

# Impact of Workplace Environment on Health Workers

Edem MJ<sup>F</sup>, Akpan EU<sup>F</sup> and Pepple NM<sup>GE</sup>

<sup>1</sup>School of Public Health, Texilla American University, Guyana

<sup>2</sup>Department of Biosciences, Salem University, Lokoja, Kogi State, Nigeria

**Corresponding author:** ÚÁ]]^Á ÞTÉÁ Ö^]ælc{^}cÁ [-Á Ói[•&á^]&^ÉÁ Úæ]^{Á W}áç^!•áç^ÉÁ Š[\[tæÉÁ S[\*áá Úçæc^ÉÁ Þá^!tæÉÁ V\KÁ GHlìEHìHFJÉiíLÁ ÒÈ{æjKÁ}}^ {á\^] ]^GO \* {æjE& [ {

**Rec date:** ÁTæ~ÁÉTÉáGEFíLÁ **Acc date:** R^]ÁFJÉáGEFíLÁ **Pub date:** ÁR~]ÁHFÉáGEFí

**Copyright:** Á í ÁGEFíÁÖá^ { Á TREÁ^cáæ]ÉV@á•á•áæ}Á [ ]^]Éæ&&^••Áæ:çá|Ááá•c:íáá^c^áá~ }á^!Ác@^Ác^!; •Á [-Ác@^ÁÖ!^æçç^ÁÖ [ { [ ]•ÁCEc:íáá~cá [ ]ÁŠá^&^••ÉÁ, @á&@Á]!; {áç•Á~}!^•c:íá&c^á~•^Éáá•c:íáá~cá [ ]Éáæ}áá^!; [á~&cá [ ]ááæ}^Á { ^áá~ { ÉÁ]; [çáá^ááç@^Á [ íá^á]æ]kæ~c@ [ íáæ}áá• [ ~!&^áæ!^Á&í^ááç^áÉ

## Abstract

Ó { ] [ ~^ÁÁ { [ íæ]Á&æ}Ááá^Áá { ]æ&c^ááá}Áá [c@Á] [ •áçç^Ááæ}áá]^\*æçç^Á, æ~•áá^Ác@^Á, [ í\ ]æ&^Á^}çá: [ ] { ^ }cÁ Y [ í\ ]æ&^Á^}çá: [ ] { ^ }cÁ ]æ~•ÁæÁ { æ] [ íÁ: [ í\ ]Áá}Ác@^Á^!; [ í { æ }&^Ááæ}áá ] [ á~&cáçáç^Á [-Ááæ}Á^ { ] [ ~^ÁÉÁT [ •cÁá}á~•c:íá^•Ááæçç^Ááæ}Á~}•æ~^, [ í\ ]æ&^Á^}çá: [ ] { ^ }cÁæ}áááæ!^Á { [ •cÁçá { ^Á~ }@^æ]c@~Ác [ [ÉÁV@í•Á•c~á~Áá•Á- [ &~•^áá [ ]Ác@^Á, [ í\ ]æ&^Á^}çá: [ ] { ^ }cÁá}Ááæ@^æ]c@^Á-æ&á]áç^Ááæ}áá@ [ , Ááçkæ~^&c^Ác@^Á@^æ]c@Á, [ í\ ]ÁÉÁCE}Á~}•æ~^Á@^æ]c@^Á-æ&á]áç^Á^}çá: [ ] { ^ }cÁ•~&@Ááæ^Á~}!; áç~!^É [ ] [ í\ ]Áá^•á~}^Áá, [ í\ ]cæçá [ ]•ÉÁ]æ&^Á [-Áç^}çá]æçá [ ]ÉÁ^ç&^••áçç^Á [ í•^ÉÁá}æ] [ ] [ íæc^Á]á~@cá}^\*ÉÁ [ [ í\ ]Á~}^!çá• [ í\ ]Á~}^!çé [ ] [ í\ ]Á, [ í\ ]Á•]æ&^ÉÁ [ [ í\ ]Á& [ { ~ }á&æçá [ ]ÉÁ [ [ í\ ]Á-á!^Á•æ~^c^Á { ^æ~•; ^Á- [ í\ ]Á^ { ^!^\*^ }&á^ÉÁáæ}áá]æ&^Á [-Á]!; [ ]æ]Á; [ c^&cáç^Á~}á } { ^ }cÁá&æ}Ááæáçç^!•^!^Áæ~^&c^Ác@^Á] [ á~&cáçáç^Á [-Ác@^Á^ { ] [ ~^ÁÉÁP^æ]c@Á, [ í\ ]Á^!^Áá}Á~&@Á^}çá: [ ] { ^ }cÁæ!^Á^ç [ ]•^áç [ ]Á [ &&~}æçá [ ]æ]Á áá^•^æ•^Á•~&@Áæ•Á@^æçá•c!^••ÉÁá^æ~}Á••ÉÁ^!^\* [ ] [ { áááá• [ í\ ]Á^!^Ááæ}áá•~ [ &æçá [ ]ÉÁ P^æ]c@Á, [ í\ ]Á!q [ ] [ á~&cáçáç^Ááæ}áá]!; [ í { æ }&^Ááæ}Áá^& } áá&æ}Áá^& } &c [ æ }ÁÁCE~ÁÉT ||T &æ}Á { ^á; [ cÁá

