

# **EFFECT OF WORK ENVIRONMENT ON ABSENTEE BEHAVIOUR OF EMPLOYEES IN TERTIARY INSTITUTIONS IN KWARA STATE**

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.57233/guijos.v4i3.3>

**ABDULBAQI SALIHU ZAKARIYA, PhD**

Department of Sociology, University of Ilorin, Ilorin Nigeria  
E-mail: [salbaq@unilorin.edu.ng](mailto:salbaq@unilorin.edu.ng) Phone No.: +2348064799651

**TEJIDEEN TOYIN OLAYINKA, PhD**

Department of Sociology, University of Ilorin, Ilorin Nigeria  
E-mail: [tejideen.to@unilorin.edu.ng](mailto:tejideen.to@unilorin.edu.ng) Phone No.: +2348036503456

**BALOGUN OBASANJO SOLOMON**

Department of Criminology and security studies, University of Ilorin, Ilorin Nigeria  
E-mail: [balogun.so@unilorin.edu.ng](mailto:balogun.so@unilorin.edu.ng) Phone No.: +2347063575854

**OLOWOOKERE JELILAT OMOSEWA**

Department of Sociology, University of Ilorin, Ilorin Nigeria  
E-mail: [olowojelilatsewa@gmail.com](mailto:olowojelilatsewa@gmail.com) Phone No.: +2348136686003

**ABDULMUHIT ISIAQ TEMITOPE**

Department of Human Kinetics and Health Education, Ahmad Bello University, Zaria  
E-mail: [abdulmuhitisiaq@gmail.com](mailto:abdulmuhitisiaq@gmail.com) Phone No.: +2348102040184

## **Abstract**

The work environment plays a crucial role in shaping employee behaviour, well-being, and overall performance. The work environment encompasses various factors, such as physical conditions, organizational culture, interpersonal relationships, workload, and job satisfaction. Despite the importance of the work environment, there remains a gap in understanding how it impacts employee absence behaviour within tertiary institutions in Kwara State. This study thus examined the effect of the work environment on the absentee behaviour of employees in tertiary institutions in Kwara State. The study adopted a mixed method. For the quantitative method, the primary research instrument was the questionnaire, while the qualitative method was the interview guide. The study population consisted of male and female academic/non-academic staff in tertiary institutions in Kwara State. A total of nine tertiary institutions were selected for this study out of the 18 tertiary institutions in Kwara state. A purposive sampling technique was deployed to select respondents from the institutions based on their knowledge and availability. For the qualitative approach, purposive sampling (non-probability technique) was used to select nine (9) respondents. The study population consisted of nine thousand, eight hundred and ten (9810) male and female academic/non-academic, full-time/casual employees in tertiary institutions in Kwara State while the sample size was 1200. The findings from the study revealed that employees' work environment is significantly related to job commitment. Similarly, the study found that the respondents' responses from different institutions on the relationship between a conducive working environment and level of motivation are different. The study therefore recommend that efforts should be made by concerned authorities to improve the work environment in tertiary institutions in the study area.

**Keywords:** Absentee behaviour; Employees; Job commitment; Tertiary institutions; Work; environment.

## Introduction

Motivation can be observed to be the drive and force acting on (external) or within (internal) human efforts and actions to initiate, direct and sustain a goal of a specified kind or stop a particular behaviour (Abdulbaqi, 2022). The critical factor is the direction of that stimulus: working hard and doing high-quality work that would activate human energy. Hence, motivation has attracted much attention in recent years among researchers, managers, practitioners, social scientists and theorists such as Ali and Anwar (2021), Aljumah (2023), and Xu et al. (2023). This should not be surprising because the nature of human beings is very complex and unpredictable, which means that humans behave differently at different periods even when faced with similar conditions. It becomes essential to note the factors which might make a worker put in his best and at the same time identify those which can make him put up the worst performance at work. Motivation has always occupied a particular focus in issues about worker behaviour, productivity and effectiveness (Uka & Prendi, 2021).

The term, work environment, revolves around the settings, situations, conditions and circumstances under which people work (Zhenjing et al., 2022). It is further elaborated by Onwuzuligbo and Nwobodo (2022) as a very broad category that encompasses the physical setting (e.g. heat, equipment etc.), characteristics of the job itself (e.g. workload, task complexity), broader organizational features (e.g. culture, history) and even aspects of the extra organizational setting (e.g. local labour market conditions, industry sector, work-home relationships). It examines the sum of the interrelationship that exists among the employees and the employers and the environment in which the employees work which includes the technical, the human and the organisational environment.

Onwuzuligbo and Nwobodo (2022) define workplace environment as the composition of three major sub-environments which include the technical environment, the human environment and the organisational environment. According to them, technical environment refers to tools, equipment, technological infrastructure and other physical or technical elements of the workplace. The human environment includes peers, others with whom employees relate, team and work groups, interactional issues, leadership and management.

Employee behaviour in the workplace is often affected by how they feel while working there (Zhenjing et al., 2022). Understanding people's work habits, which invariably revolve around personal feelings, beliefs, and emotions regarding various aspects of their

lives, is critical to understanding how they behave (Zhenjing et al., 2022). Humans have feelings about the food they eat, the people they meet, the classes they take, and the activities they participate in (Renn et al., 2024). Many workplace habits have the most significant influence on how workers behave (Renn et al., 2024).

