

WORKPLACE ORGANISATION AND EMPLOYEE PRODUCTIVITY: EMPIRICAL EVIDENCE FROM INFANT FIRMS IN SOUTHWEST, NIGERIA

¹Dauda Adewole Oladejo, ²Grace Oluwatoyin Obadare, ³Taofik Olawale
Oladunjoye and ⁴Christy Olufunmilayo Aderinto

¹Department of Entrepreneurial Studies, College of Entrepreneurship and Development Studies,
The Federal University of Agriculture, Abeokuta, Ogun State, Nigeria

²Department of Entrepreneurial Studies, Faculty of Management Sciences, Osun State University,
Osogbo, Okuku Campus, Osun State, Nigeria

³Center for Entrepreneurship Development, Yaba College of Technology, Yaba, Lagos State, Nigeria
Department of Management Studies, Faculty of Humanities, Management and Social Sciences,
Dominican University, Samonda Ibadan, Oyo State, Nigeria

Corresponding Author's email: oladejoda@funaab.edu.ng



Abstract

This study empirically examined the impact of workplace organization on worker productivity in infant entrepreneurship firms in Southwest, Nigeria. The specific objective of the study was to analyze the effects of physical structure, social interactions, management policies and practices, equipment and job aids, as well as perceived employees' psychological feelings on productivity. A descriptive study design was employed to enhance the generalizability of study results. Primary data were collected using a structured questionnaire. Correlation and regression statistics were used for data analysis. The results of this study showed that there was a statistically significant relationship between explanatory and outcome variables physical structure ($r = 0.296$), social interactions ($r = 0.663$), management policies and practices ($r = 0.550$), equipment and job aids ($r = 0.608$), and employee psychological feelings about the workplace ($r = 0.531$) ($p < 0.05$). As a result, the explanatory variables-physical structure ($R^2 = 0.087$, Adjusted $R^2 = 0.078$) ($\beta = 0.228$), social interactions ($R^2 = 0.440$, Adjusted $R^2 = 0.431$) ($\beta = 0.230$), management policies and practices ($R^2 = 0.087$, Adjusted $R^2 = 0.078$) ($\beta = 0.229$), equipment and job aids ($R^2 = 0.167$, Adjusted $R^2 = 0.158$) ($\beta = 0.491$), employee psychological feelings (Adjusted $R^2 = 0.393$, Adjusted $R^2 = 0.393$) ($\beta = 0.696$); ($p < 0.5$)) make a beneficial impact as found in this study. Therefore, it was recommended that corporate management should set up a pre-arranged workplace to improve employee productivity.

Keywords: Employee Productivity, Infant Firms, Emotion, Social Interactions, Workplace Organization, Management Policies

Introduction

Humans are the most valuable resource in any organization. The success of any profit-making or non-profit organization can be traced back to the efficiency of its employees. People work for organizations for a variety of reasons, including financial gain, self-fulfillment, self-actualization, social contacts, and a variety of other self-interests. People strive to meet their physiological, safety, love and belonging, self-esteem, and self-actualization needs through their work (Maslow,

1943). Work does, in fact, play a significant role in a person's life, consuming more time than any other single activity. This assumes that the majority of people spend more time at work than anywhere else. Employee motivation can be influenced by the quality of the workplace arrangement, resulting in improved employee performance.

It has been observed however that there is a lack of dignity of labour in society, which leads to an increase in workers' casual attitudes toward work. It is no surprising, then, that the same Nigerian workers leave the country and are rated as hardworking, high-performing nationals who excel in their chosen fields. This is a clear evidence that Nigerians' nonchalant attitude in various organizations is not due to their genetic makeup, as they are doing well outside of Nigeria. It is reasonable to want to learn about the impact of workplace organization or setting on employees' attitudes toward high performance. People's motivations for working have clearly shifted. Workers today, according to Maslow's (1943) postulation, work not only to meet their physiological needs, but also to meet other needs such as job satisfaction, opportunities for personal growth and development, work-life balance, health, and safety. Abioro et al. (2018) opined that an unhealthy work environment can lead to exhaustion as a result of stress. As a result, worker well-being has risen to prominence in the modern workplace. Surprisingly, many business owners believe that teaching employees the necessary job skills is the best way to increase productivity. They owe their employees a 'duty of care,' which is to provide a comfortable and safe working environment that is necessary for their well-being and optimal performance. Akinyele (2009) opined that an attractively designed and motivating workplace gives its employees a deep sense of responsibility and prepares them to perform their assigned tasks efficiently.

