



IMPACT OF PHYSICAL WORKSPACE ENVIRONMENT FACTORS ON EMPLOYEE PERFORMANCE & TURNOVER INTENTION

Dr. Saima Tabassum

Chairperson /Associate Professor, Department of Business Administration,
Sindh Madressatul Islam University Karachi, Pakistan

Imdad Hussain Siddiqui

PhD Scholar, Hamdard Institute of Management Science, Hamdard University,
Karachi, Pakistan

Muhammad Hammad Shabbir

Student, Department of Business Administration, Sindh Madressatul Islam University,
Karachi, Pakistan

ABSTRACT

Purpose: *The determination of conducting this research is to identify the connection, then measure the relationship among the physical workspace environment factors and employees job performance and intention towards leaving the organization.*

Methodology: *This investigation is a survey based on quantitative and explanatory research. The research conducted amongst the permanent and operational staff of higher education sector or institutes located in Karachi in both, public and private institutes. Having the data from 280 respondents, to examine the collected information, the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) Software is being used and the independent sample T-test and one way ANOVA analysis performed.*

Findings: *There is a vital impact of all the physical office atmosphere factors/ conditions on employee work performance and turnover intention.*

Theoretical Implication: *This investigation will be valuable for student and teachers. Teachers can get benefited from this research to gain new and realistic knowledge to teach the students more efficiently. While Students can get thought about how the organization working environment circumstances impact the performance and intention to leave the organization and they can use this information in their professional life.*

Originality: *This research is the reinforcement on the prior researches in the circumstance of the higher education sector of Karachi, Pakistan.*

Key words: Physical Work Environment factor, Turnover Intention, Employee Performance.

Cite this Article: Saima Tabassum, Imdad Hussain Siddiqui and Muhammad Hammad Shabbir, Impact of Physical Workspace Environment Factors on Employee Performance & Turnover Intention, *International Journal of Management (IJM)*, 12(1), 2021, pp. 573-597.

<http://www.iaeme.com/IJM/issues.asp?JType=IJM&VType=12&IType=1>

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the Research

A huge quantity of researches & literature are developing during the last three years, which recognized a diversity of backgrounds and causes of turnover intention and actual turnover in which it consists of the individual thought, employee stance, organizational circumstances, and the observation of employees about the decision-making practices (S. Y. Kim & Fernandez, 2015). Due to this, the turnover & the turnover intentions now become a very important and popular subject for research in the field of “Human resource management”, (Zeffane & Bani Melhem, 2017 & Mihajlov, 2016).

This era is very competitive era and the loss of potential employee and compromising the performance is not affordable by any organization (El-Zeiny, 2012). Many investigations reflect that atmosphere aspect of physical workplace impacts on the employee performance on the fulfillment of task and it also leads to the turnover intention (Hoboubi, Choobineh, Ghanavati, Keshavarzi, & Hosseini, 2017). Employee workroom environment is the main cause which directly impacts on the quality of work they performed and their level of output. How well the physical environment of the office is good it positively impacts on the employee wish to acquire more skills also their level of enthusiasm towards work increase (Al-Omari & Okasheh, 2017). Similarly, the previous investigation also exposes that workplace design takes an encouraging influence on the efficiency of the personnel of any organization (El-Zeiny, 2012).

Now, the turnover intention of human resources turns into an attractive and interesting area for research because the turnover intention has been started to be associated with a real planned turnover (Kim et al., 2017, Lambert et al., 2001). Professionals like to study on the variation and gap of the employee of different industries and their turnover or the turnover intentions and the cause behind this courage toward the organization and the purpose of intention to leave an organization (Zeffane & Bani Melhem, 2017).

Literature shows that there are many issues which interrupt the employee work, it also includes the workspace environment which influences the productivity and increases the anxiety level and decreases the job satisfaction which becomes the reason to leave the job (Applebaum & Fowler, 2010). Sound, air quantity and quality, lighting and temperature are the factors of the physical environment which influence the performance of employees (Jang et al., 2017). It remains extremely significant to decrease the level of turnover and the thinking of turnover from the employees' mind by dropping bad work environment and providing the good workspace surrounding to increase the job satisfaction (Lee, Seo, & Lee, 2016).

Workers are extremely important stakeholders for every organization (Asrar-ul-Haq, Kuchinke, & Iqbal, 2017). Due to this reason, organizations would like to diminish turnover to retain its important information and to save the expenditure of the process of recruitment and selection (Fazio, Gong, Sims, & Yurova, 2017). In different studies and investigation, the turnover intention has been used as a dependent variable over the employee affiliation with the organization which is the independent variable (S. Kim, Tam, Kim, & Rhee, 2017).

Physical workroom surroundings also influence the employee performance in place of work, which observes as 5 percent to 15 percent increase in productivity even if improving the layout or design of organization (Yeh & Huan, 2017). Similarly, the bad work environment can become the reason of job frustration of staff towards their job inspiration (Hoboubi et al., 2017). Because of this the physical background and condition of workroom should be kept up to date and fresh circumstances to improve the efficiency of the employee (Yeh & Huan, 2017).

Performance is dependent upon the actions done by the worker. This idea makes a distinction between performance and outcomes. Because, the outcomes is the effect or result of employee performance (Campbell, 1990; El-Zeiny, 2012). Employees believe that if the workspace has too much noise then, its impacts on the concentration of employee towards work which leads to a decrease in the quality of work (El-Zeiny, 2012). Researches also show that in the physical environment, lighting is the most important factor which impacts on the every-day efficiency of employees in any organizations. Literature shows that even sufficient lighting and having appropriate daylight diminish the rate of absence from job besides, also increase the productivity of workforces by 28 percent (El-Zeiny, 2012).

Every color has a diverse effect on the human being body and every person understands different color by their own mean. Individuals are responsive to a different color on the basis of their culture, education, and genetics which impact on their performance and output in any organization (Kamarulzaman, Saleh, Hashim, Hashim, & Abdul-Ghani, 2011). This things shows that color have an effect on the mood of the individuals, because of this the organization should choose a suitable color to make sure the mood of the entire workforce is fine to increase the performance and output because the color shades plays a vital role in the workspace environment (Kamarulzaman et al., 2011; Nizam Kamaruzzaman & Marinie Ahmad Zawawi, 2010).

Workspace environment influence the way of work of employees and their productivity and because of this, in the current decade a large number of business and organizations are starting using the interior designing in office as a way to improve the workspace environment to attract and retain workforce in organization and also to increase their performance (El-Zeiny, 2012). Literature reveals that a large number of researchers have found that, the workplace environment factors along with efficient management work act a significant part in increasing and maintaining employees performance and also to improve the organizational productivity (El-Zeiny, 2012; Leaman & Bordass, 1993; Loretta Ann Williams (2), David A. & Crerar, 1985).

Employee happiness is accepted as a significant factor for the success of any organization and it also plays a main part in the quality of work of employees. A higher stage of satisfaction improves confidence and decrease voluntary intention to leave the organization. Additional many studies show that employee satisfaction with their workspace setting and surroundings remains straight associated toward the job enjoyment of workers and indirectly related to administrative promise and turnover intention towards an organization (Dole & Schroeder, 2001; Kamarulzaman et al., 2011).