Research in organisational behaviour has addressed some work behaviours such as job satisfaction, job analysis, job performance, job effectiveness, job efficiency, job involvement, and organisational loyalty, among others, about productivity (Obiekwe et al., 2019; Azila-Gbettor et al., 2022). However, not much research has been carried out regarding the effect of the work environment on the absentee behaviour of employees in tertiary institutions. Human activity has to be understood in terms of the interplay between human thought faculties and the environmental contingencies with which they are faced (Yunita et al., 2023). Therefore, it is wise to suspend the questions of what humans intrinsically are and pay attention to what they make of themselves and their situation. Hence, the focus of this paper is to examine the effect of the work environment on absentee behaviour in tertiary institutions in Kwara State, Nigeria. The emphasis of this research is on tertiary institutions because they are the bedrock of long-term national growth, which includes economic structural transformation, human capital development, technological innovation, socio-economic aspirations, democratic citizenship creation, social stability, nation-building, and environmental preservation.

### **Study Hypothesis**

H1: There is no significant effect on respondents' work environment and their work behaviour (in terms of absentee behaviour).

### **Literature Review**

Work activity refers to an employee's or employees' expressed conduct about their employment (Adekeye et al., 2017). There are two types of workplace activity. Job actions, according to Bashir and Gani (2020), have both subjective and objective aspects. The subjective factor, which deals with psychological needs, expectations, and work perceptions, includes job satisfaction, commitment, loneliness, values, needs, aspirations, orientation to work, and motivation. The objective aspect of job behaviour, which is concerned with performance, includes productivity, labour, turnover, absenteeism, disability, strikes, and other forms of industrial protest.

According to Inayat and Khan (2021), our behaviour toward work is still affected by the nature of the environment including but not limited to the availability of resources, and conduciveness among others. As a consequence, understanding how people behave requires knowing their work attitudes. Attitudes refer to feelings, beliefs, and opinions on different aspects of the world (Brousmyche et al., 2016). Many workplace habits have the most significant potential to influence our work actions. These are work satisfaction, job commitment, and organizational contribution, which are covered in this research. It is difficult to exaggerate how unhappy people are at work. If the number of studies on job satisfaction is any indication, one of the most critical job behaviours is likely to be job satisfaction (Inayat & Khan, 2021).

Empirical studies abound that attempt to link workplace environmental factors to other employee factors. The study of Tio (2014), used 74 samples with multiple regression analysis to measure the significance of work environment on job satisfaction among staff of a particular organisation. The study found that the work environment significantly determines job satisfaction. This result corroborates the findings of previous research that investigated the connection between variables in the workplace environment and workforce or work process (Emmanuel, 2022; Kodarlikar & Umale, 2020; Pimpong, 2023; Nakpodia, 2011; Vikas & Ravis, 2011; Zhenjing et al., 2022). Other research works have been specific on factors inherent in the workplace environment. For instance, Ali-Yasin, Abdiaziz and Abdiqani (2013) investigated and found that working conditions were significantly related to employee productivity in the manufacturing sector. With particular focus on such variables as comfort level and temperature in office work, the study of Junaida et al. (2010) investigated the physical work environment on staff productivity. With 150 participants among civil servants in the Ministry of Youth and Sports in Malaysia, the study revealed the same result. This was however on workplace environment and employee productivity.

The study of Demet (2012) also revealed a significant positive relationship between workplace quality and productivity among bank workers while Faridah, Rahmatul and Razidah (2012) deviate a little from the trend in research on workplace environment. They studied the organisational environment-behaviour and its influence on safety culture in an organisation. In their opinion, as an organisation behaves, so does the working environment, and this behaviour determines the level of safety consciousness among staff. Regardless of which environmental variables were examined, there seems to be a general census among these researchers. It is generally concluded that workplace environmental factors

significantly influence other employee-related variables like health, safety, and well-being (Jain & Kaur, 2014), job satisfaction (Tio, 2014; Saddat et al., 2013), safety culture (Faridah et al., 2012), job performance (Ajayi et al., 2011), organisational performance in public sectors (Obiekwe et al., 2019) and so forth. What seems unsatisfying is that many of these researches were carried out in other developed countries and are foreign to the African context.

Few studies which have attempted to study African workplace environmental factors on staff-related variables were done in workplaces other than campuses and those studies conducted in universities fail to show the empirical link between workplace environmental factors and either teaching and nonteaching staff of higher institutions of learning (Abonyi et al., 2022; Ajayi et al., 2011; Kasimu et al., 2024; Woru et al., 2024; Zhenjing et al., 2022). The dependent variable in the study of Ajayi et al. (2011) was job satisfaction while workers' morale and perceived productivity in industrial organisations was the dependent variable in Akintayo's study in 2012. Akinyele (2010) did another study that linked the workplace environment to workers' productivity in the oil and gas industry. Yusuf and Metiboba (2012) also linked the work environment with workers' attitudes in all organisations in general.

Unavoidable, habitual, and unplanned absences are referred to as absenteeism. These are typical workplace habits that irritate both managers and coworkers. When an employee is not present at work, his or her morale plummets to zero (Kim & Lee, 2022). Unplanned employee absences are typically expected to cost between 2 and 4% of total working time (Kocakulah et al., 2016). Absenteeism research is uncommon, and there is little consensus on the root causes across disciplines, despite these significant worker absences (Harter & Adelson, 2022). Absenteeism is a significant problem for Irish businesses. According to the Irish Industry and Employers' Confederation (IBEC), absenteeism costs Irish businesses €1.5 billion a year, or €818 per employee (Kodarlikar & Umale, 2020). Absenteeism costs the economy 11 million days per year, according to the same study (Kodarlikar & Umale, 2020). In America, the epidemic is the same, and the numbers are just as troubling. The median number of days lost due to anxiety, stress, and associated illnesses was 25, significantly higher than the overall nonfatal accident and illness median of 6 (Farrants & Alexanderson, 2024).