Furthermore, employers of labour should invariably look beyond financial rewards for people's participation in productive activities; employees also want a workplace that is a home away from home for them to enjoy their work engagements. Ignoring this may have an impact on some key organizational performance factors. Absenteeism, poor customer relations, conflicts among colleagues, incessant errors and mistakes on tasks assigned, low morale and low motivation, low-quality product/service delivery, resignations, and terminations, poor employer reputation among employees, and reduced productivity are examples of these (Malik & Ahmad, 2011). Creating a safe and organized workplace, in addition to adequate remuneration/benefits, supervisor support, location, work processes, and tools, will boost employee morale and productivity.

The researchers observed groups of people doing the same thing at different companies and discovered that some are happy and efficient at their desks while others in other companies are drabby, disinterested, and uninterested in achieving maximum output. The importance of a prearranged workplace on employee well-being and efficiency is a serious workplace problem that can be costly to both the employer and the employee if not addressed immediately. Lars et al. (2014) discovered a positive correlation between working environment and productivity in their study of productivity stagnation and decreasing workforce in four Nordic countries - Norway, Finland, Denmark, and Sweden. However, desirable business goals and objectives can only be met when the work environment permits it. As a result, organizations must go beyond their traditional roles of simply providing a place for people to work and instead create an environment in which people enjoy what they do and feel a sense of pride and fulfillment in what they do (Egwu. 2011).

The following are the null hypotheses for the study. Ho1: there is no statistically significant impact of physical structure arrangement on employee productivity; Ho2: social interactions among workers have no significant influence on employee productivity; Ho3: management policies and practices have no significant impact on employee productivity; Ho4: tool and job aid arrangement have no positive effect on employee productivity; and Ho5: employee psychological feelings about the workplace organization have no significant effect on employee productivity. The study will serve as a resource for scholars and researchers conducting additional research on employee well-being and productivity. It will also assist entrepreneurs and business owners in their pursuit of a more productive work environment with existing employees.

Literature Review

Workplace Organisation Variables and Employee Productivity

Workplace organization can be defined as the pre-arrangement of an organization's internal environment. The internal environment is made up of various factors that can act as catalysts for motivating employees at work. They have a significant impact on employee performance. This study identifies five different variables for effective workplace prearrangement. These are physical structures, social interactions, workers' psychological feelings, management policies and practices, and equipment and job aids (Saklani & Jha, 2011).

The physical structure of an organization can be thought of as the area where the organization's day-to-day operations take place. According to Opperman (2002), the physical structure is made up of three distinct environments: technical, human, and organizational. According to Yusuf (2002) and Akinyele (2010) a collaborative workplace can lead to job satisfaction as a result of happiness and harmonious relationships among all organizational members. Inconvenient physical structures can cause a variety of symptoms such as fatigue, dizziness, eye-watering, and skin irritation. This can result in serious illnesses such as lung disease and cancer. According to McCoy and Evans (2005), an unplanned physical structure in organizations causes an employee to become dissatisfied with their working environment, slowing them down and directly affecting overall productivity.

The social workplace (human workplace environment) refers to workplace relationships and interactions. It consists of workplace relationships between peers, supervisors, subordinates, customers, and management. Communication styles, cooperation, and teamwork are also included. Personal respect, alienation, and discrimination at work are all issues that can undermine workers' self-esteem, respect, satisfaction, and, ultimately, productivity. Bullying is another example of a 'human relationship' in the workplace. Criticism, blaming, joking, excessive monitoring, and employee isolation are all examples of workplace bullying (Khan, Sabri, & Nasir, 2016). Bullying occurs not only through organizational leaders but also through all other members of the organization, regardless of status (Tao, 2015; Tukaki, Taniguchi & Hirokawa, 2013). Bullying causes job stress, burnout, and low productivity (Warr, Bindl, Parker & Iceoghu, 2014; Longo & Dedonno, 2018).

