

## Adoption of Open Office Strategy on Effective Service Delivery in National Government Offices in Nakuru, Kenya

**Esther Chemutai Koske, MBA (Strategic Management)**  
Department of Business and Human Resource Development  
Jomo Kenyatta University of Agriculture and Technology  
Kenya

**Dr. Josphat Kwasira**  
Senior Lecturer  
Department of Business and Human Resource Development  
Jomo Kenyatta University of Agriculture and Technology  
Kenya

### Abstract

*The effects of office design on occupant's performance have been studied mainly from architectural and psychological fields of academic since the introduction of modern open office design. However, the strategic benefits of open office design and occupant's performance have not been clearly documented. This article provides the strategic perspective of office design. It analysed how physical work environment of an open plan office affects employees' service delivery. The second objective established employees' perception on the adoption of open office strategy and the third objective ascertained how the adoption of open office strategy affects the delivery of services by national government in Kenya. The study found evidence of strategic alignment between open office design, employees' perception of open office design and improved service delivery.*

**Keywords:** Adoption, Open Office Strategy, Effective Service Delivery, National Government Offices

### 1.1 Introduction

There is a long history of research and experimentation regarding the spatial layout and design features of offices and their effects on employees and organizational efficiency. Office physical work environment have also witnessed paradigm shift towards open office away from closed cellular offices since Frederick W. Taylor published "The Principles of Scientific Management" in 1911. The early shift in office design was influenced by the need to increase surveillance and control of the workforce by management according to Charles, Farley, & Newsharm (2007). Currently, the larger and antiquated open plan designs are being adapted for modern offices for strategic purposes due to changing technology and a reflection of the hierarchical structures of many modern organizations.

Within the organizational literature, offices have been typically described as either traditional (sometimes referred to as enclosed or cellular offices) or open. Traditional closed offices tend to house one or two individuals in private rooms, enclosed by walls, often containing most of the amenities required for their job (Danielsson & Bodin, 2008). Alternatively, open-plan offices are characterized by a lack of interior walls, tend to be larger and contain greater numbers of workers, with individual workstations arranged within the office in groups (Brennan, Chugh, & Kline, 2002).

Over years, the design of office concept, especially in developed countries, has evolved alongside changing trends in enterprise management. In the 1960s, the office was seen as a communications system, with the floor-plan opening up to facilitate the free flow of information across the open plan (Danielsson & Bodin, 2008). Increased labour power during the 1970s and the consequent articulation of users' interests saw the development of the office as a place of social engagement (ibid). Since then, issues of privacy, sound control, individual office rooms, healthy environment and personally responsive environments became increasingly important. Consequently, floor-plates have also become narrow and complex.

Debate on the pros and cons of open office strategy setting have dominated architectural and psychological literature. Initially, open office design were considered cost savings through a reduction in space required while enabling increased productivity through open access. In addition, they were originally designed for people to move around and interact freely as a way of promoting creative, better thinking and problem solving technique through improved internal communication. In the contrary, working in an open-space office have been linked to high levels of stress, mental workload, poor performance, conflict, high blood pressure, lower job satisfaction and internal motivation and a high staff turnover (Danielsson & Bodin, 2008).

In Kenya, the office design strategy have witnessed paradigm shift especially in private and corporate sector in the last semi decade. For instance, nearly all banking institution offices, Kenya Power Company offices and some academic institutions offices like Kenya Institute of Management (KIM), have adopted open workspace-environment strategies. Similarly, public sector too have not been left behind as several government ministries and department offices have been transformed from closed secular offices to open office e.g. Director of Public Prosecution (DPP) offices, Land Ministry and the Huduma Centres in Kenya.

## **2.1 Literature Review**

### **2.1.1 Open Office Strategy Physical Work Environment**

Several studies have attempted to provide a link between the layout of office environment and the performance of the occupiers. To commence with, Felstead & Walters, (2005) carried out a longitudinal study on corporations that have shifted office strategy from closed office to open plan offices. With a focus to match the office environment to the work processes and productivity, the study found out that switching from closed offices to open-plan offices facilitated employees' communication and creativity, increased control over the workers. The study also reports an increased satisfaction on lower staff basically based on their nature of work which calls for collaboration. On the contrary, the study reported a decreased satisfaction with senior managers due to loss of privacy and autonomy.

