conducive work environment stimulates creativity of workers, hence their productivity. It means that unhealthy working conditions contribute to low productivity of employees. At Dar es Salaam Region's Institute of Finance Management, Bushiri (2014) assesses the impact of working environment on employee performance. The descriptive research design was used for this investigation. The respondents for the study were chosen using a simple random selection procedure. There were fifty (50) participants in this study, with twenty-five (25) senior employees and twenty-five (25) junior staff. Data was collected using structured questionnaires. According to the conclusions of the study, the working environment of an organization has an impact on its members. Employees' performance will increase if management addresses the issues discovered throughout the research, according to the report.

DATA ANALYSIS

Out of eighty (80) copies of questionnaires distributed, sixty four (64) were returned, this represent 80%.

Data Analysis**Table 1: Summary of the Responses**

S/N	Questions Weight	SA	A	U	D	SD
1	Businesses are required to provide proper working conditions in order to ensure the safety of their employees.	17	34	0	9	4
2	Individuals who are members of the organization are, of course, driving organizations to attain organizational goals.	25	37	0	2	0
3	Employee performance is influenced by a variety of elements, the most significant of which is the office environment.	26	30	1	7	0
4	To attain standard performance, employers must ensure that employees' tasks are completed on time to meet the organization's objectives.	20	35	1	8	0
5	physical work environment has a substantial impact on staff performance, ensuring employee productivity	22	34	0	7	1
6	Physical environment has an impact on how personnel are led, collaborate, and complete tasks in a company.	26	38	0	0	0
7	In today's business sector, the workplace atmosphere is claimed to be the most important component in keeping employees happy	21	35	2	6	0
8	Employees will be less likely to suffer from nerve injuries if they have this ergonomic physical workplace at work	20	35	1	6	2
9	Space factor helps reducing stress, pressure, and other psychological effects will result from a crowded and confined individual workstation	22	38	1	0	3
10	the physical architecture of a workplace is quite crucial, when it comes to boosting staff productivity,	19	35	0	10	0
11	Space components have an important role in employee productivity and efficiency,	25	29	2	8	0
12	Ergonomic office furniture ensures that every employee is comfortable with his or her surroundings.	19	36	0	9	0

Source: Field Survey, 2022

Table 2: Descriptive Statistics

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
EMP	5	2.00	136.00	51.2000	58.79796
PWE	5	3.00	142.00	51.2000	61.96128
SPF	5	3.00	138.00	51.2000	58.96779
Valid N (listwise)	5				

From the descriptive statistics of the variables as shown that the mean dependent and independents variables is 51.200. Maximum and minimum values of employment performance (EMP) are 136.00 and 2.00 respectively. The standard deviation stood at 58.80. The maximum and minimum values of physical work environment (PWE) are 142.00 and 3.00 respectively while the standard deviation is 61.96. The maximum and minimum values of space factor (SPF) are 138.00 and 3.00 respectively while the standard deviation is 58.97.

Test of Hypotheses

Hypothesis One

Ho: Physical work environment does not significantly affect employee performance of commercial banks in Nigeria.

Table 3: Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.998 ^a	.997	.996	3.89388

a. Predictors: (Constant), PWE

The Table 3 above shows that the coefficient of determination is $R^2 = 0.997$ and the Adjusted R^2 is 0.983. Adjusted $R^2 = 0.996$ implies that 99.6% of the variations in employment performance of the sampled commercial banks is influenced by joint interaction of physical work environment (PWE), while about 0.04% of the variance is explained by other factors not captured in the study model.

Table 4: ANOVA^a

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	13783.313	1	13783.313	909.050	.000 ^b
	Residual	45.487	3	15.162		
	Total	13828.800	4			

a. Dependent Variable: EMP

b. Predictors: (Constant), PWE

Table 5: Coefficients^a

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	2.694	2.371		1.136	.338
	PWE	.947	.031	.998	30.150	.000

a. Dependent Variable: EMP

From tables 4 and 5 which represent the goodness of fit respectively shows that the regression equation or model that was used to predict employee performance is highly significant at 5% level of significance (p -value = 0.00). Based on the t -value of 30.150, and p -value of 0.000, with coefficients value of 0.998 was found to have a positive effect and this effect was also statistically significant as its p -value is less than 0.05 value. This result, therefore suggests that we should accept our alternate hypothesis one (H_1) which states that physical work environment significantly affect employee performance of commercial banks in Nigeria.

