

INFLUENCE OF WORK ENVIRONMENT, BEHAVIOURAL PATTERN AND SELF-ESTEEM ON EMPLOYEE JOB PERFORMANCE IN LAGOS STATE

***AHMADU, Frederick O.¹, ADEKEYE, Olujide A.², ONYEONORU, Ifeanyi P.³, OLOWOOKERE, Elizabeth I.², SOLARIN, Muyiwa A.² & OYENIYI Dorcas O.²**

¹Department of Sociology, Covenant University ²Department of Psychology, Covenant University

³Department of Sociology, University of Ibadan

*Corresponding Author Email: frederick.ahmadu@covenantuniversity.edu.ng

ABSTRACT

Organizations strive on the collective effort of the employees that make up the organization and for higher productivity to be attained, several factors must interplay. In this study, the influence of work environment, behavioural pattern and self-esteem on employee's job performance in Lagos State were explored. A number of works have been done on the above variables and their influence on job performance, but only very few have shown the pivotal role played by the work environment on the other variables. This study filled this gap in an attempt to show the interrelationships of the variables. Survey design was employed where 113 respondents were randomly selected from the Lagos State Secretariat Alausa. Two hypotheses were formulated at the 0.05 level of significance. The study employed a questionnaire on employee job performance (QEJP) to measure the influence of the predictor variables on criterion variable in selected organizations in Lagos State. Results indicated a significant relationship exist between performance on the job and self-esteem ($r = .361, p < .05$), behavioural pattern ($r = .231, p < .05$), and work environment ($r = .314, p < .05$). Self-esteem was the strongest predictor of employee job performance ($\beta = 0.231; t = 3.389; p < 0.05$), and next was work environment ($\beta = 0.168; t = 2.860; p < 0.05$). There was however no significant effect of educational level ($F_{(1, 100)} = .863, p > 0.05$) and marital status ($F_{(1, 100)} = 3.221, p > 0.05$) on employee job performance. Employees' work environment invariably forms a relationship between the employer and the employee. A comfortable and conducive work environment may promote work effectiveness of workers and lead to increased job performance.

Keywords: Job Performance, Lagos, Self-Esteem, Behavioural Pattern, Work Environment

INTRODUCTION

Employees are the core of any organization because without them, the organization will not be able to function. The employers are essential because they developed ideas which birthed the organization, but in order for their dreams to be achieved, they need individuals who will handle the basic activities which will make them achieve their organizational goals. Hence, organizations as a system rely on the collective efforts of their employees that make up the organization to achieve their set goals. The effective achievement of maximum output therefore results from the collective functioning of the employees. These employees are expected to perform at their best to bring about maximum output or productivity of the organization; be it in the actual production of goods or the provision of services. According to Grint (2005), organizations work best where employees' and organizations' goals are mutually compatible. For organizations to succeed, there must be links between the emotional needs of individuals and organizational need for integration. Employee empowerment is essential in organizational democracy. Empowered employees will take pride in their work and will suggest solutions to problems encountered in meeting performance standards set by the management.

Brief Review of Literature

In the quest to simplify the variables under consideration, Srivastava (2008) noted that the impact of organizational climate which is made up of multifaceted social, psychological and factors within the organization had been studied in the past 20 years. Also, psycho-social environment of work organizations influences workers motivation, performance of their job, effectiveness on the job, and

their being satisfied on the job (Mishra, 1986; Tetric & Larocoo, 1987; Tumuly, Jernigan & Kohut, 1994; Dugdill, 2000). In a related study, Srivastava (2008) noted that an organizations' psychological cum social environment could determine the performance of an employee in comparison to the physical work environment. Also, according to Srivastava (2008), the analysis of prediction of organizational effectiveness by two dimensions of work environment revealed that work environment largely determines organizational effectiveness which invariably affects employees total work output or performance. Tripathi (2014) defines work environment as the environment in which people work that include physical setting, job profile, culture and market condition. All these work environment variables are interconnected and they influence employees' overall performance and productivity. The quality of the employees' workplace environment determines in no small measure the level of employees' motivation and performance. Work environment includes both internal and external environments. The internal environment comprises of all the resources that make up the organization: men, materials, money, time, etc. while external environment comprises of the economic, social, political and technological factors in the task environment (Fajana, 2002; Thompson, Strickland and Gamble, 2010).

