Research Article

Influence of Work Environment on the Psychological Well-being and Quality of Life of Some Selected Uniform Officers in Benin City

Daniel Osarenmwanta Aideyan[1*], Samuel Osarentin Olikiabo[2]

[1]Department of Health, Safety and Environmental Education, Faculty of Education, University of Benin
[2]Department of Health, Safety and Environmental Education, Faculty of Education, University of Benin
*Corresponding Author
 daniel.aideyan@uniben.edu
 https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6926-1055

Abstract

The study investigates the influence of work environment on the psychological well-being and quality of life of some selected uniform officers in Benin City. Four hypotheses were formulated as the descriptive survey research design was used. From a population of 624 of selected uniform officers which comprised of the police and the Federal Road Safety Corp (FRSC) officers, 236 officers were selected as the sample using the stratified and purposive sampling techniques. An adapted Ryff 's Psychological Well-being Scale and Mahmood's Quality of Life measurement scale were used. Psychometric properties of the instrument were ascertained. Collected data were analyzed using t-test. The findings revealed that there exists a significant difference in the psychological wellbeing and quality of life of police officers and FRSC officers who work in the office and those on the highways. Police officers working in the office had significantly higher psychological wellbeing scores than those on the highway (t=1.169, df=234, P=0.020) and also demonstrated better quality of life (t=1.158, df=234,P=0.022). Similarly, FRSC officers in office settings recorded significantly higher psychological wellbeing (t=1.171, df=234, P= 0.024) and quality of life (t=1.166, df=234, P=0.027) compared to their highway counterparts. In conclusion, work environment is a principal concept in determining the level of psychological well-being, quality of life of the studied uniform officers. Therefore, management of security officers should periodically carry out work environment assessment in relation to job satisfaction, psychological wellbeing with work benefits such as leave, vacation, and retreat granted to uniform officers at least twice a year.

Introduction

The workplace environment is the employees immediate surrounding where occupational activities are carried out. The workplace is one of the most important social spaces other than the home, establishing "a central concept for a number of things: the worker and his or her family, the employing organization, the customers of the organization, and the society as a whole". According to Grint (2005), organizations work best where employees' and

organizations' goals are mutually compatible. For organizations to succeed there must be links between the emotional needs of individuals and organizational need for integration.

Workplace environment refers to the sum of the interrelationships that exists within the employees and the environment in which they work. Tripathi (2014) defines work environment as the environment in which people work that include physical setting, job profile, culture and market condition. The work environment can be described as everything in the work area; both physical and non-physical that can affect employees in carrying out work (Sutanto et al., 2018; Widyaningrum and Rachman, 2019). The research by Alarcon et al. (2021) found that employees' levels of feeling satisfied at work and their responses to specific scenarios are influenced by the work environment.

Pohan and Rahimah (2022) stated that the work environment is all things around employees that have a substantial impact on performing their tasks. All these work environment variables are interconnected and they influence employees' overall performance and productivity. The quality of the employees' workplace environment determines in no small measure the level of employees' motivation and performance. Work environment includes both internal and external environments. The internal environment comprises of all the resources that make up the organization: men, materials, money, time, etc. while external environment comprises of the economic, social, political and technological factors in the task environment (Thompson, Strickland and Gamble, (2010); Lindfors, Berntsson, & Lundberg, (2016). The physical aspects of a workplace environment have a direct impact on the employees' productivity, performance, health and safety, comfort, concentration, job satisfaction, and morale. A proper, helpful, conducive workplace environment brings improvements to the employees' physical and mental capabilities in performing their daily routine. An improper and unfavourable workplace environment leads to work stress. It also induces work related stress in the employees. Important factors in the workplace environment include building design and age, workplace layout, cleanliness, workstation set-up, equipment design and quality, space, temperature, ventilation, lighting, noise, vibration, radiation, and air quality.

