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ABSTRACT
Recent literature has indicated the dwindling performance in the agricultural sector, especially the discontentment of farm employees in Nigeria due to a poor working environment, which has become a subject of concern and demands urgent attention. This study examined the physical work environment and modern farm performance in Tuns Farm, Osogbo, Osun State from the employees' perspective. The study employed a survey method through the distribution of a structured questionnaire to four hundred and thirty-four (434) employees of Tuns Farm. The reliability and validity test of the research instrument was observed by the use of Cronbach's Alpha tests and the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure (KMO), respectively. Data gathered was analysed by employing t-test, correlation and regression analysis as the techniques of analyses. The result (t (434) = 4.05, p < .05) revealed that improper layout has high impact on employee job satisfaction; result with (r = 0.163) revealed that lighting has effect on employees' job performance; and result with (Adj R² = 0.38) revealed that work equipment/tools has significant impact on employees' retention. It was concluded that a conducive physical work environment is significant to employees' performance on a modern farm. The study recommends that management should provide proper farm layout design subjected to annual review, adopt modern lighting/temperature system in Farmyards, and improve on a working condition that will encourage employees to increase and sustain the farm performance level.
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INTRODUCTION
Farms, as an organisation does not exist in isolation. They exist and operate within an environment which in turn and affects their activities with possible output. Aside from this, every farm has also created her environment' internal environment' which makes it peculiar to others. The internal environment consists set of resources employed in a productive way to amalgamate assets that are resourceful to the company, such as, organisation rules, pattern, procedure, building, equipment and machinery, employees proficiencies, competencies and capabilities, organisation ethics and value (Awan & Tahir, 2015; Bruno, John, &Maria, 2005). This view implies that certain factors are crucial to the performance and continued existence of a farm. For instance, a building that falls under the physical work environment can make or mar the functioning of employees on a farm. Unimpressive performance of farms in this part of the world has been attributed to unsatisfied employees, low employees' performance, and a high attrition rate of employees, to mention in few. No farm can achieve the essence of its existence when the employees operate from an unpleasant physical work environment. Working tools such as chairs, tables, lighting, and temperature are critical to performance at the micro and macro levels (Patil, & Kulkarni, 2017).
A factor that established to have contributed to this development is the nature of the work environment where activities of the farm take place. Mullins (2011), Juan (2010), and Opel (2010) attributed between 5% to 15% of the factor responsible for poor performance to lack of management attention to the work environment. The physical work environment is visibly seen as a very impactful factor within the work environment that has brought about untold hardship on the employees (Patil, & Kulkarni, 2017). In Nigeria, agricultural business is vast but not well-positioned due to the over-reliance of the economy on crude oil. The farming business as an arm of agriculture has neglected over the years due to the growth of the downstream sector. The few farming businesses are confronted with a poor physical work environment, which is obvious in their lack of adequate farming tools and protective equipment from toxic pesticides and chemicals. Aside from this, physical factors in farms such as poor farm layout have observed as one of the factors responsible for employees' unhappiness and discontent with their jobs.

Existing studies such as (Patil & Kulkarni, 2017; Awan & Tahir, 2015; Jahncke, Hygge, Halin, Green & Dimberg 2011; and Leung, Chan & Yuen, 2010) shows that illumination, high temperature, poor working conditions affect employees' performance while to the best of researcher's knowledge no consistent relationship has been established between some proxies of the physical work environment and selected employees' performance proxies in farm businesses. It is against this backdrop that the study examined improper farm layout and employee satisfaction, working equipment and tools on employees' retention, the level at which farm lighting and temperature affect employees' performance and the degree to which farm layout, lighting and temperature, and working equipment and tools when combined affect farm performance from an employees’ performance perspective.

LITERATURE REVIEW
Farm Performance: Employee Perspective

Performance is a measure of achievements record on each of the completed tasks in line with the prescribed objectives and goals of any functional organisation. Prasetya and Kato (2011) define performance as the attainment of results of a given action by employees within the official roles at the specified period. Performance could also be seen as the execution of given roles against predetermined arrangement in terms of standard of accuracy, delivery, and cost. Performance can be associated with a lot of indices, such as employees' performance, farm performance, among others. Within the context of this review, farm performance is the focus. Farm performance is the outputs of the farm against predetermine goals and objectives of the firm (Fitz-Koch, Nordquist, Carter & Hunter, 2018). A farm can fulfil its mission through sound management, strong governance, and a persistent rededication to achieving results, effective non-profits and remain dynamics in the turbulence operating environment with a veritable adaptive approach to change climate change and customer-oriented service delivery (Li, & Li, 2018). Farm performance is a process to enhance both the effectiveness of a farm and the well-being of its members through planned interventions (Fitz-Koch et al., 2018).