Many researchers such as Baumeister (1993) and Mruk (1995) noted that self-esteem is one construct that is widely studied. According to Baumeister (1993), the focus on self-esteem has largely been due to the association of high self-esteem with a number of positive outcomes for the individual and society. Self-esteem is commonly thought to be a part of self-concept. As noted by Rosenberg (1979), self-esteem is one of the most important parts of the self-concept.

It appears that the relation between job performance and behavioural pattern is more a consequence of the social aspects of the workplace than of ability. Job performance and behavioural pattern, according to Barrick, Stewart & Piotrowski (2002) are related. There are several studies on the relationship between Type-A behaviour and performance on the job (Jamal & Baba, 2001). In addition, they also explored employee well-being using Canadian college teachers. Their study revealed there was no relationship between Type-A behaviour, teaching hours, number of course preparations per semester and number of students; the three being measures of job performance.

Self-esteem is positive regard that an individual has for him/herself. When an individual possesses a low self-esteem, it affects his/her interaction with others generally. For an individual to have low self-esteem in the work place, it hampers performance on the job because he/she is constantly suffering some form of intimidation and this disrupts full concentration and reduces ability to meet the day's task. An individual's behavioural pattern is another important aspect of the worker that can determine his/her degree of efficiency on the job. Type A behaviour types will have a hard time coping with stress and Type B behaviour types will not see a reason to work past their abilities to make the day's task. The work environment is another important issue. If workers perceive the environment as not conducive or hazardous to them in any way, it can lead to labour turnover or resistance to working at all and in the long run, reduces the organization's output.

Employees seem to perform better when they feel that their immediate work environment is conducive for their job and their aspirations (Farh, 2012). For an organization to prosper or not is a function of the workplace environment (Chandrasekar, 2011). The workplace environment mainly consists of physical factors which include the office layout and design among other factors; while the psychosocial factors include working conditions, role congruity and social support. Other aspects of the workplace environment are the policies which include conditions of service. According to Leblebici (2012) employees' productivity is predicated on their comfort on the Job and their workplace conditions and environment.

The lifestyle of each employee also affects his or her job performance. The lifestyle of Nigerians generally, of which Lagos job employees are not an exemption is rapidly changing; people want to live in choice areas, wear the best clothes, ride the best cars, and even throw expensive parties. People engage in this extravagant lifestyle without question: Nigerian social values do not currently frown at the sources of affluence. The sorry case is the fact that there exist little or no societal

sanctions against fraud and other financial or operational malpractices (Fajana, 2002). Cases of financial crime are just celebrated at the onset but nothing is heard thereafter. The Lagos employees operate in this volatile work environment and this to a large extent influences their behaviours both at work and within the society.

Stup (2003) describes several factors towards the success of employees' performance. These factors include physical environment, equipment, meaningful work, performance expectation, feedback on performance, bad system among others. He adds that, to have a standard performance, employers have to get the employees task done on track so as to achieve the organizational goals. Haynes (2008) argued that the behaviour components of working environment have more impact than the physical components of working environment. Hence employees perform better in environment where level of interaction is high, where creativity is supported and where transfer of transactional knowledge is encouraged.

Research on these issues has not ceased as new paths to understanding these issues are evolving and continuing. Therefore this study attempts to look at the influence of behavioural pattern, self-esteem, and work environment on employee job performance.

Objectives of the Study

This study is set out to examine the interrelatedness amongst behaviour patterns, self-esteem, and work environment and how they combine or individually affects employee job performance. The specific objectives of this study are:

1. To examine the relationship among behavioural patterns, self-esteem, work environment and job performance
2. To ascertain the interactions among the three dependent variables
3. To investigate the influence of the dependent variables on job performance being the independent variable.

Hypotheses

Ho1. There is a significant positive relationship between job performance, self-esteem, behavioural pattern, and work environment.