1.2 Problem Statement

There are numerous educational organizations and institutions in the world who are functioning and every organization wants to increase the performance of its employees/ teachers to produce good educated future leaders and students to get a competitive advantage over others institutes. Is there any impact of physical workstation atmosphere conditions on staff performance and on the aim of turnover. The aim of this research is to measure the connection between these mentioned variables.

1.3 Research Questions

- What is the influence of corporal work-room situation factors taking place turnover intention?
- What is the effect of physical office atmosphere aspects on workers job performance?

1.4 Research Objectives

- To determine and explain the association between physical work environment factor and turnover intention.
- To find out and describe the association among physical workspace environment factors and employee job performance.
- This study will help the education sector to know about in what way the workspace environment issues of workplace impacts on employee performance in addition to the turnover intention.

Hypothesis of the Study

- There is a change in employee performance on the basis of air quality
- There is a variance in employee performance on the basis of temperature level
- There is an alteration in employee performance on the basis of noise condition
- There is a change in employee performance on the basis of source of lighting
- There is a variance in employee performance on the basis of the arrangement of work station
- There is an alteration in turnover intention on the basis of air quality
- There is a change in turnover intention on the basis of temperature level
- There is a variance in turnover intention on the basis of noise condition
- There is an alteration in turnover intention on the basis of source of lighting
- There is a change in turnover intention on the basis of the arrangement of work station

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Ho1: There is a Difference in Employee Performance on the basis of Air Quality

Employee performance can be express as actions or doing that is conducted by the employee itself to accomplish the organization's vision and goals (Al-Omari & Okasheh, 2017; Motowidlo & Schmit, 1999). The air in the work-room surroundings, mainly its components and the quality shows an important part in work actions of employees, which lead to its work efficiency and performance (Al-Omari & Okasheh, 2017). The internal air quality of workspace is identically considerable towards the wellbeing, ease and work productivity of workforces. The majority of time staff might use to work up to 90% of the time alone inside of the work-space. If the workplace internal air quality contains pollution and contamination then it is most probably that the dangerous internal air pollutants are radon, asbestos, non-living substance, which also include the smoke of tobacco, organics, natural and non-ionizing release including other noxious waste such as smell and dust, can impact comfort and thoughts of employees which leads to reluctance towards work, that may lead to a decrease in output and performance of employees (Abdou, Kholy, & Abdou, n.d.; Al-Omari & Okasheh, 2017).

Ho2: There is a Difference in Employee Performance on the basis of Temperature Level

The physical environments at the job are important because it influences the performance, job satisfaction, and also the health of staffs. It is usually unstated that the corporal interior design of the workplace along with the ecological circumstances at the organization stays the main aspects which impact on the staff and organizational performance (Al-Omari & Okasheh, 2017).

Researches revealed that the organizations in which the work-space temperature level is normal or low, it positively influences the productivity of its workforce and increase the effectiveness of its employee and association as compared to the organization in which the workspace temperature is high. Low or moderate temperature level also diminish the level of anxiety and stress in its staff members (Al-Omari & Okasheh, 2017). Effective temperature specifies the level of temperature, means actually how much hot or how much cold is our surroundings (Aamodt, 2010). In height, physical atmosphere temperature can disturb employees productivity, predominantly responsibilities essential on intellectual, bodily, and perceptual obligations (Badayai, 2012).

The workspace atmosphere and temperature level is the key influential factor which directly impacts on the level of performance and productivity of its staff (Al-Omari & Okasheh, 2017). To examine the efficiency of jobs in a more appropriate way, the best method is to do an investigation on the link between personal work performance, people, along with physical environments conditions. Because, the job performance of employees is the key factor which directly influences the profitability of any institute or businesses (Al-Omari & Okasheh, 2017; Bevan, 2012).

Temperature level has a straight effect on the well-being and comfort of the employee (“Impact of Work Environment on Performance of Employees in Manufacturing Sector in India: Literature Review,” 2016). The high-temperature level can result in heat anxiety and heat tiredness (Badayai, 2012). Research shows that according to a skinny individual, an advanced level of temperature may be recovering as compared to a fat individual. Because for chubby individual, a lower temperature level works better (Messaris et al., 2012).

Ho3: There is a Difference in Employee Performance on the basis of Noise

Noise is also an aspect of the physical environment, which plays a vital role in affecting worker productivity (Sarode & Shirsath, 2014). Unnecessary noise in the workspace, include the noise through peoples conversation, affect the worker's attention toward their work, which directly leads to the declining in their performance (Sarode & Shirsath, 2014).

Research also discovered that sometimes employees cannot obtain desirable performance in a silent environment because at some stage noise creates a productive background which also helps workers to achieve their target (Keeling, 1996).

The previous investigation also revealed that experience of arrogant sound may lead to numerous diseases, for example, cardiovascular disease, endocrine, and digestive result. To increase productivity and enhance teamwork, organizations now likely to use an open-office design, Furthermore, studies also show that this open space organization increases the noise in the work environment (Melamed & Froom, 2001).

Noise is unpredictable, it can divert employees concentration from their work if a worker does not manage the cause of noise (During & Tasks, 1991). The noise which can distract workers from their work could be the sound of printers, computers, mobile ring tones, the sound created by heater and conversation and discussion between employees (During & Tasks, 1991).

Ho4: There is a Difference in Employee Performance on the basis of Light and Color

The intensity of workplace light influence attention, alertness, and job performance. Low light can considerably improve operational practices and productivity (Sehgal, 2012). The need of light depends upon the work getting performed in the place of work, moreover different source of light result in a way that it will either raise or reduce the productivity and performance (Al-Omari & Okasheh, 2017). The employee whose nature of the job is related to reading can get into serious trouble which may cause eyestrain, headaches, irritability, and fatigue due to the lower or poor light system in the organization (Sarode & Shirsath, 2014). If the color activated in the inner environment can also have an important impact on the staff. An idea on the furnishings of color on performance originates that light color is less affecting like visually attracting and disturbing as compare to temperate colors (El-Zeiny, 2012). An individual potential to check environmental disturbance may impact how core color effect on their plan productivity (El-Zeiny, 2012). Warm colors have been creating to give confidence in doing or movement, particularly if accompanied by top enlightenment level, while cool colors encourage more inactive behavior (Applebaum & Fowler, 2010).

Ho5: There is a Difference in Employee Performance on the basis of Arrangement of Work Station

The tangible physical arrangement of a work station of an office is very important, to increase the job performance and productivity of employees (Al-Omari & Okasheh, 2017; Becker, 2002). In the current era, workspace surroundings sustenance an innovative way of working and elastic workspace which shows no difficulty in communication and interpersonal contact distinction with the entirely enclosed private place of work (Al-Omari & Okasheh, 2017; Becker, 2002). The employee workspace that is too crowded and controlled will result in anxiety, stress and other psychological consequence. Staff may feel unbalanced and have an absence of liberty and motivation in short time and it possibly will lead to identical tense surroundings, which negatively impact the value of employee efficiency (Al-Omari & Okasheh, 2017). Researches show that the workspace components like office furniture including a writing desk, chair, the filing system, shelve, drawers have a key role in the work efficiency of workers (Al-Omari & Okasheh, 2017; Luo & Sehgal, 2012).