There are four types of farm performance measures drawn from the reviews of Wilson, Charry, and Kemp (2000); Miller, Boehlje, and Dobbins (2017); and Kahan (2010), first is the human resource outcomes (Wilson et al., 2000), second is organisational outcomes (Kahan, 2010), third is financial accounting outcome (Kahan, 2010), and lastly, capital market outcomes (Miller et al., 2017). According to Wilson et al. (2000), human resource outcomes related to change in employee behaviour, which included employee satisfaction, turn over, and absenteeism. Work
performance is the way employee perform their work (Osibanjo, Akinbode, Falola, & Oludayo, 2015). Employee's performance is determined during a job performance review, with an employer taking into account factors such as leadership skills and productivity to analyse each employee on an individual basis. The review of job performance is done differently from one organisation to others either on yearly or quarterly depending on the nature of the organisation the objectives to be derived by considering contributions to the firm whether the employee will qualify for a promotion or be demoted or be fired (Rowold, 2011).

This implies that the performance of the farm can be separated. Performance is mostly subjectively measured in organisational studies. Otley (1999) viewed the performance of an organisation is predicated on employee commitment and other factors like the working environment where the organisation operates. The distinction between an organisation and employee performance is showing from the literature that a successful organisation is one that attaining its objectives through proper implementation of its strategy (Otley, 1999). Nyberg, Pieper & Trevor, (2016); Ahmad, Farrukh, Nazir, (2015); describe employees performance as a sub-set of organisational performance and organisational culture while Bohlander and Shell (2010); Vroom (1964) in another perspective see employee performance as a determinant of organisation performance. It is based on this view that this study examined farm performance from the employees' perspective.

**Employee job Satisfaction:** Morse (1997) defines satisfaction as the degree of contentment on individual desire. Satisfaction depends on the desire of an individual from time to time. Employee satisfaction is determined by how contented the workers are with their job. This is the perception or feeling of employees about the job is doing in an organisation. This is the overall evaluation of employees of the total expectation about the farm he/she is engaged with against experience in an organisation. It is the totality of enthusiasm that individuals have towards their job. Employee satisfaction could also be seen as the combination of affective response to the various perceptions of what an employee wishes to get compared with what he/she receives (Cranny, Smith, & Stone, 1992). Therefore, it is projected that the organisations should uphold the support for employee expectations to approach employee satisfaction. However, this satisfaction has no limit but varies from one individual to others as its also posited by Miller, (2006) that sometimes it requires for an employee to adjust their possessions to execute the given tasks to attain greater job satisfaction. Existing studies revealed that various factor contributes to employee's satisfaction among them is; working environment. As the organisation makes the work environment more conducive, more employee satisfaction remains. Other factors include but not limited to, comfort in the conducive working environment, tools and equipment, working methods, security guards, and parking facilities to mention in view.

**Employee job performance:** Shields (2016); Gibson (1995) describes employee's performance as the reward of the task accomplished by an individual in line with the official role in the organisation. It is the standard to which an employee does a job measured by the given standard. High performing organisations rely on employees knowing their roles in different structures and work processes in addition to the willingness to learn (Guest, 2006). Cronje (2011) says that for any employees to maintain the drive, they require to be revitalised through refresher training, expanded exposure to complementary roles and assignment to a different role due to the changing organisation and personal effects. For Dowling (2008), employees must be able to work
with new technologies in changing environments. The contribution of employees on the job is the major factor for organisational performance. Employees are performing different jobs in an organisation depending on the size, types of the organisation. High performing organisations rely on employees knowing their roles in different structures, work processes and willingness to learn (Guest, 2006).

**Employee retention:** This is recognised as an important subject of inquiry by researchers. Retention activities have been described as an amalgamation of activities entrenched in increasing organisational commitment to employees, by providing an ambitious and countless of opportunities where they can develop by performing beyond others (Bogdanowicz & Bailey, 2002). It is defined as a systematic effort by employers to create a conducive environment that supports current employees to remain with the farm. A lot of strategic approach to employee retention has been advocated for in practice. One of the areas strategic thrust has been built on is a conducive work environment. Existing studies Harris (2000); Kinnear & Sutherland (2000); Maertz & Griffeth (2004) explained the friendly working environment as a factor that promotes employee retention in the farm.

