

# 2 Theoretical framework for user-focused evaluation in office design

---

As was stated in the introduction, a user-focused renovation approach can enhance user satisfaction in offices and the functional quality of the offices while meeting energy performance goals. The first step for this renovation approach is to identify users' needs and the physical and psychological factors affecting user satisfaction, as input to office renovation projects. The main aim is to identify the factors that are affecting the physical and psychological satisfaction of users, based on what previous research has found in that field. Therefore, this chapter highlights the main parameters currently applied to the evaluation of user satisfaction, including the definitions based on the literature review.

The research approach for the literature review is discussed in section 2.2. Searching was limited to the main key terms of office, work environment, and user satisfaction and comfort. Section 2.3 explores the relationship between office renovation and user satisfaction. The terms user satisfaction and the user's expectations in workplaces are defined in section 2.4. In section 2.5, the important factors were searched through empirical-based international literature mainly. Based hereupon, section 2.6 discusses the challenge of evaluating user satisfaction. In section 2.7, the findings present ten main parameters to increase user satisfaction in office renovation. The parameters were categorised into three levels based on needs theories to organise the hierarchy of priorities.

## 2.1 Introduction

---

Awareness of healthy living has led to a concept of office design aimed to provide a comfortable work environment and to make high-quality workplaces. According to the European “Energy performance of Buildings Directive”, new energy efficient buildings should secure occupants’ comfort and high satisfaction in both physiological and psychological ways to increase productivity (Wagner et al., 2007). It means that new building concepts should be developed to meet the occupants’ comfort standard.

Some studies stated that green building offices lead to greater productivity, lower absence, and happier employees (Abbaszadeh et al., 2006; Armitage et al., 2011; Liang et al., 2014). In contrast, others argued that there is no significant relationship between green buildings and the occupants’ satisfaction with Indoor Environmental Quality (IEQ) or that the influence is quite small compared to conventional offices (Paul & Taylor, 2008; Thatcher & Milner, 2012). Leaman and Bordass (2007) and Gou et al. (2013) also concluded that the indoor environment of green buildings was not always performing highly, but that users tended to be more tolerant and forgivable in green buildings. Other research of Liang et al. (2014) explained that occupants were more tolerant with IEQ when concerning energy consumption. These studies proved that green buildings, such as LEED or Green Star certified buildings do not always support high level of user comfort and satisfaction.

Therefore, the question that this chapter considers is: does a high energy performance office provide end-users with a comfortable working environment? At present, building designs or renovation processes mainly focus on practical aspects such as energy performance, aesthetical aspects, cost optimisation, and fundamental indoor quality by complying with the building regulations. However, office renovation also has to provide a high-level comfortable work environment for the occupants’ well-being and satisfaction beside maximising energy reduction goals. Furthermore, a user-focused design approach or guideline for office renovation is lacking.

User satisfaction has been emphasised by several researchers as a significant factor for successful sustainable buildings (Leifer, 1998; Ornetzeder et al., 2016; Rothe et al., 2011; Wilkinson et al., 2011). Van Der Voordt (2004) stated that satisfaction can be related to the work itself, the social environment, the physical environment and interactions among them. Haynes (2008) narrowed down the occupants’ satisfaction to the physical environmental scale. According to him, user satisfaction can be measured by how comfortable occupants feel in their environment. The author also found that employees’ productivity became low when they are physically uncomfortable.

Several researchers have revealed the relationship between healthy buildings and employees' productivity (Abbaszadeh et al., 2006; Heerwagen, 2000; Singh et al., 2010), and the significance of IEQ impact on user satisfaction in green buildings (Altomonte et al., 2017; Krarti, 2018). According to ASHRAE (2001), poor indoor condition can cause low productivity and discomfort. Houtman et al. (2008) addressed that indoor conditions may be also connected to the mental health of building users.

The aim of this chapter is to identify the influential factors that have to be considered to increase user satisfaction in workplace. The outcome proposes ten physical and psychological parameters for user satisfaction. It also suggests the hierarchical priority structure based on needs theory: basic, proportional, and bonus factors. Integrating a user satisfaction approach for workplaces in energy renovation projects is a challenge in both building engineering and building management fields. Thereby the advanced user satisfaction approach is at the cutting edge of research in the built environment. The main research questions that will be answered in chapter 2 are: what are the initial factors to maximise user satisfaction, how can the order of priority of influential factors be determined, and how are the influential factors related to energy-efficiency?

## 2.2 Methodology

---

This chapter presents an international literature review on user satisfaction of workplaces with the aim to apply the findings to energy-efficient office renovations. The key search terms for the literature study focused on work environment including 'office renovation', 'user satisfaction', 'comfort', 'wellbeing', 'work environment', 'workspace' and 'workplace', 'energy efficiency', and 'green building'. The search was carried out by using the online journal article databases: Scopus, ScienceDirect and Google Scholar. TABLE 2.1 shows keywords used for searching journal and book databases. In order to select only office related user satisfaction, some keywords were used to sort out unrelated field information such as hospital, school, house, housing, systems, software, network, infrastructure and city grid.

TABLE 2.1 Keywords used for journal article searches

Search keywords	
AND	(work environment or office or workplace or workspace) (user satisfaction or comfort or wellbeing) (office renovation or energy efficiency or green building)
AND NOT	(hospital) (school building or educational building) (housing or house) (systems or software or network or infrastructure) (city grid or urban structure)

From Scopus, only 12 documents were found. 3 journal articles dealt with these topics from 1989 to 1999, and 9 articles were found from 2000 onwards. Seventy-seven articles were found from 2001 onwards via ScienceDirect. Google scholar was used to limit missing information as a result of excluding some keywords. The results from the literature search showed that the topic first gained interest after 2000, and so the literature review was limited to the period 2000–2018.

The scope of chapter includes the most influential factors in workplace environment and office renovation that were determined in studies during the previous two decades. 124 papers were referenced as main input to analyse the relationship between the two fields. The finding intersections approach (Ridley, 2008) was used for the literature review in this chapter (see FIG. 2.1). This approach helps to define the gap and overlapping issues between office renovation and user satisfaction, showing how each field has been developed separately, and where intersection is found.

The literature selected was classified into five categories (see TABLE 2.2). Literature was prioritised based on these categorised keywords. Literature was reviewed on energy-efficient building renovation and user satisfaction as main areas. FIG. 2.1 presents the intersection from the literature approach and keywords identifying overlapping and separated subject fields. However, user satisfaction and wellbeing has been a major consideration.

TABLE 2.2 Summary of keywords from selected journal articles

Keywords	Number of literatures
Energy efficient building renovation/sustainable office	39
Organisational management of workplace	36
User satisfaction, well-being and psychological comfort	58
Indoor climate and physical comfort	25
Office environment and comfort	31




FIG. 2.1 Literature review approach

## 2.3 Energy-efficient office renovation and user satisfaction

---

Building renovation technologies mainly deal with energy efficiency and high-quality indoor environments. However, human comfort is often overlooked in sustainable building design principles (Shahzad et al., 2016). Retrofitted buildings are often regarded as comfortable and healthy buildings because of improved indoor environmental quality (Krarti, 2018; Leaman & Bordass, 2007). Lower environmental impact or green buildings scored better on indoor environment and (Leaman & Bordass, 2007). Nonetheless, building energy research shows a conflicting issue between energy saving and optimisation of indoor comfort (Lu et al., 2017; Shaikh et al., 2014). It is a big challenge to include office users in a renovation design process due to many uncertainties, such as service change and various human behaviour, which can directly affect the selection of renovation technologies (Allouhi et al., 2015; Ma et al., 2012). Besides, there are many factors with significant impact on the sustainability of a building, for instance the building envelope, building elements and building services (Bruel et al., 2013; Iwaro & Mwashia, 2013; Jensen et al., 2013). Similar studies also found barriers regarding the relationship between economic issues and building property value (Allouhi et al., 2015; Chegut et al., 2014; Kok & Jennen, 2011; Kok & Jennen, 2012; Newell et al., 2011). Most of the studies mentioned above stressed the importance of standard renovation methods that can provide guidelines for user-focused building renovation.