The physical environment that organisations provide for employees to carry out their work activities, most commonly in some form of office space, has been shown to have a powerful role in shaping a range of psychological and behavioural outcomes for employees. Considering the number of working days lost due to work-related ill-health, it is important for organisations to adopt a more holistic approach to supporting the health and well-being of their workforce, moving towards supporting employees to perform to the best of their ability. This includes a need for organisations to take into account the impact of the office environment on health and wellbeing at work, as part of the wider work climate.

Psychological well-being refers to contentment, satisfaction with all elements of life self-actualization, peace and happiness with one's self. This means it is the presence of psychological and social skills and abilities that contributes to optimal functioning in an individual's daily life (Ryff and Keyes, 1995). Work-related stress as a result of harmful work environment has great implications on the psychological well-being of the worker leading to psychological disorders with anxiety, depression, high blood pressure, asthma, cognitive impairment, diabetes and even hardening of the arteries emanating as a result. Stress at work is produced from lack of regards for physiological, psychological and social comforts from the

equipment use in working, relationships, and other considerations that can be found in working, relationships, and other considerations that can be found in the working environment (Adegoke, 2014).

Quality of work life, referred as employees' sense of balance between their job, family and their own life for retain high quality of performance, maintain healthy and family relationship. Workplace environment are major contribution that influences the employee work and life. In a study by Serey, (2016) highlights that effective quality of work life was influenced by conclusive and suitable the present of work environment. For example, noise and noxious work sites will cause emotional distress. In addition, (Loscocco & Spitze, 2019) added that social support from co-worker and top management was associated with work environment that influence employees' work life balance. In a study carried out by Woo and Postolache, (2018) revealed that work environment in relation to work stress and demands results to workers' burnout, depression, emotional exhaustion, poor sleep quality and associated cardiovascular diseases while workers in low stress work environment expressed better sleep quality, motivation, better work life balance, increased resilience and overall better wellbeing.

There are two types of work environment according to Danielsson, and Bodin, (2008); Rothe, Lindholm, Hyvonen, and Nenonen, (2011) which are conducive and toxic work environments. Work environments are of two types; conducive work environment gives pleasurable experience to employees and enable them to actualize their abilities and behavior. This type of environment reinforces self-actualizing behaviours. Toxic work environment gives unpleasant experiences and at the same time, negate employees' behavior. This environment reinforces low self-actualizing behaviours and it leads to the development of negative traits of the employees' behavior. Stress or discomfort is an unpleasant emotion where an employee experiences tensions, anxiety and fear which is believed to be one of the main components faced by employees in an organization on a daily basis. Both external stressors like condition of working area, working hours, pressure, changes and internal stressors like work life balance, job satisfaction, are a result of the kind of workplace environment prevailing. A positive work environment would this way reduce stress and enhance the satisfaction and happiness of employee. Whereas a negative working environment would add more to the existing stress reducing the happiness and satisfaction level of employees. Quality of life (QoL) is the general well-being of individuals which includes the expectations of an individual to maintain a good life. It includes everything from health, family, job, money, safety, security and the environment. Since employees spend their entire day at the organizations, therefore it is very necessary to have a good environment that satisfies them in all possible way that relieves their stress and makes them feel happy. Happiness and a feeling of well-being will result from QoL. The ideological importance of Quality of Life is that it promotes the idea of supporting people to live in ways that are best for them in the environments they occupy.

Police work, known to be fraught with a wide range of dangerous situations. These include high-speed automatic chases, highly emotional and menacing domestic situations, the stress dealing with people who are irrational due to alcohol, drugs or mental instability, and the unpredictable armed confrontations with criminals. Job stress is produced from lack of regards for physiological, psychological and social comforts from the equipment use in working, relationships, and other considerations that can be found in the working environment. The

police officers are characterized by work-stress syndrome at workplace in various ways. However, Buhrmaster (2006); Mangwani (2012) found that, some policemen experience helplessness, feeling of inadequacy, anger, shock and guilt, while others go through periods of disbelief, depression and self-blame, and all these trigger frustration in the police job, which eventually have significant effects on their psychological well-being. Occupational stress is likely to occur more among service employees who are responsible for helping, protecting, or taking care of others. However, earlier study by Ebiai (2010) found that the level of stress among police force was significantly high as it relate to the work environment.