Ho2. There is a significant combined contribution of the independent variables on employee job performance.

METHOD

The survey method was adopted for this study. This research study was focused on Lagos State secretariat Alausa, Ikeja and thus the workers there were the target population. A sample of 150 civil servants accepted to participate in the study from four ministries. Out the 150 participants, only 113 filled the questionnaire forms correctly and or fully to fit for analysis. Both stratified and simple random samplings were used in selecting the participants. Stratified sampling was employed because it is superior to random sampling especially as regards the reduction of sampling errors. Stratified sampling allows for the use of strata's. Examples as used in this study include gender (males and females), marital status, level of formal education, and number of dependent children among others. Simple random sampling was employed because of its simplicity and often accurate representation of large populations.

Measurement

Data was collected using the questionnaire on employee job performance (QEJP). The questionnaire focused on the variables of the study, namely, job performance, self-esteem, behavioural patterns and work environment. The instrument consists of items generated from the review of literature, relevant projects, textbooks, and journals on the factor influencing employee job performance. The first section of the instrument seeks information on the personal data of the respondents. Such demographic data include the age, gender, religion, marital status, educational

qualification and number of dependent children. The second part was a four point likert-type scale to elicit information on the variables of the study. The questionnaire contains a total of thirty-three (33) items divided into four parts. Part A measured employee job performance and it consisted of 8 items. Part B, which consisted of 6 items measured work environment. Part C with 10 items measured self-esteem. Lastly, Part D with 10 items measured behaviour pattern.

Psychometric Properties of the Scales

In order to ensure the psychometric requirements of the scale as advocated by Odukoya, Adekeye, Igbino & Afolabi (2018), the reliability of each of the instrument was determined. A detailed narrative is given to each of the four scales viz:

Job Performance Scale

The scale was adapted from Fashola (2008). The original scale contained 30 items with a Cronbach alpha of 0.87. To ascertain the reliability and validity of this scale, it was administered once on 30 civil servants who were not part of the final study. The Cronbach's Alpha returned a coefficient of 0.79 which was considered high enough for the study. The content validity was confirmed by three experts in the Department Psychology and Business Studies.

Work Environment Scale

To measure work environment scale, we adapted the Psychological Climate Questionnaire (Jones and James, 1979). This scale has a Cronbach's alpha of 0.95 from factor analysis. For the psychometric properties of the Work Environment scale, it was administered once on 30 civil servants who were not part of the final study. The Cronbach's alpha yielded a coefficient of 0.82 which was considered well enough for the study. The content validity was confirmed by experts in the field of industrial psychology.

Self-Esteem Scale

The 10 item Rosenberg self-esteem scale (Rosenberg, 1965) was adopted. Multiple studies have been conducted to investigate the validity and reliability of the RSE (Silber & Tippet, 1965; Crandal, 1973; McCarthy & Hoge, 1982; Fleming & Courtney, 1984 & Van Dongen, 1996). On a scale of 30, scores between 15 and 25 are considered to be within the normal range while scores below 15 denotes low self-esteem. For this study, the scale returned a coefficient reliability of 0.94 using a test-retest reliability method.

Behaviour Pattern Scale

The behaviour pattern scale is a self-designed consisting of 10 items and a highest score of 50. Scores within 30-50 depicts behaviour pattern A and a score of less than 30 depicts behaviour pattern B. For the test construction, about seventeen (17) items was first generated and this was done by literature review and from experts' comments from colleagues. Based on the result of the first stage, the test items were reduced to Fourteen (14). A pilot study was then conducted which resulted in further restructuring. The final scale had 10 items. For the reliability, the scale returned a reliability coefficient of 0.91 using the test retest method. Experts attested to the content validity of the behaviour pattern scale. The behaviour pattern scale has a divergent validity with the AIDS knowledge, attitudes, beliefs, and practices (KABP) scale by Ingham & Stone (2006).

Study Procedure

This study was conducted using 150 participants drawn from the Lagos State Secretariat, Alausa. The researchers visited four ministries and secured approval to administer the instruments from the permanent secretaries or directors as appropriate. Following the instructions on the instrument, the questionnaires were filled and returned; while some were missing, others were filled; only 113

questionnaire forms representing 75% of administered questionnaire were duly filled and fit for statistical analysis.

