

The Relationship between Workplace Environments and Job Performance in Selected Government Offices in Selangor, Malaysia

Nur Zainie Abd Hamid

Universiti Teknologi MARA, Faculty of Business Management, Puncak Alam,
Malaysia nurzainie60@salam.uitm.edu.my

Narehan Hassan

Universiti Teknologi MARA, Faculty of Business Management, Puncak Alam,
Malaysia
drnarehan@puncakalam.uitm.edu.my

ABSTRACT

Work ethics among employees has been extensively studied since it is believed to influence job performance. One of the elements of work ethics is the workplace environments that may represent job satisfaction, organizational factors and clients. Research evidences showed that, the element plays a vital role in producing positive employees. This has become the reason for employers to be champions in mastering all the important factors that lead to an employee's high performance, especially those in the government sector where job performance is a crucial issue to be discussed. Thus, the purpose of this study is to examine the relationship between workplace environments and civil servants' job performance in Shah Alam, Selangor. This survey based correlation study using a simple random sampling technique where 150 respondents are selected from 10 government offices. Questionnaires were personally distributed with 100 percent rate of return. The data gathered is analyzed using Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS) through descriptive statistic and Pearson Product Moment Correlation test. The findings found that two major elements in the workplace; workplace environment and job performance have a weak association. The finding of this study is very critical since it can help the employers in improving the worker satisfaction especially through adjusting the workplace environments in which as a result will increase the level of their job performance.

Key Words: Job Performance, Job Satisfaction, Workplace Environments

1.0 INTRODUCTION

Workplace environment plays a crucial role in ensuring employee's job performance (Naharuddin & Sadegi, 2013) since it may impact employee morale and productivity (Chandrasekar (2011). It is also a critical factor to keep employee's satisfaction in today's world. A quality workplace environment may influence people around the organization in number of ways including their job performance. In fact, a number of previous study have shown the connection between employees satisfaction with specific workplace features such as communication, supervisor support, resource availability, role congruity and goal setting. In other words, those who

working under inconvenient will most probably engage with low performance and end up with occupational issues such as absenteeism Leblebici (2012) and vice versa.

Workplace environment factors such as lighting (Boyce, Veitch, Newsham, Myer & Hunter (2013), noise, communication and psychology support have significant impacts on employee morale in which may affect employee's work productivity. Besides, incompatible workplace environment including poorly designed workstations, unsuitable office furniture, lack of ventilation and insufficient safety measures are also contributors of occupational diseases. Research done by Ettner & Grzywacs demonstrated that workplace environment factors give significant impact on the respondents' job where it shows build relationship between both (Shikdar & Sawaqed, 2003; Ettner & Grzywacz, 2001). Prior research also suggested that, employee's job performance level will be depending on the factor of workplace environment (Naharuddin & Sadegi, 2013). Thus, when the workplace environment is inappropriate, employee productivity and performance will also decrease.

In Malaysia, workplace environments that include occupational safety and health issues are one of the most factors to achieve appropriate level of services, especially in the government sector. Therefore, this study was planned and conducted to examine the relatedness between workplace environments with job performance among employees in selected government offices in Selangor. Two research questions are raised to assist the research.

- i. What is the relationship between workplace environment and job performance?
- ii. What is the relationship between gender and age with job performance?

2.0 LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Job Performance

Job performance is defined as accomplishment of work related tasks or skill by an employee. Rotunda recommended that job performance is defined as actions that contribute to organizational goals and that are under the individual's control (Rotundo, 2002). It is related to the willingness and openness to try and achieve new aspects of the job which in turn will bring about an increase in the productivity of the individual (Sinha El-Saaba, 2004). It is measure through the level of achievement of business and social objectives and responsibilities from the perspective of the judging party (Hersey & Blanchard, 1993). The key indications of job performance are the individual personal characteristics including competency and ability to deal with role conflict (Howell & Higgins, 1990).

The argument exists in the sense of this definition includes a wide range of job behaviors and that some behaviors contribute to employee's duties and

responsibilities, while other behaviors still affect the goals of the organization but do not fall under duties and responsibilities. However, majority of prior studies has demonstrated that job performance involved a micro level of actions and behaviors of an employee that contribute to the goals of the organization (Murphy, 1989; Campbell, 1990) where it refers to all behaviors employee engage in the workplace (Jex, 2002).