Police officers' roles and responsibilities place them in challenging and stressful situations that can significantly impact on their mental wellbeing and quality of life. Police officers can be especially vulnerable to poor mental health arising from work environment if they do not have support systems (family, friends, peers, trust from colleagues and supervisors), or if they lack personal qualities that enable them to cope (Loriol, 2016). Employees are driven into job engagement using acceptable physical working environment. A physical conducive workplace environment which is comfortable, flexible and aesthetic to the employee encourages their mobility, concentration, sensory and physical connection to work roles and foster employees' engagement. It enhances the physical and mental well-being of the employees. It not only provides support for the development and maintenance of their working capacity but also enhances it. This happens since the work environment affects one's cognitive, emotional and physical well-being.

In the Nigeria's security and safety arrangement, the Police Force, Federal Road Safety Corporation, Vehicle Inspection Officers (VIO), and Nigeria Customs Authority dispense their duties and responsibilities both in the office and on the high-traffic roads. In this arrangement, these officers come across different situations and persons. Adegoke, (2014) expressed that some drivers on the highways have behavioral issues relating to depression, drunkenness, worries, anxiety and other related mental disorders which could pose danger to the passengers and the security and safety officers on the highways. Again, the study by Lindfors, Berntsson, & Lundberg, (2016); Guillemin, Bombardier, & Beaton, (2023) revealed that the conditions of the work environment determine workers' ability to response to work related stress, psychological well-being, quality of work life and the general quality of life. From the researcher's point of view, the security and safety workers have a dichotomous work frame in which some work in the office in relation to scientific, technical and coordinating roles which others are on the field to carry out operational and enforcement roles. Could these set of individual experienced similar psychological well-being and quality of life despite the distinct work environment and what could be responsible for any differences or similarities in the dependent variables? Hence, this study is put forward to investigate the influence of work environment on the psychological well-being and quality of life of some selected uniform officers in Benin City.

Hypotheses

From the background of the study and problem statement evident, four hypotheses were formulated to guide the focus of this study;

1. There is no significant difference in the psychological well-being between police officers who work in the office and those on the highways

2. There is no significant difference in the quality of life between police officers who work in the office and those on the highways

3. There is no significant difference in the psychological well-being between FRSC officers who work in the office and those on the highways

4. There is no significant difference in the quality of life between FRSC who work in the office and those on the highways

Method and Materials

The study was based on the descriptive survey research design. This design allows the researchers to compare workers in a specific work environment for example high stress work environment with workers in a different work environment for example low stress environment to determine the influence of work environment (independent variable) and psychological well-being and quality of life (dependent variables) (Cohen, Manion, & Morrison, 2017). The populations of the study comprised of all police officers under the Edo state command headquarters and all FRSC officers under the state headquarter. The total population is 624; 512 police officers and 112 FRSC officers. (Office of the various security units in Benin City, 2024). The sample for the study is 236; 181 police and 55 FRSC officers respectively. The multistage sampling technique was used which comprised of the cluster sampling technique, stratified sampling technique and purposive sampling technique, The sampling approach was first to clustered the security officers into police and FRSC officers, then the stratified sampling technique was done to create stratum based on the designation of each clustered officers against those who work in the office and those on the high-traffic roads. Thirdly, the purposive sampling technique was used to select 76, 18 for office oriented and 105, 37 for field oriented workers among police and FRSC officers respectively. Selection criteria were based on officers' rank, statutory responsibility and interest to participate in the study.