Ho6: There is a Difference in Employee Turnover Intention on the basis of Air Quality

The most important environmental factor which impacts employee job satisfaction and long term commitment is air quality or ventilation system of its workplace. Inappropriate quality of air can cause suffocation in the environment, personnel may feel sizzling and it makes bad feeling to employees which directly affect the employee job satisfaction which leads to increase in the rate of turnover intention. This issue can be solved by placing small moveable fans separately on the working desk of personnel if there is no air condition system (Bevan, 2012; Sinnappan, 2017)

Ho7: There is a Difference in Employee Turnover Intension on the basis of Temperature Level

Several investigations recognize that the temperature level significantly impacts on the worker's intention to turnover. In the high-level temperature of the work environment the employee concentrates more of their work by using the air conditioning tool (Sarode & Shirsath, 2014). After initiating air condition arrangement in the workspace, the productivity of employees increases more about to 15% from the previous performance and the employee feel more

focused, comfortable and relax because they can focus on their work, this thing shows that when a worker feels satisfied with their work environment then its intention to leave the organization is decrease. high-temperature workplace environment could influence the employee behavior and also have an effect on their motivation to do work and sometimes resulted as a turnover intention of the employee (El-Zeiny, 2012).

Ho8: There is a Difference in Employee Turnover Intension on the Basis of Noise Condition

Many studies have examined the consequence of noise for students and the employees or teaching staff, which represents that there is a fact that teachers are poorly affected by high noise levels and such noise levels lead to drowsiness, stress, irritation, and exhaustion (Applebaum, D., Fowler, S., Fiedler, N., Osinubi, O., & Robson, 2010). Increase in noise in the workplace can lead to increases the intention to leave the job and organization (Applebaum, D., Fowler, S., Fiedler, N., Osinubi, O., & Robson, 2010). In taking over to the actual mishap acquired by acknowledgment to extreme noise, connected acknowledgment has been associated with eminent levels of stress, high nervousness, increased irritation, depression, and exhaustion (Grebennikov & Grebennikov, 2007). The problem of noise and sound either it is high or low is something that could not be avoided (Kamarulzaman, Saleh, Hashim, Hashim, & Abdul-Ghani, 2011). According to a sandstorm, noise creates a stress in the physical work environment towards the job satisfaction (Sundstrom, E., Town, J. P., Rice, R. W., Osborn, D. P., & Brill, 1994). Previous studies represent that not only speeches create noise, but it can also be formed by mobile ringtone and keyboard (During & Tasks, 1991). The decreasing in performance cannot be recognized to the existence of speech only. According to (Han & Sean, 2017) there are two factors of resonance, music, and noise. Noise can create offensiveness in the environment it could cause the distraction toward work which affected productivity and increases stress level and inaccuracies. While the music could decrease the stress level and can give relaxation to employees. Most of the researcher found that slow music should be played in the background of the workplace. But it should be according to the workers or listeners (Han & Sean, 2017). Researchers have found that slow or soothing sound can decreases productivity while fast and energetic music in the background of the workplace can increases output which may lead to decreases' in employee turnover intention (Sinnappan, 2017).

Ho9: There is a Difference in Employee Turnover Intension on the basis of Light and Color

Researches revealed that good lighting increases the attendance and decreases absenteeism which clearly shows the positive relationship between workplace lighting and productivity and organizational commitment (Al-Omari & Okasheh, 2017). The previous investigation also declared that poor lightening can cause anxiety which can make employee stressful and disturbed so that they are unable to perform their task properly (Kovner, Budin, & Norman, 2010). Researches show that adjusting the level of light can improve the performance of personnel effectively; natural light like sunlight also has a vital part in the performance it increases up to 118% productivity of employees which lead to job gratification and decrease the rate of turnover (Al-Omari & Okasheh, 2017). Previous studies represent the calm lighting is appropriate as illustration support if there is an absence or deficient outside lighting which damage after image to accomplish a task (Roelofsen & Roelofsen, 2013). To make active mental level, the appropriate amount of blue light in the range of light will be effective. Blue light is more noticeable by the human eye (Sinnappan, 2017). It is more effective for the employees when the physical environment temperature is about to increase, As a result, the new activated color appear to accord to an advanced domain such as wellbeing, functionality and plan performance (Mosadeghrad, Ferlie, & Rosenberg, 2011).

Ho10: There is a Difference in Employee Turnover Intension on the Basis of Space

The arrangement of workspace is one of the major contributors to in job satisfaction of an employee because it relates to the space and design of the workplace (Al-Omari & Okasheh, 2017). Previous investigations represent the performance, employees attitude toward work and organizational commitment of an employee is dependent on the design and layout of the workspace environment (Nwagbara, Oruh, Ugorji, & Ennsra, 2013). workstation is a very important part of workplace factor physically, deprived layout and the congested environment will not guide to optimization but alone raise the chance of being harmful in such an incident like striking or tripping beside the objects. Moreover, the layout also plays the main role to identify the visual appeal of the place of work (Nwagbara et al., 2013). The manufacturing company has a different layout, the call center has a different layout. These layouts are different according to the specific task of employees (Naharuddin, 2013). The workplace practices and prefers solitude are very important for a flexible workplace. The layout of privacy are more better for the high ranking employees in the organization and in where the private matters are discussed often in line of the banking, apart from this the layout of flexible design is more applicable for the team of personnel working with the coordination which is the most essential part of getting project done in a very effective or efficient manner (“Impact of Work Environment on Performance of Employees in Manufacturing Sector in India: Literature Review,” 2016).

3. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Research Design

This investigation is quantitative research in nature and it has accomplished by gathering numerical data for applying the data gathering tool specific for the quantitative research such as questionnaire, which is close-ended, as it is explanatory research and only one method is used so, it is well thought-out as mono-method.

3.2 Population & Sampling

The target people of this investigation is mainly staff of education field located in Karachi. This study is fully quantitative in nature so it needs to describe the correct sample size and sample technique. Therefore, we have decided to go for the non-probability convenient sampling. Since the population framework (the list of all employees who are working in the education sector in Karachi) is not available and at this stage, we are also unable to make that list. The sample of this research will be 280. The questionnaire was used to collect the data.

4. DATA ANALYSIS

We collected the data from the employees through the questionnaires and then analyze the data through SPSS software by the technique of independent sample T-test and one way ANOVA and then describe and interpret the result of research.