From a functional point of view, the main concept of the office design is becoming more focused on the occupant's satisfaction and preferences. At the same time, the concept of office design has changed due to the various working patterns with the advancement of ICT. Studies have proved that a high quality of the physical environment is directly connected to employee satisfaction (Veitch et al., 2007; Wells, 2000) and productivity (Al-Horr et al., 2016; Maarleveld et al., 2009; Tucker & Smith, 2008; Wilkinson et al., 2011). Other studies have investigated the relationship between sustainable office buildings and workspace environment (Arge, 2005; Dobbelsteen, 2004; Wilkinson et al., 2011), and the well-being and health of occupants and office design (De Croon et al., 2005; Leder et al., 2016; G. Newsham et al., 2009).

In those findings, the physical working environment (e.g., the organisational plan and indoor environmental quality) and user comfort are interlinked to satisfaction, and these perspectives need to be considered for office renovation. Thus, three concepts for the sustainable office plan can be defined: high functionality for occupants, renovation strategies for energy efficiency and user satisfaction.

## 2.4 An overview of the occupant satisfaction of workplaces

---

### 2.4.1 Definition of the occupants' satisfaction of workplaces

---

Occupant satisfaction is quite intangible. Huber et al. (2014) alerted that a general overview of user satisfaction and influencing factors in building design research is lacking. Moreover, it is difficult to define the term of user satisfaction, since there is no standardised measurement method for user satisfaction. Van der Voordt (2003), however, defined that employee satisfaction is improved by meeting the employees' preferences and needs in their working environment, and the increase of the employees' satisfaction level is caused by their physical and psychological comfort degree. Shaikh et al. (2014) stated that comfort is the condition of mind influenced by psychological effects and is coherent with satisfaction of the environment. Their definitions show that the occupants' preferences are important elements for them to be satisfied and perform well. Rothe et al. (2012) also agreed that when the workplace condition meets the occupants' preferences, they show higher user satisfaction. Other research of Rothe et al. (2011) summarised the concepts of user needs, preferences and requirement based on literature (see FIG. 2.2). Basic psychological needs, such as comfort, safety, sense of belonging, and security are required for people to perform well and maximise their potentials.

The majority of scholars have explored the relationship between environmental influences and occupants' well-being by focusing on the range from physical-related well-being, such as indoor environmental quality (IEQ) (Humphreys, 2005; Levin, 2003; Mofidi & Akbari, 2016; G. Newsham et al., 2009; Wargoeki et al., 2012), to psychological-related well-being. These factors are controlled by organisational management, the employees' way of working as described by work pattern, flexibility of workspaces, and social interaction (Ekstrand & Hansen, 2016; Harris, 2016; Haynes, 2007; Ruostela et al., 2015). The influence of the office layout, ceiling height and openness (Danielsson & Bodin, 2008; Vartanian et al., 2015) also have been studied as a part of psychological elements.




FIG. 2.2 The relationship between the concepts need, preference, and requirement and implementation (Rothe et al. (2010))

## 2.4.2 Occupant preferences and expectations of workplaces

Understanding occupants' preferences and requirements in working environment is a key driver to increase their satisfaction level. IEQ is the main element which has an effect on the degree of user satisfaction (Bluyssen, 2013; Frontczak et al., 2012). A preliminary study of Wilkinson et al. (2011) analysed parameters influencing user satisfaction in office buildings from various perspectives. The author revealed that there was a big gap between user satisfaction and expectations in individual control of environmental quality. Moreover, IEQ factors such as temperature, ventilation, heating, cooling and lighting were the most problematic issues, because the indoor condition does not qualify occupants' expectations.

From the employee's perspective, the interesting issues of office renovation are well-being and a healthy work environment (Leather et al., 2003). Employees want to work in a hygienic, comfortable and user controllable workplace where they can feel at home (Naccarella et al., 2018). Another study about the user value of office buildings distinguished the meaning of well-being into psychological well-being and physical well-being. Van der Voordt and Wegen (2005) defined the concept of functional quality of buildings with nine aspects: accessibility, parking facilities, efficiency, flexibility, safety, spatial orientation, privacy, territoriality and social contact, health and physical well-being, and sustainability.

TABLE 2.3 shows the most frequently mentioned factors with a significant impact on user satisfaction, according to the selected literature from the last twenty years. The literature was selected based on keywords: occupants (user) satisfaction, comfort/well-being, indoor climate and comfort, energy efficient building renovation. Nevertheless, a built environmental factor being mentioned in the literature does not necessarily establish a casual link. Many studies of Haynes (2007), Van Der Voordt (2004), Rothe et al. (2011), Appel-Meulenbroek et al. (2011), Wilkinson et al. (2011), Techau et al. (2016), and Ornetzeder et al. (2016) cover a wide range of user requirements contributing to satisfaction, ranging from physiological and psychological to social aspects. Rothe et al. (2011), and Al-Horr et al. (2016) included additional factors such as building location and amenities as factors that attribute user preferences. Kim and De Dear (2013) conducted survey based on various parameters that are not only physical and psychological conditions but also ergonomics and office equipment (see TABLE 2.3). The main conclusion was that spatial configuration has a significant influence on physical and psychological satisfaction.

Harris (2016), Oseland (2009), and Danielsson and Bodin (2008) focused on psychological aspects of user requirements such as interaction with colleagues, privacy, and outside scenery. Interestingly, the researchers connected these preferences to office types and organisation. Choi and Moon (2017) revealed that environmental satisfaction is influenced by the location of the workstations. Baird et al. (2012); Choi and Moon (2017); Liu et al. (2018), and Levin (2003) studied the relationship between user satisfaction and indoor environmental parameters. Levin (2003) emphasised that user control over indoor environment is essential to increase the level of user satisfaction. Pathak et al. (2014) observed in an empirical study that thermal, lighting and spatial arrangements are the most important parameters for users' comfort, satisfaction and efficiency.

Based on TABLE 2.3, the top ten factors for measuring user satisfaction level according to the literature were selected: thermal comfort, air quality, noise, light, user control, privacy, spatial comfort, concentration, communication/collaboration, and social contact. Indoor climate and thermal comfort are significantly related to each other. Many studies deal with the topic. On the other hand, organisational management of workplace strongly influences psychological comfort of employees.