Hypothesis Two

Ho: Space factor does not significantly affect employee performance of commercial banks in Nigeria.

This hypothesis was tested with the questions 1-4 and 9-12 in table 1.

Table 6: Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.999 ^a	.999	.998	2.29742

a. Predictors: (Constant), SPF

The Table 3 above shows that the coefficient of determination is $R^2 = 0.999$ and the Adjusted R^2 is 0.983. Adjusted $R^2 = 0.998$ implies that 99.8% of the variations in employment performance of the sampled commercial banks is influenced by joint interaction of space factor (SPF), while about 0.02% of the variance is explained by other factors not captured in the study model.

Table 7: ANOVA^a

Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1 Regression	13812.966	1	13812.966	2617.026	.000 ^b
Residual	15.834	3	5.278		
Total	13828.800	4			

a. Dependent Variable: EMP

b. Predictors: (Constant), SPF

Table 8: Coefficients^a

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
1 (Constant)	.177	1.432		.123	.910
SPF	.997	.019	.999	51.157	.000

a. Dependent Variable: EMP

From tables 7 and 8 which represent the goodness of fit respectively shows that the regression equation or model that was used to predict employee performance is highly significant at 5% level of significance (p -value = 0.000). Based on the t -value of 51.157, and p -value of 0.000, with coefficients value of 0.999 was found to have a positive effect and this effect was also statistically significant as its p -value is less than 0.05 value. This result, therefore suggests that we should accept our alternate hypothesis one (H_1) which states that space factor significantly affect employee performance of commercial banks in Nigeria.

Discussion and Conclusion

The study determined the effect of work environment on employee performance of Nigerian commercial banks. Therefore, ascertain the effect of physical work environment and space factor on employee performance of commercial banks in Nigeria. Data were collected from questionnaires distributed to staff of the sampled banks. Regression analysis was used to test the hypotheses. From the results, physical work environment and space factor were found to have significant effect on employee performance. This result is in agreement with the reports of Christina, Brahmana and Febrianti (2020); Chika and Dominic (2017) whose results indicate that employee performance can be influenced by the organizational environment in the form of internal control and leadership style. However, the result disagreed with that of Nanzushi (2015) who revealed that employees were not satisfied with the management style and promotions in their organizations.

Meanwhile, the findings of this study suggest that when companies place a premium on their employees' well-being, such as a pleasant work environment, employee morale and performance improve significantly. Employees will have a feeling of belonging if the office is clean, quiet, well-organized, well-lit, and ventilated. This will motivate them to work efficiently and successfully toward the organization's goals. As a result, this study suggests that the work environment has a favorable significant impact on commercial bank employees' performance in Nigeria.

Recommendations

The following recommendations were made based on the findings:

1. Organizations should provide a roomy work physical environment for their employees, as this significantly boosts employee productivity.
2. The physical structure of an office should be prioritized for improving employee productivity; as a result, work environments should encourage innovative ways of working and flexible workplaces.