Employee absence has a wide range of direct and indirect effects (Vega et al., 2020). For example, absenteeism causes higher prices, which can be caused both directly and indirectly. Employees are responsible for direct costs such as compulsory maternity leave, the cost of covering absences with temporary workers, and lower productivity (Kocakulah et al., 2016). Indirect costs, such as low morale among substitute staff and lower customer satisfaction, are challenging to quantify, affecting overall production levels (Ladson, 2019). Another consequence of absenteeism is a disturbance of workflow and decreased product quality (Kocakulah et al., 2018). When it comes to the costs of absenteeism, the effect on businesses and even a country's economy is immense. Businesses and politicians would benefit from a clearer understanding of absenteeism determinants (Čikeš et al., 2018). As a result, legislators are focusing their efforts on improving the situation.

### **Theoretical Framework**

This study is anchored on theory of Neoliberalism. Economic emancipation proponents contend that higher efficiency and effectiveness would result in a "bigger pie" for all (Crotty, 2000). To remain globally competitive, most countries have pursued Economic Liberalization, which includes partial or complete privatization of government agencies and assets, increased labour-market flexibility, lower corporate taxes, fewer controls on domestic and foreign capital, free markets, and so on.

Companies and countries that are easy to adapt, slow to complain, and open to change, according to Blair (2007), will prosper. In the sense of developing countries, neoliberalism refers to economic liberalization or the opening up of their markets to international capital and investment. Neoliberalism ushered in a modern financial movement at the turn of the century (Dumenil & Levy, 2002). A massive wave of mergers occurred as a new financial system was created that was closely linked to the economy, resulting in a new network of Capitalist institutions.

Economic emancipation proponents contend that higher efficiency and effectiveness would result in a "bigger pie" for all (Crotty, 2000). This means for better performance of employees in tertiary institutions, the staff are to be highly equipped with the required tools necessary for required functions. The work environment should be conducive. Physiological, psychological as well as social needs of staff should be catered to. All these would eventually transform institutions into well-functioning organizations with the stated objectives consistently met.

## Methodology

The study adopted a mixed method (triangulation), which entailed the use of survey design and critical informant interview. Quantitative and qualitative techniques were adopted in collecting the data. The study population consisted of nine thousand, eight hundred and ten (9810) male and female academic/non-academic, full-time/casual employees in tertiary institutions in Kwara State. Using Research Advisor's (2006) sample size table at a confidence level of 95%, confidence interval of 3 and population of 9,810, the sample size needed for this study is 963. However, to cater to those respondents who might not return the questionnaires and those who might not complete their questionnaires, an additional 237 were added, making a total sample size of 1200. A total of nine tertiary institutions were selected for this study out of the 18 tertiary institutions in Kwara state. A purposive sampling technique was deployed to select respondents from the institutions based on the purpose of the study.

For the qualitative approach, purposive sampling (non-probability technique) was used to select nine (9) respondents. Each interview session lasted for only 10 minutes. With this procedure, a representative sample whose characteristics are approximately the same as that of the entire population under study was guaranteed. For the quantitative method, the primary research instrument was the questionnaire, while the qualitative method was the interview guide. The quantitative data were analysed using chi-square and multiple regression while content analysis was used to analyse the qualitative data.

## Results

The findings of the study are described below.

**Table 1:** Socio-demographic Characteristics of Respondents

| Socio-demographic characteristics | Options            | Frequency | Percentage (%) |
|-----------------------------------|--------------------|-----------|----------------|
| Sex                               | Male               | 704       | 61.2           |
|                                   | Female             | 447       | 38.8           |
|                                   | <b>Total</b>       | 1151      | 100            |
| Age                               | Below 25           | 76        | 6.6            |
|                                   | 26-30              | 161       | 14.0           |
|                                   | 31-35              | 157       | 13.6           |
|                                   | 36-40              | 360       | 31.3           |
|                                   | 41-45              | 281       | 24.4           |
|                                   | 46 years and above | 116       | 10.1           |
|                                   | <b>Total</b>       | 1151      | 100            |
| Marital Status                    | Married            | 1036      | 90.0           |
|                                   | Single             | 86        | 7.5            |
|                                   | Widow              | 17        | 1.5            |
|                                   | Separated          | 12        | 1.0            |
|                                   | <b>Total</b>       | 1151      | 100            |

|                  |                     |      |      |
|------------------|---------------------|------|------|
| <b>Education</b> | No Formal Education | 23   | 2.4  |
|                  | Primary Education   | 204  | 17.7 |
|                  | Secondary Education | 266  | 23.1 |
|                  | Tertiary Education  | 653  | 56.7 |
|                  | <b>Total</b>        | 1151 | 100  |

**Source: Researchers' Field Survey, 2022**

The percentage frequency distribution of the respondents concerning sex shows that 704 (61.2%) of the respondents were males, with 447 (38.8%) being females. The frequency distribution about sex shows that the male respondents are numerically more than the female counterparts. It could be deduced that, while male academic staff are more than female lecturers in tertiary institutions in Kwara State, male and female non-academic staff are almost the same in tertiary institutions in Kwara.