Apparatuses, work-life balance, work process, and employee training and development are examples of equipment and job aids. Job aid or performance support is the step-by-step explanation of work methods. Job aids and equipment improve work execution. A job aid is similar to a cheat sheet of cues that allows workers to complete a task without having to memorize it. It could be a chart with illustrations, diagrams, or simple methods for carrying out work. Employee

efficiencies are increased because they do not have to commit to their memories' work procedures. As a result, productivity rises. Some of the factors that contribute to worker productivity are outdated technology, unsafe equipment, and tools. To achieve increased worker productivity in an organization, it is necessary to constantly update obsolete equipment and adapt to positive changes in technology (Chika & Shimawua, 2017).

Employees' perceptions of their workplace are described in the psychological workplace environment. Employees' feelings about their work are summarized in terms of time spent at work, teamwork, conflict resolution practices, work methods, reward systems, and other written and unwritten employment contracts. These elements have an impact on employee performance. According to Mohammed (2005) raising workers' wages improves their work performance and organizational outputs. The use of soothing paints to paint offices increases employee productivity (Andrew, 2016). However, a psychological workplace organization or setting is made up of three phenomena: affective, cognitive, and behavioral (George, 2017). These have an impact on how a worker feels and performs.

Management policies can be defined as guidelines for management actions in the day-to-day operations of an organization. Organizations should set aside policies on various aspects of their operations in order to run profitable operations. When management policies are meticulously drafted, emphasizing both corporate and individual goals, they become catalysts in the successful operation of the organization, whether for-profit or not-for-profit. To create an enviable workplace where employees want to go above and beyond the call of duty, all organization members or their representatives must be involved in developing these policies. Management practices put policies into action in order to achieve the goals and objectives of organizations. Management practices refer to the act of implementing policies using approved procedures over time. Management policies and practices that are effective will motivate workers to high performance and increase productivity.

Theoretical Foundation for the Study

This research is founded on Herzberg's two-factor theory. According to the theory, two sets of determinants influence workers' willingness to work and levels of performance (Ribbons & Judge, 2007). He referred to these determinants as motivation and hygiene factors. In this context, motivators are fundamental or basic factors that increase employee job satisfaction, whereas hygiene factors prevent employee dissatisfaction. According to this theory, improving the working environment motivates employees to perform well (Ribbons & Judge, 2007). This research is founded on Herzberg's two-factor theory. According to the theory, two sets of determinants influence workers' willingness to work and levels of performance (Ribbons & Judge, 2007). He referred to these determinants as motivation and hygiene factors. In this context, motivators are fundamental or basic factors that increase employee job satisfaction, whereas hygiene factors prevent employee dissatisfaction. According to this theory, improving the working environment motivates employees to perform well (Ribbons & Judge, 2007).

This theory is relevant to the present study as it stresses the need to define relationships among workers, supervision styles, and institutional guidelines, and improve workplace (hygiene conditions). These factors can motivate workers to optimum productivity. Workers look forward to the fulfillment of both written and unwritten employment contracts by their employers. Workers with ill-feeling about their organizations' employment agreements may not work to full capacity and vice-versa.

Previous Studies

Chandraseker (2011) investigated the impact of the work environment on organizational performance in government agencies. He claimed that the location of an organization has an impact on employee morale and productivity. He averred that the poorly designed physical structure of the organization, with laughable furniture and fittings, poor aeration, and inappropriate safety procedures at work all contributed to a decrease in worker productivity. Ali et al. (2013) discovered a significant relationship between working conditions and employee productivity in Sub-Saharan African manufacturing firms. The physical workspace and office temperature were areas of emphasis.