Another interesting study, Ilozor & Oluwoye, (1999) conducted a research that investigated the impact of open-plan measures and the effectiveness of facilities space management. The study showed that organizations with open plan office offer a more productive workplace than closed office design. Furthermore, the study showed that open plan office designs offer an innovative work setting that improve employees *vis-a-via* organizational performance. Thus the study concluded that physical properties of the office environments can be used to influence organizational performance.

In assessing the notion of office design and organization's ability to respond to the changing business world, Bradley & Hood, (2003) carried out a study on workspace flexibility and office design. Their study capitalized on the need to keep the office free of clutter, which can restrict the organization's ability to adapt and respond quickly to market forces. The study showed that office design affects organizations ability to adapt to changing work environment, with open plan office design being more flexible. From the findings, the study concluded that office physical environment should adoptive to changes in work processes to minimize the mismatch between the office environment and the dynamic work processes.

In an endeavour to establish the impact of workplace on worker performance, Brill & Weidemann, (2001) carried out an evaluation of individual performance, team performance and job satisfaction with regards to different office setting designs i.e. single-occupant rooms, double-occupant rooms and open plan office. Their study findings revealed that closed office designs were more preferred by managers contrary to lower level staff who preferred medium office size. Accordingly, Brill & Weidemann identified ten of the most important workplace qualities of an ideal office design as: ability to do distraction-free solo work, support for impromptu interactions, support for meetings and undistracted group work, workspace comfort, ergonomics and enough space for work tools. Other are workspace side-by-side work and "dropping in to chat", located near or can easily find co-workers, workplace has good places for breaks, access to needed technology, quality lighting and access to daylight, temperature control and air quality.

### **2.1.2 Employees Perception on Office Design Strategy and Service Delivery**

Great scholarly efforts have been made to establish the link between occupant's perception of office design and work productivity or service delivery using various variables that influences work performance.

Studies conducted in late 1970s and 1980s provided support for the hypothesis that open-plan offices were related with more adverse environmental circumstances. For instance, one of the variables that have extensively been used to assess employee's workspace to service delivery is job privacy.

In a similar study, Brennan *et al* (2002) conducted a longitudinal study that aimed to evaluate the transition of office occupiers from traditional cellular offices to an open-plan office environment. The measurement intervals adopted were before the move, four weeks after the move and six months after the move. The study included measures of satisfaction with the physical environment, physical stress, relations with team members and perceived performance. The performance measure adopted was a self-assessed measure, assessed on a 20-item scale of opinionated questions. The main conclusion drawn from the study was that the office occupiers were dissatisfied with their move to a new open-plan environment, and that dissatisfaction did not improve after the six-month adjustment period. Brennan *et al* (2002) concluded that the respondents found the openness of the environment reduced production in terms of increased disturbance and distractions. Therefore, the study recommended the need to involve office occupants in planning office design strategy. The trend towards open-plan office environment has largely been driven by organizations aim to reduce accommodation costs.

Hedge (1982) interviews managers whose organizations have shifted from closed offices to open offices. He reported a reduction in perception on satisfaction with privacy of managers who occupied previously walled offices. The study attributed this to the decrease in manager's confidentiality of conversation. In this line, Hedge warned that "employees who enjoyed performing managerial and technical tasks reacted more unfavorably to open-plan offices than did clerical staff, which suggest that higher level employees would react worse to open offices.

Privacy need have also been related to several facets of job satisfaction. Montgomery (2004) noted that employees who left an open-plan office in order to go to either a low-density open-plan office or to a partitioned office experienced significant improvement in ask-privacy, communication privacy, crowding, and office satisfaction. Positive consequences of change from cellular closed office to open plan office are more effective for employees with low levels of stimulus screening or high privacy needs. In support of this, Becker (1991) assessed the states of "more open team-oriented environments on perceived visibility and accessibility, increased face-to-face interaction and improved privacy. The study supported an improved work effectiveness of individuals and teams in open cubic environments i.e. cubicles than open environment or closed environment. Besides, the study also showed that changing from enclosed workspaces to open workspaces results to perceived better visibility and accessibility, increased face-to-face interaction, and improved perceived privacy. All these have implications in job satisfaction and commitment on occupier service delivery (Becker, 1991).