TABLE 2.3 Criteria influencing user satisfaction in office buildings

References	User preferences/requirement factors																			
	Thermal comfort	Air quality	Noise control	Light/ Daylight	User control	Spatial comfort	Privacy	Ability to do work	Concentration	Communication / collaboration	Social contact	Work location	Ambience	Aesthetic	Dimension work desk	Ergonomics	Building location/amenities	View/scenery	Well-equipped facility	
Altomonte et al. (2019)	+	+		+	+	+						+							+	
Liu et al. (2018)	+	+	+	+	+		+			+										
Choi and Moon (2017)	+	+	+	+		+	+												+	
Al-Horr et al. (2016)	+	+	+	+		+	+					+		+				+		
Harris (2016)									+	+		+	+							
Techau et al. (2016)		+	+	+	+								+						+	
Ornetzeder et al. (2016)	+	+	+	+		+	+	+			+	+							+	
Pathak et al. (2014)	+			+		+						+								
Kim and De Dear (2013)	+	+	+	+		+	+			+		+			+	+			+	
Baird et al. (2012)	+	+	+	+	+															
Appel-Meulenbroek et al. (2011)	+				+	+	+				+	+	+	+	+	+			+	
Wilkinson et al. (2011)	+	+	+	+	+							+							+	
Rothe et al. (2011)	+	+	+	+		+	+	+	+	+		+	+					+	+	
Niemi and Lindholm (2010)	+	+	+	+						+		+								
Oseland (2009)							+		+	+	+	+							+	
Danielsson and Bodin (2008)					+		+		+	+	+	+								
Haynes (2007)	+		+	+			+		+	+	+	+		+						
Van Der Voordt (2004)	+		+	+			+		+	+	+	+	+						+	
Levin (2003)	+	+		+	+															
Total	15	12	12	15	8	8	11	2	6	9	6	14	5	3	2	2	2	2	5	6

## 2.5 Measuring user satisfaction and measurement factors

---

### 2.5.1 User satisfaction measurement

---

Although measuring user satisfaction is complicated, it is imperative to develop a measurement method that can be applied to building design. A higher user satisfaction can strengthen renovation design solutions and the building's total value (Shafaghat et al., 2016). Post occupancy evaluation (POE) has widely been used to evaluate building performance (Göçer et al., 2015). This method is also applicable for user's wellbeing and satisfaction with renovation projects (Al-Horr et al., 2016). Existing measurement tools mainly focus on the indoor office environment.

TABLE 2.4 shows literature on user satisfaction parameters as well as on analytical measurement tools. It also highlights that POE is a common method to collect feedbacks on a building's performance in use. POE uses three different tools, questionnaires and interviews, bills and metrics, and physical measurements by using sensors. Green buildings are considered healthy indoor environments when 80% of the end-users are satisfied with the environmental settings (ASHRAE Standard, 2010). However, in a recent study, Loftness et al. (2018) designed a new framework for evaluating building performance and POE, based on spatial, thermal, air, acoustic, visual and building integrity.

TABLE 2.4 Summary of studies investigating parameters affecting user satisfaction

Study	Title	Results	Tools
Loftness et al. (2018)	Critical Frameworks for Building Evaluation: User Satisfaction, Environmental Measurements and the Technical Attributes of Building Systems (POE + M)	POE+M helps occupants and managers to understand the impacts of work environments on health and productivity; to analyse building systems for IEQ.	Post Occupants Evaluation and Measurements (POE + M), National Environmental Assessment Toolkit (NEAT)
Candido et al. (2016)	BOSSA: A multidimensional post-occupancy evaluation tool	Evaluation tool for nine indoor environmental quality dimensions and occupants' satisfaction	Building Occupants Survey System Australia (BOSSA)
Wargocki et al. (2012)	Satisfaction and self-estimated performance in relation to indoor environmental parameters and building features	Occupants in green buildings are on average more satisfied with their air quality and thermal comfort. Green offices prefer the spatial layout of open or partitioned floor plans to enclosed private offices.	LEED-rated/green buildings for indoor environmental quality (IEQ)
Blyussen et al. (2011)	Comfort of workers in office buildings: The European HOPE project	Perceived comfort is more than the indoor air quality, noise, lighting and thermal comfort responses. it also includes emotional state	Sir Karl Popper's theory model, Principal component analysis (PCA)
Schakib-Ekbatan et al. (2010)	Occupant satisfaction as an indicator for the socio-cultural dimension of sustainable office buildings development of an overall building index	User satisfaction for comfort parameters at workplaces was affected by temperature, lighting conditions, air quality, acoustics, spatial condition and office layout	Principal component analysis (PCA), Post occupancy evaluation (POE)
Veitch et al. (2007)	A model of satisfaction with open-plan office conditions: COPE field findings	18-item environmental satisfaction measure formed a three-factor structure reflecting satisfaction with: privacy/acoustics, lighting, and ventilation/temperature	Satisfaction with environmental features (SEF) measure
Humphreys (2005)	Quantifying occupant comfort: are combined indices of the indoor environment practicable?	Balanced occupants' satisfaction and overall assessments about indoor environment.	ASHRAE scale
Leifer (1998)	Evaluating user satisfaction: case studies in Australasia	User survey instrument based on nine parameters five grade scales regarding to user satisfaction	User satisfaction evaluation tool developed by Works Canada

## 2.5.2 Classification of parameters affecting user satisfaction

---

Many studies mixed physical quality and psychological or cognitive user satisfaction by using a cause and effect analytical approach. The approach basically analyses measurable human behaviour and satisfaction based on physical conditions (Vischer, 2008). However, perceived satisfaction is more than physical conditions (Bluyssen et al., 2011). Therefore, it is important to develop a theoretical framework to determine the order of priority or the degree of importance among factors influencing user satisfaction.

From an architectural point of view, Vischer (2008a) illustrated a form for assessing user experience including three comfort levels: physical comfort, functional comfort and psychological comfort, and how well the office provides effective and comfortable workplaces to users. Feige et al. (2013) redefined the dimension of comfort factors with three levels: Physical comfort relates to biological responses to indoor quality, climate, noise and ergonomics; functional comfort refers to the suitability for work tasks; psychological comfort indicates space-related needs such as social and spatial variables. Kim and de Dear (2012) classified the dimensions of comfort into three categories: basic factors can cause dissatisfaction when they are not fulfilled; proportional factors can change the satisfaction level proportionally; and bonus factors that although showing poor performance do not result in dissatisfaction. The classification of Kim and de Dear (2012) is similar to the Kano model (Kano, 1984).

## 2.5.3 Physical factors

---

Physical factors were selected based on the relationship with biological responses to indoor climate and quality. Those factors are basic needs that may cause severe dissatisfaction and illness.

### **Thermal comfort**

---

Thermal comfort is subjective and depends on dynamic factors consisting of four variables: air temperature, relative humidity, relative air velocity, and radiation (Hong et al., 2015). Although providing a place where every occupant can be fully satisfied is practically impossible, it is important to define the thermal comfort range of occupants. Thermal comfort in an office can be measured by the number of discomfort complaints from occupants (Al-Horr et al., 2016). A laboratory

study examining the effect of operative temperature on relative work performance. According to Roelofsen (2002) and Witterseh et al. (2004), comfortable temperature brings optimal work performance. Lan et al. (2012) shows that in summer the indoor temperature for optimum performance can be increased from 23.9 to 25.4°C. In winter, the indoor air temperature for optimum performance can be decreased from 21.9 to 19.7°C. Another laboratory study of Tham and Willem (2010) tested thermal comfort levels and time exposure of occupants in three different room conditions. The result is that the thermal comfort is the highest at 23°C, and that decreasing the temperature in winter and increasing it in summer for energy efficiency had a negative impact on occupants' comfort. Two studies of Ornetzeder et al. (2016) and Tham and Willem (2010) stated that the preferred indoor air temperature for occupants' comfort is regardless of energy efficiency considerations.