Zhenjing et al. (2022) investigated the impact of workplace environment on employee task performance using employee commitment and achievement-striving ability as mediators. According to the findings, a positive work environment has the ability to improve employee performance. They claimed that a positive work environment significantly increased employee commitment and achievement-striving ability. Siriattakul et al. (2019) investigated the role of employee engagement in mediating the relationship between team and coworker relations, work environment, training and development, and employee performance, concluding that a work environment essentially consists of the tools, structure, system, conditions. Also, empirical literature review on the working environment, motivation, and social attributes on career performance in Oman, Abdali, et al (2021) discovered that maintaining an impressive working environment essentially helps an organization maintain a good image in front of the pool of skilled candidates in the market and helps it acquire the best talents whose impact can improve organisation productivity.

Osibanjo et al. (2014) investigated the impact of the working environment on employees' performance at the institute of finance management in Dar es salaam region. They found that factors which an organization should pay utmost attention to include the work environment as it is capable of leading to a greater level of performance. They also discovered that the absence of job aids can lead to a considerable fall in the employee productivity rate. Awan and Tahir (2015) investigated the impact of the working environment on employee productivity in insurance companies in Pakistan; the study found that factors such as supervisor support, coworker relationships, training and development, attractive and quick incentives, and recognition plans, and adequate workload at work are helpful in developing a working environment that has a positive impact on employee productivity in organizations.

Abioro et al. (2018) concluded in their study of work-life balance practices on productivity in Nigerian universities that high-level performance among workers necessitates the organization's consistent attention to the work-life balance of its workforce at all levels. Unsafe and unhealthy workplace conditions, such as poor ventilation, inadequate lighting, and excessive noise, have a negative impact on worker health and productivity, according to Chandrasekar (2011). Similarly, Banbury and Berry (1998) submitted that the type and quality of the workplace lighting system promote a cooling experience for employees, resulting in increased productivity. Hwa explained that Heat, noise, and dim lighting in the workplace have all been shown to have an indirect and direct impact on a variety of psychological processes. Noise, for example, lowers cognitive performance in certain tasks.

Khaled and Haneen (2017) investigated the influence of work environment on job performance: a case study of an engineering company in Jordan. They found that the situational

constraints consisting of factors such as noise, office furniture, ventilation, and light, which are the major work environment conditions that have a negative impact on job performance should gain more attention.

Furthermore, Olukunle (2015) and Ali (2013) contended that working conditions have a positive relationship with worker output. Hughes (2007) conducted a study on 2000 employees from various organizations and discovered that nine(9) out of ten(10) employees believed that the quality of their workspace had a positive impact on productivity. Oludeyi (2013) in his study of secondary school classroom design, discovered a significant correlation between a good physical environment and teacher commitment. He claimed that a low-quality workplace contributes to health problems and complaints, as well as lower productivity.

Methodology

To improve the generalizability of the study's findings, a descriptive research design was used. The study population consisted of all members of the infant firms who were either employees or owners (1,003). The firms in the study are small-scale, owner-managed businesses with between 5 and 20 full-time employees. Bakeries, hair and beauty salons, pharmacy shops, restaurants, provision stores, supermarkets, carwash outlets, tailoring, woodwork and furniture, agricultural processing firms, and poultry farms are among these businesses. The sample size for the study was 100 and was arrived at using the random sampling table by Krecije (1970). To elicit information from study participants, a well-structured questionnaire was used. A pilot study was conducted to ensure the research instrument's validity. This procedure aided in the modification of the research instrument prior to its administration to study participants. Physical structures, social interaction, employees' perceived psychological feelings, management policies and practices, and job aids and supports were the explanatory variables in the firms under the study. Employee productivity was the outcome variable. The data collected for the study were analyzed using correlation and regression statistics.

Operationalization of Research Constructs

The independent variable is the workplace organization which was measured by the physical structures, perceived psychological feelings, Job aid and supervisor support, social interaction among workers, and management policies and practices.