### **2.1.3 Open Office Design Strategy**

Organization offices have been typically described, within the office strategy design literature, as either traditional (sometimes referred to as enclosed or cellular offices), open-plan or virtual (no physical location). Traditional offices tend to house one or two individuals in private rooms, enclosed by walls, often containing most of the amenities required for their job (Danielsson & Bodin, 2008). According to Danielson & Bodin (2008), it is essential for any successful office to have some private space, if for no other reason than to give employees a sense of aspiration, that they might raise their status and be entitled to their own section of the office. Consequently, a traditional closed office design provides heavily partitioned space with a clear hierarchical structure. However, the major limitation is that this design can impose some barriers on communication within employees (*ibid*).

Open-plan offices are characterized by lack of interior walls, tend to be larger in space and contain greater numbers of workers, with individual workstations arranged within the office in groups (Brennan, Chugh, & Kline, 2002). This particular style of design is more common in offices where employees are engaged with computer based tasks rather than telecommunications. The organization of desk structure in an open plan layout may be in a circular format with as many as four people on a quad desk. Alternately, this layout might also have sections arranged in a horizontal line structure (Brennan *et al*, 2002).

Open plan office spaces can provide a social, more interactive environment for employees, especially in smaller offices. However, it will not suit everybody so if organisation is considering making the switch to open plan, it may want to weigh up the advantages and disadvantages first.

There are a number of claimed merits of open plan office such as cost effective, enhance ease and efficient communication with employees and work colleagues amongst others (Danielsson & Bodin, 2008). On the other hand, a number of demerits have also been put forward against open office design. Large open offices have become the norm across modern cities despite a sizeable literature documenting the disadvantages, including noisy environment, increased distraction, lack of confidentiality and health problems and diminished worker satisfaction (Ives & Ferdinands, 1974).

### **2.3 Theoretical Review and Conceptual Framework**

The study takes the approach to the analysis of the office design based on the user's perception of office physical work environment and service delivery as advanced by Lynch's theory of office environment (Lynch, 1960). According to Lynch, office environments are traditionally analyzed from either a spatial organization or functional perspective, or out of a work environment perspective. The Lynch's method was developed to analyze and evaluate urban environments as an analysis tool on three different office environments namely closed office, open plan office and landscape office. The method is based on the concept of "imageability," which, according to Lynch, is the "quality in a physical object which gives it a high probability of evoking a strong image in any given observer. Lynch uses five different elements to measure the "imageability" of a space, which were landmark, node, path, edge and district. These elements translate to fit an interior office work environment and are based on the user's perception and experience of the environment.

Based on Lynch theory, the study developed conceptual framework using two variables. To enable the researcher to investigate the strategic alignment between office design and employees service delivery, the study defined the relationship between variable in a cause effect manner. The independent variable factor constitutes two major issues. The first issue was office physical work environment, as defined by the design layout. Office physical work environment was be analysed in terms of five indicators of office design namely furniture, noise, temperature, lighting and spatial arrangement. These indicators were assessed on how they influence individual service delivery. The second issue of analysis was employees perception of adoption of open office. The study analyse the following factors; employees flexibility, comfort, health and privacy or autonomy to identify their relative influence on employee's service delivery. Finally, the last issue of independent variable was open office design strategy. The open office design was analysed under number of office occupants, office space and defined paths/aisle within the working desk.

### **3.0 Research Objectives**

The study sought to furnish information on how adoption of open office strategy affects effective service delivery in national government offices in Nakuru County, Kenya. it was guided by the following specific objectives;

- i. To analyse the effect of physical work environment of an open office design on effective service delivery of national government employees working in open offices.
- ii. To establish employees perceived effective service delivery on the adoption of open office strategy.
- iii. To ascertain how open office strategy affects occupant's effective service delivery in government offices.