In the organization, especially for-profit orientation organization, job performance is considered as the most important aspect in generating continuous profit. Employee's performance is determined during job performance reviews with the consideration factors of time management, leadership skills and productivity to assess each employee on an individual basis. It is a technique to measure the level of achievement of business and social objectives and responsibilities from the perspective of the judging party (Hersey & Blanchard, 1993). Besides, one's job performance also can be defined based on the three dimension suggested by (Mtlkovich & Wigdor, 1991); outcomes, behaviors and personal traits.

Many factors could affect employee's job performance including physical work environment, equipment, meaningful work, performance expectation, and feedback on performance, reward for good or bad system, standard operating procedures, knowledge, skills and attitudes (Stup, 2003). However, the physical work environment has been widely study since it contributed a considerable concern on the employee's job performance.

2.2 Workplace Environment

Workplace environment, in the literal sense bring the meaning of the surroundings at the place of occupation which include inside, outside, at a desk and in a cubicle (Rezaul, 2014). Besides, it is also refers to positive, negative or friendly mental state of an individual. A supportive workplace environment is said to have the ability in engaging employee with their performance. Many managers in an organization have started to realize the importance of workplace environments towards producing positive employees and aware that it is the quality of the employee's workplace environment that related to job performance. In fact, it is the quality of workplace environment that most impacts the employee level of job performance and motivation (Chandrasekar, 2011).

Several factors of workplace environment may leads to the level of job performance and one of them is job satisfaction (Arman, Mastura, Shardy & Samsiah, 2014). It plays a crucial role since performance of an individual is reciprocal with the amount of satisfaction derives from his or her work. Fisher believed that, happy worker are those who are productive and those who are satisfied with their jobs, and they are likely to be better performers in the organizations (Fisher, 2003). This is because performance may lead to rewards and in turn, the rewards will create satisfaction. Those who are complaining on the discomfort and dissatisfaction also are those whose job performance is affected

by the workplace environment (Leaman, 1995).

Job performance also may be affected by organizational factor such as company size, level of authority and type of client (Arman et. al, 2014). The study found that the level of power recorded the most influential element towards the outcome of a project's manager performance. Yielding an appropriate amount of authority may be effective because it provide the best interest to make decisions as well as to demonstrate a required degree of authority to be success in deliberating the duties.

3.0 METHODOLOGY

This correlation study was conducted in selected government offices in Shah Alam, Selangor. The list of government offices was taken from Kementerian Negeri Selangor Portal and there were 10 selected government offices for this study as shown in table 1. Taken Salkind as a recommendation, only 30% from the population of 500 civil servants in the selected government offices were selected as samples for studied Salkind (2009). Respondents were randomly selected to give equal and independent chance of being selected as part of the sample for all. A set of questionnaire was adapted and distributed which consist of 3 section; Section A: demographic information, Section B: The workplace environment among employees at selected government offices in Shah Alam Selangor and Section C: The workplace environment element that influences job performance.

Table 1 Selected Government Offices

No	Selected Government Office
1	Jabatan Pembangunan Koperasi Negeri Selangor
2	Jabatan Agama Islam Negeri Selangor
3	Lembaga Perumahan dan Hartanah Selangor
4	Perbadanan Kemajuan Negeri Selangor
5	Jabatan Kerja Raya Negeri Selangor
6	Jabatan Pilihan Raya Negeri Selangor
7	Suruhanjaya Pencegah Rasuah Malaysia Negeri Selangor
8	Setiausaha Kerajaan Negeri Selangor
9	Pejabat RELA Negeri Selangor
10	Jabatan Pelajaran Negeri Selangor

4.0 FINDINGS

4.1 Descriptive Analysis

Respondents' Demographic Information

Table II below summarized the respondents' demographic information of this study. A total of 51 (39.5%) male and 78 (60.5%) female were involved in the study. Majority of them (95.3%) were Malay and the remaining 5 were Chinese, Indian and others. The respondents aged groups were less than 21 years old (5, 3.9 %), 21 to 30 years old (67, 51.9%), 31 to 40 years old (36, 27.9 %), 40 and above (21, 16.3 %). The highest education level of the respondents indicated that 60 respondents (46.5 %) were a diploma holder, 44 (34.1 %) were SPM holder, 13 (10.1 %) were bachelor degree holder while the remaining 12 (9.3 %) were unknown. This study involved civil servants in all management levels of the organization including 2 respondents from managerial level (grade N48 and above), 28 respondents form supervisory level (grade N27 and N44) and 99 respondents from support staff level (grade N27 and below).