accountability, and encouraging team work will promote trust and loyalty among the workers and encourages better teamwork among them. Besides, they develop a sense of ownership and belonging towards the organization. Maximizing health worker's productivity is centered on personal motivation and the infrastructure at the work environment.

workplace communication is a key to cultivation of success and professionalism [16]. A company that communicates throughout the workplace in an manner is more likely to avoid problems with completing the daily procedures, and less likely to have a problem with improper occurrence and will generate a stronger morale and a more positive attitude towards work. When employees communicate with each other, productivity will increase because communication means less complains and more work getting done [17].

It removes confusion and frees up wasted time that would have been otherwise spent on explanation or argument [18]. It makes workplace more enjoyable, less anxiety among co-workers which in turn means positive attitude towards work and increased productivity [19,20].

Furthermore, another aspect of communication that productivity is noise level. Noise has negative on communication, frustration levels increase while productivity decreases in relation to persistence and loudness of noise. A reason adduced for this is that spoken communication becomes progressively more as noise levels increase.

ability of a health worker to work in a crowd of many uncontrolled patients is limited. In a survey in a survey reported that nine out of ten workers believed that a workspace quality the attitude of employees and increases their productivity [21]. Chandraseker also that unsafe and unhealthy workplace environment in terms of poor ventilation, inappropriate lighting, excessive noise etc. workers' productivity and health [15].

### Workplace environment factors

Health worker' performance can be by salary increase and bonuses, but this is short lived and have a limited compared to the impact workplace environment has on the performance of the employee. It is the quality of the employee's workplace environment that most impacts on their level of motivation and subsequent performance. How well they engage with the organization, especially with their immediate environment, to a great extent their error rate, level of innovation and collaboration with other employees, absenteeism and ultimately, how long they stay in the job.

Many studies have revealed that most employees leave their organization because of the relationship with their immediate



**Workplace incentives** management understands that incentives can be used as a reward system to motivate health workers. In this facility, 61.52% of respondents were highly with the incentives/reward system practiced, this can adversely the performance of the worker (Table 7).

S/ N	Responses	Percentage
F	Pi* @ ^iUæç•-i^â	Féî
G	Úæç•-i^â	ÍéÇ
H	Úæççæ  ^iUæç•-i^â	FéÉJ
I	Öi••æç•-i^â	GeÉì
í	Pi* @ ^iái••æç•-i^â	ÍFÉí
Á	V[æ]	FÉ€

**Table 7:** Workplace incentives and workers performance

## Results and Analysis

### Physical environment on health worker performance

Physical environment, which consists of design, ventilation, lighting and other basic amenities have a great impact on the performance of workers in the health facility. Analysis revealed that a large number of employees (74.7%) felt about their location and space where they stay half of the day, and were also with the other amenities like lightings, toilets, furniture, colour of the wall and roof structure. 65% of the respo the workplace is gentle

## References

1. Chapins A (1996) Workplace and the performance of workers. Reston: USA.
2. Mike A (2010) Visual workplace: How you see performance in the planet and in the International Journal of Financial Trade 11: 250-260
3. Shikdar AA (2002) of ergonomic issues that workers in oilrigs in desert environment. Inter.JOSE 10 169-177.
4. Becker F (2002) Improving organizational performance by exploiting workplace JFacultyManage 1: 154-162.
5. Becker FO (1981) Workspace creating environments in organization. New York: Praeger.
6. Humphries M (2005) Quantifying occupant comfort: Are combined indices of the indoor environment practicable? Building Research and Information. 33 317-325
7. Karasek R, T (1980) Health work: Stress, productivity and the reconstruction of working life.
8. Veitch JA, Charles KE, Newsham GR, Marquardt CJG, Geerts J (2004) Workstation characteristics and environmental satisfaction in open-plan COPE Field Findings (NRCC-47629): National Research Council.
9. Dilani A (2004) Design and health III: Health promotion through environmental design. IADH.
10. Milton DK, Glencross PM, Walters MD (2000) Risk of sick leave associated with outdoor air supply rate, and occupant complaints Indoor Air 10 212-221.
11. Veitch JA, Newsham GR (2000) Exercised control, lighting choices and energy use: An