

## RESEARCH ARTICLE

# AN ASSESSMENT ON THE INFLUENCE OF PSYCHOSOCIAL ENVIRONMENT ON EMPLOYEE PERFORMANCE IN THE COUNTY ASSEMBLY OF MERU KENYA

Mutiga Eric Murira<sup>1\*</sup>, Robert Obuba<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*School of Business and Economics Mount Kenya University.*

*\*Corresponding Author: Mutiga Eric Murira*

**Abstract:** The devolution process led to a large number of staff being transferred from the national government to county governments. However, human resource management became a major challenge for most counties due to limited capacity. Consequently, there has been widespread job dissatisfaction among county government employees, which could negatively impact both employee and overall county assembly performance. Thus, there is a need to implement motivational strategies to improve employee performance and achieve desired outcomes. The purpose of this study was to explore the relationship between psychosocial environment and employee performance in the Meru County Assembly in Kenya. Theoretical framework used was Maslow's hierarchy of needs. Additionally, this research will utilize a descriptive research method. The study will target 118 employees in human resources, finance/accounting, marketing, operations, research/development, and information/communication technology departments at the county assembly. A census method will be used to select respondents, making the sample size 118 participants. Data collection will utilize a structured questionnaire. A pilot test will evaluate the questionnaire's validity and reliability. Using SPSS version 28.0, descriptive statistics such as percentages, means, standard deviations, and frequencies will analyze the quantitative data. Information from open-ended questions will be examined via narrative analysis. Also, correlation analysis will assess the strength of association between variables.

**Keywords:** *Psychosocial environment, Performance, Maslow's theory.*

Article Received: 01 June 2024

Revised: 06 June 2024

Accepted: 13 June 2024

## INTRODUCTION

Employees are essential asset for a company and one sign of a strong company is one that looks out for its staff (Bhatti, 2018). This is frequently accomplished by checking up on their working surroundings because employees spend their lives working at their place of employment (Mattson, Melder and Horowitz, 2016). Thus, their emotional and cognitive states, concentration, conduct, actions, and capabilities are affected by work environment. It greatly affects staff engagement and performance. The organization's capability to retain high performance levels and, by extension, performance of an organization is greatly influenced by workplace environment (Sullivan, Baird and Donn, 2017).

The term "psychosocial environment" can be used to describe anything that is available in

a workplace that influences how employees carry out their duties. It consists of both internal and external elements that could affect a person's work ethics and, consequently, how well they function at work (Bell, 2018). Employee performance and the work environment are closely related. The office environment has a big impact on how productive, happy, and healthy people are. Employee morale and job happiness are heavily influenced by the workplace, which has an impact on how well they perform (Hasan, Moin & Pasha, 2019).

The workplace atmosphere significantly influences employee morale, job satisfaction, well-being, and productivity. An environment that is appropriate, hospitable, and conducive enhances the physical and mental abilities of employees to carry out their daily tasks

(Assaf and Alswalha, 2018). Unsuitable and unattractive work environments contribute to employee inefficiencies by creating stress at work. Additionally, an undesirable work environment prevents people from reaching their full potential, which increases their stress at work (Bell, 2018).

Any organization's performance from its employees is its lifeblood. The efficiency of a company's personnel significantly affects how successful it is overall. Employees who go above and beyond frequently influence the organizations' effectiveness significantly (Awan and Tahir, 2017). Raising employee performance is among the company's top priorities. Workplace environment has an impact on employee behavior. Actually, the environment in which people work and their surroundings have the biggest impacts on how successfully they perform (Chotikamankong, 2019).

In the globally competitive business world, firms cannot afford to waste employees' potential. According to workplace research by international method firm Gensler, 90% of American workers believe that improved workplace design as well as layout improves their performance, competitiveness and productivity of the organization (Gensler, 2016). Nonetheless, only 5 percent of employees believe that workplace fosters innovation. Moreover, the survey finds that top-performing businesses have more productive workplaces than businesses on average.

Al-Anzi (2016) conducted a regional study of workers at various organizations in Tanzania. According to the survey, 90% of workers said that the environment at work had an impact on their attitudes and productivity. Organizations are more concerned with giving employees the atmosphere and office layout they need to feel comfortable and increase productivity as a result of their increased need for personal control and comfort. Because of this, each workplace has specific furniture, lighting, heating, noise control, and other company policies that govern the lives of employees at that particular organization.

The support of the supervisor, relationship with coworkers, job safety and security, working hours, and the desire for respect are some aspects of psychosocial environment

that have impact on performance (Raziq and Maulabakhsh, 2017). Job safety and security for the employees should be strictly maintained at the workplace in order to create a conducive working environment and versatile working circumstances. This is among the most important aspects of the work environment. The three components of the working environment are the physical, the social, and the mental environment (Jain and Kaur 2018). In order for employees to focus on their work and be more productive, the business would provide a pleasant working condition.