### **4.0 Research Methods**

Descriptive research design was adopted as the research strategy since it enabled it is "designed to provide a picture of situation as it naturally happens," hence may be used to justify current practice, make judgment and develop theories (Shaughnessy, Zechmeister, & Zechmeister, 2006). Therefore, for the purpose of this study, the design allowed for soliciting views on issues related to workspace and perceptual service delivery. The study target population of national government employees in Kenya who work in open offices. Specifically, the participants were staffs of *Huduma* Centres and Director of Public Prosecution in Nakuru County. These offices were selected because they have been fully transformed into open office and have operated for more than two years providing services to the public. From a population of 150 staff, a sample size of 81 respondents was used for the study.

Both qualitative and quantitative data collection methods were employed by the study to enhance reliability. The instrument used for primary data collection was structured questionnaire, Data was analyzed with Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS) to draw inferential and measures of dispersions.

## 5.0 Results and Discussion

From 90.1% response rate, the demographic information of respondents revealed that female were the dominant gender accounting for 61.6%, youths aged between 18-45 years accounted for 68.5% of respondents, 79.5% of respondents had post primary qualification, 93.2% of respondents work in low-level management and subordinates. In addition, 75.6% of respondents shares office cubes between 2-10 occupants, 27.3% of low level-staffs have been effectively trained on office plan strategy while 40% of upper level staff have been effectively trained.

### 5.1 Effects of Physical Work Environment of Open Office

The specific objective one aimed to analyse the effects of physical work environment of open office on occupant's service delivery. Five issues of concern were developed and assessed on a five liker scale. The analysed results are shown in Table 1. It can be seen from Table 1 that majority of respondents agreed ( $m=3.81$ ) that national government open offices has enough physical work space, enough natural light ( $m=4.05$ ) and low ambient temperature ( $m=3.55$ ). It was also agreed that office spatial arrangement provide enough aisle for easy movement ( $m=3.82$ ) and enhances service delivery ( $m=4.05$ ). These findings on physical work environment reveals that national government open offices are spacious enough, well supplied with natural light and has enough aisle for ease of movement. However, they are not sufficiently supplied with ambient temperature may be due to concentration of staff and customers in those offices. These findings support the findings by Veitch *et al* (2007) who found that lighting and ventilation factors clearly represent satisfaction with open office. In relation to the results of Danielsson & Bodin (2008), the findings on insufficient ambient temperature and aeration, corroborates their finding that open office type offices has significance negative effect on employee health status. Additionally, another supporting study is by Brill & Weidemann (2001) who concluded that some of the factors of an ideal open office are quality lighting and access to daylight, temperature control and air quality.

In an attempt to establish the strategic fit between variables of office physical work environment and employees service delivery. The study employed Pearson correlation analysis and the result are shown in Table 2. The findings revealed that there existed a strong positive correlation of 0.501 between physical work environment and natural light, strong positive correlation of 0.611 between physical work environment and ambient temperature, strong positive correlation of 0.559 between physical work environment and enough aisle for ease of movement, relatively weak positive correlation of 0.457 between physical work environment and enhanced service delivery; all correlation are significance at 0.01 level of confidence. The implication of these findings is paramount and points to the fact that open office strategy physical work environment is highly influenced by supply of natural light, ambient temperature and enough aisle for ease movement. However to enhance speed of service delivery aisle for movement should be well defined. Thus, the study can strategically link physical environment to natural light, ambient temperature and aisle for movement.

### 5.2 Employees Perceived Effective Service Delivery on Adoption of Open Office Strategy

The study findings on objective two - employees' perceived effective service delivery on adoption of open office strategy - was analyzed on a 5 point Likert scale. The study result is provided in the Table 3. From Table 3, it is clear that significant number of respondents strongly agreed that open office are motivating ( $m=3.92$ ), leads to improvement in service delivery ( $m=4.16$ ) and reduces individual privacy ( $m=4.04$ ). Additionally, respondents also agreed that employees support open plan office strategy ( $m=3.75$ ) and the benefits of open office strategy outweigh its drawbacks ( $m=3.86$ ). The study findings on perception of open office strategy points that national government open offices are highly motivating, leads to improvement in service delivery and more supported by staff as its benefits outweigh its drawbacks. However open office strategy reduces individual privacy. These findings corroborates with the study of Becker (1991) who noted that changing from closed workspaces to open workspaces resulted in perceived better visibility, accessibility and increased face-to-face interaction. Becker concluded the open office have implications in job satisfaction (motivation) and commitment on occupier service delivery. Similarly, Brennan, et al (2002) study also noted that open office employees, who initially occupied closed office, expressed workspace satisfaction (motivation) after the adjustment period due to the benefits of open office, however the study stressed on engaging employees in office layout planning.