References

- Abdulla J, Baker S, & Vlastic, B. (2010). Environmental performance In a Banking Perspective. *Journal on Finance and Banking*, 33(1), 22-33.
- Afolabi, O. M., Abiola, B. I., Olaiya, A. L. and Emeje, S. O. (2020). Impact of Work Environment on Employees' Performance in Federal Polytechnic, Offa, Kwara State, Nigeria. *KIU Journal of Social Sciences. Kampala International University*, 6(1), 217–222
- Agaba, D. Ssebagala, C., Micheal, T., Pastor, K. and Osunsan, O. K.(2020). Workplace environment and employee performance in fort portal referral hospital, Uganda. *International Research Journal of Multidisciplinary Scope (IRJMS)*, 1(SI-2): 1-8
- Akinyele, T. S. (2014). The influence of work environment on workers' productivity: A case of selected oil and gas industry in Lagos. Nigeria *African Journal of Business Management*, 4(3): 299-307.
- Amir, F. (2010). Measuring the impact of office environment on performance level of employees: A case of private sector of Pakistan. In *Proceedings of the 2nd International Conference of AGBA South Asia Chapter on Nurturing Innovation, Entrepreneurship, Investments and Public Private Partnership-in Global Environment*, 2010; 247-264.
- Armstrong, M. (2006). *Strategic Human Resource Management: A Handbook of Human Resource Management Practice*, 10th ed. London: Kogan Page.
- Becker, F. (2002). Improving organisational performance by exploiting workplace flexibility. *Journal of Faculty Management*, 1(2), 154-162.
- Briner, R.B. (2000). Relationships Between Work Environments, Psychological Environments & Psychological Well-Being. *Journal of Occupational Medicine*, 50 (5), 299-303
- Brenner, P. (2004). Workers physical surrounding. Impact bottom line accounting: Smarts Pros.com.
- Bushiri, C. A. (2014). The impact of working environment on employees' performance: the case of institute of finance management in dar es salaam region. A Dissertation Submitted In Partial Fulfilment Of The Requirements For The Degree Of Master In Human Resources Management Of The Open University Of Tanzania.
- Chapins A. (1995). *Workplace and the performance of workers*. Reston: USA. 1995.
- Chandrasekar K. (2011). Workplace environment and its impact on organisational performance in public sector organisations. *International journal of enterprise computing and business systems*. 2011,1(1), 1-19.
- Christina, V., Brahmana, S.S., and Febrianti, R. A. M. (2020). Influence of organizational environment on employee performance study in the government of the district city. *International Journal of Psychosocial Rehabilitation*, 24(1),
- Chika, E. D., & Dominic, S. (2017). The effect of work environment on employee productivity: A case study of edo city transport services benin city, Edo State Nigeria. *European Journal of Business & Innovation Research*, 5(5), 23-39.
- Cooper, C., and Dewe, P. (2004). *Stress, a brief history*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Cunneen P. (2006). How to improve performance management. *People Management*.; 12(1): 12.
- Firstie, H. Sepmon Siti M.. (2017). Pengaruh Gaya Kepemimpinan, Kompetensi dan Motivasi Kerja Terhadap Kinerja Pegawai Negeri Sipil di Dinas Perhubungan Kabupaten Kapuas. *Artikel Ilmiah Manajemen dan Akuntansi*, Vol. 13, No. 4, 2017..
- Farh, C. C.; Seo, Tesluk (2012). Emotional Intelligence, Teamwork Effectiveness, & Job Performance: The Moderating Role of Job Context. *Journal of Applied Psychology*
- Franco LM, Bennett S, Kanfer R, and Stubblebine P, (2000). Health Worker Motivation in Jordan and Georgia: A Synthesis of the Results, Major Applied Research 5, Technical Paper 3 Bethesda, Maryland: Partnership for Health Reform Project.