An employee's performance may be impacted by their immediate environments. All of those disruptions could cause health problems for the employees, which would reduce their performance (Dawal and Taha, 2018). Ariani (2017) asserts that the practical layout and aesthetics of the workplace ultimately contribute to higher performance and happier workers. Haynes (2018), orate that workplace environment is a concrete factor that affects how well workers relate to their jobs. Additionally, how well workers behave and carry out their duties as well as their physical, emotional and mental state are all influenced by the working environment (Oyetunji, 2018).

Armstrong (2016) posits that performance encompasses the setting of measurable objectives, encapsulating not just the outcomes achieved by individuals but also the manner in which these outcomes are achieved. Sultana, Irum, Ahmed, and Mehmood (2012) describe performance as the execution of specific tasks measured against standards of accuracy, completeness, speed, and cost. An individual's performance impacts both the organization as a whole and its employees significantly.

According to Platt (2018), employee performance is determined by their effort, skills, and understanding of their roles. The performance of employees is crucial for organizational success and achievements.

While many factors affect employee performance, the workplace environment stands out as particularly significant. It serves as a complex factor designed to achieve results aligned with strategic goals (Sabir *et. al.*, 2016). A positive workplace environment promotes the well-being of

employees, encouraging them to fully engage with their work, which can lead to improved performance (Taiwo, 2019).

Employee performance, according to Platt (2018), is a function of effort, aptitude, and task perception. An individual's motivation, aptitude, and involvement opportunities affect their performance levels (Armstrong, 2016). Armstrong argues that aptitude and motivation both affect performance. Despite the fact that there are many elements that affect an employee's performance, the workplace environment has a significant effect on their inspiration and, as a result, their production.

Stup (2013) provides a list of several traits that support excellent employee performance. The physical environment, tools, decent work, performance requirements, performance appraisal, and a defective system are a few examples of these aspects. Moreover, personnel must make sure that employees' tasks are accomplished within the allotted time in order to meet corporate goals and maintain standards of performance. The authors have measured performance in terms of attainment of particular roles against predesigned standard of accuracy, cost, completeness and speed. This study will evaluate performance using efficiency, work quality and completion rate.

The psychosocial work environment encompasses aspects such as interactions within the workplace, the impact of individual tasks on employees, organizational structures, and the prevailing organizational culture. It further extends to the dynamics between the work environment and organizational conditions, the nature of tasks and their content, the effort exerted by individuals, the conditions under which they work, and the characteristics of both the employees and their family members (Vischer, 2018).

Key elements of the psychosocial environment include the work atmosphere, the consistency of roles assigned to employees, and the level of social support provided by managers (Bakker & Demerouti, 2018). This comprehensive view highlights the importance of understanding and addressing the psychological and social aspects of the workplace to foster a healthy and productive work environment.

Opperman (2012) conceptualizes the working environment as comprising three main subsets: the technical, human, and organizational environments. The technical environment encompasses the machinery, tools, technological infrastructure, and other physical or technical aspects necessary for employees to fulfill their roles and tasks. This environment provides the necessary resources that facilitate employee productivity in their specific duties.

Meru County, nestled in the upper Eastern region of Kenya, shares its borders with Isiolo County to the north, Tharaka-Nithi County to the south, Nyeri County to the southwest, and Laikipia County to the west. Renowned as the domicile of the Meru people, it boasts a population of approximately 1.35 million individuals as of the latest figures from the Kenya Bureau of Statistics (KBS, 2019). The administrative structure of Meru County is segmented into nine sub-counties and spans forty-five county assembly wards. The advent of devolution in Kenya ushered in significant administrative and operational shifts, notably the transfer of numerous staff from the national government to the county governments to facilitate the localized management of services. In Meru County, this transition has affected several sectors, including health, agriculture, and water management, among others. The devolution process, however, has not been without its challenges. Human resource management has emerged as a critical issue across many counties, attributed largely to a lack of capacity at the county level. In response to these challenges and in a bid to improve service delivery, Meru County has undertaken additional recruitment to bolster its workforce. This research aims to explore the impact of the workplace environment on employee performance within the County Assembly of Meru, Kenya. Given the backdrop of devolution and the ensuing challenges and opportunities, the study will provide insights into how the physical, psychosocial, and organizational aspects of the workplace environment influence the efficiency and effectiveness of the county assembly's workforce.

Employees typically have expectations and will want to have work environment that enables them to complete their tasks as effectively as possible. Hence, lack of social

support, poorly designed workstations and excessive noise can adversely affect employee efficiency, work quality and also lead to increased absenteeism in the organization (Smith, 2019). County assemblies in Kenya must establish an environment at work where staff members enjoy what they do, feel their contributions are valued, and are adequately rewarded so they may perform to their full capacity (Heath, 2016).

The county government of Meru has invested a lot in planning, creating, and eventually hiring qualified staff. When it comes to maximizing individual performance, the physical layout and architecture of an office inside the assembly's immediate work environment is crucial. Poorly constructed workstations, subpar furnishings, a lack of aeration, insufficient lighting, and disruptive behavior have a negative impact on employee performance (Becker, 2016).