The presentation of findings of age shows that 76 (6.6%) of the respondents were below 25 years of age; 161 (14.0%) were 26-30 years old; 157 (13.6%) of the respondents were 31-35 years old; 360 (31.3%) of the respondents were 36-40 years old; 281 (24.4%) of the respondents were 41-45 years old, and 116 (10.1%) of the respondents were aged 46 years old and above. The respondents' distribution by age shows that respondents in the age range of 36-40 are the most significant percentage of the sample (31.3%).

The acquired data signify that 996 (86.5%) of the respondents were married; 6 (0.5%) were single; 7 (0.6%) of the respondents were widows/widowers, and 142 (12.3%) of the respondents were separated. The statistics show that the married are numerically superior to other categories. It could be deduced that the majority of academic and non-academic staff are married. The researcher observed that two are likely to be single out of 10 staff in tertiary institutions in Kwara State. This is expected because of most of the academic and non-academic staff of tertiary institutions in Kwara State. This is supported by the view of Nwosu et al. (2018) that the majority of the staff in academic and non-academic staff are married.

Concerning education, the findings show that 28 (2.4%) of the respondents have no formal education; 204 (17.7%) are limited to primary school education; 266 (23.1%) of the respondents are limited to secondary school education, and 653 (56.7%) are tertiary institution graduates. The frequency distribution in terms of education shows that tertiary institution graduates are numerically superior. It is expected that tertiary institutions' staff will have higher degrees because it is the minimum academic qualification for most

positions in tertiary institutions. Also, this may be because it increases the chances of promotion at work and the level of appointment.

### Descriptive Statistics

**Table 2: Respondents' Degree of Motivation when working in a Conducive Environment**

| Options            | Frequency   | Percentage   | Cumulative Percentage |
|--------------------|-------------|--------------|-----------------------|
|                    | N           | %            | %                     |
| Highly motivated   | 228         | 19.8         | 19.8                  |
| Motivated          | 307         | 28.2         | 48                    |
| Neutral            | 61          | 5.3          | 53.3                  |
| Unmotivated        | 325         | 26.7         | 80                    |
| Highly unmotivated | 230         | 20.0         | 100                   |
| <b>Total</b>       | <b>1151</b> | <b>100.0</b> | <b>100</b>            |

**Source: Researchers' Field Survey, 2022**

An examination of the respondents relative to their degree of motivation when working in a conducive environment shows that 228 (19.8 percent) of the respondents are highly motivated when working in a conducive environment; 307 (26.7 percent) of the respondents are motivated when working in a conducive environment; 61 (5.3 percent) of the respondents are neutral when working in a conducive environment; 325 (28.2 percent) of the respondents are unmotivated when working in a conducive environment, and 230 (20.0 percent) of the respondents are highly unmotivated when working in a conducive environment. This supports the findings of Yusuf and Metiboba (2012), Onoyase (2017) and Akah et al. (2022) on the importance of the work environment.

**Table 3: Respondents' Frequency in Attendance Behaviour**

| Options        | Frequency   | Percentage   | Cumulative Percentage |
|----------------|-------------|--------------|-----------------------|
|                | N           | %            | %                     |
| Very regular   | 348         | 30.2         | 30.2                  |
| Regular        | 409         | 35.5         | 65.7                  |
| Very irregular | 156         | 13.6         | 79.3                  |
| Irregular      | 238         | 20.7         | 100                   |
| <b>Total</b>   | <b>1151</b> | <b>100.0</b> | <b>100</b>            |

**Source: Researchers' Field Survey, 2022**

An examination of the respondents relative to frequency in attendance behaviour shows that 348 (30.2%) are very regular, 409 (35.5%) are regular, 156 (13.6%) are very

irregular, and 238 (20.7%) are irregular. This means that the majority, 409 (35.5 percent), of the respondents, were regular regarding attendance behaviour.

**Table 4: Respondents' Perception of Irregular Attendance at Work**

| Options         | Frequency   | Percentage   | Cumulative Percentage |
|-----------------|-------------|--------------|-----------------------|
|                 | N           | %            | %                     |
| I see it as bad | 747         | 64.9         | 64.9                  |
| It is not bad   | 404         | 35.1         | 100                   |
| <b>Total</b>    | <b>1151</b> | <b>100.0</b> | <b>100</b>            |

**Source: Researchers' Field Survey, 2022**

The data presented in Table 3 shows that the majority, 747 (64.9 percent) of the respondents, revealed that they perceive irregular attendance at work as bad. This may be because irregular attendance affects productivity, which no institution can survive without, as cited by Olatunji et al. (2015).

**Table 5: Respondents' Degree of Motivation when working in a Conducive Environment**

| Options            | Frequency   | Percentage   | Cumulative Percentage |
|--------------------|-------------|--------------|-----------------------|
|                    | N           | %            | %                     |
| Highly motivated   | 228         | 19.8         | 19.8                  |
| Motivated          | 307         | 28.2         | 48                    |
| Neutral            | 61          | 5.3          | 53.3                  |
| Unmotivated        | 325         | 26.7         | 80                    |
| Highly unmotivated | 230         | 20.0         | 100                   |
| <b>Total</b>       | <b>1151</b> | <b>100.0</b> | <b>100</b>            |

**Source: Researchers' Field Survey, 2022**

The examination of the respondents relative to their degree of motivation when working in a conducive environment shows that 228 (19.8 percent) of the respondents are highly motivated when working in a conducive environment; 307 (26.7 percent) of the respondents are motivated when working in a conducive environment; 61 (5.3 percent) of the respondents are neutral when working in a conducive environment; 325 (28.2 percent) of the respondents are unmotivated when working in a conducive environment, and 230 (20.0 percent) of the respondents are highly unmotivated when working in a conducive environment. This data presented shows that the majority of the respondents, 307 (28.2 percent), are motivated when working in a conducive environment. This supports the

findings of Yusuf and Metiboba (2012), Olatunji et al. (2015), and Onoyase (2017) on the importance of the work environment. The following table focuses on the degree of motivation by promotion in a consistent manner.