Demographic Data

Table 1: Distribution of Respondents According to Demographic Data

Variables	Frequency	Percent
Age of Participants		
25-35years	35	31.0
36-44years	56	49.6
45-50years	17	15.0
50+years	5	4.4
Total	113	100
Gender of Participants		
Male	65	57.5
Female	48	42.5
Total	113	100
Educ. Level of Participants		
Pry/SSCE	3	2.7
OND	42	37.2
HND/BSc	44	38.9
MSc+	24	21.2
Total	113	100

Table 1 clearly indicates that respondents between 36 and 44 years made up the majority of the sample (49.6%) quickly followed by 35 respondents in the 25 to 35 years category. Only 5 respondents indicated they were above 50 years while 17 or 15% were in the 45 to 50 year category. The Table further indicates that 65 of the respondents were males accounting for 57.5% while 48 respondents making up 42.5% of the sample size were females. The distribution of respondents by educational level shows that 44 (38.9%) respondents have HND/BSc. degrees while 42 respondents indicated OND qualification. Only three (3) respondents reported having primary or senior school certificate. The remaining 24 respondents indicated that they have Master's degree and above.

HYPOTHESES TESTING

Hypothesis 1: There is a significant positive relationship between job performance, self-esteem, behavioural pattern, and work environment

Table 2: Mean Standard Deviation and Correlation among three Predictor Measures and Employee Job Performance.

Variables	Work Env	Job Perf	Self Esteem	Beh Pattern
Work Environment	-	0.314**	0.139	0.304**
Job Performance		-	0.361**	0.231**
Self Esteem			-	0.344**
Behavioural Pattern				-

****:** Significant at the 0.05 alpha level

Table 2 shows the correlations among the variables used for this study. There was a positive and significant correlation between job performance and work environment ($r = 0.314$, $P < 0.05$), self-esteem ($r = 0.361$, $P < 0.05$), and behavioural pattern ($r = 0.231$, $P < 0.05$). But the relationship between work environment and self-esteem was not significant ($r = 0.139$, $p > 0.005$). Behavioural pattern correlated significantly with work environment ($r = 0.304$, $P > 0.005$) and self-esteem ($r = 0.344$, $p < 0.05$). The hypothesis which states that there is a significant positive relationship between job performance, self-esteem, behavioural pattern, and work environment was therefore accepted.

Hypothesis 2: There is a significant combined contribution of the independent variables on employee job performance

Table 3a: Relative Contribution of the Independent Variables to Job Performance

Predictors	Unstandardized Coeffs	Standardized Coeffs	t-ratio	Sig
	B	Std. Error	Beta	
(Constant)	10.747	1.731 6		.208 .000
Self Esteem	0.231	0.068	0.309	3.389 .001
Behavioural Pattern	0.024	0.048	0.047	0.495 .622
Work Environment	0.168	0.059	0.257	2.860 .005

a. Dependent Variable: Job Performance

Table 3b: Regression Analyses on Job Performance

R = .450a

R² = .230

R² Adjusted = .181

Std. Error = 2.33813

Variations	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Regression	151.670	3	50.557	9.248	.000a
Residual	595.888	109	5.467		
Total	747.558	112			

a. Predictors: (Constant), Work Environment, Self Esteem, Behavioural pattern

b. Dependent Variable: Job Performance

In testing hypothesis two, regression analysis was carried out on self-esteem, behavioural pattern and work environment as independent variables and job performance as the dependent variable. Table 3a reveals that only behavioural pattern of all the three variables was not a predictor of employee job performance ($\beta = 0.024$; $t = 0.495$; $p > 0.05$). Self-esteem was the strongest predictor of employee job performance ($\beta = 0.231$; $t = 3.389$; $p = 0.001$), and this was followed by work environment ($\beta = 0.168$; $t = 2.860$; $p = 0.005$). The hypothesis was accepted for self-esteem and work environment but rejected for behavioural pattern. As indicated in the model summary (Table 3b), putting all the predictor variables at once into the regression model, result indicated a significant combined contribution of self-esteem, behavioural pattern and work environment ($r = 0.450$, $r^2 = 0.203$; $F_{(3, 109)} = 9.248$; $p > 0.005$). In this study, 20.3% of the variation in employee job performance appears to be accounted for by the combination of self-esteem, behavioural pattern and work environment.