Table 1 Statistics

		Age	Gender	Year of Experience	Types of Institution	Air	Temperature	Noise	Light & Color	Space
N	Valid	280	280	280	280	280	280	280	280	280
	Missing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mean		4.1679	1.4857	2.2286	1.4857	1.6500	1.5643	1.5250	2.1250	1.1071
Median		4.0000	1.0000	2.0000	1.0000	2.0000	2.0000	2.0000	2.0000	1.0000

Mode		3.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	1.00
Std. Deviation		1.57616	.50069	1.34853	.50069	.47782	.49674	.50027	.92482	.30985
Variance		2.484	.251	1.819	.251	.228	.247	.250	.855	.096
Skewness		.705	.057	.937	.057	-.632	-.261	-.101	.242	2.554
Std. Error of Skewness		.146	.146	.146	.146	.146	.146	.146	.146	.146
Kurtosis		-.057	-2.011	.046	-2.011	-1.612	-1.946	-2.004	-.980	4.556
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.290	.290	.290	.290	.290	.290	.290	.290	.290

4.1 Main Result of the Experiment

There is an important influence of the physical workroom environment factors on employees productivity and performance and turnover intention. The below table represents the distribution of the sample in terms of gender. The information displayed below tells us that out of a total sample of 280 respondents, 144 were Male representing 51.4 percent of the total sample and there are 136 Female respondents who constitute about 48.6 percent of total sample making cumulative of 100.0 percent.

Table 2 Gender

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Male	144	51.4	51.4	51.4
	Female	136	48.6	48.6	100.0
	Total	280	100.0	100.0	

The data collected from the universities employees shows that most of the respondents or employees of the university have the work experience of 1 to 5 years. The below data shows that the majority of respondents are those people who have the work experience of 1 to 5 years. They constitute about 41.4 percent of the entire sample and they stand 116 in number out of a total sample of 280 respondents. The second largest cluster of employees is comprising of people who range from 6 to 10 years of work experience bracket. They are 63 in number and constitute about 22.5 percent of the total sample and people ranging from 11 to 15 years work experience are 49 in number constituting about 17.5 percent and 81.4 as a cumulative percentage. Another group of respondents is comprising of people who range from 16 to 20 years of work experience. They are 32 in number and constitute about 11.4 percent of total sample and people ranging from 21 to 25 are 13 in number constituting about 4.6 percent and the last portion in sample consist of those people who range from 26 & Above are 7 in number constituting about 2.5 percent of total sample and located at 100% cumulative percentage.

Table 3 Year of Experience

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 to 5 years	116	41.4	41.4	41.4
	6 to 10 years	63	22.5	22.5	63.9
	11 to 15 years	49	17.5	17.5	81.4
	16 to 20 years	32	11.4	11.4	92.9

	21 to 25 years	13	4.6	4.6	97.5
	26 & Above years	7	2.5	2.5	100.0
	Total	280	100.0	100.0	

The below table represents the distribution of the sample in terms of types of institution. The information displayed below tells us that out of a total sample of 280 respondents, 144 were Public Institute representing 51.4 percent of the whole sample and there are 136 Private Institute which constitutes about 48.6 percent of total sample making cumulative of 100.0 percent.

Table 4 Types of Institution

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Public Institute	144	51.4	51.4	51.4
	Private Institute	136	48.6	48.6	100.0
	Total	280	100.0	100.0	

The below data displays that most of the respondents are those people who are between the age of 26 to 30. They constitute about 27.5 out of a hundred of the overall sample and they are 77 in number out of a total sample of 280 staff of higher education institute in Karachi. The second largest group of respondents is comprising of people who range from 31 to 35 years age bracket. They are 65 in number and constitute about 23.2 percent of the total sample and people ranging from 36 to 40 are 52 in number constituting about 18.6 percent and 69.3 as a cumulative percentage. Another group of respondents is comprising of people who range from 21 to 25 years age bracket. They are 35 in number and constitute about 12.5 percent of the total sample and people ranging from 41 to 45 are 25 in number constituting about 8.9 percent and people ranging from 46 to 50 are 12 in number constituting about 4.3 percent. The last portion in the sample consist of those people who range from 51 & Above is 14 in number constituting about 5.0 percent of the total sample and located at 100% cumulative percentage.

Table 5 Age

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	21 to 25	35	12.5	12.5	12.5
	26 to 30	77	27.5	27.5	40.0
	31 to 35	65	23.2	23.2	63.2
	36 to 40	52	18.6	18.6	81.8
	41 to 45	25	8.9	8.9	90.7
	46 to 50	12	4.3	4.3	95.0
	51 & Above	14	5.0	5.0	100.0
	Total	280	100.0	100.0	

The below table represents the distribution of the sample in terms of Air Quality. The information displayed below tells us that out of a total sample of 280 respondents, 98 respondents filled questionnaire that their working environment have pollution and they stayed showing 35 percent of the overall sample and there are 182 respondents who work in the

environment where is the freshness in air quality, which constitutes about 65 percent of total sample making cumulative of 100 percent.

Table 6 Air

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Pollution	98	35.0	35.0	35.0
	Freshness	182	65.0	65.0	100.0
	Total	280	100.0	100.0	

The below table represents the distribution of the sample in terms of Temperature level in the working environment. The information displayed below tells us that out of a total sample of 280 respondents, 122 were working in the environment with a high level of temperature representing 43.6 out of a hundred of the entire sample and there are 158 respondents who were working in the environment with the low-temperature level and constitute about 56.4 percent of total sample making cumulative of 100.0 percent.

Table 7 Temperature

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	High Temperature Level	122	43.6	43.6	43.6
	Low Temperature Level	158	56.4	56.4	100.0
	Total	280	100.0	100.0	

The below table represents the distribution of the sample in terms of noise condition in the physical work environment. The information displayed below tells us that out of a total sample of 280 respondents, 133 respondents ask that their working environment have noise and they were representing 47.5 % of the overall sample and there are 147 workers of higher education institutes who did their work and there is no any noise in their working environment. which constitutes about 52.5 percent of total sample making cumulative of 100.0 percent.

Table 8 Noise

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	133	47.5	47.5	47.5
	No	147	52.5	52.5	100.0
	Total	280	100.0	100.0	

The below table represents the distribution of the sample in terms of light and color in the working environment. The information displayed below tells us that the employees of higher education sector in Karachi shows that out of a total sample of 280 respondents, 86 employees work in sunlight and they constitute about 30.7 % of the whole sample. While the 91 staffs of different universities represent that their working environment has incandescent light and color which comprises of 32.5 percent. While some respondents are comprising of people who work in the window lights. They are 85 in number and constitute about 30.4 % of the total sample and people work in the environment where light and color comes from the good views are 18 in number constituting about 6.4 percent of the total sample and located at 100% cumulative percentage.

Table 9 Light & Color

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Sunlight	86	30.7	30.7	30.7
	Incandescent	91	32.5	32.5	63.2
	Windows	85	30.4	30.4	93.6
	Views	18	6.4	6.4	100.0
	Total	280	100.0	100.0	

The below table represents the distribution of the sample in terms of the work-space condition in the physical work environment. The information displayed below tells us that out of a total sample of 280 respondents, 250 respondents give the information that in their working environment they have proper arrangement of work station and they were representing 89.3 % of the overall sample and there are only 30 respondents who said that in their working environment there is no any arrangement of work station, they constitute about 10.7 percent of total sample making cumulative of 100 percent.