### **Test of Hypothesis on the Relationship between Work Environment and Absence Behaviour**

$H_0^1$  = There is no significant relationship between work environment and worker's absentee behaviour. In testing the hypothesis, two variables are of interest; work environment and worker's absence satisfaction.

**Table 6: Cross-tabulation of Work Environment and Absentee Behaviour**

|                    | Worker's Absentee Behaviour |            |                |            | Total       |
|--------------------|-----------------------------|------------|----------------|------------|-------------|
|                    | Very Regular                | Regular    | Very Irregular | Irregular  |             |
| Highly motivated   | 127                         | 56         | 12             | 33         | <b>228</b>  |
| Motivated          | 111                         | 111        | 48             | 55         | <b>325</b>  |
| Neutral            | 11                          | 13         | 21             | 16         | <b>61</b>   |
| Unmotivated        | 49                          | 168        | 39             | 51         | <b>307</b>  |
| Highly Unmotivated | 50                          | 61         | 36             | 83         | <b>230</b>  |
| <b>Total</b>       | <b>348</b>                  | <b>409</b> | <b>156</b>     | <b>238</b> | <b>1151</b> |

**Source: Researchers' Field Survey, 2022**

$\chi^2 c = 196.853$      $\chi^2 t = 21.026$ ; Alpha level = 0.05

**To obtain the degree of freedom, a formula is used**

$df = (r-1)(c-1) = (5-1)(4-1) = (4)(3) = 12$

The results in Table 6 show the calculated chi-square value to be 196.853. The degree of freedom is calculated to be 12. After checking the chi-square table, 21.026 is arrived at as the chi-square tabulated. Since the  $\chi^2 c$  is greater than the  $\chi^2 t$ , the alternate hypothesis is accepted, and the null is rejected. This connotes that there is a significant relationship between the work environment and workers' absence behaviour. When the respondents were interviewed, we asked them to comment on whether the work environment influenced their absence behaviour, the following statements made by some of them in assessing how the work environment influenced their absence behaviour are quite revealing. For example, in an interview on 22/08/2022, an employee who is an academic staff of University of Ilorin had this to say about the posed question:

A good work environment is very important. When the environment is not good, employees will not be motivated to come to work. It is only natural. There was a time when we had a total blackout in this institution.

I had to stay back at home because I needed electricity to carry out some activities. I was absent from work on that particular day. Many of my colleagues were absent then too.

In an interview, a female respondent who is a non-academic staff of Kwara State University responded that:

Listen to me. Even if the employees come to work, an unsafe work environment can lead to involuntary absence through the ensuing work hazard. I know someone who once fell from a flight of stairs that ought to have been fixed a long time ago. He had to miss work because he was in the hospital. He did not intend to miss work in that scenario, but the circumstances were beyond his control.

In another interview, a male respondent, a lecturer and an associate professor at Alhikmah University had this to say about the posed question:

Honestly, it is not like our work environment is something to write home about. The air conditioner is always faulty, and we are frequently cut off from internet connectivity. Despite these and more, I still come to work regularly. It would help if you saw how universities are in terms of the work environment. When I went to international conferences, I was mesmerized. We are simply lagging. However, that has not impacted my attendance behaviour in any way.

A female respondent who is a casual staff of University of Ilorin had this to say in response to the posed question:

I will not lie; the work environment influenced my attendance behaviour. If this institution were as aesthetically pleasing as Harvard University, I would not miss a day's work. That is simply the truth of the matter. However, as that is not so, I sometimes decide to stay home for the day if I find out that there is no light. I cannot survive in a place where there is too much heat. It adversely affects my health.

It appears from the comments harvested above that the majority of the respondents interviewed believed that their work environment influenced their absentee behaviour, complementing the findings in Table 6.

#### Test of Multiple Regression Analysis

| R    | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. error of the estimate | R square change | F change | df1 | df2 | Sig. F change |
|------|----------|-------------------|----------------------------|-----------------|----------|-----|-----|---------------|
| .861 | .752     | .749              | .34510                     | .785            | 267.213  | 4   | 471 | .000          |

### Regression Results on Determinants of Work Environment

| Model            | Unstandardized coefficient |           | Standardized coefficient | T     | Sig. |
|------------------|----------------------------|-----------|--------------------------|-------|------|
|                  | B                          | Std error | Beta                     |       |      |
| (Constant)       | .732                       | .126      |                          | 6.346 | .000 |
| Work environment | .675                       | .131      | .043                     | 1.084 | .000 |

Source: Researchers' Field Survey, 2022

The above multiple regression analysis results show that respondents' work environment affects absence behaviour. Thus, figure 0.732 represents the magnitude of the intercept. This intercept means that whether these independent variables are available or not, about 0.732 factors contributing to the work environment in the study area will exist. S.E. represents the standard error of the parameter estimate. It is used to test the significance of the hypothesis. The hypothesis is statistically significant if the computed standard error is less than half of the numerical value of the parameter estimate. Thus, from the results of this regression analysis, it is clear that the computed standard error of the regression model is (0.126) for intercept, while (0.131) is for the slopes of the dependent variables. Therefore, it is clear that the standard errors of the parameter estimates validate the magnitude of their contribution and relationship with work behaviour.