**An Overview of Physical Work Environment**

Environment means ambience and surroundings that have a potential impact on the endeavours of the human being. The work environment is the facility where people work together for achieving organisational objectives. It represents its buildings, its furniture, and its layout and physical condition where organisational activities take place. The physical environment in the workplace has been described as all matters and incentives that employees interact within their working lives (Patil., & Kulkarni., 2017; Awan, & Tahir, 2015; Elsbach & Pratt, 2007). Material objects can be observed at both the macro (e.g. buildings) and micro levels (e.g. furnishings and office arrangements). Stimuli include the conditions under which employees work, such as the lighting and temperature. Salient factors within the physical work environment that may impact on employees can be split into several broad areas: ambient properties, spatial arrangements and architectural design. Ambient properties refer to factors such as noise, temperature, air quality, and vibration; spatial arrangements refer to factors such as office layout, level of enclosure and proximity to the office (Evans, Johansson & Carrere, 1994; McCoy, 2002). Architectural design refers to elements such as lighting or the presence of windows (Evans, Johansson & Carrere, 1994; McCoy, 2002).

The physical factors involve the interactions of employees with office space arrangement, computers, chairs, tables, lighting, office temperature etc. that enhances employee comfortability (Knudsen, Bucks and Lindt, 2011), safety, health, satisfaction and performance (Moran, 2010). Hence, to ensure employee satisfaction and workplace performance, organisations must provide a suitable environment (Bozeman and Gaughan, 2011), adequate office spaces (Al-Anzi, 2009), appropriate work tools and furniture (O'niel 2011; Hameed, 2009). Organisations are expected to identify areas where there is poor ergonomics workstation that contribute to stress outcomes such as employees' dissatisfaction, poor performance, complaints and perhaps, intention to quit the organisation due to stress (Mohd, Shah, Manna & Abu, 2011).

**Farm Lay Out:** This is the setting and arrangement of the work system and activities in the farmyard. Farm layout should provide flexibility in use for employees to perform well. This encapsulates the farm itself and the location of the buildings. For instance, if his farm buildings are located in the centre of his road frontage, rotation and access to his pastures will be much
easier. In addendum, the farmhouse location allows the farmer myriad opportunities to expand his lots. Therefore, the design of the building to be constructed and its location should both be influenced principally by desirable farm practices and efficiency of employees. Farm layout differs depending on the type of farming. For example, clean ground each year is essential in nurturing of young chickens and pigs. Studies of a group of farms in Minnesota show that livestock farmers spend approximately 75 per cent of their time around the farm buildings. If the farmer travels five extra steps each day while doing his chores, he travels one extra mile in a year. Interior arrangement of buildings, particularly in dairy barns, is essential in keeping travel and chore time to a minimum. The machine shed is out from the fence so that doors may be opened on both sides of the building. Machinery may be pulled through the shed rather than backed out. The milkhouse is adjacent to the barn. This placement eliminates two extra trips per day. A cattle guard used for the entrance to the lane; this saves the time and trouble of opening a gate. The poultry house location allows range for the hens. This poultry house has a feed storage room.

The lighting of Farmyard: Lighting plays an essential part on the farm. It improves on the security around the farmland, lighting also provides a suitable conducive production environment for livestock, a secure work environment for employees on the farm, especially during the dark. Light allows an individual to gather the information from its surrounding, and determine the size, shape, colour and movement. Sufficient light makes it easier for the workers to work and can prevent accidents. There are so many ways defective lighting can affect employees’ performance which include lighting effects, poor lightening design and poor fixing of lightening (HSE, 2002). Indoor lighting of farm facilities as one of the types of lighting is vital to efficient farms production. Lighting systems is expected to meet minimum lighting requirements, especially in the energy-efficient and economical manner. Lighting sources found on the farm include incandescent, tungsten-halogen, fluorescent, mercury vapour, metal halide, etc.

Existing studies of lighting in the workplace have consistently shown that sunlight has positive effects on workers’ subjective well-being; and that employees prefer to work near windows or in workplaces with natural lighting (Leather, Pyrgas, Beale & Lawrence, 1998; Oldham & Fried, 1987; Wang &Boubekri, 2009; Yildirim et al. 2007). Emphasis on the need to understand how the use of artificial lighting impacts directly or indirectly on worker well-being and performance. Lighting around the place of work may influence employee performance in several ways. It may affect eye strain and visual comfort (Van Bommel & Van Beld, 2004; Boyce, 2003). Juslen & Tenner, (2005) posited lighting might also influence cognitive performance and problem-solving ability by interfering with physiological factors like circadian rhythms.