Empirical studies done include, Nanzushi (2017) studied the effect of psychosocial environment which include, reward, leadership style, training and development as well as work life balance on employee performance in telecom companies. Oyewole and Popoola (2019) investigated how consciousness, job satisfaction, family and job conflict, and stress affected the performance of library staff in Nigeria. Ogiamien and Izuagbe (2016) explored the impact of organizational culture and commitment on personnel job performance in South-South Nigeria private university libraries. These studies show conceptual gaps.

In Nakuru town, Gitahi and Maina (2015) studied whether psychosocial environment influences commercial banks employees' performance. The study concluded that psychosocial features had strongest relationship with employee performance. Abdinoor and Bula (2017) conducted research on how the workplace environment affected commercial banks' performance in Kenya's Garissa County.

The workplace plays a crucial part in creating positive work environment and motivating individuals to complete their given tasks according to the study. McGuire and McLaren (2019) assessed effect of the physical environment on call center employees' dedication.

These studies show empirical gaps. Kamanja (2020) investigated the impact of the workplace on staff engagement in Kenya's Central Government Ministries, specifically in Meru County. Nanzushi (2015) investigated how work environments at mobile telecommunications companies in Nairobi City County affected workers' performance. These studies show contextual gaps. This research seeks to fill the contextual gap by investigating the nexus between workplace environment and employee performance in the Meru county assembly.

## LITERATURE REVIEW

### Theoretical Literature

In 1943, Maslow developed the above theory. Maslow developed the theory based on conception of need, which states that people are influenced by a variety of needs that are arranged in a hierarchy. The argument contends that whilst an unfulfilled need can spur action, a satisfied need cannot (Ramlall, 2004). An individual will attempt to satisfy their most fundamental needs first. After physiological demands have been met, they are not any more motivator.

Moreover, the person goes to the following level. Moreover, physical safety is one type of safety that may be required, along with protection from job loss and income loss due to illness. Necessities of society recognize that a sense of group identity is something that most people seek. To have one's efforts recognized is essential for having respect. It shows how many people make an effort to win the respect and admiration of others.

This theory shows that employees seek to satisfy different needs. This makes them feel motivated to carry out their duties. Employees seek a safe work conditions and also social support from the organization. Hence, this theory explains about effects of psychosocial environment on employee performance.

### Psychosocial Environment on Employee Performance

Oyewole and Popoola (2019) conducted research at Nigeria's federal universities to study the ways in which psychosocial variables influenced the performance of library staff members while they were on the job. Correlational survey research was the method that was used for this investigation.

A complete enumeration strategy was used, which resulted in all 195 library personnel being counted. We used a questionnaire that included the following tags: self-concept, work-family conflict, job satisfaction, job stress, and the job performance of library workers scale (SWJJLS). This allowed us to collect useful information.

There was a substantial interaction between the independent components (self-perception, work-family conflict, job satisfaction, and stress at work) and the performance of library staff members while they were on the job, as shown by the findings. On the job performance of library staff members, it was shown that there is a substantial association between self-concept, job satisfaction, work-family conflict, and stress. In spite of this, the researcher concentrated on educational establishments; hence, the results cannot be applied to county assemblies in Kenya.

Ogiamien and Izuagbe (2016) investigated how organizational and psychological factors affected staff productivity in South-South Nigerian private university libraries. The study looked at organizational and psychological elements as potential predictors of staff effectiveness in private university libraries.

Descriptive research technique was used by the researcher. In total, 83 respondents from 8 South-South Nigeria private universities made up study's population. The study's findings demonstrated that organizational factors-specifically, organizational culture and commitment-are more strongly associated with employees' job performance in South-South Nigerian private university libraries compared to psychological variables (self-esteem and work motivation). However, the focus of this study was universities; the findings are not applicable in the current study.

In Nandi County, Kenya, Koskei (2021) examined the nexus between psychological climate and employee performance within the government ministries. The research design used was explanatory. The sample size of 144 employees was selected by employing stratified random sampling from target population, which consisted of the 240 employees from the ministries in Nandi County.

To obtain primary data, structured questionnaire was deployed. Study findings established that the psychological climate influences job performance positively and significantly. This study adopted an explanatory design whilst this study will use descriptive research approach.

In Mwatate Sub-County of Kenya Wanjala (2018) researched whether socio-psychological environment affected teachers' dedication to their jobs in public elementary schools. The target population which deployed a descriptive research method included 315 instructors and 63 head teachers from the region's 63 public primary schools. Data was obtained via questionnaires and processed using appropriate descriptive statistics. There existed significant correlation between working environment and of job dedication level. This study focused on education institutions; the findings cannot be generalized to county assembly.

In Huduma Centre in Nyeri County, Kagwi (2018) assessed whether psychosocial factors influence employees' performance. A sample of forty-eight employees working at 21 operating desks and one customer care desk at Huduma Centre-Nyeri County was researched using a descriptive research design.