Table 2 Respondents' Demographic Information

Demographic Information	Characteristic	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Gender	Male	51	39.5
	Female	78	60.5
Race	Malay	123	95.3
	Chinese	3	2.3
	Indian	1	0.8
	Others	2	10.6
Age	< 21 year old	5	3.9
	21 to 30 year old	67	51.9
	31 to 40 year old	36	27.9
	> 40 year old	21	16.3
Highest Education Level	Bachelor Degree	13	10.1
	Diploma	60	46.5
	Sijil Pelajaran Malaysia (SPM)	44	34.1
	Others	12	9.3
Job Status	Managerial Level (> N48)	2	1.6
	Supervisory Level (N27 and N44)	28	21.7
	Support Staff (< N27)	88	68.2
	Others	11	8.5

4.2 Correlational Analysis

The Relationship between Demographic Factors and Job Performance

Other than focusing on primary purpose of the study, the researcher also has determined the influence of demographic factors such as gender and age with job performance. The results were as illustrated in table III where gender is proved to has a significant positive weak association with job performance by $p = <0.05$, $r=0.192$, while no association shown between respondent’s age with job performance with $p = > 0.05$, $r=0.608$. This indicated that, gender can be applied as one of the factor that may affect an individual job performance level.

Table 3 The Relationship Between Gender And Age With Job Performance

		Job Performance
Gender	Correlation Coefficient	.192
	Sig. (2 tailed)	.030
	N	129
Age	Correlation Coefficient	.046
	Sig. (2 tailed)	.608
	N	129

The Relationship between Workplace Environment and Job Performance

Table IV showed that, the mean for workplace environment is 3.8128. Consistent with Ajala, whose study revealed the important of workplace features [21], this study also suggested that workplace environment influence the respondents well in indicating their level of job performance. This is because, a proper and comfortable workplace environment may prevent or contribute less stress while getting work done to an individual [22]. Besides that, as depicted in table V, workplace environment demonstrated a significant positive weak association with job performance by $p=0.209$, $r=0.018$. The finding supported research by Ismail, Jusoh, Zulkifli, Sopian and Derus where they found employees in automotive industry will perform better when engaging with a pleasure workplace environment [23].

Table 4 Mean Of Workplace Environment

Workplace Environment	N	Mean
	129	3.8128

Table 5 The Relationship between Workplace Environments with Employee's Job Performance

		Job Performance
Workplace Environment	Pearson Correlation	.209
	Sig. (2 tailed)	.018
	N	129

CONCLUSION

The present study suggested that, workplace environment and respondents' gender may be considered as factors that influencing the level of job performance. The results of this study is consistent with Arman, Mastura, Shardy & Samsiah (2014), Chandrasekar (2011), Ismail, Jusoh, Zulkifli, Sopian and Derus (2009), Fisher (2003) and Leaman (1995). The practice of good workplace environment may bring benefits to the organization, where it may encourage employees to produce positive behavior while at the same time preventing from disloyalty and dissatisfaction (Mohamed Shaffril & Uli, 2010). However, neglecting the aspect may result in significant losses for workers as well as the organization. Employers specifically, should ensure they have provided the appropriate means of good and pleasant workplace environment to employees to allow them possess required level of job performance for the purpose of bringing the monetary or non-monetary profit to the organization.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The authors gratefully thank the contribution by Dean of Faculty Business Management, Universiti Teknologi MARA (UiTM), Malaysia as well as the faculty members. A special thank also goes to the family members and colleagues for the guidance and support which extensively contributed to the quality and completion of this study. The contents of this publication are solely the responsibility of the authors.