## **Air quality**

A work place with good air quality has an impact on the health condition and satisfaction rate of occupants. Indoor air quality (IAQ) defines the air quality related to pollutants, contaminants, and ventilation. IAQ studies have found these issues by conducting a survey about irritation, headaches, fatigue and illness, which are related to Sick Building Syndrome (SBS) symptoms (Seppänen et al., 2006; Wargocki et al., 2000). IAQ is one of factors has influence on SBS, particularly caused by chemical and biological contaminants, inadequate ventilation, and physical air humidity (Berglund et al., 1999; Joshi, 2008). Stolwijk (1991) defined the sick-building syndrome as 'the occurrence of an excessive number of subjective complaints by the occupants of a building. These complaints include headache, irritation of the eyes, nose, and throat, lethargy, inability to concentrate, objectionable odours, and less frequently, nausea, dizziness, chest tightness, etc.'

Ventilation systems play a key role for air quality. Newsham et al. (2013) found that LEED rated buildings provided higher satisfaction levels with the air quality than non-LEED rated buildings. However, Ornetzeder et al. (2016) reported that occupants' satisfaction with the air quality was relatively low during winter due to dry air and low humidity. Schiavon and Altomonte (2014) stated that LEED buildings did not necessarily affect occupants' satisfaction with the indoor environment. In line with earlier research, occupants in non-BREEAM certified offices tended to be more satisfied with the air quality than occupants in BREE certified offices (Altomonte et al., 2017). Particularly, modern office buildings that have an automatic air handling unit without openable windows could cause occupant dissatisfaction.

## **Noise control**

---

Noise has a high relevance in office building design. The effect of noise can lead to distraction and interruptions in work processes of occupants. Noise in the office normally comes from colleagues, and it often occurs in the open-plan office (Ornetzeder et al., 2016). Banbury and Berry (2005) stated that office noise would cause dissatisfaction with the work environment. The most disturbing noise is irrelevant speech in the background (Hongisto, 2005), especially 'intelligible speech' (Venetjoki et al., 2006). Altomonte et al. (2019) revealed a strong relationship between noise, sound privacy and occupant satisfaction. Noise performance not only has an impact on privacy but also productivity. For instance, open-plan offices have advantages in terms of good interaction and communication with colleagues (Heerwagen et al., 2004). Kim and De Dear (2013) stated that enhanced interactions in open-plan offices do not compensate for distraction from noise. However, they found sound-privacy is a relatively unimportant factor in overall workspace satisfaction. The British Standards Institution recommends a range of background noise level that is acceptable for open-plan offices of 45 to 50 dB and for cellular offices of 35 to 40 dB (Field, 2008; Standard, 2014). In European standards, the level for the cellular office is 30 to 40 dB and for the open-plan office 35 to 45 dB.

## **Light and daylight**

---

Light conditions have an impact on visual comfort and are another factor with an influence on user satisfaction. Many studies have shown the correlation between daylight and user satisfaction. Groth (2007) found that lighting quality is important to attain user satisfaction. Kim and De Dear (2013) found that occupants in open-plan office were provided with more light than those in cellular offices. An et al. (2016) stated that more sun exposure was related to less depression and higher user satisfaction. The majority of office users prefers natural light over artificial light, for physical and psychological reasons (Galasiu & Veitch, 2006). Dissatisfaction with light quality was mainly caused by glare, and when the glazed percentage was under 40%, people felt comfortable in their workplaces (Menzies & Wherrett, 2005). A research of Villa and Labayrade (2016) aiming for energy-efficient luminous environment identified an optimal solution to be suitable for different user requirements. In shared office spaces, the solution is to supply an individual task lamp that does not have a high-power demand (11W each, LED lighting). Most problems of visual comfort were caused by too much sunlight (glare) coming from the south façade (Ornetzeder et al., 2016). The window and shade system, in this point of view, are important factors for an outdoor view and to serve natural light.

The preferred window size varies for different office conditions; a survey (Galasiu & Veitch, 2006) stated that the optimal window size on average needs to be in the range of 1.8 to 2.4 m in height to provide a wide lateral view.

#### 2.5.4 **Functional comfort factors**

---

Functional factors are related to the suitability for work activities. When those factors have the right value, users can be satisfied with work environment and perform the work task efficiently.

##### **User control**

---

User control is considered as one of the important factors in relation to the cognitive aspect, since when the indoor environment is individually controlled, the user satisfaction is likely to increase (Lee & Brand, 2005; Liu et al., 2018; Loftness et al., 2018; Proctor, 2014). A research found that when office workers could control their own indoor environment, their health was improved (Raw et al., 1990). Brager et al. (2004) revealed that occupants with a higher degree of personal control experienced most thermal satisfaction, and emphasised the importance of personal thermal control.

From an economic perspective, user control can cause a waste of energy due to inefficient thermal control (Shahzad et al., 2016). In general, if people adjust to a cooler temperature during summer than the average temperature, and to a warmer temperature during winter, this will cause a greater energy use. According to Zhang et al. (2010), reducing the degree of personal control in workplace could save energy, but had no severe impact on user comfort. In addition, determining the optimal points of IEQ levels for various occupant types and the optimal operational strategy will be key to achieve both goals.

##### **Privacy**

---

Privacy has a close relationship with office layout. The privacy of office workers is better protected in an individual space than in an open-plan office. Privacy is distinguished by physical and cognitive aspects; sound privacy, visual privacy and perceived privacy, experienced by uncontrolled social contact and interruptions (Kim & De Dear, 2013). Especially, the open-plan office has poor privacy conditions.

On the other hand, combi and flex offices lead to higher satisfaction for privacy and concentration, since those offices still can provide back-up spaces (De Been & Beijer, 2014). However, the occurrence of privacy problems in an open-plan office depends on the density of workstations, office layout, people moving around, noise level, next to several other factors. High density might lead to decreased satisfaction due to the lack of privacy and unexpected social contact (Maher & von Hippel, 2005). On the contrary, a larger workstation with low density increases the satisfaction rate with acoustics and privacy (Leder et al., 2016) because of a greater distance between colleagues. When privacy increased, the environmental satisfaction tended to increase (Duval et al., 2002).

## **Concentration**

Concentration implies being able to focus on work (Vos & Van der Voordt, 2002). Studies dealing with concentration issues mainly compare the occupants experience between open-plan and cellular office, and investigate distracting factors. Concentration is disturbed by different elements: air quality, intelligible speech, and glare. In the work environment, concentration is a significant factor for a worker who has more single-oriented work task. Kaarlela-Tuomaala et al. (2009) revealed that the most distracting factor in open-plan offices was intelligible speech followed by too high or too low temperature. In private offices, temperature was the most distracting factor followed by draught, and intelligible speech was third.

## **Communication/collaboration**

Improvement of the communication level is connected to productivity, and leads to effective collaboration (Heerwagen et al., 2004), because better information exchange between colleagues and having more contact creates more understanding of each other (Van der Voordt, 2003). Open-plan offices are believed to enhance communication and interactions between colleagues (Brand & Smith, 2005). On the contrary, open plan offices have a potential sound disruption and lack of privacy (Kim & De Dear, 2013; Schiavon & Altomonte, 2014). One empirical study of De Been and Beijer (2014) explained that people were more satisfied with communication in combi offices than cellular and flex offices. Rothe et al. (2011) stated that opportunity to concentrate and opportunity to communicate were the most important attributes, and privacy was found less important for productivity.

## 2.5.5 Psychological comfort factor

---

Psychological factors are related to spatial needs such as social and spatial comfort. These factors contribute to better work results and high level of satisfaction, although absence of these factors does not mean that people are not able to work.