Independent variable - Workplace organization (WO)

Dependent variable -Employees' Productivity (EP)

Therefore,

$$Y = f(X)$$

Where Y = Dependent Variable (DV)

X = Independent Variable (IV)

Employees' productivity (EP) = f (Workplace Organisation (WO))

That is EP = f(WO),

Where Y = Employees' Productivity and

$$X = (X_1, X_2, X_3, X_4, X_5)$$

X₁= Physical structure

X₂ = Social interactions

X₃ = Management policies and practices

X₄ = Job aids/Supervisor support

X₅ = Psychological feelings of employees at work

Results and Discussion

Table1: Analysis of the Impact of the physical structure on employees' productivity ANOVA

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	1.043	1	1.043	9.484	.003b
	Residual	10.883	99	.110		
	Total	11.925	100			

* $p < .05$

a. Dependent Variable: Employees' Productivity

b. Predictors: (Constant), Physical structure

R Square = 0.087

Adjusted R Square = 0 .078

B = 0.296

Source: Authors' computation, 2022

Table 2 Correlation of physical structures at workplace and productivity

Variable		Productivity
Productivity	Pearson Correlation	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	
physical environment/ergonomics of the workplace	Pearson Correlation	.296** .003
	Sig. (2-tailed)	
	N	116

* Correlation is significant at 0.05 level (2 tailed)

Table 3: Analysis of the Impact of the social interaction on productivity among employees. ANOVA

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Regression	3.023	1	1.043	8.332	.003b
Residual	12.762	99	.110		
Total	15.785	100			

* $p < .05$

a. Dependent Variable: Employees' Productivity

b. Predictors: (Constant), Social Interaction

R Square = 0.440,

Adjusted R Square = 0 .431

$\beta = 0.230$

Source: Authors' computation, 2022

Table 4: Correlation of social interaction in the workplace affect productivity

<u>Variable</u>		<u>Productivity</u>
Productivity	Pearson Correlation	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	
social interaction	Pearson Correlation	.663** .001
	Sig. (2-tailed)	
N		116

* Correlation is significant at 0.05 level (2 tailed)

Table 5: Regression of the effect of management/policies/practices on employees' productivity ANOVA

Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Regression	2.502	1	3.204	4.035	.008b
1 Residual	11.418	99	.207		

* $p < .05$

a. Dependent Variable: Workers' Productivity

b. Predictors: (Constant), management goals/policies

R Square = 0 .375

Adjusted R Square = 0 .362

$\beta = 0.229$

Source: Authors' computation, 2022

Table 6: Correlation of effect of management policies/practices on workers' productivity

<u>Variable</u>		<u>Performance</u>
Performance	Pearson Correlation	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	
Management goals/policies	Pearson Correlation	.550** .000
	Sig. (2-tailed)	
N		116

* Correlation is significant at 0.05 level (2-tailed)

Table 7: Analysis of the Impact of the equipment/job aids/support on employees' productivity ANOVA

Model	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Regression	2.010	1	2.010	19.991	.000b
1 Residual	10.055	100	.101		
Total	12.065	101			

* $p < .05$

a. Dependent Variable: Employees' Productivity

b. Predictors: (Constant), equipment/job aids

R Square = 0 .167

Adjusted R Square = 0.158

$\beta = 0.49$

Source: Authors' computation, 2022

Table 8 : Correlation of impact of equipment/ job aids on worker productivity

Variable	Productivity	
worker productivity	Pearson Correlation	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	
equipment/ job aids	Pearson Correlation	.608** .000
	Sig. (2-tailed)	
	N	116

* Correlation is significant at 0.05 level (2-tailed)

Table 9: Analysis of the impact of psychological/emotional feelings on workers' productivity ANOVA

Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Regression	4.811	1	4.811	66.322	.000b
1 Residual	7.254	100	.073		
Total	12.065	101			

* $p < .05$

a. Dependent Variable: Workers' Productivity

b. Predictors: (Constant), psychological/emotional feelings

R Square = 0.399

Adjusted R Square = 0.393,

$\beta = 0.696$

Source: Authors' computation, 2022

Table 10: Correlation of psychological feeling about workplace on employees' productivity