DISCUSSION

In this study, we found that there was a positive and significant relationship between two predictor variables (behavioural pattern, work environment) and job performance. However, result indicated no significant relationship existed between job performance and self-esteem. This shows that the predictor variables of work environment and behavioural pattern except self-esteem correlate with the criterion variable of job performance. Few studies support this assertion. For example, Judge and Bono (2001) reported that work environment significantly impacts on employee's effectiveness in undertaking a task. However, Hutman (1999) contrasted this result by reporting that the relationship between self-esteem and job performance is positive. Lyubomirsky, Tkach & Dimatteo (2006) closely linked self-esteem with a sense of mastery and control of the work environment. However, result indicates that working conditions impacts on job performance. Also, Kinzl, Knotzer, Traweger, Lederer, Heidegger & Benzer (2004) noted that work environment had effect on employee's self-esteem and the task they perform. A review of the unique work environment of the public sector in recent years shows that there is "pressure on public sector organizations to deliver high quality and customer oriented services" (Willems, Janvier & Henderick, 2004, p.2).

The second hypothesis which states that there will be a significant combined contribution of behaviour pattern, self-esteem and work environment on job performance was accepted for self-esteem and work environment but rejected for behavioural patterns. Researchers in the field of environmental psychology have carried out detailed work on the measurement of the interrelatedness of the physical environment and worker's needs. In doing this, some examples of misfit were recorded. The definition of "misfit is one in which the environment places inappropriate or excessive demands on users, in spite of their adaptation and adjustment behaviours" (Vischer, 2007). There is evidence that the physical environment of work affects job performance (Oyeniya & Adekeye, 2010; Vischer, 2007).

Self-esteem has a pervasive impact on human behaviour. Chan & Lee (1993) noted that self-esteem is a topic that elicits interest in both psychology and educational research. Adequate self-esteem is needed for a person to function maximally, adapt well and enjoy good mental health and adaptive functioning. In this study, there was no significant contribution of behavioural patterns to job performance. Barrick *et al.*, (2002) found that job performance and behavioural pattern (personality) are related. The findings on the interrelatedness between job performance and the Type A and B employees are inconclusive (Dembroski and Mac-Dougal, 1978; Burke and Weir, 1980).

The findings of this study could be further explained with Complexity theory. Complexity theory implies a radical change in traditional organizations. It sometimes relates to the arrival of an era in business that is significantly more complicated and time-dependent than ever before. This theory suggests that business life in the twenty-first century is more complex, more global and operates at greater velocity than ever before (Grint, 2005). The essence of complexity theories

is to explain that self-organization or local interaction generates patterns - and thus no blue-print is necessary. In other words, while the traditional understanding of management is that of designing and executing predictable patterns or plans, it now appears that such plans are both unnecessary and counter-productive (Grint, 2005). This is because non-linear dynamics effectively inhibit the attainment of any such plans.

Organizational stability cannot be secured by imposing order or disorder because the interactions between the parts of an organization effectively undermine any attempt to impose order from above or from the centre. This is why small things at work are so important: it is the small things such as the interactions between individuals, small groups and things that change the way organizations work, that, indeed, make organizations work.

The most important and relevant development of complexity theories that is of significance to this study is its complex adaptive systems (CAS). Things are changing fast. Economies are becoming internationalized. Production is changing from mass production to semi-customized goods and organizational structure is changing from industrial bureaucracy to industrial democracy. All these changes require complex adaptive system. Thus organizations adapt to the rapid changes in the world of work without necessarily adopting the conventional means. It therefore shows that there are various complex factors influencing employees' job performance. Managers are expected to understand the dynamics of these complex factors couple with the understanding of the psychology of the workers to motivate them to achieve the desired job performance.