Table 10 Space

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Arrangement of work station	250	89.3	89.3	89.3
	Not arrangement of work station	30	10.7	10.7	100.0
	Total	280	100.0	100.0	

4.2 Reliability

In our research, our instruments of both dependent variable are reliable. Because through the reliability test of first dependent variable (Employee Performance) having the 3 number of the instrument the score of Cronbach’s Alpha is 0.665 which is showing its reliability and similarly through the reliability test of the second dependent variable (Turnover Intention) we find the Cronbach’s Alpha of dependent variable which is 0.847 it means that it is highly reliable.

Table 11 Case Processing Summary

		N	%
Cases	Valid	280	100.0
	Excluded a	0	.0
	Total	280	100.0

Table 12 Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.665	3

Table 13 Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.847	3

4.3 Descriptive

The below tables shows the average mean of employee performance is 10.5643 and having the standard deviation of 2.38938. The Skewness of employee performance is -.958 while the kurtosis is 1.235. Similarly, the average mean of Turnover Intention is 7.7607 and the standard deviation is 3.26432. In this, the Skewness is -.958, while the Kurtosis of Turnover Intention is -.940.

Table 14 Descriptive Statistics

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean		Std. Deviation	Skewness		Kurtosis	
	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic		Statistic	Statistic	Std. Error	Statistic	Std. Error
TEP	280	3.00	15.00	10.5643	.14279	2.38938	-.958	.146	1.235	.290
TTI	280	3.00	15.00	7.7607	.19508	.146	-.940	.290		
Valid N (listwise)	280									

Table 15 Group Statistics

	Air	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
TEP	Pollution	98	10.0102	2.84114	.28700
	Freshness	182	10.8626	2.05392	.15225

Table 16 Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
								Lower		Upper
TEP	Equal variances assumed	21.054	.000	-2.884	278	.004	-.85243	.29552	-1.43418	-.27069
	Equal variances not assumed			-2.624	152.791	.010	-.85243	.32488	-1.49427	-.21060

An independent-samples t-test was conducted to compare the employee performance in physical work environment air quality in pollution and in freshness conditions. The above tables shows that there is a substantial variance in the scores pollution (M=10.01, SD=2.84) and freshness (M=10.86, SD=2.05) conditions; $t(152.791) = -2.624, p = 0.010$.

The above table of Independent Samples Test shows the significant level p-value) of 0.010. which means that there is an important effect of air quality in employee performance It means that both types of air quality (Polluted Air & Freshness in Air) impact the employee performance differently. Specifically, our result indicates that more freshness in the working environment, it positively impact on employee performance. Similarly, if the working environment has pollution then it will negatively impact on employee performance.

Table 17 Group Statistics

	Temperature	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
TEP	High Temperature Level	122	9.9918	2.66441	.24122
	Low Temperature Level	158	11.0063	2.05497	.16348

Table 18 Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
TEP	Equal variances assumed	18.323	.000	-3.598	278	.000	-1.01453	.28200	-1.56966	-.45939
	Equal variances not assumed			-3.482	221.643	.001	-1.01453	.29140	-1.58880	-.44025

An independent-samples t-test was conducted to compare the employee performance in physical work environment temperature level in high-level temperature and similarly in low-level temperature conditions. The above tables shows that there is a significant difference in the scores high temperature level (M=9.9918, SD=2.66441) and low temperature level (M=11.0063, SD=2.05497) conditions; $t(221.643) = -3.482, p = 0.001$.

The above table of Independent Samples Test shows the significant level (p-value) of 0.001. which means that there is a significant effect of temperature level in employee performance It means that both types of temperature level (High-level temperature & Low-temperature level) impact the employee performance in a different way. Specifically, our result indicates that the employee working in the low-temperature level working environment, their performance is relatively high as compared to the employee working in the high-temperature level working environment.

Table 19 Group Statistics

	Noise	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
TEP	Yes	133	10.0000	2.59662	.22516
	No	147	11.0748	2.06434	.17026

Table 20 Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
TEP	Equal variances assumed	12.541	.000	-3.851	278	.000	-1.07483	.27911	-1.62426	-.52539
	Equal variances not assumed			-3.808	251.713	.000	-1.07483	.28228	-1.63077	-.51889

An independent-samples t-test was conducted to compare the employee performance according to the noise condition of the physical work environment in a noise environment and similarly in no noise environment conditions. The above tables show that there is an important change in the scores noise in the working environment (M=10.0000, SD=2.59662) and an

environment with no noise ($M=11.0748$, $SD=2.06434$) conditions; $t(251.713) = -3.808$, $p = 0.000$.

The above table of Independent Samples Test shows the significant level (p-value) of 0.000 which means that there is a significant effect of noise conditions in employee performance. It means that both types of noise conditions (noisy environment & environment with no noise) impact employee performance in a different way. Specifically, our result indicates that the employees working in the environment with no noise, their performance is relatively high as compared to the employee working in a noisy working environment.

Table 21 Descriptive

TEP	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean	Minimum	Maximum
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound	
Sunlight	86	9.9651	2.73301	.29471	9.3792	10.5511	3.00 15.00
Incandescent	91	11.2308	1.85039	.19397	10.8454	11.6161	3.00 15.00
Windows	85	10.8118	2.22269	.24108	10.3323	11.2912	3.00 15.00
Views	18	8.8889	2.51791	.59348	7.6368	10.1410	4.00 13.00
Total	280	10.5643	2.38938	.14279	10.2832	10.8454	3.00 15.00
Descriptive							

Table 22 Test of Homogeneity of Variances

TEP	Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
	5.238	3	276	.002

Table 23 ANOVA

TEP	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	127.028	3	42.343	7.973	.000
Within Groups	1465.815	276	5.311		
Total	1592.843	279			

Table 24 Robust Tests of Equality of Means

TEP	Statistic a	df1	df2	Sig.
Welch	7.569	3	71.470	.000
a. Asymptotically F distributed.				

The one way ANOVA test was conducted to compare the employee performance on the basis of different light and color conditions in the physical work environment including sunlight, incandescent, windows and views conditions. The Welch test also conducted to get an accurate result. Because the above table of homogeneity of variances represent the significance value is very less than 0.05. to avoid this, we used the Welch test for our study.

The above table of ANOVA represents that there is a significant difference in the performance of employees between different sources of light and color, $F(3,276) = 7.973$, $p < 0.05$. The above table of Robust Test of Equality of Means also shows a significant level of 0.000, it means that there is a significant effect of different light and color conditions on the performance of employees. It means that each type of light and color conditions (sunlight, incandescent, windows, and views) impact employee performance in the higher education sector of Karachi.

Table 25 Group Statistics

	Space	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
TEP	Arrangement of work station	250	10.7240	2.29191	.14495
	Not arrangement of work station	30	9.2333	2.78770	.50896

Table 26 Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		Independent Samples Test						
		F	Sig.	t	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
								Lower		Upper
TEP	Equal variances assumed	3.638	.058	3.285	278	.001	1.49067	.45378	.59739	2.38394
	Equal variances not assumed			2.817	33.869	.008	1.49067	.52920	.41505	2.56628

An independent-samples t-test was conducted to compare the employee performance according to work-space in the physical work environment in the arrangement of the work station and in not arrangement of work station conditions. The above tables show that there is a significant difference in the score's arrangement of work station ($M=10.7240$, $SD=2.29191$) and not an arrangement of work station ($M=9.2333$, $SD=2.78770$) conditions; $t(278) = 3.285$, $p = 0.001$.