Variable	Productivity	
Productivity	Pearson Correlation	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	
psychological feeling	Pearson Correlation	.531** .000
	Sig. (2-tailed)	
	N	116

* Correlation is significant at 0.05 level (2-tailed)

Discussion of Findings

This study looked at the impact of workplace organization on employee productivity in infant entrepreneurship firms in southwest Nigeria. Table 1 depicts an analysis of the impact of organizational physical structure on employee productivity. The general form of the model determined was $EP = 1.97 + 0.228$, where EP = Employee Productivity. The quality of available

physical structure arrangements has a significant impact on employee productivity ($F=9.484$, $p<0.5$). It was discovered that a one percent improvement in the arrangement of physical structures resulted in a 22.8% increase in employee productivity ($\beta =0.228$, $p<0.5$). The Pearson correlation test was used to determine the relationship that exists between the physical structure and the productivity of employees; the results of the analysis are shown in table 2 above. The findings revealed a statistically significant positive correlation between physical structure and employee productivity ($r= 0.296$, $p<0.5$), rejecting the null hypothesis. This finding is consistent with Chandraseker's (2011) study on the effect of workplace arrangement on organizational performance in government organizations; he discovered that poorly designed internal environments with laughable furniture and fittings, poor aeration, and inappropriate safety procedures had a negative impact on workers' productivity. Furthermore, Chika and Dominic (2017) conducted a study on Edo City Transport Services in Benin City, Nigeria, and discovered that the workplace environment has a positive impact on employee productivity.

Social interaction among workers at work was also investigated in order to assess its impact on employee productivity. The findings of the study are shown in table 3 above; social interaction among workers had a significant impact on employee productivity ($F=8.33$, $p<0.5$). The general form of the model equation is $EP = 0.782 + 0.230$, where EP denotes employee productivity. Furthermore, the study's findings revealed that social interactions among employees have a catalytic effect on employee productivity ($\beta =.230$, $p<0.5$), ($r =0.663$, $p<0.5$). This means that a one-unit increase in social interaction at work resulted in a 23 percent increase in employee productivity. The hypothesis tested to confirm the potency of this factor revealed a statistically significant positive correlation between social interaction and employee productivity ($r =0.663$, $p.05$); thus, the researchers rejected the null hypothesis that social interactions among workers have no statistically significant impact on their productivity. Given these findings, it is clear that social interactions among coworkers, managers, and staff are capable of fostering positive feelings and morale while also improving job satisfaction. It is worth noting that negative interactions can cause misperception, apprehension, and stress, as well as indecision, all of which have a negative impact on work efficiency and company output; positive social interaction should be encouraged because of its positive impact on productivity. As a result, company executives should not leave workplace social interactions to chance. When possible, leadership should strive to assist everyone in the organization in developing skills for positive social interactions.

The impact of management policies and practices on employee productivity was discovered to be a significant predictor of worker productivity ($F=69.32$, $p<0.5$). The general form of the model equation is represented by the coefficients of the results: $EP = 3.638 + 0.229$, where EP = Employees' productivity ($r = 0.550$, $p<0.5$). ($\beta=.229$, $p<0.5$). This means that a one-unit increase in effective management policies and practices increased worker productivity by 22.9 percent. To confirm the strength of management policies and practices as an omnibus concept on worker productivity, the Pearson correlation model was used to test the hypothesis that there is no statistically significant effect of management policies/practices on employee productivity. The test revealed a positive relationship between management policies and employee productivity ($r = 0.550$, $p<0.5$). The researchers were forced to abandon the null hypothesis in favor of the alternate hypothesis. According to the researchers, management policies and practices are effective factors in increasing employee productivity. These findings were not unrelated to study participants' appreciation of initial training for new intakes and retraining for existing ones. It was also clear from their responses that they saw the fair distribution of workload and involvement in decision-making as significant incentives. In this regard, the findings of this study are consistent

with those of Olukunle (2015) and Ali (2013), who discovered that working conditions have a positive association with high levels of output by workers. Managers' and the enterprise's actions, as manifested in company policies and practices, can definitively influence the realization of business productivity. As a result, company leaders should ensure that they not only have good policies and best practices in place but that they also involve their employees in developing these policies so that the employees are completely aligned with them in their roles. This finding is also consistent with the findings of Mohammed (2005), who claimed that when there is a significant upward review of compensation and consistent promotions, workers become more committed, increasing productivity.