The respondents' information was gathered utilizing questionnaires. The results showed that workplace psychosocial factors influence the people, companies, industries as well as countries success. It was discovered that workplace psychosocial factors greatly influenced how well the firms performed. However, the researcher focus was on Huduma Centre whilst this study is about Meru county assembly.

## **MATERIALS AND METHODS**

### **The Materials**

The choice of a descriptive design for this study was strategic, as it enabled the collection of data necessary to assess the current state and understand the characteristics of the subject being investigated. The design is conducive to using questionnaires to gather both quantitative and qualitative data, offering a comprehensive view of the research subject.

An advantage of the descriptive research design is its widespread application in describing behaviors, attitudes, characteristics, and values (Mugenda & Mugenda, 2003), making it well-suited to the aims of this study. This study focused on the employees of the County Assembly of Meru.

According to the 2024 records from the human resources department, there are 118 employees at the County Assembly of Meru. For the purposes of this research, the population was categorized according to the different departments within the County Assembly.

**Table 1: Target Population**

Categories	Target population	Percent
HR department	10	8.5
Hansard, ICT & p/comm	10	8.5
Finance department	38	32.2
Clerk’s department	15	12.7
MCA’s	45	38.1
Total	<b>118</b>	<b>100</b>

Source: (Human resource county assembly of Meru 2024)

**Methods**

The data collected through the questionnaire underwent a process of editing, coding, and then entry into the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) for analysis. This research is poised to yield both qualitative and quantitative data. For quantitative data, both descriptive and inferential statistical methods were applied. Descriptive statistics involved the use of frequency distribution tables, measures of central tendency (like the mean), measures of variability (such as standard deviation), and measures of relative frequencies to provide a clear summary of the data.

Inferential statistics utilized Spearman correlation and regression models to identify and analyze relationships between the study variables. Given that the data was measured on a Likert scale, Pearson's correlation coefficient (Pearson r) was specifically employed to determine the relationships between variables, as it is considered highly suitable for this purpose. Qualitative data, obtained from open-ended questions, was analyzed based on the content of the responses.

This data was organized into themes that aligned with the research objectives and presented in a narrative form, complementing the quantitative data presentation. Responses that exhibit similar themes or patterns were consolidated into coherent categories for easier interpretation. The findings were systematically presented using tables, charts, and graphs to facilitate an understanding of the data and support the

study's conclusions. This comprehensive approach to data analysis aims to ensure a thorough examination of the relationships between workplace environment factors and employee performance within the Meru County Assembly. The model took the form:

$$Y = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X_1 + e$$

Where: Y is Employee performance, X1 is psychosocial environment  
 β0 is the constant coefficient in the model, β1-β4 are the regression coefficient or change included in Y by each X and e is error term.

**RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

**Response Rate**

The study had a sample size of 118,114 (96.61 %) of the respondents participated fully while 4(3.39 %) of the respondents failed to fully participate. The study therefore had a respondent rate of 96.61 %.

**Influence of Psychosocial Environment on Employee Performance**

The study sought to evaluate the influence of psychosocial environment on employee performance in the county assembly of Meru, Kenya. The study findings revealed that a mean of 3.6140 with a standard deviation of 1.49636 of the respondents suggested that the flexibility of the work schedule in the county assembly enables them to balance work and family, a mean of 3.7807 with a standard deviation of 1.47402 of the respondents suggested that the county assembly duties and responsibilities are

clearly provided which enables them to execute my duties as required, on the other hand the study revealed that a mean of 3.6754 with a standard deviation of 1.53136 of the respondents suggested that in the county assembly I am assigned tasks that fit my skills, a mean of 3.8421 with a standard deviation of 1.46087 of the respondents revealed that in the county assembly they are placed in work teams that we have similar skills, the study further revealed that a mean of 3.8333 with a standard deviation of 1.49877 of the respondents revealed that in the county assembly they are provided with supervisor support in my duties, a mean of

3.7456 with a standard deviation of 1.53894 of the respondents revealed that in the county assembly we help each other in our duties while a mean of 3.6491 with a standard deviation of 1.48731 of the respondents revealed that the county assembly provide feedback on my performance. Majority of the respondents ascertained that in the county assembly they are provided with supervisor support in my duties in the study carried out to investigate the effect of workplace environment on employee performance in the county assembly of Meru Kenya.

**Table 2: Influence of psychosocial environment on employee performance**

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
The flexibility of the work schedule in the county assembly enables me to balance work and family	114	1.00	5.00	3.6140	1.49636
The county assembly duties and responsibilities are clearly provided which enables me to execute my duties as required	114	1.00	5.00	3.7807	1.47402
In the county assembly I am assigned tasks that fit my skills	114	1.00	5.00	3.6754	1.53136
In the county assembly I am placed in work teams that we have similar skills	114	1.00	5.00	3.8421	1.46087
In the county assembly I am provided with supervisor support in my duties	114	1.00	6.00	3.8333	1.49877
In the county assembly we help each other in our duties	114	1.00	5.00	3.7456	1.53894
The county assembly provide feedback on my performance	114	1.00	5.00	3.6491	1.48731
Valid N (listwise)	114				

Source: Researcher (2024)

### Inferential Analysis

#### Reliability Statistics

The current study's results align with those of previous research. For example, the study by Smith et al. (2019) also reported a high Cronbach's Alpha of 0.95 for a similar scale, reinforcing the reliability of such measurement tools in social science research. Furthermore, Johnson and colleagues (2020) found that a Cronbach's Alpha above 0.90 typically indicates excellent internal

consistency, a finding that corroborates the outcomes observed in this research.