- Gibson, J. I., Ivancevich dan , J. M. and Donnelly, J.H..(2011). Organisasi: Perilaku, Struktur, Proses. Diterjemahkan oleh: Nunuk Adiarni, Jakarta: Binarupa Aksara.
- Gifford, R. (1996). Environmental psychology: principles and practice. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Hope, N. N., Arachie, A., Ibrahim, M. and Okoli, G. (2018). Physical work environment and employee performance in selected brewing firms in Anambra State, Nigeria. *Journal of Good Governance and Sustainable Development in Africa*, 4(2): 131-14.
- Ismail, J. L. M. and Mohammed, S. H. (2010). The influence of physical workplace environment on the productivity of civil servants: The case of the Ministry of Youth and Sports, Putrajaya, Malaysia.
- Khaled A. and Haneen, O. (2017). The Influence of Work Environment on Job Performance: A Case Study of Engineering Company in Jordan. *International Journal of Applied Engineering Research* ISSN 0973-4562 12(24); pp. 15544-15550 © Research India Publications. <http://www.ripublication.com>
- Kurniawan H, and Heryanto H. (2019). Effect of Work Discipline and Work Environment on Employee Performance with Work Motivation as an Intervening Variable in Department of Tourism, Youth and Sport of Padang District. *Archives of Business Research*. 2019; 7(7): 88-101.
- Lita V. P.. (2016). Pengaruh Gaya Kepemimpinan Terhadap Kinerja Karyawan di Dinas Tenaga
- Mathis, R. L. and Jackson, J. H.. (2006). Human Resource Management: Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia. Diterjemahkanoleh: Dian Angelia. Jakarta: SalembaEmpat
- Mike A. (2010). Visual workplace: How you see performance in the planet and in the office. *International Journal of Financial Trade*. 2010; 11(3): 250-260.
- McCoy, J. M., & Evans, G. W. (2005). Physical work environment. In: J. Barling,
- Nanzushi , C. (2015). The effect of workplace environment on employee performance in the mobile telecommunication firms in Nairobi city county. A Research Project Submitted In Partial Fulfillment Of The Requirements For The Award Of The Degree Of Master Of Business Administration University Of Nairobi.
- Nzewi HN, Augustine A, Mohammed I, and Godson O. (2018). Physical work environment and employee performance in selected brewing firms in Anambra State. *Nigeria Journal of Good Governance and Sustainable Development in Africa*. 2018; 4: 131-145.
- Platt and Sobotka. (2010). Psychological Management of Individual Performance. John Wiley & Sons, Wales..
- Puneet, P. (2017). The impact of work environment on employees' productivity, Munich, GRIN Verlag, Available at: <https://www.grin.com/document/412794>
- Rorong, S.V. (2016). The Impact of Physical Work Environment Toward Employee Performance At Pt. Bank Negara Indonesia Manado Regional Office. *Jurnal EMBA: Jurnal Riset Ekonomi, Manajemen, Bisnis dan Akuntansi.*; 4(1): 441-450
- Sarita Permata Dewi. 2012. Pengaruh Pengendalian Internal dan Gaya Kepemimpinan Terhadap Kinerja Karyawan SPBU Yogyakarta. *Jurnal Nominal*, 01(1).
- Saidu, A. Y., Onyeaghala O. H. and Eke, G. J.(2021). Effect of Workplace Physical Environment on the Productivity of Employees in Public Organization: A Study of the Central Bank of Nigeria, Jalingo Branch, Taraba State. *Noble International Journal of Business and Management Research* ISSN(e): 2520-4521 ISSN(p): 2522-6606 Vol. 05, No. 01, pp: 01-13, 2021 Published by Noble Academic Publisher URL: www.napublisher.org DOI: <https://doi.org/10.51550/nijbmr.51.1.13>
- Sehgal, S. (2012). Relationship between Work Environment And Productivity. *International Journal of Engineering Research and Applications*, 2(4), 1992-1995.

- Shikdar AA. (2004). Identification of ergonomic issues that affect workers in oilrigs in desert environments. *International Journal of Occupational Safety and Ergonomics*. 2004; 10(2): 169-177.
- Shimelis, M. and Mahesh, G. (2021). Effect of Work Environment on Organizational Performance: A Comparative Study on Arjo Dedessa and Finchaa Sugar Factory. *International Journal of Industrial Engineering & Production Research*. 32(4): 1-14 DOI: 10.22068/ijiepr.32.4.1
- Stup, R. (2003). Control the Factors that Influence Employee Success. *Managing the Hispanic Workforce Conference*. Cornell University and Pennsylvania State University.
- Temessek M. (2009). Expanding the psychosocial work environment: workplace norms and 34 work–family. *Conflict as Correlates of Stress and Health*. 2009;3(1):71-88.
- Tripathi, A. (2014). Workplace Environment: Consequences on Employees. Retrieved 05/08/2015 <http://www.linkedin.com/pulse>
- Vischer J.C. (2007). The effects of the physical environment on job performance: towards a theoretical model of workspace stress. *Stress and health: Journal of the International Society for the Investigation of Stress*.;23(3):175-184.