The respondents are public servants who work with the various arms of the security outfits for the state government. These are the police officers and the federal road safety corps officers, the police officers are saddle with the responsibility of internal security of the lives and properties of the populations while the federal road safety corps officer are saddle with the responsibility of drivers and road users' safety including checking for vehicular documents. These workers can work on the field or do the tasks in their office. Majority (70%) of the workers are males, average age of 35-50 years and married. Years of experience for most of the workers are above 10 years, with about 40% that are university graduates.

The instrument used to measure the psychological well-being of the uniformed officers was an adapted instrument of Ryff and Keyes developed in 1995. The 18-item version of Ryff's Psychological Well-being Scale (Ryff and Keyes, 1995) is a self-report instrument that comprises 18 items measuring six dimensions of psychological well-being: autonomy, environmental mastery, self-acceptance, personal growth, positive relations with others, and purpose in life. The items are rated on a 6-point Likert scale, ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 6 (strongly agree). Therefore, the total score is in the range of 18–108, with higher scores representing greater wellbeing. However, the items were adjusted to fit the work life experiences of the participants and options rated on modified 4-point Likert scale. The internal

consistency was determined using the Cronbach Alpha analysis, in which 20 instrument were administered and responses were sectioned into odd and even numbered items. 0.79 reliability coefficient was derived. To measure quality of life (QoL), earlier concept of measurement was put into consideration. The first dimension of QOL is remuneration and benefits and these include pay, compensation packages and promotions as mentioned by Clark (1997). The second one relate to job characteristics which include extrinsic job characteristics such as physical working conditions, work design, basic ergonomics, and technology. The third deals with interpersonal relationships. It includes teamwork, role and goal clarity, work role overload, problem solving and conflict management competencies of the team members, educational level and team diversity (Nandan and Nandan, 1995). The next dimension of QOL is work environment. It covers work overload or underload, job insecurity, shift work, working hours, business travel, risks and danger, new technologies, and the quality of the physical environment as enumerated by Dana and Griffin (1999). The subsequent dimension is about organizational support and facilities dealing with issues like social integration into the workplace community, a socially responsible work culture, relationships and interactions with co-workers and supervisors, and support from one's supervisor as described by (Clark, 1997; Cooper & Cartwright, 1994). Organizational policies and management style is another important dimension of QOL and it includes leadership style, job assignment, job division, staff appointment and promotion policy among other (Danna and Grffin, 1999; Edwards, Scully, and Brtek, 2000). The seventh dimension covers safety & security assurance and includes issues such as job security, job safety retirement scheme, Compensation on accident at workplace Workers association (Danna and Griffin, 1999). The QoL dimension on individual and family life includes personal and family life satisfaction, relationship with family members, and personal lifestyle as mentioned by Carlson (1999). The last dimension is related to personal health and well-being describe by Cummin, (1997). All these informed the items incorporated into the final adapted draft of the instrument with emphasis to suit the sociocultural nature of Nigeria. The instrument for measurement of quality of life was adapted from Mahmood, Uli, Othman, Samah, Ali, Hj, Hassan & Shaffri, (2011). However, the items were adjusted to fit the work life experiences of the participants and options rated on modified 4-point Likert scale. The internal consistency was determined as done for the psychologically wellbeing instrument, using the cronbach alpha analysis, 0.83 was derived.

The instruments were administered by the researchers and six research assistants (3 each of police and FRSC officers) trained for data collection. Completed instrument were collected, sorted, coded and analyzed using the Statistical Package of Social Science (SPSS) version 25 at 0.05 alpha level of significance. The independent sample t-test was used to compare the mean difference in psychological well-being and quality of life between officers who work in the office and those who work on the high-traffic roads.