Farming Equipment and Tools: The use of appropriate agricultural equipment and tools for farming contributes to the performance of any farming business. Equipment and tools are required in the propagation of plant, soil preparation, weed control, irrigation, harvesting, postharvest handling, storage, weed control and distribution. Agricultural tools are instruments employed to dig the land, carrying sand, weeding, soil removal, trenching, carrying fertiliser or materials, etc. Other useful agricultural tools are blades, peaks, rakes, machetes, and transplanting tool to mention in few. Machines: The machines are useful materials used to shape the action of forces based energy work, for its part in the agricultural, motor mechanisms used in this work lighten the
production and improve farming techniques. Among the most widely used agricultural machines working in the fields mentioned is a tractor, working tractor, combine or mower. Farm Equipment: These are a group of devices designed to open furrows in the ground, shredding, spraying and fertilising the soil. They are plough, drag, sprayer, fertiliser, and packing

Theoretical Framework
Hawthorne Studies
These studies, otherwise known as Hawthorne Experiments, were conducted between 1927 and 1939 in Western Electric, Cicero, Illinois- Chicago. The work was centred on work conditions and employee productivity. According to Mayo (1939), environmental factors influenced employee behaviour. This result seems relevant to this present study as the physical work environment is assumed to be a major determinant of farm performance. Mayo hypothesised that the physical working environment directly affects an employee's performance. Farmworkers in this wise can be influenced by the physical work environment they are confined to work. According to the theorist, extensive research involved submitting workers to working environments where he manipulated physical factors such as lighting, humidity or temperature if this affected their performance. This is what this study has done by subjecting farmworkers to selected components within the physical work environment to explore their effects on employees' performance.

With the series of experiments carried out like increases in illumination, in these lighting studies, light intensity was altered to examine its effect on workers' activities. His theory proved a poor correlation between these physical factors to heightened or reduced employee performance. The study effect, in essence, can be applied to the farm workplace to examine employees' performance as these physical work environment changes. Mayo's experiments show an increase in workers' productivity as factors of the work environment change, could this be the case in the current study. The outcome of this study will either confirm or refute the work of Hawthorne experiment in a farm organisation.

Empirical Review
Patil & Kulkarni (2017) investigated the work environment and its impact on employees' performance in the hospitality industry, Belagavi, India. The study carried out with the use of physical environmental factors, and social environment factors represent the proxies of work environment on the employee's performance with a structured questionnaire distributed among employees in the industry using stratified disproportionate random sampling. Findings show that physical environment factors such office design, lighting, hygiene influence improved performance and commitment of employees. At the same time, it was concluded that proper work environment increases employees' performance and motivational level and reduces the absenteeism and employees' turnover rate.

Srivastava (2008) identified the physical environment as one of the several components of the environment in the work organisation. He further established that illumination, temperature, and atmospheric conditions on workers' performance. Modern organisations are making all possible effort to make the working environment more comfortable, safety and health (Richard, 2003). However, some sectors do not appreciate the place of the physical working environment on workers' performance. According to Miller, Erickson &Yust (2001), employees enjoy the work environment that provides a sense of belonging. Wells &Thelen (2002) has stated in their study that organisations with generous human resource policies have the tendencies to satisfying and
retaining employees by making available the provision to increase well conducive environment which spur motivation and commitment level of employees to the organisation beyond the short run.

Alimoglu&Donmez (2005) examined the physical work environment on the psychological health of nurses through experimentation of group in daylight and control group in daylight. They established that no significant differences are observed between the groups. In a related study by Applebaum, Fowler, Fiedler, Osinubi& Robson (2010) looked into the physical environment as well on psychological health on Nurses working in acute care settings. However, a significant but weak relationship between perceived stress and noise was observed. It was not clear how this relationship manifests. No significant relationships were observed between perceived stress and odour.