R-Square ( $R^2$ ) measures the goodness of fit of the regression model. It represents the proportion of total variation of the dependent variable as explained by the independent variables. Based on this regression result, about 79% of the total variation of the dependent variable (absence behaviour) is explained by the independent variables. Hence, it shows the strength of the regression model. This implies that there were only 21% of variables that were not explained in the model. Based on this, there were enough variables in the model to measure the work environment.

Above all, F-test statistics test the overall significance of the estimated regression analysis model. The computed empirical value of the F-test is 267.213 while its theoretical value at 0.05 level of significance is 2.84. Since the computed empirical value is greater than its theoretical value, it is concluded that the F-test is statistically significant. Therefore, the whole regression model is statistically significant.

**Table 7: Disaggregation of Conducive Environment and Work Behaviour Based on Institutions**

|                                                                | Institution                                         |               |              |               |               |             |                      |                               |                     |
|----------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------|---------------|--------------|---------------|---------------|-------------|----------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------|
| How motivated are you when working in a conducive environment? | Unilorin                                            | KWASU         | Al-Hikmah    | Kwara Poly    | Offa Poly     | Poly Igbowu | College of Education | Muyideen College of Education | Nana Ayisha College |
| Highly motivated                                               | 88<br>(38.6%)                                       | 0<br>(0.0%)   | 13<br>(5.7%) | 39<br>(17.1)  | 56<br>(24.6%) | 2<br>(0.9%) | 22<br>(9.6%)         | 5<br>(2.2%)                   | 3<br>(1.3%)         |
| Motivated                                                      | 125<br>(40.7%)                                      | 29<br>(9.4%)  | 21<br>(6.8%) | 41<br>(13.4%) | 52<br>(16.9%) | 2<br>(0.7%) | 30<br>(9.8%)         | 7<br>(2.3%)                   | 0<br>(0.0%)         |
| Neutral                                                        | 23<br>(37.7%)                                       | 0<br>(0.0%)   | 5<br>(8.2%)  | 13<br>(21.3%) | 12<br>(19.7%) | 1<br>(1.6%) | 5<br>(8.2%)          | 2<br>(3.3%)                   | 0<br>(0.0%)         |
| Unmotivated                                                    | 145<br>(44.6%)                                      | 96<br>(29.5%) | 14<br>(4.3%) | 14<br>(4.3%)  | 17<br>(5.2%)  | 0<br>(0.0%) | 36<br>(11.1%)        | 2<br>(0.6%)                   | 1 (0.3%)            |
| Highly unmotivated                                             | 101<br>(43.9%)                                      | 52<br>(22.6%) | 13<br>(5.7%) | 16<br>(7.0%)  | 22<br>(9.6%)  | 0<br>(0.0%) | 23<br>(10.0%)        | 0<br>(0.0%)                   | 2<br>(1.3%)         |
| <b>ANOVA</b>                                                   | <b>F = 19.938 and the significant value is 0.01</b> |               |              |               |               |             |                      |                               |                     |

**Source: Researchers' Field Survey, 2022**

From table 7, the responses from the different institutions on the relationship between a conducive working environment and level of motivation are different. The  $F=19.938$  is statistically significant at 0.01. This implies a statistically significant difference in the responses of respondents from various institutions on the relationship between a conducive working environment and level of motivation. This could be plausible because the work environments of the selected tertiary institutions are different. This could have impacted their responses as well as service delivery and productivity in their respective institutions.

### Discussion of Findings

The finding from this study revealed a significant relationship between work environment and absence behaviour. This supports Kodarlikar and Umale's (2020) findings that an unsafe work environment causes high rates of employee absenteeism. Yusuf and Metiboba (2012) and Olatunji et al. (2016) have noted the importance of the work environment in their study. However, the result of this study is against the findings of Onoyase (2017), who discovered that there is no significant relationship between employees' work environment and their work behaviour. According to Onoyase (2017), a larger force that motivates staff to work is salary.

## Conclusion

It can be drawn from the findings of the study that there were variations in the socio-demographics of the respondents, as has been pointed out. Employees' work environment was established to be significantly related to job commitment. This implies that a serene work environment is more likely to bring about greater levels of commitment among employees of tertiary institutions in Kwara State. Similarly, the study found that the respondents' responses from different institutions on the relationship between a conducive working environment and level of motivation are different. The  $F = 19.938$  is statistically significant at 0.01. This implies a statistically significant difference in the responses of respondents from various institutions on the relationship between a conducive working environment and level of motivation. This could be plausible because the work environments of the selected tertiary institutions are different. This could have impacted their responses as well as service delivery and productivity in their respective institutions.

## Recommendations

- i. Efforts should be made by the university management to improve the work environment in various tertiary institutions.
- ii. It has been established that the work environment is one of the motivators of work behaviour. Therefore, it should be made standard if the best work behaviour is to be obtained from employees.