Results

 From the t-test analysis of the data collected, results are hereby presented.
H_{01} : There is no significant difference in the psychological well-being between police officers who work in the office and those on the highways

Table 1. *Summary of T-test Analysis of the Significant Difference Between Psychological Well-being and Police Officers*

	t-test value	df	x	Sig. (2tailed)	Remark
Equal variance assumed	1.169	234	22.73	0.020	Ho Rejected

　　　　Table 1 presents the independent sample t-test analysis of the difference in the psychological well-being between police officers that work in the office and those on the highways. The table reveals a t-test value of 1.169, degree of freedom of 234 and significance level of 0.020 which is less than the set alpha level of 0.05. Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected. It can therefore be deduced that the conditions and experience of police officers on the highway in terms of unruly behavior of road users, high flow of traffic may have significantly affected the psychological well-being in terms of clear purpose in life, personal growth, self-acceptance, meaningful connections with others, self-worth and autonomy of police officers and are negative on the part of those on the highway and poor work environment and conditions.

H_{02} : There is no significant difference in the quality of life between police officers work in the office and those on the highways

Table 2. *Summary of T-test Analysis of the Significant Difference Between Quality of life and Police Officers*

	t-test value	df	x	Sig.(2tailed)	Remark
Equal variance assumed	1.158	234	20.99	0.022	Ho Rejected

　　　　Table 2 discloses the independent sample t-test analysis of the difference in the quality of life between police officers who work in the office and those on the highways. The table reveals a t-test value of 1.158, degree of freedom of 234 and significance level of 0.022 which is less than the set alpha level of 0.05. Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected. It can therefore be deduced that the compensations packages, promotion, teamwork, high risk and danger and work and family satisfaction may have significantly affected the quality of life of police officers, negatively impacted those on the highway due to poor work environment and conditions.

H_{03} : There is no significant difference in the psychological well-being between FRSC officers who work in the office and those on the highways

Table 3. *Summary of T-test Analysis of the Significant Difference Between Psychological Well-being and FRSC Officers*

	t-test value	df	x	Sig. (2tailed)	Remark
Equal variance assumed	1.171	234	19.73	0.024	Ho Rejected

　　　　Table 3 reveals the independent sample t-test analysis of the difference in the psychological well-being between FRSC who work in the office and those on the highways. The table reveals a t-test value of 1.171, degree of freedom of 234 and significance level of 0.024 which is less than the set alpha level of 0.05. Therefore, the null hypothesis which state there is no significant difference in the psychological well-being between FRSC officers who work in the office and those on the highways is rejected. It can therefore be deduced that the conditions and experience of FRSC officers on the highway in terms of clear purpose in life, personal growth, self-acceptance, meaningful connections with others, self-worth and autonomy may

have significantly affected the psychological well-being of FRSC officers and these indices tend to be negative on the part of those on the highway.

H_{04} : There is no significant difference in the quality of life between FRSC officers who work in the office and those on the highways

Table 4. *Summary of T-test Analysis of the Significant Difference in the Quality of Life Between FRSC Officers*

	t-test value	df	x	Sig. (2tailed)	Remark
Equal variance assumed	1.166	234	18.99	0.027	Ho Rejected

Table 4 states the independent sample t-test analysis of the difference in the quality of life between FRSC officers that work in the office and those on the highways. The table reveals a t-test value of 1.166, degree of freedom of 234 and significance level of 0.027 which is lesser than the set alpha level of 0.05. Therefore, the null hypothesis which state there is no significant difference in the quality of life between FRSC officers that work in the office and those on the highways is rejected. It can therefore be deduced that the compensations packages, promotion, teamwork, high risk and danger and work and family satisfaction may have significantly affected the quality of life of FRSC officers and negatively on the part of those on the highway and poor work environment and conditions.

Discussion

The findings of this study revealed a significant difference in the psychological well-being of police officers who work in the office and those on the highways. This finding is in line with the findings of (Mangwani, (2012); Adegoke (2014); Tyagi and Dhar, (2014) who reported that the work environment plays a significant role in the psychological health of employees. It is the opinion of the researchers that while other factors may have impacted the psychological well-being of the selected police officers as it relates to self-acceptance, meaningful connections to others, self-worth, clear purpose in life and autonomy, the significant difference in the psychological well-being of police officers who work in the office and those who function on the highways is noteworthy.