The prearranged equipment and job aids' quality was found to significantly improve employee productivity ($F=19.99$, $p<0.5$). This is shown in table 7 above. The general form of the model equation established based on the coefficients of the results was expressed as $EP= 1.25 + 0.491$; where EP= employees' productivity. Furthermore, the study results revealed that equipment and job aids have a positive impact on employee productivity ($\beta =.491$, $p<0.5$). This means that a one-unit improvement in the prearrangement of equipment and job aids results in a 49.1% increase in worker productivity. The strength of the relationship between equipment and job aids and employee productivity was examined to confirm the potency of these variables (equipment and job aids). Pearson's correlation model was used (see table 8). The test revealed a statistically significant positive correlation ($r =0.608$, $p<0.5$) between equipment and job aids and worker productivity. To have a competitive advantage over others in the same industry, an organization must not only provide adequate equipment and job aids but also have a quality organization of these equipment and job aids in place for a strong influence on employee performance.

Employees' psychological feelings about their work were also examined during the course of this study; it was discovered that employees' psychological feelings have a significant impact on employees' productivity ($F=66.32$, $p<0.5$). Furthermore, there is a positive relationship between employees' psychological feelings and productivity. ($r = 0.531$, $p<.05$). This relationship results in a significant increase in employee productivity of 69.6 percent ($\beta=.696$, $p<0.5$). As a result, workplace organizations should be given special consideration in order to improve employee productivity.

Conclusion and Recommendations

This study looked at how workplace organization affects employees' productivity in infant entrepreneurial firms in Southwest, Nigeria. The study analyzed the impact of physical structure, social interactions, management practices and policies, equipment and tool aids, and psychological feelings on employees' productivity. Based on the findings, we concluded that there is a positive relationship between the explanatory variables (physical structure, social interactions, management policies and practices, equipment and tool aids, and psychological feelings of employees) and the outcome variable (employees' productivity). Therefore, the following recommendations are put forward:

- i. Managers of infant firms should improve their efforts in creating friendly and enabling workplaces with adequate and prearranged job aids and effective supervision strategies to enhance employees' productivity.
- ii. Operators of infant firms should constantly assess the physical structure and working conditions to meet modern and improved workplace settings.

- iii. Employees should make sure they understand both written and unwritten employment contracts to improve their positive psychological feelings about their organization. This will result in increased productivity.