The above table of Independent Samples Test shows the equal variance assumed a significant level (p-value) of 0.001. which means that there is a significant effect of work-space conditions on employee performance. It means that both types of work-space conditions (Arrangement of work station & Not arrangement of work station) impact the employee performance differently. Specifically, our result indicates that the working environment, according to work-space conditions, the employees who work in the environment with the arrangement of work station it positively impact on their performance. Similarly, if the work-space has no arrangement of work station then it will negatively impact on employee performance.

Table 27 Group Statistics

	Air	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
TTI	Pollution	98	9.2551	3.32845	.33622
	Freshness	182	6.9560	2.93733	.21773

Table 28 Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
TTI	Equal variances assumed	1.692	.194	5.959	278	.000	2.29906	.38584	1.53953	3.05859
	Equal variances not assumed			5.740	178.582	.000	2.29906	.40057	1.50861	3.08951

An independent-samples t-test was conducted to compare the employee turnover intention in physical work environment air quality in pollution and in freshness conditions. The above tables show that there is a significant difference in the scores pollution ($M=9.2551$, $SD=3.32845$) and freshness ($M=6.9560$, $SD=2.93733$) conditions; $t(278)=5.959$, $p=0.000$.

The above table of Independent Samples Test shows the significant level (p-value) of 0.000 when the equal variance is assumed. which means that there is a significant effect of air quality in employee turnover intention. It means that both types of air quality (Air with pollution & Air with freshness) impact the employee turnover intention another way. Precisely, our result specifies that more freshness in the working environment air, it reduce the employee turnover intention. Similarly, if the working environment has pollution then it will increase the employee intention to leave the organization.

Table 29 Group Statistics

	Temperature	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
TTI	High Temperature Level	122	8.8525	3.36406	.30457
	Low Temperature Level	158	6.9177	2.92794	.23293

Table 30 Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	T	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
TTI	Equal variances assumed	4.139	.043	5.136	278	.000	1.93474	.37666	1.19326	2.67621
	Equal variances not assumed			5.046	240.527	.000	1.93474	.38343	1.17943	2.69005

An independent-samples t-test was conducted to compare the employee turnover intention in the physical work environment temperature level in high-level temperature and similarly in low-level temperature conditions. The above tables show that there is a significant difference

in the scores high-temperature level (M=8.8525, SD=3.36406) and low-temperature level (M=6.9177, SD=2.92794) conditions; $t(240.527) = 5.046, p = 0.000$.

The above table of Independent Samples Test shows the significant level (p-value) is 0.000 if the equal variance not assumed. which means that there is a significant effect of temperature level in employee intention to leave the organization. It means that both types of temperature level (High-temperature level & Low-level temperature) impact the employee turnover intention. Specifically, our result indicates that the employee working in the low-temperature level working environment, their turnover intention is relatively low as compared to the employee working in the high-temperature level working environment.

Table 31 Group Statistics

	Noise	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
TTI	Yes	133	8.7068	3.23284	.28032
	No	147	6.9048	3.05953	.25235

Table 32 Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
								Lower	Upper	
TTI	Equal variances assumed	.897	.344	4.791	278	.000	1.80201	.37613	1.06158	2.54243
	Equal variances not assumed			4.778	271.452	.000	1.80201	.37717	1.05945	2.54456

An independent-samples t-test was conducted to compare the employee intention to leave the organization according to the noise condition in the physical work environment in a noise environment and similarly in no noise environment conditions. The above tables show that there is a significant difference in the scores noise in the working environment (M=8.7068, SD=3.23284) and an environment with no noise (M=6.9048, SD=3.05953) conditions; $t(278) = 4.791, p = 0.000$.

The above table of Independent Samples Test shows the significant level (p-value) of 0.000 if equal variance assumed, which means that there is a significant effect of noise conditions in employee turnover intention. It means that both types of noise conditions (noisy environment & environment with no noise) impact the employee turnover intention. Specifically, our result indicates that the employees working in the environment with no noise, their intention to leave the organization is very low and similarly the turnover intention of employees is very high who are working in the noisy working environment.

Table 33 Descriptive

TTI	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Sunlight	86	9.1395	3.35073	.36132	8.4211	9.8579	3.00	15.00
Incandescent	91	6.9890	3.05321	.32006	6.3531	7.6249	3.00	15.00
Windows	85	7.0588	2.82570	.30649	6.4493	7.6683	3.00	13.00
Views	18	8.3889	3.77513	.88981	6.5116	10.2662	3.00	14.00
Total	280	7.7607	3.26432	.19508	7.3767	8.1447	3.00	15.00
Descriptives								

The above table represents that from the 280 employees of different universities, 91 respondents represents that the major source of light and color in their physical work environment is incandescent having the mean of 6.98 and standard deviation of 3.05, while the 86 employees shows that the sunlight is the major source of light and color in their environment with the mean value 9.139 and standard deviation of 3.350. 85 employees represent that windows are a major source of light and color in their physical work environment with mean 7.05 and standard deviation 2.82 and only 18 respondents said that the views are the major source of light and color for them and representing the mean of 8.38 and 3.775.

Table 34 Test of Homogeneity of Variances

TTI	df1	df2	Sig.
Levene Statistic	3	276	.113

Table 35 ANOVA

TTI	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	266.670	3	88.890	9.065	.000
Within Groups	2706.298	276	9.805		
Total	2972.968	279			

Table 36 Robust Tests of Equality of Means

TTI	Statistic a	df1	df2	Sig.
Welch	8.398	3	71.362	.000

The one way ANOVA test and Welch test was conducted to compare the employee intention to leave the organization according to the different light and color conditions in the physical work environment including sunlight, incandescent, windows and views conditions.

The above table of ANOVA represents that there is a significant difference on the turnover intention of employees between different physical work environment conditions regarding different light and color, $F(3,276) = 9.065, p < 0.05$. The above table of ANOVA shows a significant level of 0.000, it means that there is a significant effect of different light and color conditions on employee turnover intention. It means that each type of light and color conditions (sunlight, incandescent, windows, and views) impact the employee intention to leave the organization positively or negatively.

Table 37 Group Statistics

	Space	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
TTI	Arrangement of work station	250	7.4520	3.17364	.20072
	Not arrangement of work station	30	10.3333	2.89272	.52814

Table 38 Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
								Lower		Upper
TTI	Equal variances assumed	1.594	.208	-4.741	278	.000	-2.88133	.60777	-4.07775	-1.68492
	Equal variances not assumed			-5.100	37.890	.000	-2.88133	.56499	-4.02521	-1.73746

An independent-samples t-test was conducted to compare the employee turnover intention according to work-space in the physical work environment in the arrangement of a work station and is not an arrangement of work station conditions. The above tables show that there is a significant difference in the score's arrangement of work station ($M=7.4520, SD=3.17364$) and not an arrangement of work station ($M=10.3333, SD=2.89272$) conditions; $t(278) = -4.741, p = 0.000$.