### Social contact

---

Establishing social contact is another factor to satisfy user demands. The definition of social contact here means interacting with other people during breaks or to have a chat occasionally. This parameter is highly linked to office layout and workplace operation, but is not necessarily required for user satisfaction. Samani (2015) used the concept of social and spatial density defined by Duval et al. (2002). According to Samani (2015), increased density provided chances for building friendship, communication, and environmental work satisfaction. Shier and Graham (2011) found that the overall wellbeing was affected by the relationship with colleagues.

### Spatial comfort

---

Spatial comfort is another key factor that determines to which extent workers are satisfied and motivated in their workplace (Chandrasekar, 2011). Spatial comfort here defines that employees feel at home at their workplace. For example, they can ensure their privacy, or they can have a sense of belonging in their working group through the spatial design of the office. Although this is a quite subjective factor, it is worthwhile to mention for office design: several studies have revealed that office workers who feel comfortable with their work environment tend to show better work results and have relatively higher self-esteem (Leder et al., 2016; Lee & Brand, 2005; Salama & Courtney, 2013). The awareness of spatial comfort is also associated with the organisation of the office such as spatial configuration and density of workplaces. Kim et al. (2016) stated that flexi-desk users tended to be dissatisfied due to the issues about lack of territory and ability to personalise their work desks. Ikonne and Yacob (2014) found that spatial comfort significantly contributes to high level of satisfaction. A survey revealed that almost 90% of the respondents found that better workplace layout and functional support result in higher overall workers' performance (El-Zeiny, 2012). Vischer (2008) states that a sense of territoriality and belonging is one of the typologies of the environmental psychology of workspace. Through other studies, it is identified that spatial comfort is only defined by workplace design and layout.

## 2.6 Discussion

---

This chapter presented the influential factors for user satisfaction and the importance of user satisfaction in office renovation processes. The definition of user satisfaction in this research is different from job satisfaction of employees. Job satisfaction often includes emotional aspects of having a good working relationship with a boss or a leader or colleagues. Job satisfaction, however, is not part of the physical design approach in office renovations.

The physical and psychological factors that can increase user satisfaction, were classified and analysed. The purpose of this section is to explore influential factors related to user satisfaction in broad range. The literature is not always empirical based studies. Therefore, the factors in this section are not necessarily evidence-based casual factors. The main challenge was how to compare the factors and evaluation of user satisfaction from different sources. Measuring human comfort and satisfaction is subjective, so the results might depend on the specific user's opinion. One possible method to deal with this, is to employ a questionnaire. However, qualitative data gathered by empirical research would need to be further processed to reveal correlations between satisfaction and office design.

The theories of human comfort help to understand the priority of user needs and requirements, and to decide the extent of including user demands in office renovations to enhance user satisfaction. The categorisations of factors influencing user satisfaction that were introduced by other researchers are quite similar to each other. However, they also can be interpreted in various ways. This literature review provides a classification which may help to examine user satisfaction based on the prioritisations of comfort.

## 2.7 Conclusion

This chapter reviewed factors affecting user satisfaction in work environments. Findings in chapter 2 highlight ten influential factors (e.g., thermal comfort, air quality, lighting, noise, user control, privacy, concentration, communication, social contact, and spatial comfort). In FIG. 2.3, the ten factors are integrated into the three-step requirement structure: physical comfort, functional comfort and psychological comfort. Physical factors listed in the previous chapter do not only contribute to user satisfaction, but are also associated with energy use. Therefore, these 10 factors should be included in a framework for achieving user satisfaction. Using this framework, designers or owners may decide to which extent they want to achieve user satisfaction and balance between energy saving and satisfaction.




FIG. 2.3 Classification of physical and psychological factors based on the dimensions of comfort

## References

- Abbaszadeh, S., Zagreus, L., Lehrer, D., & Huizenga, C. (2006). Occupant satisfaction with indoor environmental quality in green buildings. *Proceedings, Healthy Buildings*, 3, 365-370.
- Al-Horr, Y., Arif, M., Kaushik, A., Mazroei, A., Katafygiotou, M., & Elsarrag, E. (2016). Occupant productivity and office indoor environment quality: A review of the literature. *Building and Environment*, 105, 369-389. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.buildenv.2016.06.001>
- Allouhi, A., El Fouih, Y., Kousksou, T., Jamil, A., Zeraoui, Y., & Mourad, Y. (2015). Energy consumption and efficiency in buildings: current status and future trends. *Journal of Cleaner production*, 109, 118-130. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2015.05.139>
- Altomonte, S., Saadouni, S., Kent, M. G., & Schiavon, S. (2017). Satisfaction with indoor environmental quality in BREEAM and non-BREEAM certified office buildings. *Architectural Science Review*, 60(4), 343-355. doi:10.1080/00038628.2017.1336983
- Altomonte, S., Schiavon, S., Kent, M. G., & Brager, G. (2019). Indoor environmental quality and occupant satisfaction in green-certified buildings. *Building Research & Information*, 47(3), 255-274.
- An, M., Colarelli, S. M., O'Brien, K., & Boyajian, M. E. (2016). Why we need more nature at work: effects of natural elements and sunlight on employee mental health and work attitudes. *PLoS one*, 11(5), e0155614.
- Appel-Meulenbroek, R., Appel-Meulenbroek, R., Groenen, P., & Janssen, I. (2011). An end-user's perspective on activity-based office concepts. *Journal of Corporate Real Estate*, 13(2), 122-135.
- Arge, K. (2005). Adaptable office buildings: theory and practice. *Facilities*, 23(3/4), 119-127. doi:[doi:10.1108/02632770510578494](http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/02632770510578494)
- Armitage, L., Murugan, A., & Kato, H. (2011). Green offices in Australia: a user perception survey. *Journal of Corporate Real Estate*, 13(3), 169-180.
- Standard 55-2010. Thermal Environmental Conditions for Human Occupancy, (2010).
- Baird, G., Leaman, A., & Thompson, J. (2012). A comparison of the performance of sustainable buildings with conventional buildings from the point of view of the users. *Architectural science review*, 55(2), 135-144.
- Banbury, S. P., & Berry, D. C. (2005). Office noise and employee concentration: Identifying causes of disruption and potential improvements. *Ergonomics*, 48(1), 25-37.
- Berglund, B., Bluysen, P., Clausen, G., Garriga-Trillo, A., Gunnarsen, L., Knöppel, H., . . . Winneke, G. (1999). Sensory evaluation of indoor air quality. *European Collaborative Action: Indoor Air Quality and its Impact on Man. European Commission Report* (20), 24-25.
- Bluysen, P. M. (2013). *The healthy indoor environment: How to assess occupants' wellbeing in buildings*. London: Routledge.
- Bluysen, P. M., Aries, M., & van Dommelen, P. (2011). Comfort of workers in office buildings: The European HOPE project. *Building and Environment*, 46(1), 280-288. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.buildenv.2010.07.024>
- Brager, G., Paliaga, G., & De Dear, R. (2004). Operable windows, personal control and occupant comfort.
- Brand, J. L., & Smith, T. J. (2005). *Effects of reducing enclosure on perceptions of occupancy quality, job satisfaction, and job performance in open-plan offices*. Paper presented at the Proceedings of the Human Factors and Ergonomics Society Annual Meeting.
- Bruel, R., Fong, P., & Lees, E. (2013). A guide to developing strategies for building energy renovation. *Buildings Performance Institute Europe*.
- Candido, C., Kim, J., de Dear, R., & Thomas, L. (2016). BOSSA: a multidimensional post-occupancy evaluation tool. *Building Research & Information*, 44(2), 214-228.
- Chandrasekar, K. (2011). Workplace environment and its impact on organisational performance in public sector organisations. *International Journal of Enterprise Computing and Business Systems*, 1(1), 1-16.
- Chegut, A., Eichholtz, P., & Kok, N. (2014). Supply, Demand and the Value of Green Buildings. *Urban Studies*, 51(1), 22-43.
- Choi, J.-H., & Moon, J. (2017). Impacts of human and spatial factors on user satisfaction in office environments. *Building and Environment*, 114, 23-35. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.buildenv.2016.12.003>
- Danielsson, C. B., & Bodin, L. (2008). Office type in relation to health, well-being, and job satisfaction among employees. *Environment and behavior*, 40(5), 636-668.