Gensler (2005) conducted a study on 200 UK business managers supports for an improved working condition. The results show the increase in employee productivity by 19 per cent and while the overall productivity of the organisation is increased by 17 per cent. These improvements have a significant impact on the economy of the organisation as a whole. The research was followed up by Gensler (2006) another survey research conducted among 2,000 office workers in the USA. The result shows that 90 per cent of the respondents agreed that better working condition and layout increase commitment and employee performance. The degree of relationship between physical working environment and organisational performance has been reviewed within the farming business from the employee perspective, and no empirical establishment has been confirmed in Osun State, Nigeria as it related to any of the proxies advanced for in the study. Therefore, there is a need to conduct an empirical study to explore the effect of the physical working environment on organisational performance in the farm business setting.

**METHODOLOGY**

The survey method was employed for this study, which involves the use of a structured questionnaire to gather data on issues of the physical work environment and farm performance from the employees' perspective. The physical work environment was measured with farm layout, farm equipment and tools, and the lighting and temperature of the office and farmyard. In contrast, farm performance as the dependent variable was measured with employee job satisfaction, employee job performance and employee retention. The study is restricted the Tuns Farm Nigeria Limited in Osogbo, Osun State. The respondents are different categories of workers such as Vets, Animal breeders, Poultry, workers, Animal Scientists, Animal Health Technologist, Animal Nutritionist, Agricultural Engineers, Managers, Marketers, and Administrators. The record of Tuns farm Nigeria Limited in Osogbo, Osun State shows an active staff strength of 5,002 of both permanent and temporary staff. In this regard, because of time constraints and other resources, 537 workers were considered by the use of Cochran Formula as a sample size for this study. These participants were stratified along with their sections/department first to ensure adequate representation across the organisation. At the same time, simple random sampling was employed to select the desired participants in each of the sections/departments.

The instrument adopted for this study was a self-designed questionnaire with two (2) sections, namely, Section A: Personal Data of respondents and Section B: Physical work environment and farm performance were in line with the reviewed literature. The instrument was made a close-
ended questionnaire, with section "A" personal data of respondents comprising five (5) items as age group, gender, highest educational qualification, etc. In comparison, section "B" consists of seventeen (17) items that sought information physical work environment and farm performance. A reliability coefficient of 0.80 means that 80 per cent of the variance in observed scores (the actual scores obtained on the measure) is due to the variance in the true scores (the precise amount of the characteristic obsessed by the respondent). In other words, KMO score obtained from the measuring instrument is an 80 per cent true reflection of the underlying trait measured. For the analysis, the study will employ both the descriptive and the inferential statistics would be employed for data analysis. The descriptive statistic was used through simple frequencies distribution and percentages for analysing responses from a questionnaire. In contrast, inferential statistics such as correlation and regression were considered adequate for the hypothesis.

Table 1: Analyses of Administered Questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questionnaires Administered</th>
<th>Questionnaire Returned</th>
<th>Questionnaire Usable</th>
<th>% of Used Questionnaire</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>537</td>
<td>479</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Study (2019)

For the reliability and validity test, the reliability estimate obtained for the Cronbach's Alpha is 0.896; which is far greater than the required benchmark of 0.75 (Asika, 2001). Also, the validity test for this study is obtained through the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure (KMO) is 0.839 with a value greater than 0.7. This suggests that the instrument of analyses employed for this study is reliable and valid. It is the most appropriate for a study such as this. More so, the rate of usable questionnaires from the number of the questionnaires administered is 81 per cent. This further reinforces the reliability of the instrument employed for the analyses of this study (see Table 2).

Table 2: Reliability Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha</th>
<th>No of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.896</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Validity Test (KMO)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure (KMO)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.839</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: SPSS Output

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

4.1 Results

Table 3: Relationship between improper farm layout and employee job satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Farm Layout</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std Deviation</th>
<th>D.f</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>40.78</td>
<td>6.44</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>&lt; .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>30.62</td>
<td>10.46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The result in Table 1 revealed that improper farm layout has a high impact on farm performance (t (434) = 4.05, p < .05). The result showed clearly that employees believed that improper farm layout has a high impact on their job satisfaction (X = 40.78, S.D. = 6.44). In contrast, some believed that improper farm layout has a low impact on their job satisfaction (X = 30.62, S.D. = 10.46).
=10.46). Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected, while the alternative hypothesis is accepted. That is, improper farm layout has a high impact on employee job satisfaction.

Table 4: Relationship between farm lighting/temperature and employee performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Farm lighting/temperature</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>23.76</td>
<td>3.587</td>
<td>0.163**</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Performance</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>22.51</td>
<td>3.605</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

The result, as presented in Table 4 confirmed that there is a significant relationship between farm lighting/temperature and employee performance. The obtained positive Pearson Correlation Coefficient (r = 0.163) is an indication that the farm lighting/temperature affects employee performance.