Again, the study revealed a significant difference in the quality of life of police officers who work in the office and those on the highways. This finding is in line with the finding of (Serey, 2016; Woo & Postolache, 2018; Loscocco & Spitze, 2019) who reported that work environment plays a significant role in the quality of work life and invariably on the quality of life of employees. It is the opinion of the researchers that while other factors may have impacted the quality of life of the selected police officers as it relates to compensation packages, promotion, team work, high risk and danger and work and family satisfaction, the significant difference in the quality of life of police officers who work in the office and those that function on the highways is noteworthy.

Furthermore, the study revealed a significant difference in the psychological well-being of FRSC officers who work in the office and those on the highways. This finding is in line with the findings of Adegoke (2014); Tyagi and Dhar (2014); Loriol, 2016) who reported that work environment plays a significant role in the psychological health of employees. It is the opinion

of the researchers that while other factors may have impacted the psychological well-being of the selected FRSC officers as it relates to self-acceptance, meaningful connections to others, self-worth, clear purpose in life and autonomy, the significant difference in the psychological well-being of FRSC officers who work in the office and those who function on the highways is noteworthy.

Finally, the study revealed a significant difference in the quality of life of FRSC officers who work in the office and those on the highways. This finding is in line with the findings of Lindfors, Berntsson, & Lundberg, (2016); Guillemin, Bombardier, & Beaton, (2023) who reported that the work environment plays a significant role in the quality of work life and invariably on the quality of life of employees. It is the opinion of the researchers that while other factors may have impacted the quality of life of the selected police officers as it relates to compensation packages, promotion, team work, high risk and danger and work and family satisfaction, the significant difference in the quality of life of FRSC officers who have work in the office and those that function on the highways is noteworthy.

The limitation of this study is the difficulty in getting the officers to response to questionnaires; however, this was surmountable as the researcher went through the commandant and officer-in-charge of the security agencies.

Conclusion

Work environment is a principal concept and valuable tool in determining the level of psychological well-being, quality of life and invariably productivity and satisfaction. Many of the indices relating to mental health, social relations productivity and life fulfillment are anchored in the work environment of employees. There is a significant difference in the psychological and quality of life of police and FRSC officers who work in the office and those who operate on the highways. It is revealed that those in the office demonstrate better psychological well-being and quality of life than their counterparts who work on the highways.

Based on the findings of the study, the following recommendations were made; management of security officers should periodically carry out work environment assessment in relation to job satisfaction, psychological wellbeing and quality of life; the government should improve the remuneration of police and FRSC especially those on the highways and provide a special risk and danger package allowances to boost motivation, psychological health and job satisfaction; health education and counseling units should be provided at the police stations and made functional to address issues related to psychological wellbeing and mental health and work benefits such as leave, vacation, retreat should be promoted by police management at least twice a year.

Acknowledgement

Conflict of Interest

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

References

Adegoke, T.G. (2014). Effects of occupational stress on psychological well-being of police employees in Ibadan metropolis, Nigeria. *African Journals Online*, *8*(1), 302-320. https://www.ajol.info/index.php/ajoe/article/view/11309

Akinnawo, E. O. (2010). The traumatic experiences and psychological health of women working in two male-dominated professions in Nigeria. *Gender and Behaviour, 8* (2), 63-74. https://doi.org/10.4314/gab.v8i2.61949

Haruna, A., & Pongri, J. (2024). The impact of work environment on job satisfaction in selected state universities in North East, Nigeria. *Journal of Contemporary Education Research, 5*(8), 1-16. www.hummingbirdjournals.com

Bonifacio, P. (2011). *The psychological effects of police work: A psychodynamic approach*. Plenum Publishing Corporation.

Buhrmaster, S. (2006). *Suicide by Cop: 15 warning signs that you might be involved*. Topics and tactics for Law Enforcement.