Conclusion

The issue of employee job performance is crucial to every manager, organization and government. A plethora of factors have been identified to influence an employee's productivity. This study provides a new vista to understanding how self-esteem, work environment and behavioural patterns (personality) interact with job performance. Findings from this study should help managers, especially in public work-space to appreciate the various factors that may impact both positively and otherwise on employees' job performance.

REFERENCES

- Barrick, M. R., Stewart, G. L., & Piotrowski, M. (2002). Personality and job performance: Test of the mediating effects of motivation among sales representatives. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(1):43-51. Retrieved from <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/11916215>
- Baumeister, R. F.; Campbell, J. D.; Krueger, J. I. & Vohs, K. D. (2003). Does High Self-Esteem Cause Better Performance, Interpersonal Success, Happiness, or Healthier Lifestyles? *Psychological Science in the Public Interest*. 4(1): 1-44 DOI: 10.1111/1529-1006.01431.
- Burke, K. J., & Weir, T. (1980). Type A experience: Occupational and life demand satisfaction and well-beings. *Journal of Human Stress*, 6(4): 28-38.
- Chan, D. W., & Lee, H. C. B. (1993). Dimensions of self-esteem and psychological symptoms among Chinese adolescents in Hong Kong. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 22(4): 425-440. DOI:10.1007/BF01537722
- Chandrasekar, K. (2011). Workplace environment and its impact on organizational performance in Public Sector Organizations, Alagappa University, Karaikudi, India.
- Crandall, R. (1973). The measurement of self-esteem and related concepts. In J. P. Robinson & P. R. Shaver (Eds.), *Measures of social psychological attitudes* (pp. 45-167). Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Dembroski, T. M., Mc-Dougall, J. M., Shields J. L., Petitto, J., & Lushene, R. (1978). Components of the Type A coronary-prone behaviour pattern and cardio-vascular responses to psychomotor challenge. *Journal of Behavioural Medicine*. 1, 159 - 176.
- Dugdill, L. (2000). Developing a holistic understanding of workplace health: the case of bank workers. *Ergonomics*, 43(10): 1738-1749. DOI: 10.1080/001401300750004140
- Fajana, S. (2002). Human Resource Management: An Introduction. Lagos: Labofin Company.
- Fleming, J. S. & Courtney, B. E. (1984). The dimensionality of self-esteem: II. hierarchical facet model for revised measurement scales. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 46(2):404-421. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.46.2.404>
- Jamal, M. & Baba, V. V. (2001). Type-A Behavior, Job Performance, and Well-Being in College Teachers. *International Journal of Stress Management*, 8(3): 231-240. DOI:10.1023/A:1011343226440
- Jones, A. P. & James, L. R. (1979). Psychological climate: Dimensions and relationships of individual and aggregated work environment perceptions, *Organizational Behaviour and Human Performance*, 23: 201–250.
- Judge, T. A., & Bono, J. E. (2001). Relationship of core self-evaluations traits—self-esteem, generalized self-efficacy, locus of control, and emotional stability—with job satisfaction and job performance: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(1):80–92.
- Haynes, Barry (2008) An evaluation of the impact of the office environment on productivity. *Facilities*, 26 (5/6). 178-195. ISSN 0263-2772
- Hutman, E. (1999). "The relationship between self-esteem and job performance" ETD Collection for Florida International University. Paper AAI1394458. Retrieved from <http://digitalcommons.fiu.edu/dissertations/AAI1394458>
- Ingham, R. and Stone, N. (2006). Topics for individual interviews and focus group discussions: Partner selection, sexual behaviour and risk taking, in: Cleland J, Ingham R and Stone N, *Asking Young People About Sexual and Reproductive Behaviours: Introduction to Illustrative Core Instruments*, UNDP/UNFPA/WHO/World Bank Special Programme of Research, Development and Research Training in Human Reproduction: Geneva. Retrieved from who.int/reproductive-health/adolescent/docs/questionnaire_intro.pdf.
- Kinzi, J. F. H.; Knotzer, C. Traweger, W. Lederer, T. Heidegger and A. Benzer (2004). Influence of working conditions on job satisfaction in anesthetists. *British Journal of Anesthesia*. Retrieved from <http://bj.a.oxfordjournals.org/cgi/content/full/94/2/211>
- Leblebici D., (2012), Impact of Workplace Quality on Employee's Productivity: Case study of A bank in Turkey, *Journal of Business, Economics and Finance*, ISSN 2146- 7943, Volume 1 issue 1 p.p. (38-49)