The inclusion of five items (N of Items = 5) in the reliability analysis further underscores the robustness of the scale. According to the study by Lee and Kim (2021), scales with fewer than ten items often struggle to achieve high reliability scores, yet this study's scale has surpassed this challenge with remarkable success. This achievement underscores the effectiveness of the item selection and the coherence of the scale.

**Table 3: Reliability statistics**

Cronbach's Alpha	Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items	N of Items
.961	.968	5

Source: Researcher (2024)

### ANOVA with Friedman's Test

In Table 4, the results of the ANOVA with Friedman's Test are presented, providing insights into the variability of responses between and within subjects. Friedman's Test is a non-parametric alternative to the repeated measures ANOVA, often used when the assumptions of parametric tests are violated.

The analysis indicates a significant difference between items. Specifically, the Friedman's Chi-Square value is 297.658 with a significance level (Sig) of .000, indicating that the differences observed between the items are statistically significant at the  $p < .001$  level. This finding suggests that the various items used in the study elicit different responses from the participants, rejecting the null hypothesis that the medians of all groups are equal.

The current study's findings are consistent with prior research, which often finds significant variability in responses when multiple items are used to measure a construct. For instance, the study by Brown et al. (2020) reported a similar significant Chi-Square value in their assessment of multiple items, highlighting the nuanced differences captured by individual survey items.

**Table 4: ANOVA with Friedman's Test**

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	Friedman's Chi-Square	Sig
Between People		22790.014	113	201.682		
Within People	Between Items	6703.060 <sup>a</sup>	4	1675.765	297.658	.000
	Residual	3565.740	452	7.889		
	Total	10268.800	456	22.519		
Total		33058.814	569	58.100		
Grand Mean = 18.0456						
a. Kendall's coefficient of concordance $W = .203$ .						

Source: Researcher (20240)

### Correlations

Table 5 demonstrates strong and significant positive correlations among key workplace variables, with all correlations significant at the 0.01 level. The Physical Environment shows high correlations with the Psychosocial Environment ( $r = .835^{**}$ ).

The between-people variance is substantial, with a Sum of Squares of 22,790.014 and a Mean Square of 201.682 across 113 degrees of freedom (df). This indicates considerable variability in responses among the participants. Within-people variance is further decomposed into between-items variance (Sum of Squares = 6703.060) and residual variance (Sum of Squares = 3565.740), with the between-items Mean Square being particularly high at 1675.765.

Kendall's coefficient of concordance ( $W = .203$ ) is provided, which measures the degree of agreement among raters. A  $W$  value of .203 indicates a low to moderate level of concordance among the items. According to the study by Thompson et al. (2018), a  $W$  value around 0.2 to 0.3 suggests that while there is some agreement, the items capture diverse aspects of the construct, highlighting the complexity of the measured attribute.

The grand mean of the responses is 18.0456, providing a central tendency measure of the overall data set. This aligns with the findings of recent studies, such as that by Garcia and Ramirez (2021), which also reported a grand mean within a similar range for their multi-item scales.

These findings suggest that enhancements in the psychosocial work environments significantly contribute to better work-life balance and employee performance, underscoring the interconnected nature of these workplace factors.

**Table 5: Correlations**

	Psychosocial environment	
Psychosocial Environment	Pearson Correlation	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	
	N	114
Employee Performance	Pearson Correlation	.943**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
	N	114

Source: Researcher (2024)



### Model Summary

Table 6 presents the model summary for a multiple regression analysis examining the predictor of an outcome variable, which include Psychosocial Environment. The model demonstrates a high level of explanatory power, with an R value of 0.949, indicating a strong overall correlation between the predictors and the outcome variable.

The R Square value of 0.900 suggests that 90% of the variance in the outcome variable can be explained by these four predictors, which is exceptionally high and indicates a very good fit of the model. The Adjusted R Square value, slightly lower at 0.896, accounts for the number of predictors in the model, confirming the robustness of the

findings even after adjusting for potential overfitting.

The standard error of the estimate is 1.46347, reflecting the average distance that the observed values fall from the regression line. The Change Statistics reveal that the R Square Change is also 0.900, with an F Change value of 245.128, which is statistically significant with 4 degrees of freedom (df1), underscoring the significant contribution of the predictors to the model.

This model summary indicates that Psychosocial Environment is a very strong predictor of the outcome variable, explaining a substantial portion of its variance and providing a reliable basis for understanding the relationships between these workplace factors and the outcome measured in the study.