Bullock K & Garland J (2018) Police officers, mental (ill-) health and spoiled identity. *Criminology and Criminal Justice, 18*(2), 36-49. https://doi.org/10.1177/1748895817695856

Carlson, D.S., (1999). Personality and role variables as predictors of three forms of work family conflict. *Journal of Vocational Behaviour*, 55, 236-253. https://doi.org/10.1006/jvbe.1999.1680

Clark, A., (1997). Job satisfaction and gender: Why are women so happy at work" *Journal of Labour Economics, 4*(4), 341-372. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0927-5371(97)00010-9

Cohen, D., Manion, P. & Morrison, E., (2017). *Educational research and statistic (*5th ed). Sydney. Glase Press

Cooper, C. & S. Cartwright, (1994). Healthy mind; healthy organizations: A proactive approach to occupational stress. *Journal of Human Relations*, *47*, 455-471. Healthy Mind; Healthy Organization — A Proactive Approach to Occupatio

Cummins, R.A. (1997). *Comprehensive quality of life scale-adult* (5th ed.), Melbourne, Deakin University, School of Psychology Press.

Danna, K. & Griffin R.W, (1999). Health and well-being in the workplace: A review and synthesis of the literature. *Journal of Management*, *25*(3), 357-384. https://doi.org/10.1177/014920639902500305

Danielsson, C. B., & Bodin, L. (2008). Office type in relation to health, wellbeing, and job satisfaction among employees. *Environment and Behavior*, *40*(5), 636-668. https://doi.org/10.1177/0013916507307459

Ebiai, A. (2011). Occupational stress and psycho-physiologic disorders in organizations Nigeria, Southwest. *Journal of Research in National Development, 8*(2), 1-12. https://doi.org/10.4314/jorind.v8i2.66798

Edwards, J.R., J.A. Scully & M.D. Brtek, (2000). The nature and outcomes of work: A replication and extension of interdisciplinary work-design research. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *85*, 860-868. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.85.6.860

Elizur, D., & Shye, S. (2019). Quality of work life and its relation to quality of life. *Applied Psychology*, 39(3), 275-291. https://doi.org/10.1111/J.1464-0597.1990

Fairbrother, K. & Warn, J. (2003) Workplace dimensions, stress and job satisfaction. *Journal of Managerial Psychology, 18*(1), 8-21. https://doi.org/10.1108/02683940310459565

Fajana, S, (2002). *Human resource management*: An Introduction. Lagos: Labofin Company.

Guillemin, F., Bombardier, C., & Beaton, D. (2023). Cross-cultural adaptation of health-related quality of life measures: literature review and proposed guidelines. *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology, 46*, 1417–1432. https://doi.org/10.1016/0895-4356(93)90142-N

Keech J, Cole K, & Hagger M, (2020). The association between stress mindset and physical and psychological wellbeing. *Psychology and Health, 35*(11), 1306–1325 https://www.sciepub.com/reference/421089

Lindfors, P., Berntsson, L., & Lundberg, U. (2006). Factor structure of Ryff 's psychological well-being scales in Swedish female and male white-collar workers. *Personal Individual Difference, 40*, 1213–1222. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.PAID.2005.10.016

Loriol, M. (2016). Collective forms of coping and the social construction of work stress among industrial workers and police officers in France. *Theory & Psychology*, *26*(1), 112–129. https://doi.org/10.1177/0959354315616877

Loscocco, K.A. & Spitze, G., (2019). Working-conditions, social support, and the well-being of female and male factory-workers. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior, 31*(4), 313–327. . https://doi.org/10.2307/2136816

Lowe, G., Schellenburg, G. & Shannon, H.S. (2003), Correlates of employees' perception of a healthy work environment, *American Journal of Health Promotion*, *17*, (6), 390-399. https://doi.org/10.4278/0890-1171.6390

Mahmood, N.A., Uli, J., Othman J., Samah, B.A ., Ali, N.A., Hj, M.S. Hassan & Shaffri, H.A.M (2011). Instrument for measuring quality of life of employees in the Malaysian public sector, *Australian Journal of Basic and Applied Sciences, 5*(9), 40-50. http://www.ajbasweb.com/2011/September-2011/40-50.pdf

Mangwani, G. B. (2012). *Suicides in the South African police service: A study of Contributory Factors and Recommendation.* Unpublished master's degree submitted to the Ishvore University of Technology, Pretoria, South Africa.