- De Been, I., & Beijer, M. (2014). The influence of office type on satisfaction and perceived productivity support. *Journal of Facilities Management*, 12(2), 142-157.
- De Croon, E., Sluiter, J., Kuijjer, P. P., & Frings-Dresen, M. (2005). The effect of office concepts on worker health and performance: a systematic review of the literature. *Ergonomics*, 48(2), 119-134. doi:10.1080/00140130512331319409
- Dobbelsteen, A. v. d. (2004). *The Sustainable Office. An exploration of the potential for factor 20 environmental improvement of office accommodation*: TU Delft, Delft University of Technology.
- Duval, C. L., Veitch, J. A., & Charles, K. (2002). *Open-plan office density and environmental satisfaction*: Institute for Research in Construction.
- Ekstrand, M., & Hansen, G. K. (2016). Make it work! Creating an integrated workplace concept. *Journal of Corporate Real Estate*, 18(1), 17-29. doi:doi:10.1108/JCRE-10-2015-0031
- El-Zeiny, R. M. A. (2012). The Interior Design of Workplace and its Impact on Employees' Performance: A Case Study of the Private Sector Corporations in Egypt. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 35, 746-756. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2012.02.145
- Feige, A., Wallbaum, H., Janser, M., & Windlinger, L. (2013). Impact of sustainable office buildings on occupant's comfort and productivity. *Journal of Corporate Real Estate*, 15(1), 7-34.
- Field, C. (2008). Acoustic design in green buildings. *Ashrae Journal*, 50(9), 60-66.
- Frontczak, M., Schiavon, S., Goins, J., Arens, E., Zhang, H., & Wargocki, P. (2012). Quantitative relationships between occupant satisfaction and satisfaction aspects of indoor environmental quality and building design. *Indoor Air*, 22(2), 119-131.
- Galasiu, A. D., & Veitch, J. A. (2006). Occupant preferences and satisfaction with the luminous environment and control systems in daylight offices: a literature review. *Energy and Buildings*, 38(7), 728-742. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.enbuild.2006.03.001
- Göçer, Ö., Hua, Y., & Göçer, K. (2015). Completing the missing link in building design process: Enhancing post-occupancy evaluation method for effective feedback for building performance. *Building and Environment*, 89, 14-27. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.buildenv.2015.02.011
- Gou, Z., Prasad, D., & Siu-Yu Lau, S. (2013). Are green buildings more satisfactory and comfortable? *Habitat International*, 39, 156-161. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.habitatint.2012.12.007
- Groth, A. (2007). Climatic and non climatic aspect of indoor environment. *Energy Efficiency Building Design Guidelines for Botswana*, 6-9.
- Harris, R. (2016). New organisations and new workplaces: Implications for workplace design and management. *Journal of Corporate Real Estate*, 18(1), 4-16. doi:10.1108/jcre-10-2015-0026
- Haynes, B. P. (2007). Office productivity: A theoretical framework. *Journal of Corporate Real Estate*, 9(2), 97-110. doi:10.1108/14630010710828108
- Haynes, B. P. (2008). The impact of office comfort on productivity. *Journal of Facilities Management*, 6(1), 37-51.
- Heerwagen, J. (2000). Green buildings, organizational success and occupant productivity. *Building Research & Information*, 28(5-6), 353-367.
- Heerwagen, J. H., Kampschroer, K., Powell, K. M., & Loftness, V. (2004). Collaborative knowledge work environments. *Building Research & Information*, 32(6), 510-528.
- Hong, T., D'Oca, S., Turner, W. J., & Taylor-Lange, S. C. (2015). An ontology to represent energy-related occupant behavior in buildings. Part I: Introduction to the DNAs framework. *Building and Environment*, 92, 764-777.
- Hongisto, V. (2005). A model predicting the effect of speech of varying intelligibility on work performance. *Indoor Air*, 15(6), 458-468. doi:10.1111/j.1600-0668.2005.00391.x
- Houtman, I., Douwes, M., Jong, T. d., Meeuwssen, J., Jongen, M., Brekelmans, F., . . . Zwetsloot, G. (2008). *New forms of physical and psychosocial health risks at work*. Brussels: European Parliament.
- Huber, C., Koch, D., & Busko, S. (2014). An international comparison of user satisfaction in buildings from the perspective of facility management. *International Journal of Facility Management*, 5(2).
- Humphreys, M. A. (2005). Quantifying occupant comfort: are combined indices of the indoor environment practicable? *Building Research & Information*, 33(4), 317-325.
- Ikonne, C. N., & Yacob, H. (2014). Influence of Spatial Comfort and Environmental Workplace Ergonomics on Job Satisfaction of Librarians in the Federal and State University Libraries in Southern Nigeria. *Open Access Library Journal*, 1(06), 1-10.