REFERENCES

- Ajala, E. M., "The Influence of Workplace Environment on Workers' Welfare, Performance and Productivity", *The African Symposium: Online Journal of the African Educational Research Network*, Vol. 12, No. 1, pp. 141-149, June 2012.
- Arman, A. R., Mastura, J., Shardy, A. & Samsiah, M. , "Work environment factors and job performance: the construction project manager's perspective", retrieved June 12, 2014, from http://eprints.usm.my/16071/1/Arman_Abdul_Razak.pdf
- Boyce, P., Veitch, J., Newsham, G. Myer, M. & Hunter, C., "Lighting Quality and Office Work: A field simulation study", Ottawa, Canada: U.S Department of Energy & National Research Council of Canada, 2013.
- Campbell, J. P., 1990, "Modeling the Performance Prediction Problem in Industrial and Organizational Psychology. In M. D. Dunnette and L. M. Hough (Eds.), *Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, Vol. 1, pp. 687-732. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Chandrasekar, K., "Workplace Environment and its Impact on Organisational Performance in Public Sector Organisations", *International Journal of Enterprise Computing and Business Systems*, Vol. 1, No. 1, January 2011.
- Ettner, S. L., & Grzywacz, J. G. "Workers' perception of how job affect health: A social ecological perspective. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*", Vol. 6, No. 2, pp. 101-113, 2001.
- Fisher, C. D., "Why do lay people believe that satisfaction and performance are correlated? Possible sources of a commonsense theory", *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, Vol. 24, pp. 753-777, 2003.
- Hersey, P. & Blanchard, K.B., 1993, *Management of organization behavior utilizing human resources* (8th. ed.). Englewood Cliffs. NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Howell, J. M. & Higgins, C. A., "Champions of Technological Innovation Administration Sceicne Quarterly, Vol. 35, pp. 317-341, 1990.
- Ismail, A. R., Jusoh, N., Zulkifli, R., Sopian, K. & Deros, B. M. (2009). *Thermal Comfort Assesment: A Case Study at Malaysia Automotive Industry* Mohamed Shaffril, H. A. & Uli, J, "The Influence of Socio-

Demographic Factors on Work Performance among Employees of Government Agriculture Agencies in Malaysia”, *The Journal of International Social Research*, Vol. 3, No. 10, pp. 459-469, 2010.

Jex, S.M. (2002) *Organizational Psychology: A Scientist-Practitioner Approach*. John Wiley & Sons, New York.

Leaman, A., “Dissatisfaction and Office Productivity”, *Facilities*, Vol. 13, No. 2, pp. 13-19, 1995.

Leblebici, D., “Impact of Workplace Quality on Employee’s Productivity: Case Study of a Bank in Turkey”, *Journal of Business, Economics and Finance*, Vol. 1, No. 1, pp. 38-49, 2012.

McCoy, J. M., & Evans, G. W. (2005). Physical work environment. In: J. Barling, E.K. Kelloway & M.R. Frone (Eds.), *Handbook of Work Stress*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publication pp. 219–245.

Mtlkovich. G. and A Wigdor. 1991, Pay for performance (National Academy Press, Stup, R. (2003). Control the factors that influence employee success. *Managing the Hispanic Workforce Conference*. Cornell University and Pennsylvania State University.

Murphy, K. R., 1989, “Dimensions of Job Performance. In Dillon R, Pellingrino, J (Eds.), *Testing: Applied and theoretical perspectives*, pp. 218-247, New York: Praeger.

Naharuddin, N. M. & Sadegi, M., “Factors of Workplace Environment that Affect Employees Performance: A Case Study of Miyazu Malaysia”, *International Journal of Independent Research and Studies*, Vol. 2, No. 2, pp. 66-78, April, 2013.

Rezaul, K., “Creating healthy workplace environment”, Retrieved June 14, 2014, from [wikinut.com: http://writing.wikinut.com/Creating-healthy-workplace-environemtn/1zuuqbl/](http://writing.wikinut.com/Creating-healthy-workplace-environemtn/1zuuqbl/).

Rotundo, M., “The Relative Importance of Task, Citizenship, and Counterproductive Performance to global ratings of job performance: A policy-capturing approach”, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 87, No. 1, pp. 66-80, 2002.

Shikdar, A. A., & Sawaqed, N. M., “Worker productivity, and occupational health and safety issues in selected industries”, *Computers and Industrial Engineering*, Vol. 45, No. 4, 563-572, 2003

Salkind, N. J. (2009). *Exploring research* (7th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson.

Sinha El-Saaba, "The Skills and Career Path of an Effective Project Manager", *International Journal of Project Management*, Vol. 19, pp. 1-7, 2004.