## References

- Abdulbaqi, S. Z. (2022). *Motivation and work behaviour among employees in different employment types in tertiary institutions in Kwara State, Nigeria* (Doctoral Thesis). University of Ilorin, Ilorin, Nigeria.
- Abonyi, U. K., Yeboah, R., Luguterah, A. W., & Serpa, S. (2020). Exploring work environment factors influencing the application of teacher professional development in Ghanaian basic schools. *Cogent Social Sciences*, 6(1). <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311886.2020.1778915>
- Adekeye O. A., Igbino A. O., Solarin M. A., Ahmadu F. O., & Owoyomi O. E. (2017). *Exploring occupational stress and job involvement of workers in private and public organizations*. <https://eprints.covenantuniversity.edu.ng/12261/1/EXPLORING%20OCCUPATIONAL%20STRESS%20AND%20JOB%20INVOLVEMENT.pdf>

- Ajayi, I. A., Awosusi, O. O., Arogundade, B. B., & Ekundayo, H. T. (2011). Work environment as correlate of academic staff job performance in South West Nigerian Universities. *European Journal of Educational Studies*, 3(1).
- Akah, L. U., Owan, V. J., Aduma, P. O., Onyenweaku, E. O., Olofu, M. A., Alawa, D. A., Ikutal, A., & Usoro, A. A. (2022). Occupational stress and academic staff job performance in two Nigerian Universities. *Journal of Curriculum and Teaching*, 11(5), 64-78
- Akinyele, S. T. (2010) The Influence of work environment on workers productivity: A case of selected oil and gas industry in Lagos, Nigeria. *African Journal of Business Management*, 4(3), 299-307
- Ali, B. J., & Anwar, G. (2021). An empirical study of employees' motivation and its influence on job satisfaction. *International Journal of Engineering, Business and Management*, 5(2), 21-30. <https://doi.org/10.22161/ijebm.5.2.3>
- Ali-Yassin, S. A., Abdiaziz, A. A., & Abdiqani A. A. (2013). Working conditions and employees' productivity in manufacturing companies in Sub-Saharan African context: case of Somalia. *Educational Research International*, 2(2).
- Aljumah, A. (2023). The impact of extrinsic and intrinsic motivation on job satisfaction: The mediating role of transactional leadership. *Cogent Business & Management*, 10(3). <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311975.2023.2270813>
- Azila-Gbetteor, E. M., Atsu, E., & Quarshie, A. N. K. (2022). Job stress and job involvement among tertiary interns: the buffering role of perceived coworker support. *Heliyon*, 8(9), e10414. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2022.e10414>
- Bashir, B., & Gani, A. (2020). Testing the effects of job satisfaction on organizational commitment. *Journal of Management Development*, 39(4), 525-542. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JMD-07-2018-0210>
- Blair, R. J. R. (2007). Aggression, psychopathy and free will from a cognitive neuroscience perspective. *Behavioural sciences and the law*, 25(2), 321-331.
- Brousmiche, K.-L., Kant, J.-D., Sabouret, N., & Prenot-Guinard, F. (2016). From beliefs to attitudes: Polias, a model of attitude dynamics based on cognitive modeling and field data. *Journal of Artificial Societies and Social Simulation*, 19(4), 2. <https://doi.org/10.18564/jasss.3161>
- Čikeš, V., Ribarić, H. M., & Črnjar, K. (2018). The determinants and outcomes of absence behavior: A systematic literature review. *Social Sciences*, 7(8), 120. <https://doi.org/10.3390/socsci7080120>
- Crotty, W. (2000). Ireland: Economics and the reinventing of a Nation. *Policy Studies Journal*, 28(4), 799-814.
- Demet L. (2012) Impact of workplace quality on employee's productivity: case study of a bank in Turkey. *Journal of Business, Economics & Finance*, 1(1).

- Dumenil, G., & Levy, D. (2002). The profit rate: where and how much did it fall? Did it recover? (USA 1948-2000). *Review of Radical Political Economics*, 34(4), 437-461. <https://doi.org/10.1177/048661340203400403>
- Emmanuel, O. O. (2022). The dynamics of work environment and its impact on organizational objectives. *Annals of Human Resource Management Research*, 1(2), 145–158. <https://doi.org/10.35912/ahrmr.v1i2.826>
- Faridah I., Rahmatul H. S., & Razidah I. (2012). *The organisational environment-behaviour factors' towards safety culture development*. Paper presented at Asia Pacific International Conference on Environment-Behaviour Studies, Salamis Bay Conti Resort Hotel, Famagusta, North Cyprus, 7- 9.
- Farrants, K., & Alexanderson, K. (2024). Sickness absence after work accidents and post-traumatic stress among white-collar workers in the retail and wholesale industry; a longitudinal Swedish cohort study. *BMC Public Health*, 24(1), 2389. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-024-19865-0>
- Harter, J., & Adelson, J. (2022). Job satisfaction and absenteeism: A longitudinal study. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 43(4), 651-665.
- Inayat, W., & Khan, M. J. (2021). A study of job satisfaction and its effect on the performance of employees working in private sector organizations, Peshawar. *Education Research International*, 2021(1), 1-9. <https://doi.org/10.1155/2021/1751495>
- Jain, R. & Kaur, S. (2014) Impact of work environment on job satisfaction. *International Journal of Scientific and Research Publications*, 4(1), 1-8.
- Junaida, I., Mahadir, L., Hajjar, M. S., & Afida, A. (2010) The Influence of physical workplace environment on the productivity of civil servants: the case of the Ministry of Youth and Sports, Putrajaya, Malaysia. *Voice of Academia*, 5(1), 21-37
- Kasimu, S., Matakhitwen, K., & Emmanuel, D. (2024). Work environment and academic staff performance in tertiary institutions in Nigeria. *International Journal of Applied and Advanced Multidisciplinary Research*, 2(3), 259–270. <https://doi.org/10.59890/ijaamr.v2i3.1587>
- Kim, J., & Lee, Y. (2022). Mental health and absenteeism: A systematic review. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 27(3), 537-555.
- Kocakulah, M. C., Bryan, T. G., & Lynch, S. (2018). Effects of absenteeism on company productivity, efficiency, and profitability. *Business and Economic Research*, 8(1), 115-135. <https://doi.org/10.5296/ber.v8i1.12800>
- Kocakulah, M. C., Kelley, A. G., Mitchell, K. M., Ruggieri, M. P. (2016). Absenteeism problems and costs: Causes, effects and cures. *International Business & Economics Research Journal*, 15(3), 89-96
- Kodarlikar, M., & Umale, V. (2020). A healthy workplace environment: Impact on employee and organizational performance. *IRE Journals*, 4(2), 116–122.