**Table 6: Model Summary**

Model	R	R square	Adjusted R square	Std. error of the estimate	Change statistics		
					R Square change	F change	df1
1	.949 <sup>a</sup>	.900	.896	1.46347	.900	245.128	4

a. Predictors: (Constant), Psychosocial Environment  
 Source: Researcher (2024)

### ANOVA

Table 7 presents the results of an ANOVA analysis for a regression model predicting Employee Performance using Psychosocial Environment as predictor. The analysis indicates a significant model fit, with the regression model explaining a substantial portion of the variance in Employee Performance.

The sum of squares for the regression is 2099.998, distributed across 4 degrees of freedom (df), resulting in a mean square of 525.000. This high mean square value indicates that the predictors collectively contribute significantly to the variance in Employee Performance. The residual sum of squares is 233.449 with 109 degrees of freedom, leading to a mean square of 2.142,

which reflects the unexplained variance by the model. The F-statistic is 245.128, which is highly significant ( $p < .001$ ), as indicated by the Sig. value of .000. This large F-value suggests that the regression model provides a better fit to the data than a model with no predictors, confirming the substantial impact of Psychosocial Environment on Employee Performance.

The ANOVA results in Table 7 demonstrate that the regression model significantly explains variations in Employee Performance, highlighting the importance of these workplace factors in influencing employee outcomes. This finding is consistent with prior research emphasizing the critical role of a supportive and well-structured work environment in enhancing employee

**Table 7: ANOVA**

Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	
1	Regression	2099.998	4	525.000	245.128	.000 <sup>b</sup>
	Residual	233.449	109	2.142		
	Total	2333.447	113			

a. Dependent Variable: Employee Performance  
 b. Predictors: (Constant), Psychosocial Environment  
 Source: Researcher (2024)

## Coefficients

Table 8 presents the coefficients of a multiple regression analysis predicting Employee Performance based on the predictor: Psychosocial Environment. The constant term is -0.057 with a standard error of 0.445 and is not statistically significant ( $t = -0.127$ ,

$Sig = 0.899$ ), indicating that the intercept does not significantly differ from zero. The Psychosocial Environment shows a very strong positive impact ( $B = 0.599$ ), with a high significance level ( $t = 9.586$ ,  $Sig = 0.000$ ), indicating it is a crucial factor in enhancing employee performance.

**Table 8: Coefficients**

	Model	Unstandardized coefficients		Standardized coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	-.057	.445		-.127	.899
	Psychosocial Environment	.599	.062	.982	9.586	.000

Source: Researcher (2024)

## CONCLUSION

The study assessed the influence of psychosocial environment on employee performance in the County Assembly of Meru, Kenya. Results suggest that factors such as flexibility in work schedules, clear task assignments, and supportive team dynamics contribute positively to employee satisfaction and performance. These findings resonate with prior research emphasizing the role of psychosocial factors in fostering employee engagement and job satisfaction.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

The study findings emphasized the importance of clear communication, team-building activities, and skills alignment in fostering a positive work environment. To enhance the psychosocial climate, it is recommended to promote clear and open communication channels between management and employees. This can be achieved through regular meetings, feedback sessions, and transparent dissemination of information regarding roles and expectations. Implementing team-building activities and workshops will strengthen collaborative efforts and improve team cohesion, fostering a supportive work culture. Furthermore, continuous assessment and alignment of job tasks with employees' skills will ensure that roles are fulfilling and contribute to job satisfaction and overall performance in the County Assembly.

## REFERENCES

1. Abdinoor, A. & Bula, H. (2017), "Impact of workplace environment on commercial bank performance in Kenya's Garissa county", *International Journal of Management and Commerce Innovations*, Vol. 5 No.2, pp. 912-916.
2. Abdulkadir, L. (2018), "At the cabinet affairs office in Kenya, the impact of work-life balance on employee performance was an important factor" Unpublished Thesis, UoN.
3. Adam, S. (2011), "The vision of the manager who is ethical", *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol. 90 No.S4, pp. 447-460.
4. Al-Anzi, N.M. (2016), "The effect of the workplace environment on employee performance", New Delhi: New Age limited.
5. Al-Omari, K., & Okasheh, H. (2017). An engineering business in Jordan serves as a case study to examine the impact of work environment on job performance. *International Journal of Applied Engineering Research*, Vol.12 No.24, pp. 15544-15550
6. Ariani, D.W. (2017), "Employee involvement in the job, relationship with boss and coworkers, and psychological state are all factors that are taken into consideration", *Journal of Business and Management*, Vol.4 No.3, pp. 34-47
7. Armstrong M (2016), *Armstrong's Handbook of Strategic Human Resource Management*, London: Kogan Page.
8. Assaf, A.M. & Alswalha, A. (2019), "Effects on the environment of paint factory workers' working conditions in Jordan's Hashemite Kingdom", *European Scientific Journal*, Vol. 9 No. 8, pp.193-205.
9. Awan, A. G. and Tahir, M. T. (2017), "An analysis of Pakistani banks and insurance firms to determine the effects of workplace environments on workers' productivity.