The study findings for correlation between issues of concern under staff perception of open office strategy are presented in Table 4.

From the table, it can be seen that there exist a strong significance correlation of 0.582 between employees' perceived improvement in service delivery and motivation, strong significance correlation of 0.561 between staff support of open office and motivation and relatively weak but significance correlation of 0.449 between motivation and support for open office; all correlations are significance at 0.01 level of confidence. Additionally, there exist a strong significance correlation of 0.561 between perceived added benefits of open office and improved service delivery, at 0.01 level of confidence. Contrary to argument that open office reduces individual privacy, the study did not find any significance correlation between reduction in individual privacy and perceived motivation, service delivery and support for open office strategy.

The strategic implication of these findings reveals that transition to open office enhances staff motivation, which in turn, improves perceived service delivery and other added benefits thus boosting support for open office initiative. With these findings, the study can establish a strategic fit between open office and staff motivation, improved perceived service delivery, lower management or subordinates support. In support of this correlation finding, Haynes (2007) concluded that there is direct correlation between persons' performance and environment in which he or she works.

### **5.3 Open Office Strategy and Effective Service Delivery**

The third and last specific objective was designed to assess employees' effective service delivery. Five issues of concern were developed to analyze the effective service delivery. Study results with response to these issues of concern are depicted in Table 5. Table 5 shows that respondents strongly agreed that open office strategy highly enhances human capital value addition through interaction ( $m=4.21$ ) and encourages ease and frequent engagement with superior, peer or subordinate ( $m=3.96$ ). Also respondents were indifferent as to whether open office allows them to deliver services that commensurate their earnings ( $m=2.75$ ) or values that meet their expectation ( $m=2.6$ ). On the other hand, majority of respondents did not agree that, if given an opportunity to choose an office, they would opt for a closed office ( $m=2.7$ ). Equally, respondents too did not agree that open office is the most ideal office strategy ( $m=2.6$ ). The implication of this findings is that open offices strategy highly enhances human capital value addition through interaction but do not allow staff to deliver effectively. It also highly encourages ease and frequent engagement with superior, peer or subordinate, and that is why most respondents' preferred it to closed office, even though it does not meet their expectation as the ideal office or workstation.

These findings are supported by Van de Ven & Poole (1995) who indicated that open office enhances perceived productivity based on occupant response to stimuli. Open office improves both visual and acoustic innovative stimuli for occupiers than closed cellular offices. Additionally, Brennan et al (2002) study also corroborated this finding. They found that open office promoted innovation and creativity at workspace due to its ability to provide an interactive and collaborative environment. This, they concluded that high performance workplace should match the requirements of the individuals, and their work process, to the physical environment, to mitigate the consequences of creating a mismatch office environment, which could have an effect on both the health of the individual and their performance levels.

The analyzed result of correlation analysis is shown in table 4.6. From the research findings, it is evident that there is a relative strong correlation of 0.443 between junior staffs frequent collaboration with superiors and advancement of human capital addition value. Even though small proportion of staff opted to work in close office, the relative strong correlation of 0.425 between workstation meeting staff expectation and choice of office depicts that those who opt to change office felt that they were not performing to their expectation. Lastly, service delivery compared to performance did not exhibit any significance correlation. These findings have significant strategic implication in office design and service delivery. It can be seen that open office strategy encourages frequent collaboration between junior staffs with superior staffs which contributes to advancement of human capital additional value. Similarly, staffs would opt for closed offices if their actual performance does not commensurate perceived performance or expectation. The following strategic fits between open office and performance can be established, open office strategy and: staff or human capital development and, frequent collaboration between team.

### **5.4 Summary of Findings**

The study finding on physical work environment reveals an average summary statistics of mode = 4, mean = 3.856, Std dev. = 1.12 implying that respondents agreed that it influences employees service delivery.