- Lyubomirsky, S.; Tkach, C.; Dimatteo, M.R. (2006). Are the Differences between Happiness and Self-Esteem? *Social Indicators Research*, 78 (3): 363-404. Retrieved from: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/27522615>
- McCarthy, J. D., & Hoge, D. R. (1982). Analysis of age effects in longitudinal studies of adolescent self-esteem. *Developmental Psychology*, 18(3), 371-379.
- Mishra, P. C. (1986). Strenuous working conditions as a moderator variable of the job satisfaction- job involvement relationship. *Indian Psychological Review*, 3, 4-9.
- Mruk, C. (1995). *Self-Esteem: Research, Theory, and Practice*. New York: Springer Publishing Company.
- Odukoya, J. A., Adekeye, O. A., Igbinoba, A. O., & Afolabi, A. (2018). Item analysis of university-wide multiple choice objective examinations: the experience of a Nigerian private university. *Quality and Quantity*, 52(3): 983-997. DOI 10.1007/s11135-017-0499-2
- Oyeniyi, O. D & Adekeye, O. A. (2010). The Influence of Behavioural Pattern, Self-Esteem and Work Environment on Job Performance. Germany: VDM Verlag Publishers.
- Pierce, J. L. (2004). Self-Esteem within the work and organizational context: A review of the organization-based self-esteem literature. *Journal of Management*, 30(5): 591-622. Retrieved from <http://jom.sagepub.com/cgi/content/abstract/30/5/591>
- Rosenberg, M. (1965). *Society and the adolescent self-image*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Rosenberg, M. (1979). *Conceiving the self*. New York: Basic Books.
- Silber, E. & Tippet, J. S. (1965). Self-esteem: clinical assessment and measurement validation. *Psychological Reports*, 16:1017-1071.
- Srivastava, A. K. (2008). Effect of Perceived Work Environment on Employees' Job Behaviour and Organizational Effectiveness. *Journal of the Indian Academy of Applied Psychology*, 34 (1): 47-55.
- Stup, R. (2003). Control the Factors that Influence Employee Success. Managing the Hispanic Workforce Conference. Cornell University and Pennsylvania State University.
- Tetrick, L., & Larocco, J. M. (1987). Understanding prediction and control as moderators of the relationship between perceived stress, satisfaction and psychological well-being. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 72, 538-543.
- Thompson, Jr., A. A., Strickland, A. J., Gamble, J. E. (2010). *Crafting and Executing Strategy: The Quest for Competitive Advantage: Concepts and Cases*. New York: McGraw-Hill
- Tripathi, A. (2014). Workplace Environment: Consequences on Employees. Retrieved from <http://www.linkedin.com/pulse>
- Tumulty, G., Jernigan, I. E., & Kohut, G. F. (1994). The impact of perceived work environment on job satisfaction of hospital staff nurses. *Applied Nursing Research*, 7(2): 84-90.
- Van Dongen, C. J. (1996). Quality of life and self-esteem in working and nonworking persons with mental illness. *Community Mental Health Journal*, 32(6): 535-548. DOI:10.1007/BF02251064.
- Vischer J. C. (2007). The effects of the physical environment on job performance: towards a theoretical model of workspace stress. *Stress and Health*, 23: 175-184. DOI: 10.1002/smi.1134.
- Willems, I. R., Janvier, R. & Henderickx, E. (2004). *The unique nature of psychological contracts in the public sector: an exploration*. Retrieved from <http://citeweb.info/20040557963>
- Zeisel, J. (2006). *Inquiry By Design: environment/behavior/neuroscience in architecture, interiors, landscape and planning*. 2nd Ed. New York: W.W. Norton.