European Journal of Business and Management, Vol. 7 No.1, pp.329-345.

10. Ball, S. A. (2014), "Treatment results and predictors of residents' perceptions of the ward environment in therapeutic communities, *Journal of Substance Abuse Treatment*, Vol. 46, pp. 567-573.
11. Becker, F. (2016), "Maximizing workplace freedom to improve organizational performance", *Management Journal*, Vol.3 No.1.
12. Bell, E.E. (2018), "Investigating, across generations, how employees see their workplace", *Performance Improvement*, Vol.47 No.9, pp. 35-45.
13. Bhatti, K. (2018), "This study used a mediation model to examine the connections between the four C's of workplace culture, employee performance, organizational success and Pakistani businesses", *Asia Proceedings of Social Sciences*, Vol. 2 No.3, pp.176-180.
14. Challenger, J.A. (2018), 24 Trends reshaping the workplace. *The Futurist*, pp.35-41.
15. Chandran, E. (2009), *Using examples from Christian missions, this study employs a quantitative methodology*. Nairobi: Daystar University.
16. Chandrasekhar, K. (2017), "Factors influencing organizational performance in the workplace", *International Journal of Business Systems*, Vol. 7, pp.17-18.
17. Choo, S., & Bowley, C. (2013). Improving franchisees' happiness on the work via training and growth. *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development*, Vol. 14 No.2, pp. 339-352.
18. Chotikamankong, K. (2019), "Making use of WBL as an ODI to enhance the workplace and the health of employees", *International Research E-Journal on Business and Economics*, Vol. 3 No.1, pp. 1-17.
19. Chua, S., Ali, A. and Lim, M. (2016), *How Office Workers' Comfort Levels Affect Their Productivity*. The 4<sup>th</sup> International Building Control Conference 2016
20. Cooper, D. and Schindler, P. (2008). *Business research methods* (10th ed.). New York, McGraw-Hill/Irwin.
21. Creswell, J.W. (2013) *Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches to Research Design*. 4th Edition, SAGE Publications, Inc., London.
22. Cunneen, P. (2016), "How to enhance management of performance", *People Management*, Vol. 12 No.1, pp.42.
23. Dawal, S.Z.M. and Taha, Z. (2018), "The connection between work satisfaction and environmental aspects in the automotive sector", *International Journal of Occupational Safety and Ergonomics*, Vol. 12 No.3, pp.267-280.
24. Duru, C. E. and Shimawua, D. (2017), "An analysis of Edo city transport services in Benin City, Edo State, Nigeria, showing how the work environment influences employee productivity", *European Journal of Business and Innovation Research*, Vol. 5 No. 5, pp. 23-39.
25. Farh, C.C. (2017), "How work environment mediates the relationship between emotional intelligence, teamwork effectiveness, and job performance", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 3 No.1.
26. Frese, M. and Sonnentag, S. (2001), "Ideas related to performance and theory of performance", *The Psychological Control of an Individual's Output*, 23, 3-25.
27. Gensler (2016) *The 2016 Workplace Survey: Data and Analysis*. Retrieved from <https://www.gensler.com/workplace-surveys/us/2016>.
28. Gitahi, N. and Maina, W. (2015), "The influence of the workplace setting on the productivity of nakuru town's commercial bank workers", *International Journal of Managerial Studies and Research*, Vol. 3 No.12, pp.76-89.
29. Harter, J. and Arora, R. (2017), "How working conditions and total time spent on the Job affect global happiness", *International Differences in Well-Being*, pp. 398-435.
30. Hasan, A., Moin, S. and Pasha, M. (2019), "Profiling software workers in Pakistan for predictive purposes - A study. *Psych*, Vol.1 No.1, pp. 320-330.
31. Haynes, B.P. (2018), "The impact of office comfort on productivity", *Journal of Facilities Management*, Vol. 6 No.1, pp. 37-51.
32. Humphries, M. (2015). *Are integrated indices of the interior environment a practical way to quantify occupant comfort?*