The results for perception of open office strategy gave a weighted average summary of mode = 4, mean = 3.946 and Std dev. = 1.0828, implying that respondents agreed that employees perception on open office affects their service delivery. Finally, the results of how open office strategy affects actual employees service reveals an average mode = 4, mean = 3.298 and Std dev. = 1.01 implying that respondents relatively agreed ,that open office strategy relatively influence their performance

### **6.0 Conclusions**

The study concludes that open office design has significance influence on occupants perceived and actual performance. The specific effects of national government open plan office strategy are adequate space, well supply with natural light and air, enough aisles for movement. However, these offices are not supplied with ambient temperature may due to concentration of staff and customers. The study also concludes that staff perception of open office strategy leads to occupants motivation, improvement in service delivery and are more supported by staff. Additionally, open office perceived benefits outweigh drawbacks. The other significant conclusion made by the study is that open office strategy encourages high collaborative engagement with formal clients including fellow staffs, is comfortable and makes staffs feel part of organization and enhances ease of consultation. Lastly the study concludes that open offices strategy highly enhances human capital value addition through interaction, ease frequent engagement with superior, peer or subordinate and for that most employees prefers it to closed office. In the contrary, the study also concludes that open office strategy do not meet occupants expectation as the ideal office or workstation.

### **7.0 Recommendations**

The study made the following recommends as per the research objectives.

#### **7.1 Physical Work Environment**

Based on the findings that there in inadequate effective training amongst low level management and subordinate staff on physical work environment design, the study recommends for an effective tailored training of these classes of staff. Specific emphasis of training should be placed on how office design affects service delivery. Additionally, based on the finding of poor supply of ambient temperature within open offices, the study recommends that adequately artificial temperature regulators should be installed to supplement the natural temperatures. This would improve work environment and enhance employees' performance.

#### **7.2 Employees Perceived Effective Service Delivery**

Based on the findings that open office strategy do not allows staffs to easily engage informal clients, the study recommends that at the design strategy a meeting room included to allow staff to engage their informal clients and friend without causing disturbance to other staff. However established strategic fits of perceived service delivery open office are more ideal for teamwork or group work as opposed to individual task.

#### **7.3 Employees Effective Service Delivery**

Based on the finding that open plan office do not allow employees to deliver services that commensurate their earning, the study recommends that employees or office occupants should be incorporated in the initial office design stage so as to make employees feel part and parcel of the strategy. In addition, remuneration should also be based on the level of service delivery.

### **8.0 Suggestion for Further Study**

Though the study achieved its objective, it used qualitative data. These data were purely opinions and views of respondents thus could not provide an effective measure of performance. The study recommends further study on the subject using quantitative data i.e. actual number of service delivery.

**Table 1: Effects of Physical Work Environment of Open Office Strategy**

Issues of concern	N	Min	Max	Mode	Mean	Std Dev
Physical work space	73	1	5	4	3.81	0.163
Natural light	73	1	5	5	4.05	0.092
Ambient temperature	73	1	5	4	3.55	1.225
Enough aisle for ease movement	73	1	5	4	3.82	0.959
Enhanced service delivery	73	1	5	5	4.05	1.066

**Table 2: Correlations - Physical Work Environment Issues of Concern**

Issues of concern	1	2	3	4	5
1. Physical work space	1				
2. Natural light	.501(**)	1			
3. Ambient temperature	.611(**)	0.548(**)	1		
4. Enough aisle for easy movement	.559(**)	0.501(**)	0.537(**)	1	
5. Enhanced service delivery	.457(**)	0.344(**)	0.423(**)	0.526(**)	1

\*\* Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

**Table 3: Perception of Adoption of Open Office Strategy**

Issues of concern	N	Min	Max	Mean	Std Dev
Open office is motivating	73	1	5	3.92	1.115
Improvement in service delivery	73	1	5	4.16	1.028
Reduced individual privacy	73	1	5	4.04	1.218
Staff support open office	73	1	5	3.75	1.077
Open office is more benefiting	73	1	5	3.86	0.976