Table 5: Regression Analysis of farm work equipment and tools contribution to employee retention

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R-squared</th>
<th>0.434884</th>
<th>Mean dependent var</th>
<th>76373452</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted R-squared</td>
<td>0.385105</td>
<td>S.D. dependent var</td>
<td>56429367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Log-likelihood</td>
<td>143.453</td>
<td>F-statistic</td>
<td>15.33230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durbin-Watson stat</td>
<td>1.829633</td>
<td>Prob(F-statistic)</td>
<td>0.457702</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Estimation Command: \( ER_v = \beta_0 + \beta_{FWE} + u \). Source: Authors’ computation (2020)

Table 5 explains that there exists a positive interaction between the variables measured. However, the relationship is statistically significant \( (P < 0.05) \). Moreover, 1% increase in the contribution of farm working equipment and tools will lead to about 38.5% increase in the level of employee retention. The results revealed that farm working equipment and tools contribute to the retention of an employee, although the contribution is partially significant while other variables contribute to employee retention. Therefore, the study rejects the null hypothesis and concludes that farm working equipment and tools have a significant impact on employee retention.

DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

The study investigated the physical work environment on-farm performance from employees’ perspectives at Tuns Farm Nigeria Limited, Osogbo, Osun State. It sought to find out whether physical working environment proxies such as farm layout, farm lighting and temperature, and farm working equipment and tools can influence farm performance via employees’ performance proxies. After a careful review of the literature, survey research was carried out on the study to measure the respondents’ views about the issue. The study area was Tuns Farm in Osogbo, and the population was made up of the workers on the farm, where the sampling technique was appropriately employed to select the target respondents for this research. In all, 434 respondents comprising of all categories of staff were involved in the study. Several findings were
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discovered: It was revealed that Tuns Farm Nigeria Limited physical working environment had an impact on employee job satisfaction, employee retention, and employee job performance.

The first finding shows, improper farm layout has a high impact on employee job satisfaction, meaning that proper farm layout will increase the capacity of workers and boost their morale when proper layout structure is being provided will give a comfortable working environment. This result corroborates with the result of findings credited to Gensler (2006) that an improved working condition and layout result will increase employee performance. Therefore, Tuns Farm needs to keep to the existing farm layout structure and continue to improve upon it so that it will continue to give satisfaction to workers to work comfortably and perform their job. Another finding showed the significant relationship between farm lighting/temperature and employee job performance. This means that by having proper lighting/temperature employees, job performance will be increased. This is in line with the previous findings of Patil and Kulkarni (2017), Srivastava (2008) that illumination, temperature, and good working conditions are determinants of workers' job performance.

The last finding revealed that the working equipment and tools have a significant impact on employee retention, meaning that having good working equipment and tools will encourage workers to stay long with the farmland reduces labour turnover, which strengthening the sustainability of the farm. The result is in line with the earlier literature Applebaum, Fowler, Fiedler, Osinubi & Robson (2010). The study, therefore, arrived at the ground that the physical working environment is fundamental to farm performance. To improve on the farm's performance via employees, management must ensure that the physical working environment is supportive to workers before adopting such. In this instance, farm layout, lighting and temperature, and equipment and tools must be friendly to workers. These findings of this study are in line with the previous literature Patil & Kulkarni (2017), Srivastava (2008), Miller, Erickson & Yust (2001), (Richard, 2003), Alimoglu and Donmez (2005), Gensler (2005), Applebaum, Fowler, Fiedler, Osinubi, and Robson (2010)

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The physical work environment plays a vital role in farm performance. Ensuring proper farm layout, lighting, and temperature, and provision of modern equipment and tools will go a long promoting farm performance. Therefore, it is the responsibility of Tuns Farm to provide proper farm layout, appropriate lighting and temperature environment, and modern equipment and tools that can guarantee employee's satisfaction, retention, and performance imperative for the farm's performance. Based on the outcome of this survey, the following recommendations are as a result of this put forward:

1. Management should ensure proper farm layout design, and this should be subject review annually.
2. The farm should also adopt a modern lighting/temperature system for their farmyards.
3. Management should prioritise the capacity to build a work environment that will motivate to increase employees’ farm performance.
4. A provision of modern working equipment and tools should be the priority of the management to improve the working capacity and boost employees’ morale.
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