- Ladson, D. A. (2019). *Strategies for increasing employee morale and mitigating turnover in the banking industry* (Doctoral dissertation). Walden University.
- Nakpodia, E. D. (2011) Work environment and productivity among primary school teachers in Nigeria. *International Multidisciplinary Journal, Ethiopia*, 5(5), 367-381
- Nwosu, I. A., Nsude, I., Nwafor, K. A., Oginyi, R. C. N., & Ugwuanyi, C. U. (2018). Evaluation of work attitude and job performance among non-teaching staff of a Nigerian University. *IOSR Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 23(8), 71-80.
- Obiekwe, O., Obibhunun, L., & Omah, O. (2019). Impact of employee job satisfaction on organizational performance. *Academic Journal of Current Research*, 6(12), 6-12.
- Olatunji, A. G., Ola-Rilwan, S., Akor, S. J. & Badmus, I. S. (2015). Nature of employment and work behaviour of bank employees. *Nigerian Journal of Applied Behavioural Sciences*, 3(June), 285-300.
- Onoyase, A. (2017). Motivation and job performance of lecturers of tertiary institutions in Nigeria: Implication for counselling. *Journal of Educational Research*, 4(2), 280-289. <https://doi.org/10.22158/wjer.v4n2p280>
- Onwuzuligbo, L. T., & Nwobodo, V. O. (2022). Work environment and employee performance: A study of pharmaceutical firms in Enugu State, Nigeria. *British International Journal of Business and Marketing Research*, 5(6), 10-22. <https://aspjournals.org/Journals/index.php/bijbmr/index>
- Pimpong, M. (2023). Work environmental factors and its impact on employee productivity: The mediating role of employee commitment. *E-Journal of Humanities, Arts and Social Sciences (EHASS)*, 4(8), 916–935. <https://doi.org/10.38159/ehass.2023482>
- Renn, R. W., Preston, F., Fabian, F., & Steinbauer, R. (2024). Employee work habits: A definition and process model. *Human Resource Management Review*, 34(2), 101009. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2023.101009>
- Research Advisors (2006). *Sample size table*. <http://research-advisors.com/tools/SampleSize.htm>
- Saddat H. K., Zarqa A., Sajida P., Farheen N., & Malik M. S. (2013) Exploring the impact of infrastructure, pay incentives and workplace environment on employees' performance: a case study of Sargodha University. *Asian Journal of Empirical Research*, 2(4), 118-140
- Tio, E. (2014). The impact of working environment towards employee job satisfaction: a case study In PT.X. *iBuss Management*, 2(1), 1-5
- Uka, A., & Prendi, A. (2021). Motivation as an indicator of performance and productivity from the perspective of employees. *Management & Marketing. Challenges for the Knowledge Society*, 16(3), 268-285. <https://doi.org/10.2478/mmcks-2021-0016>
- Vega, M. M. C., Fuente, Á. A. F., & Ortiz, J. P. H. (2020). Work absence, remuneration, and equity: A confused relationship. *Cuadernos de Administración (Universidad del Valle)*, 36(68), 126-137. <https://doi.org/10.25100/cdea.v36i68.9743>

- Vikas C. & Ravi, P. (2011) Analysis of factors influencing employees' productivity in relation to workplace environment. *International Journal of Research in Commerce & Management*, 2(5), 21-33
- Woru, A. Y., Adamu, N. M., Gana, J. & Danjuma, Y. A. (2024). The impact of work environment on academic staff performance in the school of business studies of Niger State Polytechnic, Bida Campus. *International Journal of Education and National Development*, 2(1), 34-51.
- Xu, X., Zhou, L., Ampon-Wireko, S., & Quansah, P. E. (2023). Assessing the mediating role of motivation in the relationship between perceived management support and perceived job satisfaction among family doctors in Jiangsu province, China. *Human Resources for Health*, 21(1), 71. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12960-023-00849-x>
- Yunita, T., Sasmoko, S., Bandur, A., & Alamsjah, F. (2023). Contingency perspective to bridge human capital perception to achieve ambidexterity in environmental dynamism. *Social Sciences & Humanities Open*, 9, 100806. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssaho.2024.100806>
- Yusuf, N., & Metiboba, S. (2012). Work Environment and Job Attitude among Employees in a Nigerian Work Organization. *Journal of Sustainable Society*, 1(2), 36–43. <https://doi.org/10.11634/21682585140398>
- Zhenjing, G., Chupradit, S., Ku, K. Y., Nassani, A. A., & Haffar, M. (2022). Impact of Employees' Workplace Environment on Employees' Performance: A Multi-Mediation Model. *Frontiers in Public Health*, 10, 890400. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpubh.2022.890400>