The above table of Independent Samples Test shows the equal variance assumed a significant level (p-value) of 0.000. which means that there is a significant effect of work-space conditions on employee turnover intention. It means that both types of work-space conditions (Arrangement of work station & Not arrangement of work station) impact the employee intention to leave the organization. Specifically, our result indicates that the working environment, according to work-space conditions, the employees who work in the environment with the arrangement of the work station it reduce their turnover intention. Similarly, if the work-space has no arrangement of work station then it will increase the intention to leave the organization.

4.4 Result

Table 39

Hypothesis	Statement	Equal Variance	P. Value	Inference
Ho1	AQ → EP	Not Assumed	0.010	Supported
Ho2	TL → EP	Not Assumed	0.001	Supported
Ho3	NC → EP	Not Assumed	0.000	Supported
Ho4	L&C → EP	-	0.000	Supported
Ho5	AWS → EP	Assumed	0.001	Supported
Ho6	AQ → TI	Assumed	0.000	Supported
Ho7	TL → TI	Not Assumed	0.000	Supported
Ho8	NC → TI	Assumed	0.000	Supported
Ho9	L&C → TI	-	0.000	Supported
Ho 10	AWS → TI	Not Assumed	0.000	Supported

5. DISCUSSION

There is an impact of physical workroom environment factors on employees productivity and performance and similarly, there is also an effect of physical workspace environment factors on turnover intention of personnel. Our study found out, whenever the physical work environment condition is good in any university located in Karachi, it increases the performance of its employees. Similarly, whenever the physical work environment condition is bad in the higher education sector of Karachi, it decreases the employee's performance and productivity.

Our study also found that the good physical workspace surrounding conditions resulted in decreasing the rate of turnover intention and bad office environment conditions resulted in the increase of turnover intention of employees. It means that the air quality, temperature level, noise condition, light and color, and workspace conditions plays a role in the changing of employees performance and turnover intention.

This research is confirmatory from the previous investigation that shows that the lack of ventilation, the high-temperature level, unsuitable lightening, poorly designed workstation, and excessive noise negatively impact on employee performance and positively impact turnover intention ("Impact of Work Environment on Performance of Employees in Manufacturing Sector in India: Literature Review," 2016).

This investigation is the confirmatory research from the previous studies that there is a substantial effect of workplace atmosphere on employee productivity (Jayaweera, 2015). The finding of this investigation is also reliable with the prior investigation presenting an association among working environment aspects and employee work performance (Fine & Kobrick, 1978).

This research is also verified from the result of previous research representing the similar result that there is an impact of physical work-space atmosphere issues on employee effectiveness and performance (Al-Omari & Okasheh, 2017).

This research is confirmatory from the previous research, verified that the work environment has a weighty positive influence on organizational commitment and reduce the intention of turnover (Hanaysha, 2016). It shows that the workroom situation is a key factor that can influence job satisfaction and intention to leave job amongst the employee of higher education sector or university in Karachi.

This investigation is confirmatory form the previous related research that, it is also found that only physical environment factors do not impact on turnover intention but, employee engagement activity and organizational learning conditions also impact on the organizational commitment and the rate of turnover intention. It means that if the organization adopted the employee engagement activities and organizational learning culture in their organization then, the turnover intention of the employees of that organization will also decrease and the level of organizational commitment increase (Hanaysha, 2016).

This research is confirmatory form the prior relevant research studies that, the effective job insecurity also has an encouraging impact on the turnover intention. Which shows that the employees who feel and who aware of the possibility of losing their jobs increase their turnover intention (Akgunduz & Eryilmaz, 2018).

5.1 Future Recommendation

This investigation has some limitations which propose new opportunities for future researches. This research was shown in the higher education sector of Karachi, Pakistan. Further studies can be conducted in other countries and also in other sectors to overcome the above-mentioned limitations and to get a broad generalization. Further researches can also be directed to test the impact of physical work environment influences on workers motivation to work. This study can also be conducted in the textile industry and the pharmaceutical industry.

6. CONCLUSION

In this study, we tested the impact of physical workspace environment influences on employee performance and turnover intention in the higher education sector of Pakistan located in Karachi. The outcome of the tentative investigation presents significant support for the proposed hypothesis. As per finding, in the higher education institutes of Pakistan, there is the difference on employee performance and workers aim to leave the job on the basis of different physical environment factors including the air quality, temperature level, noise condition, lightning, and arrangement of the work station. If the physical environment condition is good then it positively impacts the employee performance and negatively impacts the employee turnover intention and similarly, if the physical work environment condition is bad then it negatively impacts on employee performance while positively impact employee turnover intention.

REFERENCES

- [1] Aamodt, A. (2010). Knowledge-Intensive Case-Based Reasoning in CREEK. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-540-28631-8_1
- [2] Abdou, P. O. A., Kholy, G. M. El, & Abdou, A. A. (n.d.). Correlation Between Indoor Environmental Quality and Productivity in Buildings indoor air environment and worker productivity. While qualitative information is fairly plentiful, another hand, many people maintain that the measurable changes in productive. *Environmental Studies*, 1–15.
- [3] Akgunduz, Y., & Eryilmaz, G. (2018). Does turnover intention mediate the effects of job insecurity and co-worker support on social loafing? *International Journal of Hospitality Management*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2017.09.010>
- [4] Al-Omari, K., & Okasheh, H. (2017). The influence of the work environment on job performance: A case study of an engineering company in Jordan. *International Journal of Applied Engineering Research*.

- [5] Applebaum, D., Fowler, S., Fiedler, N., Osinubi, O., & Robson, M. (2010). The impact of environmental factors on nursing stress, job satisfaction, and turnover intention. *Nursing Administration*, 40(323).
- [6] Applebaum, D., & Fowler, S. (2010). The Impact of Environmental Factors on Nursing Stress, Job Satisfaction, and Turnover Intention, 40(7), 323–328. <https://doi.org/10.1097/NNA.0b013e3181e9393b>
- [7] Asrar-ul-Haq, M., Kuchinke, K. P., & Iqbal, A. (2017). The relationship between corporate social responsibility, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment: Case of Pakistani higher education. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 142, 2352–2363. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2016.11.040>
- [8] Badayai, A. R. A. (2012). A Theoretical Framework and Analytical Discussion on Uncongenial Physical Workplace Environment and Job Performance among Workers in Industrial Sectors. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2012.04.214>
- [9] Becker, F. (2002). Improving organisational performance by exploiting workplace flexibility. *Journal of Facilities Management*. <https://doi.org/10.1108/14725960310807890>
- [10] Bevan, S. (2012). Good work, high performance, and productivity. European HRD Circle, (May). Retrieved from <https://european-hrd-circle.org/stephen-bevan-good-work-high-performance-and-productivity/>
- [11] Campbell, J. P. (1990). Modeling the Performance Prediction Problem in Industrial and Organizational Psychology. In *Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*. <https://doi.org/10.1026/1617-6391.3.3.135>
- [12] Dole, C., & Schroeder, R. G. (2001). The impact of various factors on the personality, job satisfaction and turnover intentions of professional accountants. *Managerial Auditing Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.1108/02686900110389188>
- [13] During, N. A., & Tasks, D. N. (1991). Noise annoyance during, 39–49.
- [14] El-Zeiny, R. M. A. (2012). The Interior Design of Workplace and its Impact on Employees' Performance: A Case Study of the Private Sector Corporations in Egypt. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2012.02.145>
- [15] Fine, B. J., & Kobrick, J. L. (1978). Effects of Altitude and Heat on Complex Cognitive Tasks. *Human Factors: The Journal of Human Factors and Ergonomics Society*, 20(1), 115–122. <https://doi.org/10.1177/001872087802000115>
- [16] Grebennikov, L., & Grebennikov, L. (2007). Preschool teachers' exposure to classroom noise. *Preschool teachers' exposure to classroom noise*, (November 2014), 37–41. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669760500446382>
- [17] Han, H., & Sean, S. (2017). International Journal of Hospitality Management Impact of hotel-restaurant image and quality of physical-environment, service, and food on satisfaction and intention. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 63, 82–92. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2017.03.006>
- [18] Hanaysha, J. (2016). Testing the Effects of Employee Engagement, Work Environment, and Organizational Learning on Organizational Commitment. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2016.07.139>