- Iwano, J., & Mwashia, A. (2013). The impact of sustainable building envelope design on building sustainability using Integrated Performance Model. *International Journal of Sustainable Built Environment*, 2(2), 153-171. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ijbsbe.2014.03.002>
- Jensen, P. A., Maslesa, E., Gohardani, N., Björk, F., Kanarachos, S., & Fokaides, P. A. (2013, 12-14 June). *Sustainability Evaluation of Retrofitting and Renovation of Buildings in Early Stages*. Paper presented at the 7th Nordic Conference on Construction Economics and Organisation.
- Joshi, S. M. (2008). The sick building syndrome. *Indian journal of occupational and environmental medicine*, 12(2), 61.
- Kaarlela-Tuomaala, A., Helenius, R., Keskinen, E., & Hongisto, V. (2009). Effects of acoustic environment on work in private office rooms and open-plan offices—longitudinal study during relocation. *Ergonomics*, 52(11), 1423-1444.
- Kano, N. (1984). Attractive quality and must-be quality. *Hinshitsu (Quality, The Journal of Japanese Society for Quality Control)*, 14, 39-48.
- Kim, J., Candido, C., Thomas, L., & de Dear, R. (2016). Desk ownership in the workplace: The effect of non-territorial working on employee workplace satisfaction, perceived productivity and health. *Building and Environment*, 103, 203-214. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.buildenv.2016.04.015>
- Kim, J., & de Dear, R. (2012). Nonlinear relationships between individual IEQ factors and overall workspace satisfaction. *Building and Environment*, 49, 33-40.
- Kim, J., & De Dear, R. (2013). Workspace satisfaction: The privacy-communication trade-off in open-plan offices. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 36, 18-26.
- Kok, N., & Jennen, M. (2011). The value of energy labels in the European office market. *Maastricht University and RSM Erasmus, Maastricht and Rotterdam*.
- Kok, N., & Jennen, M. (2012). The impact of energy labels and accessibility on office rents. *Energy Policy*, 46, 489-497. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2012.04.015>
- Krarti, M. (2018). *Optimal Design and Retrofit of Energy Efficient Buildings, Communities, and Urban Centers*: Elsevier Science.
- Lan, L., Wargocki, P., & Lian, Z. (2012). Optimal thermal environment improves performance of office work. *REHVA Journal*, 49(1), 12-17.
- Leaman, A., & Bordass, B. (2007). Are users more tolerant of 'green' buildings? *Building Research & Information*, 35(6), 662-673.
- Leather, P., Beale, D., & Sullivan, L. (2003). Noise, psychosocial stress and their interaction in the workplace. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 23(2), 213-222.
- Leder, S., Newsham, G. R., Veitch, J. A., Mancini, S., & Charles, K. E. (2016). Effects of office environment on employee satisfaction: A new analysis. *Building Research & Information*, 44(1), 34-50.
- Lee, S. Y., & Brand, J. L. (2005). Effects of control over office workspace on perceptions of the work environment and work outcomes. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 25(3), 323-333. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvp.2005.08.001>
- Leifer, D. (1998). Evaluating user satisfaction: case studies in Australasia. *Facilities*, 16(5/6), 138-142.
- Levin, H. (2003). *Designing for people: what do building occupants really want?* Paper presented at the Healthy Buildings 2003, Singapore.
- Liang, H.-H., Chen, C.-P., Hwang, R.-L., Shih, W.-M., Lo, S.-C., & Liao, H.-Y. (2014). Satisfaction of occupants toward indoor environment quality of certified green office buildings in Taiwan. *Building and Environment*, 72, 232-242. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.buildenv.2013.11.007>
- Liu, Y., Wang, Z., Lin, B., Hong, J., & Zhu, Y. (2018). Occupant satisfaction in Three-Star-certified office buildings based on comparative study using LEED and BREEAM. *Building and Environment*, 132, 1-10. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.buildenv.2018.01.011>
- Loftness, V., Hartkopf, V., Aziz, A., Choi, J.-H., & Park, J. (2018). Critical Frameworks for Building Evaluation: User Satisfaction, Environmental Measurements and the Technical Attributes of Building Systems (POE+M). In *Building Performance Evaluation* (pp. 29-48). Cham: Springer.
- Lu, C. H., Wu, C. L., Weng, M. Y., Chen, W. C., & Fu, L. C. (2017). Context-Aware Energy Saving System With Multiple Comfort-Constrained Optimization in M2M-Based Home Environment. *IEEE Transactions on Automation Science and Engineering*, 14(3), 1400-1414. doi:10.1109/TASE.2015.2440303
- Ma, Z., Cooper, P., Daly, D., & Ledo, L. (2012). Existing building retrofits: Methodology and state-of-the-art. *Energy and Buildings*, 55, 889-902. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.enbuild.2012.08.018>

- Maarleveld, M., Volker, L., & Van Der Voordt, T. J. (2009). Measuring employee satisfaction in new offices—the WODI toolkit. *Journal of Facilities Management*, 7(3), 181-197.
- Maher, A., & von Hippel, C. (2005). Individual differences in employee reactions to open-plan offices. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 25(2), 219-229.
- Menzies, G. F., & Wherrett, J. R. (2005). Windows in the workplace: examining issues of environmental sustainability and occupant comfort in the selection of multi-glazed windows. *Energy and Buildings*, 37(6), 623-630. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enbuild.2004.09.012
- Mofidi, F., & Akbari, H. (2016). Integrated optimization of energy costs and occupants' productivity in commercial buildings. *Energy and Buildings*, 129, 247-260. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.enbuild.2016.07.059
- Naccarella, L., Newton, C., Pert, A., Seemann, K., Williams, R., Sellick, K., & Dow, B. (2018). Workplace design for the Australian residential aged care workforce. *Australasian journal on ageing*, 37(3), 194-201.
- Newell, G., McFarlane, J., & Kok, N. (2011). Building better returns—A study of the financial performance of green office buildings in Australia. *University of Western Sydney, Sydney*.
- Newsham, G., Brand, J., Donnelly, C., Veitch, J., Aries, M., & Charles, K. (2009). Linking indoor environment conditions to job satisfaction: a field study. *Building Research & Information*, 37(2), 129-147.
- Newsham, G. R., Birt, B. J., Arseneault, C., Thompson, A. J., Veitch, J. A., Mancini, S., . . . Burns, G. J. (2013). Do 'green' buildings have better indoor environments? New evidence. *Building Research & Information*, 41(4), 415-434.
- Niemi, J., & Lindholm, A. L. (2010). Methods for evaluating office occupiers' needs and preferences. *Journal of Corporate Real Estate*, 12(1), 33-46. doi:10.1108/14630011011025906
- Ornetzeder, M., Wicher, M., & Suschek-Berger, J. (2016). User satisfaction and well-being in energy efficient office buildings: Evidence from cutting-edge projects in Austria. *Energy and Buildings*, 118, 18-26.
- Oseland, N. (2009). The impact of psychological needs on office design. *Journal of Corporate Real Estate*, 11(4), 244-254. doi:10.1108/14630010911006738
- Pathak, P. M., Dongre, A. R., & Shiwalkar, J. P. (2014). Impact of Spatial, Thermal and Lighting Parameters on the Efficiency and Comfort of Users in Indian Workspaces. *Journal of Sustainable Development*, 7(4), 111.
- Paul, W. L., & Taylor, P. A. (2008). A comparison of occupant comfort and satisfaction between a green building and a conventional building. *Building and Environment*, 43(11), 1858-1870. doi:10.1016/j.buildenv.2007.11.006
- Proctor, C. R. (2014). *Effective organizational communication affects employee attitude, happiness, and job satisfaction*. Southern Utah University. Department of Communication. 2014.,
- Raw, G. J., Roys, M. S., & Leaman, A. (1990). *Further Findings from the Office Environment Survey: Productivity*. Toronto: Building Research Establishment.
- Ridley, D. D. (2008). *The Literature review : a step-by-step guide for students*. London :: Sage Publications.
- Roelofsen, P. (2002). The impact of office environments on employee performance: The design of the workplace as a strategy for productivity enhancement. *Journal of Facilities Management*, 1(3), 247-264.
- Rothe, P., Lindholm, A.-L., Hyvönen, A., & Nenonen, S. (2010). *Workplace preferences—does age make a difference*. Paper presented at the CIB W070 International Conference in Facilities Management.
- Rothe, P., Lindholm, A. L., Hyvönen, A., & Nenonen, S. (2011). User preferences of office occupiers: Investigating the differences. *Journal of Corporate Real Estate*, 13(2), 81-97. doi:10.1108/14630011111136803
- Rothe, P., Lindholm, A. L., Hyvönen, A., & Nenonen, S. (2012). Work environment preferences – does age make a difference? *Facilities*, 30(1/2), 78-95. doi:10.1108/02632771211194284
- Rothe, P. M., Beijer, M., & Van der Voordt, T. J. (2011, 24-25 May). *Most important aspects of the work environment: a comparison between two countries*. Paper presented at the EFMC2011: Proceedings of the 10th EuroFM research symposium: Cracking the productivity nut, Vienna, Austria, 24-25 May, 2011, Vienna.
- Ruostela, J., Lönnqvist, A., Palvalin, M., Vuolle, M., Patjas, M., & Raji, A.-L. (2015). 'New Ways of Working' as a tool for improving the performance of a knowledge-intensive company. *Knowledge Management Research & Practice*, 13(4), 382-390. doi:10.1057/kmrp.2013.57
- Salama, A. M., & Courtney, L. (2013). The impact of the spatial qualities of the workplace on architects' job satisfaction. *International Journal of Architectural Research:ArchNet-IJAR*, 7(1), 52-64.