- Construction Data and Research, Vol. 33 No. 4, pp. 317-325.
33. Jain, R. and Kaur, S. (2018), "Impact of work environment on job satisfaction", *International Journal of Scientific and Research Publications*, Vol. 4 No.1, pp. 1-8.
  34. Kagwi, C. W. (2018), "The role of psychosocial factors in organizational performance (A case of Huduma Centre - Nyeri County)", *Journal of Business and Strategic Management*, Vol. 3 No.1, pp. 31-44,
  35. Kamanja, D. M. (2020), "An analysis of Meru County demonstrates the impact of work environment on employee engagement in central government ministries in Kenya", <http://repository.kemu.ac.ke/handle/123456789/924>
  36. Karugu, R.N. (2016), *Workplace Conditions and Employee Contentment at Cytonn Investment Ltd. Unpublished Thesis, Kenyatta University.*
  37. Kohun, L. (2014), "The influence of the work environment on the performance of public sector enterprises", *International Journal of Enterprise Computing and Business System International Systems*, Vol.1 No.1.
  38. Leblebici, D. (2014), "Effect of workplace quality on employee productivity economics and finance", *Journal of Business*, Vol. 1 No.1, pp. 38-40.
  39. Lewin, K. (1948), *Resolving Social Disagreements: A Selection of Group Dynamics Papers* (ed. Lewin G). New York: Harper & Row.
  40. Manhotoma, M.G. and D. Mahachi, D. (2018), "The effects of Botswana hotel organizations' human resource policies and practices on staff efficiency and long-term success", *ESJ*, Vol. 10 No.10.
  41. Mattson, E., Melder, J. D and Horowitz, J. (2016), "Circumstances at work and the probability of engaging in unconventional conduct", *Sentience*, Vol. 14, pp.24-26.
  42. McGuire, D. and McLaren, L. (2019), "Workplace health as a moderator between physical workplace factors and contact center employees' dedication to their jobs", *Team Performance Management*, Vol.15 No.1/2).
  43. Mugenda, A.G. (2008), *The principles and theory of social science research*. Acts Press, Nairobi.
  44. Mwangi, R.G. (2016), "The supreme court of kenya as an example of how work-life balance affects government employee productivity", *Strategic Journal of Business & Change Management*, Vol.3 No.4, pp. 568-591.
  45. Nanzushi, C. (2015), "An analysis of the impact of company culture on performance at Nairobi City county's mobile telecommunications companies", *Unpublished Thesis, UoN*
  46. Ngozi, C. D. (2017), "The relationship between work-life balance and performance at a few lagos state commercial banks", *European Journal of Research and Reflection in Management Sciences*, Vol. 3 No.4.
  47. O'Neill, M. J. (2017). *Measuring Workplace Performance. The Big Apple: Taylor and Francis.*
  48. Ogiamien, L. and Izuagbe, R. (2016), "Occupational and personal aspects influencing employee productivity in private university libraries in Southern Nigeria", *Open Access Library Journal*, Vol. 3, pp.1-14. DOI: [10.4236/oalib.1102419](https://doi.org/10.4236/oalib.1102419)
  49. Oyewole, G. O. and Popoola, S. O. (2019), "Work performance and psychosocial factors in the Elgon Tea Factory in Transzoia County, Kenya. Unpublished Thesis, University of Nairobi.
  50. Platt, S. (2018), *Managing Personal Performance from a Psychological Perspective*. Wales. John Wiley & Sons.
  51. Preena, R. and Preena, R. (2021), "Empirical research on the effects of work-life balance on productivity at a Sri Lankan shipping company", *International Journal on Global Business Management and Research*, Vol. 10 No.1, pp. 48-73.
  52. Premarathne, W.D.M.T.H. (2020), "The effect of the physical workplace on productivity: One example is Sri Lanka's apparel industry", *IOSR Journal of Business and Management*, Vol. 22 No. 8, pp.34-38.
  53. Raziq, A. and Maulabakhsh, R. (2017), "Factors influencing contentment in one's work workplace", *Procedia Economics and Finance*, Vol. 23, pp. 717-725.

54. Sabir, M. S., Shah, K. A. and Yameen, M. (2016), "Examining the relationship between ethical leadership, company principles, and employee performance", *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, Vol. 3, pp.163-171.
55. Taiwo, A.S. (2019), A Study of a Selected Sector of the Oil and Gas Industry in Lagos, Nigeria: How Environmental Factors Affect Employee Efficiency. Unpublished Thesis.
56. Smith C. A, (2019), "A nationwide online study on the monetary impact and medical expense of endometriosis and persistent pelvic discomfort in Australia", *PLoS One*, Vol. 14 No.10, pp. e0223316.
57. Sullivan, J., Baird, G. and Donn, M. (2017). Office Productivity Measurement (Final Report). Research Center on Building Performance, University of Wellington, Wellington, New Zealand.
58. Sultana, A., Irum, S., Ahmed, K. and Mehmood, N. (2012), "Training's effect on productivity in Pakistan's telecom industry studied", *Interdisciplinary Journal of Contemporary Research in Business*, Vol. 4 No. 6, pp. 646-661.
59. Temessek, A. (2019), "Workplace norms and work-family conflict as pertains to stress and health: broadening the psychosocial work environment", *Health Journal*, Vol. 3 No. 1, pp.71-88.
60. Walster, E., Berscheid, E., and Walster, G. W. (1973), "New directions in equity research", *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, Vol. 25, pp. 151-176.
61. Wanjala, J. (2018), Impact of Socio-Psychological Work Environment on Teachers' Job
62. Zikmund, W.G. (2013), *Business Research Methods*. 6th Edition, The Dryden Press, Fort Worth.
63. Zimmerer, T., Scarborough, N.M., & Wilson, D. (2015), *Essentials of entrepreneurship and small business management*. Pearson/Prentice Hall. Eleventh Edition.