**Table 4: Correlation – Employees Perception on Open Office Strategy**

Issues of concern	1	2	3	4	5
1 Open office is motivating	1				
2 Improvement in service delivery	0.582(**)	1			
3 Reduced individual privacy	0.125	0.150	1		
4 Staff support Open office	0.561(**)	0.326(**)	0.103	1	
5 Open office is more benefiting	0.449(**)	0.521(**)	0.192	0.377(**)	1

\*\* Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

**Table 5: Effective Service Delivery on Adoption of Open Office Strategy**

Issues of concern	N	Min	Max	Mean	Std Dev
Enhance human capital value through interaction	73	1	5	4.21	1.027
Delivery of value added services	73	1	5	2.75	1.34
Ease and frequent engagement with superior, peer and subordinate	73	1	5	3.96	1.241
Change to closed office if allowed	73	1	5	2.7	1.324
Does the open office meet staff expectation	73	1	5	2.6	1.222
Is open office the most ideal workstation	73	1	5	3.57	0.917

**Table 6: Correlation – Service Performance**

Issues of concern	1	2	3	4	5	6
1 Human capital addition value	1					
2 Service delivery do not commensurate my earning	-0.199	1				
3 Ease and frequent engagement	0.443(**)	-0.233(*)	1			
4 Opt for open office	-0.231	0.196	-0.308(**)	1		
5 Workstation does not meet my expectation	-0.399(**)	0.397(**)	-0.185	0.425(**)	1	
6 Closeness of current workspace to ideal work environment	0.269(*)	0.016	0.176	-0.260(*)	-0.096	1

\*\* Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

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

### References

- Barley, K. (1987). *Methods of social science research* (4<sup>th</sup> Ed.). New York: The Free Press.
- Becker, F. (1991). Workplace planning, design, and management, *Advances in Environment, Behavior and Design Journal*, Vol. 3, 115-151.
- Boyce, P. (1974). User's assessments of a landscaped office. *Journal of Architectural Research*, 44–62.
- Bradley, S., & Hood, C. (2003). Delivering minimalist workplaces that improve corporate agility. *Journal of Facilities Management*, 68-84.
- Brand, J., & Smith, T. J. (2005). Effects of reducing enclosure on perceptions of occupancy quality, job satisfaction, and job performance in open-plan offices. *Proceedings of the Human Factors and Ergonomics Society 49th Annual Meeting*, Vol. 49, 818-822.
- Brennan, A., Chugh, J. S., & Kline, T. (2002). Traditional versus open office design: A longitudinal study. *Environment and Behavior*, 279–299.
- Brill, M., & Weidemann, S. (2001). *Disproving Widespread Myths about Workplace Design*. Jasper: Kimball International: Associates, BOSTI.
- Charles, K., Farley, K., & Newsharm, G. (2007). A model of satisfaction with an open-plan office condition: COPE field findings. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 117-189.
- Charles, K., & Veitch, J. (2002). Environmental Satisfaction in Open-Plan Environments: Effects of Workstation Size, Partition Height and Windows. *Institute for Research in Construction Vol.2*, 119-124
- Croswell, N. (2009). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative and Mixed Methods Approaches*. (3<sup>rd</sup> Ed.) London: Sage Press.
- Danielsson, C., & Bodin, L. (2008). Office type in relation to health, well-being, and job satisfaction among employees. *Journal of Environment and Behavior*, 636- 668.
- Duffy. (1992). *The changing workplace*. London: Phaidon Press.
- Duffy, F. (1997). *The New Office*. London: Conran Octopus Press.
- Felstead, A., & Walters, S. (2005). The shifting locations of work: New statistical evidence on the space and places of employment. *Work, Employment and Society*, 15 31.
- Government of Kenya (2014). *Huduma Kenya: Staregic Plan for 2014-2016*. Nairobi: Government Printers.
- Guthrie, G. (2010). *Basic Research Methods*. New Delhi, India: SAGE Publications.
- Haynes, P. (2007). Office productivity: A theoretical framework. *Journal of Corporate Real Estate*, 97–110.
- Hedge, A. (1982). The open-plan office: A systematic investigation of employee reactions to their work environment. *Environment and Behavior*, 519-542.
- Higgins, J., & McAllaste, C. (1991). If you want strategic change, don't forget to change your cultural artefacts. *Journal of Change Management*, pp. 63–74.
- Hunsaker, P. (2005). *Management: A skill approach* (2<sup>nd</sup> Ed.). NJ: Upper Saddle River.
- Ilozor, B., & Oluwoye, J. (1999). Open-plan measures in the determination of facilities. *Facilities*, 237-245.
- Ives, S., & Ferdinands, R. (1974). Working in a landscaped office. *Personnel Practice Bulletin*, 26–41.