- Samani, S. A. (2015). The impact of personal control over office workspace on environmental satisfaction and performance. *Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities*, 1(3), 163-175.
- Schakib-Ekbatan, K., Wagner, A., & Lussac, C. (2010, 9-11 April). *Occupant satisfaction as an indicator for the socio-cultural dimension of sustainable office buildingsdevelopment of an overall building index*. Paper presented at the Proceedings of Conference: Adapting to Change: New Thinking on Comfort, Windsor.
- Schiavon, S., & Altomonte, S. (2014). Influence of factors unrelated to environmental quality on occupant satisfaction in LEED and non-LEED certified buildings. *Building and Environment*, 77, 148-159. doi:10.1016/j.buildenv.2014.03.028
- Seppänen, O., Fisk, W. J., & Lei, Q. (2006). Ventilation and performance in office work. *Indoor Air*, 16(1), 28-36.
- Shafaghat, A., Keyvanfar, A., Abd. Majid, M. Z., Lamit, H. B., Ahmad, M. H., Ferwati, M. S., & Ghoshal, S. K. (2016). Methods for adaptive behaviors satisfaction assessment with energy efficient building design. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, 57, 250-259. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2015.12.133
- Shahzad, S., Brennan, J., Theodossopoulos, D., Hughes, B., & Calautit, J. K. (2016). Energy and comfort in contemporary open plan and traditional personal offices. *Applied energy*, 185, 1542-1555. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.apenergy.2016.02.100
- Shaikh, P. H., Nor, N. B. M., Nallagownden, P., Elamvazuthi, I., & Ibrahim, T. (2014). A review on optimized control systems for building energy and comfort management of smart sustainable buildings. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, 34, 409-429. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2014.03.027
- Shier, M. L., & Graham, J. R. (2011). Work-related factors that impact social work practitioners' subjective well-being: Well-being in the workplace. *Journal of Social Work*, 11(4), 402-421. doi:10.1177/1468017310380486
- Singh, A., Syal, M., Grady, S. C., & Korkmaz, S. (2010). Effects of Green Buildings on Employee Health and Productivity. *American Journal of Public Health*, 100(9), 1665-1668. doi:10.2105/AJPH.2009.180687
- Standard, B. (2014). BS 8233: 2014. *Guidance on Sound Insulation and Noise Reduction for Buildings*.
- Stolwijk, J. (1991). Sick-building syndrome. *Environmental Health Perspectives*, 95, 99.
- Techau, D., Owen, C., Paton, D., & Fay, R. (2016). Buildings, Brains & Behaviour Towards an affective neuroscience of architecture: The Hedonic Impact of Sustainable Work Environments on Occupant Well-being. *World Health Design*, 1, 24-37.
- Tham, K. W., & Willem, H. C. (2010). Room air temperature affects occupants' physiology, perceptions and mental alertness. *Building and Environment*, 45(1), 40-44. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.buildenv.2009.04.002
- Thatcher, A., & Milner, K. (2012). The impact of a 'green'building on employees' physical and psychological wellbeing. *Work*, 41(Supplement 1), 3816-3823.
- Tucker, M., & Smith, A. (2008). User perceptions in workplace productivity and strategic FM delivery. *Facilities*, 26(5/6), 196-212.
- Van der Voordt, D. J. M. (2003). *Costs and Benefits of Innovative Workplace Design*. Delft: Delft University of Technology, Faculty of Architecture, Department of Real Estate and Housing.
- Van der Voordt, D. J. M., & Wegen, H. B. R. (2005). *Architecture in Use: An Introduction to the Programming, Design and Evaluation of Buildings*. Bussum: Architectural Press, Routledge.
- Van Der Voordt, T. J. (2004). Productivity and employee satisfaction in flexible workplaces. *Journal of Corporate Real Estate*, 6(2), 133-148.
- Vartanian, O., Navarrete, G., Chatterjee, A., Fich, L. B., Gonzalez-Mora, J. L., Leder, H., . . . Skov, M. (2015). Architectural design and the brain: Effects of ceiling height and perceived enclosure on beauty judgments and approach-avoidance decisions. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 41, 10-18. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvp.2014.11.006
- Veitch, J. A., Charles, K. E., Farley, K. M. J., & Newsham, G. R. (2007). A model of satisfaction with open-plan office conditions: COPE field findings. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 27(3), 177-189. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvp.2007.04.002
- Venetjoki, N., Kaarlela-Tuomaala, A., Keskinen, E., & Hongisto, V. (2006). The effect of speech and speech intelligibility on task performance. *Ergonomics*, 49(11), 1068-1091.
- Villa, C., & Labayrade, R. (2016). A suitable and energy-efficient luminous environment for a shared office. *Lighting Research and Technology*, 48(6), 755-770. doi:10.1177/1477153515578309

- Vischer, J. C. (2008). Towards a user-centred theory of the built environment. *Building Research & Information*, 36(3), 231-240. doi:10.1080/09613210801936472
- Vischer, J. C. (2008). Towards an environmental psychology of workspace: How people are affected by environments for work. *Architectural Science Review*, 51(2), 97-108.
- Vos, P., & van der Voordt, T. (2002). Tomorrow's offices through today's eyes: Effects of innovation in the working environment. *Journal of Corporate Real Estate*, 4(1), 48-65.
- Wagner, A., Gossauer, E., Moosmann, C., Gropp, T., & Leonhart, R. (2007). Thermal comfort and workplace occupant satisfaction—Results of field studies in German low energy office buildings. *Energy and Buildings*, 39(7), 758-769. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enbuild.2007.02.013
- Wargocki, P., Frontczak, M., Schiavon, S., Goins, J., Arens, E., & Zhang, H. (2012). Satisfaction and self-estimated performance in relation to indoor environmental parameters and building features. In.
- Wargocki, P., Wyon, D. P., Sundell, J., Clausen, G., & Fanger, P. (2000). The effects of outdoor air supply rate in an office on perceived air quality, sick building syndrome (SBS) symptoms and productivity. *Indoor Air*, 10(4), 222-236.
- Wells, M. M. (2000). OFFICE CLUTTER OR MEANINGFUL PERSONAL DISPLAYS: THE ROLE OF OFFICE PERSONALIZATION IN EMPLOYEE AND ORGANIZATIONAL WELL-BEING. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 20(3), 239-255. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1006/jev.1999.0166
- Wilkinson, S. J., Reed, R., & Jailani, J. (2011, 16-19 January). *User satisfaction in sustainable office buildings: a preliminary study*. Paper presented at the PRRES 2011: Proceedings of the 17th Pacific Rim Real Estate Society Annual Conference, Gold Coast.
- Witterseh, T., Wyon, D. P., & Clausen, G. (2004). The effects of moderate heat stress and open-plan office noise distraction on SBS symptoms and on the performance of office work. *Indoor Air*, 14(8), 30-40.
- Zhang, H., Arens, E., Kim, D., Buchberger, E., Bauman, F., & Huizenga, C. (2010). Comfort, perceived air quality, and work performance in a low-power task–ambient conditioning system. *Building and Environment*, 45(1), 29-39. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.buildenv.2009.02.016