- [19] Hoboubi, N., Choobineh, A., Ghanavati, F. K., Keshavarzi, S., & Hosseini, A. A. (2017). The Impact of Job Stress and Job Satisfaction on Workforce Productivity in an Iranian Petrochemical Industry. *Safety and Health at Work*, 8(1), 67–71. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.shaw.2016.07.002>
- [20] Impact of Work Environment on Performance of Employees in Manufacturing Sector in India: Literature Review. (2016). *International Journal of Science and Research (IJSR)*. <https://doi.org/10.21275/v5i4.nov162579>
- [21] Jang, Y., Lee, A. A., Zadrozny, M., Bae, S., Kim, M. T., & Marti, N. C. (2017). Determinants of Job Satisfaction and Turnover Intent in Home Health Workers : The Role of Job Demands and Resources. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0733464815586059>
- [22] Jayaweera, T. (2015). Impact of Work Environmental Factors on Job Performance, Mediating Role of Work Motivation: A Study of Hotel Sector in England. *International Journal of Business and Management*. <https://doi.org/10.5539/ijbm.v10n3p271>
- [23] Kamarulzaman, N., Saleh, A. A., Hashim, S. Z., Hashim, H., & Abdul-Ghani, A. A. (2011). An overview of the influence of physical office environments towards employees. In *Procedia Engineering*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.proeng.2011.11.164>
- [24] Keeling, B. . and kallaus. (1996). No Title.
- [25] Kim, S., Tam, L., Kim, J. N., & Rhee, Y. (2017). Determinants of employee turnover intention: Understanding the roles of organizational justice, supervisory justice, authoritarian organizational culture, and organization-employee relationship quality. *Corporate Communications*. <https://doi.org/10.1108/CCIJ-11-2016-0074>
- [26] Kim, S. Y., & Fernandez, S. (2015). Employee Empowerment and Turnover Intention in the U.S. Federal Bureaucracy. *American Review of Public Administration*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0275074015583712>
- [27] Kovner, C., Budin, W. C., & Norman, R. (2010). *Physical Work Environment*, 59(6), 441–451. <https://doi.org/10.1097/NNR.0b013e3181fb2f25>
- [28] Leaman, A., & Bordass, B. (1993). Building Design, Complexity and Manageability. *Facilities*. <https://doi.org/10.1108/EUM0000000002256>
- [29] Lee, B., Seo, D., & Lee, J. (2016). Impact of the work environment and work-related stress on turnover intention in physical therapists, 2358–2361.
- [30] Loretta Ann Williams (2), David A., L. A., & Crerar, D. A. (1985). Silica Diagenesis, II. General Mechanisms. *SEPM Journal of Sedimentary Research*. <https://doi.org/10.1306/212F86B1-2B24-11D7-8648000102C1865D>
- [31] Luo, W., & Sehgal, A. (2012). Regulation of circadian behavioral output via a MicroRNA-JAK/STAT circuit. *Cell*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cell.2011.12.024>
- [32] Melamed, S., & Froom, P. (2001). The Interactive Effect of Chronic Exposure to Noise and Job Complexity on Changes in Blood Pressure and Job Satisfaction : A Longitudinal Study of Industrial Employees, 6(3), 182–195. <https://doi.org/10.1037//1076-8998.6.3.182>
- [33] Messaris, E., Sehgal, R., Deiling, S., Koltun, W. A., Stewart, D., McKenna, K., & Poritz, L. S. (2012). Dehydration is the most common indication for readmission after diverting ileostomy creation. *Diseases of the Colon and Rectum*. <https://doi.org/10.1097/DCR.0b013e31823d0ec5>

- [34] Mosadeghrad, A. M., Ferlie, E., & Rosenberg, D. (2011). A study of relationship between job stress, quality of working life and turnover intention among hospital employees, 170–181.
- [35] Motowidlo, S. J., & Schmit, M. J. (1999). Performance assessment in unique jobs. In *The changing nature of job performance: Implications for staffing, motivation, and development*.
- [36] Naharuddin, N. M. (2013). Factors of Workplace Environment that Affect Employees Performance : A Case Study of Miyazu Malaysia, 2(2), 66–78.
- [37] Nizam Kamaruzzaman, S., & Marinie Ahmad Zawawi, E. (2010). Development of facilities management in Malaysia. *Journal of Facilities Management*. <https://doi.org/10.1108/14725961011019094>
- [38] Nwagbara, U., Oruh, E. S., Ugorji, C., & Ennsra, M. (2013). The Impact of Effective Communication on Employee Turnover Intension at First Bank of Nigeria, II(4), 13–21.
- [39] Roelofsen, P., & Roelofsen, P. (2013). The impact of office environments on employee performance : The design of the workplace as a strategy for productivity enhancement.
- [40] Sarode, A. P., & Shirsath, M. (2014). The Factors Affecting Employee Work Environment & It ' s Relation with Employee Productivity, 3(11), 2735–2737.
- [41] Sehgal, S. (2012). relationship between work environment and productivity. *International Journal of Engineering Research*, 2(4).
- [42] Sinnappan, T. (2017). *WORKING ENVIRONMENT AND ITS INFLUENCE*, (August).
- [43] Sundstrom, E., Town, J. P., Rice, R. W., Osborn, D. P., & Brill, M. (1994).). Office noise, satisfaction, and performance. *Environment and behavior*, 26(2).
- [44] Yeh, S., & Huan, T. (2017). Assessing the impact of work environment factors on employee creative performance of fine-dining restaurants. *Tourism Management*, 58, 119–131. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2016.10.006>
- [45] Zeffane, R., & Bani Melhem, S. J. (2017). Trust, job satisfaction, perceived organizational performance and turnover intention. *Employee Relations*, 39(7), 1148–1167. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ER-06-2017-0135>