- Kothari, R. (2009). *Research Methodology: Methods and Techniques* (10<sup>th</sup> Ed.). New Delhi: New Age International (P) Ltd.
- Kumar, R. (2011). *Research Methodology: A Step by step guide for beginners* (3<sup>rd</sup> Ed.). New Delhi: SAGE Press.
- Kupritz, V. (2003). Accommodating privacy to facilitate new ways of working. *Journal of Architectural and Planning Research*, 122-135.
- Kupritz, V. (1998). Privacy in the work place: The impact of building design. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, pp. 341–356.
- Laing, A., Duffy, D., Jaunzens, D., & Willis, S. (1998). *New Environments for Working: The redesign of offices and the environmental system for new ways of working*. London: E and FN Press.
- Leach, F., & Westbrook, J. (2000). Motivation and Job Satisfaction in One Government research and Development Environment. *Engineering Management Journal*, 3-9.
- Leaman, A., & Bordass, W. (2005). *Productivity in Buildings: The Killer Variables*. London: The Usable Buildings Trust.
- Lee, S., & Brand, L. (2005). Effects of control over office workspace on perceptions of the work environment and work outcomes. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 323–333.
- McCoy, J. (2005). Linking the physical work environment to creative context. *Journal of Creative Behavior*, 169–191.
- Montgomery, K. (2004). *Understanding the Relationship between the design of the workspace environment and wellness*. Texas: Texas Tech University.
- Mugenda, O., & Mugenda, A. (2009). *Research methods*. Nairobi: UoN Press.
- Neyman, J. (1934). On the two different aspects of the representative method: the method of stratified sampling and the method of purposive selection,” . *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society*, 558-606.
- O’Neill, M. (1994). Work space adjustability, storage, and enclosure as predictors of employee reactions and performance. *Environment and Behavior*, 504–526.
- Oldham, G., & Brass,. D. (1979). Employee reactions to an open-plan office: A naturally occurring quasi-experiment. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 67–84.
- Rasmussen, S., & Erik, S. (2002). *Essentials of Social Research Methodology*. Southern Denmark: Odense University Press .
- Ruthankoon, R., & Ogunlana, S. (2003). Testing Herzberg’s Two-Factor Theory in the Thai Construction Industry. *Engineering, Construction and Architectural Management*, 333-334.
- Schermerhorn, J., Hunt, J., & Osborn, N. (2003). *Organizational behaviour: Instructor's resource guide* (8<sup>th</sup> Ed.). Hoboken: NJ: John wiley & Sons Inc Press.
- Shaughnessy, J., Zechmeister, E., & Zechmeister, J. (2006). *Research methods in psychology* (7<sup>th</sup> Ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill Press.
- Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1999). *Basics of Qualitative Research Techniques and Procedures for Developing Grounded Theory* (2<sup>nd</sup> Ed.). London: Sage Publications.
- Sundstrom, E., Town, J., Rice, R., Osborn, D., & Brill, M. (1994). Office noise, satisfaction and performance. *Environment and Behaviour*, 195-222.
- Van de Ven, A., & Poole, S. (1995). Explaining development and change in organizations. *Academy of Management Review*, 510-540.
- Veitch, J., Charles, K., Farley, M., & Newsham, G. (2007). A model of satisfaction with open-plan office conditions: Cope field endings. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 177–189.
- Veitch, J., Charles, K., Farley, K., & Newsham, G. (2007). A model of satisfaction with open-plan office conditions: Cope field findings. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 177–189.
- Yamane, T. (1973). *Statistics: an introduction analysis* (3<sup>rd</sup> Ed.). Singapore: Times Printers.
- Zalesny, M., Farace, R., & Kurchner-Hawkins, R. (1985). Determinants of employee work perceptions and attitudes: Perceived work environment and organizational level. *Environment and Behavior*, 567–592.