References

- Abdali, S. A., & Bhuiyan, A. B. (2021). The empirical review on the working environment, motivation and social attributes on career performance in Oman. *International Journal of Business and Management Future*, 6(1), 12-25. <https://doi.org/10.46281/ijbmf.v6i1.1464>
- Abioro, M. A., Oladejo D.A., Ashogbon, F.O. (2018). Work-life balance practices and employee productivity in the Nigerian University System. *Crawford Journal of Business and Social Sciences*. 13(11), 49-59.
- Akinyele, S. T. (2009). The influence of work environment on workers' productivity: A case of selected oil and gas industry in Lagos, Nigeria. *African Journal of Business Management*, 4 (3) 299 –307.
- Akinyele, S.T. (2010). The influence of work environment, workers' morale and perceived productivity in Nigeria. *Research Journal on Business Management*, 1(1). 50-61.
- Al- Anzi, N.M. (2009). Workplace environment and its implication on employee performance. *A study submitted to the Department in Saudi Aramco, Open University of Malaysia*.
- Andrew, H. (2016). Six elements of a perfect work environment. Retrieved 10/12/2022 from www.smallbusinessceo.com
- Awan, A., &Tahir, T. (2015). Impact of working environment on employee's productivity in insurance companies in Pakistan. *European Journal of Business and Management* Vol.7(1),2222-1905 (Online) www.iiste.org ISSN (Paper) ISSN 2222-2839
- Banbury, S.,&Berry D. C. (1998). Disruption of office-related tasks by speech and office noise. *Britain Journal of Psychology*, 89, 499 – 517.
- Chandrasekar, K. (2011). Workplace environment and its impact on organizational performance in public sector organizations. *International journal of enterprise computing and business system*. 1, 9-20.
- Chase, N (1997). *Quality Troy*. Hitchwork Publishing Company.
- Chika, E., & 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 and Innovation Research* 5(5), 23 – 39.
- George, K. (2017). The effect of work environment on job satisfaction: Evidence from the baking sector in Ghana. *Journal of Human Resource Management*. 5(1): 12 -18.
- Hughes, H. L., Durand V.A. (2014). *Bullying as workplace incivility: Bullying in the Workplace: Causes, symptoms, remedies*. Routledge: Abingdon, UK.
- Khaled, A., & 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 Vol.12(24) pp. 15544-15550 Research India Publications. <http://www.ripublication.com> 15544
- Khan, S., Sabri P., Nasir N. (2016). Cost of workplace bullying of employees: An Anti-Bullying Policy through the introduction of workplace spirituality in higher education sector of lahor, *Pakistan. Journal of Science International* 2016, 28, 541 – 549.
- Longo, J., De Donno, M.A. (2018). Development of vignettes of exploring workplace bullying. *Issues in Mental Health Nursing*, 2, 1 – 5.
- McCoy, J.M.,&Evans G.W. (2005). Physical work environment. *Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publication*, pp 219:245.
- Mohammed, G. (2005). Competence of maternal and child clinic workers in detecting malnutrition in Somali; *African Health Sciences*, 5(4): 319 -321.

- Olukunle, S.&Oludeyi, K. (2015) A Review of literature on work environment and work commitment: *Implication for Future Research in Citadels of Learning*. pg.34 <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/286930387>, retrieved 20/3/2022.
- Opperman, C.S, (2002). *Tropical business issues*. Partner Price Water House Coopers.
- Osibanjo, A. O., Abiodun, A. J., & Adeniji, A. A. (2014). Impact of job environment on job satisfaction & commitment among Nigerian nurses. *Journal of South Africa Business Research*, 1-11.
- Puneet, P. (2017).The impact of work environment on employees' productivity, Munich, GRIN Verlag, <https://www.grin.com/document/412794>
- Siriattakul, P., Saengchai, S., & Jermstittiparsert, K. (2019). The Mediating Role of Employee Engagement between Team and Coworker Relation, Work Environment, Training and Development and Employee Performance. *International Journal of Psychosocial Rehabilitation*, 23(4).
- Saklani,A, & Jha, S. (2011). Impact of ergonomic changes on office employee productivity. *International Journal of Management Research*. 9(2), 114-133.
- Tao, N, Zhang, J., &Song, S. (2015). Relationship between job burnout and neuro-endocrine indicators in soldiers in the Xinjiang Arid Desert: A cross-sectional study. *International Journal of Environmental Resources*. 12(15), 154-161.
- Tukak,i, J., Taniguchi, T. ,& Hirokawa, K.(2013). Associations of workplace bullying and harassment with Pain. *International Journal of Environmental Resources*. 10, 4560 – 4570.
- Warr., P., Bindl, U.K., Parker, S. K, Iceoghu, I. (2014). Four quadrant investigation of job-related effects and Behaviors. *European Journal of Work Organizational Psychology*, 23, 342 - 363.
- Yusuf, N., & Metitoba, S. (2002). Work Environment and Job Attitude among Employees in a Nigerian Work Organization. *Journal of Sustainable Society*, 1 (2). 36-43.
- Zhenjing, G. u., Chupradit, Supat K., Yeku,, N., Abdelmohsen, A.,M. (2022. impact of employees' workplace environment on employees' performance: a multi-mediation model, *Frontiers in Public Health*.10(1), 1-13. DOI:10.3389/fpubh.2022.890400