Nandan, S. & M. Nandan., (1995). Improving quality of care and quality of work life through interdisciplinary health care teams. *Journal of Pyschology and Human Development*, *21*(2), 46-57.

Pohan, F. & Angkat, R. (2022). The effect of the work environment on employee performance in the Beringin district office of Deli Serdang. Jurnal Ilmiah Teunuleh - *The International Journal of Social Sciences*, *3*(1), 101-115. https://doi.org/10.51612/teunuleh.v3i1.83

Razak, N. A, Ma'mor, H. M, & Hassan, N (2016). Measuring reliability and validity instruments   of work environment towards quality work life. *Procedia Economics and Finance, 37*, 520–528. https://doi.org/10.1016/S2212-5671(16)30160-5

Rothe, P, Lindholm, A., Hyvonen, A., & Nenonen, S. (2011). User preferences of office   occupiers: investigating the differences. *Journal of Corporate Real Estate*, *13*(2), 87-98. https://doi.org/10.1108/14630011111136803

Ryff, C. D., & Keyes, C. L. M. (1995). The structure of psychological well-being revisited. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 69*, 719–727. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.69.4.719

Ryff, C. D. (1995). Psychological well-being in adult life. *Current Directorate of Psychological Science*. 4, 99–104. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8721.ep10772395

Serey, T.T., (2016). Choosing a robust quality of work life. *Business Forum, 27*(2), 7- 10. Choosing a Robust Quality of Work Life. | EBSCOhost

Shane J.M. (2013). Daily work experiences and police performance. *Police Practice and Research,* 14(1), 17–34. https://doi.org/10.1080/15614263.2011.596717

Shane J.M. (2010). Organizational stressors and police performance. *Journal of Criminal Justice, 38*(4), 807–818. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcrimjus.2010.05.008

Sutanto, E. M, Sampson, J. S, & Mulyono, F. (2018). Organizational justice, work environment   and motivation. *International Journal of Business and Society,* 19(2), 313-322.https://www.ijbs.unimas.my/images/repository/pdf/vol19-no2-paper4.pdf

Tripathi,   A.   (2014).   Workplace   Environment: Consequences   on   Employees. https://www.linkedin.com/pulse/workplace-environment-consequences-   employees-ajay-tripathi

Tyagi, A., & Dhar, R. L. (2014). Factors affecting health of the police officials: Mediating role   of   job stress. Policing: *An International Journal of Police Strategies & Management*, *37*(3), 649–664. https://doi.org/10.1108/PIJPSM-12-2013-0128

Vischer, J. C. (2007). The effects of the physical environment on job performance: Towards a theoretical model of workspace stress. Stress & Health: *Journal of the International Society for the Investigation of Stress, 23*(3), 175-184. https://doi.org/10.1002/smi.1134

Widyaningrum, E & Rachman, M. M. R. (2019). The influence of the work environment, organizational commitment and organizational citizenship behavior on employee performance and motivation as intervening. *European   Journal   of   Business   and   Management*,   *11*,   (35),16-27. https://iiste.org/journal/index.php/EJBM/article/view/507

Woo, J. M., & Postolache, T. T. (2008). The impact of work environment on mood disorders and suicide: Evidence and implications. *International Journal on Disability and Human Development, 7*(2), 185-200. https://doi.org/10.1515/1JDHD.2008.7.2.185