



Ain Shams University  
Faculty of Engineering  
Department of Architecture

## An Approach for Designing Office Workspaces to Enhance Work Communication Performance

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment  
of the requirements for the degree of  
Doctor of Philosophy in Architecture

Prepared By: **Haitham Abdelsalam Mohamed**

Teaching Assistant

Department of Architecture - Ain Shams University

Supervised By:

**Prof. Morad Abdelkader**

Professor of Architecture and  
Environmental Control

Department of Architecture

Ain Shams University

**Associate Prof. Diao Eldin Ibrahim**

Associate Professor of Architecture

Department of Architecture

Ain Shams University



Faculty of Engineering  
Department of Architecture

## **An Approach for Designing Office Workspaces to Enhance Work Communication Performance**

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment  
of the requirements for the degree of  
Doctor of Philosophy in Architecture

By: **Haitham Abdelsalam Mohamed Ahmed Ali**

### **Board of Examiners**

**Professor Dr.Basil Ahmed Kamel**

Professor of Architecture – Cairo University

**Professor Dr.Yasser Mohamed Mansour**

Professor of Architecture – Ain Shams University

**Professor Dr.Morad Abdelkader Abdelmohsen**

Professor of Architecture and environmental control  
Ain Shams University

**Asst.Professor Dr.Diaa Eldin Ibrahim Mohamed**

Associate Professor of Architecture – Ain Shams University

### **Exam Date:**

Approval Stamp

Approval Date

Faculty Board Approval

University Board Approval

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to formally thank the supervisors of my thesis

**Dr. Morad Abdelkader** and **Dr.Diaa Eldin Ibrahim**

for their advice, encouragement, and inspiration throughout this research.

Also I would like to thank the jury members

**Dr. Basil Kamel** and **Dr. Yasser Mansour**

Many thanks to the doctors who attended my seminars

for their advice and support

Dr. Mohamed Gabr, Dr.Hanan Sabry, Dr.Tamer Samir, Dr.Sabah Soliman,

and Dr.Abeer Mostafa

Also I would like to thank the people of the organizations I have studied for

sharing their experiences with me and allowing me to investigate their

everyday working life.

## **Abstract:**

Aiming to better understanding of workspaces design and its link to users' behavior inside these spaces, this thesis focused on the relation of workspace spatial aspects and the communication process between the employees. Despite there are a lot of studies addressed improving the design of office workspaces, but there are no rigor results that could be implemented to improve the communication aspects of the users. The thesis reviewed the previous literature in depth then followed with the applied field study. Three office building in Cairo have been examined. Spatial factors i.e. (proximity, accessibility, visibility, and enclosure) have been investigated to find their relation to communication factors i.e. (tools, rates, privacy, distraction, and network). Space syntax analysis has been conducted in addition to Social Network Analysis and statistical analysis. Many essential results have been found, so the study suggested design implications from the findings. Additionally the study recommended important topics for the future research.

<b>1. Introduction</b>	
1.1 Preface	1
1.2 Research Problem	3
1.3 Research Objectives	3
1.4 Research Questions	4
1.5 Research Hypotheses	4
1.7 Research Structure	5
<b>2. Literature Review</b>	
2.1 Introduction	6
2.2 Evolution of Organization Theory:	7
2.3. The Organizational Process	9
2.4 Workspace and Organization (1960's-1990's)	14
2.4.1. Studies of the physical settings influence in organizations	15
2.4.2 Significant Studies in Workspace Communications:	20
2.4.3 The New Space Syntax Theory	23
2.5 Workspace and Organization (Mid 1990's onwards)	26
2.5.1. The Evolution of Organization Theory:	26
2.5.2 New Change in Office Workspaces:	29
2.5.3. Flexibility to change in Workspace:	34
2.5.4 Studies of Communication in Workspace:	36
2.6 Conclusion on Workspace and Organization Studies:	42
2.6.1 Disciplinary Boundaries and Disciplinary Cultures	43
2.6.2 Speculative Presumptions	45
2.6.3 Vague Operationalization:	45
2.6.4 Contradictory Evidence	46
2.6.5 Outdated Studies Lacking Further Articulation	50

<b>3. The Applied Study - Methodology</b>	
3.1. Preface	52
3.2. Workspace Variables	53
3.2.1. Interpersonal Proximity	53
3.2.2. Level of Enclosure	56
3.2.3. Accessibility and Visibility	57
3.3. Communication Variables	58
3.3.1. Communication Tools	58
3.3.2. Communication Rate	59
3.3.3. Communication Distraction:	60
3.3.4. Communication Privacy	61
3.3.5. Communication Network	62
3.4 Applied Study Tools	64
3.4.1 Structured Interviews	64
3.4.2 Questionnaire Survey:	64
3.4.3 Social Network Analysis	65
3.4.4 Space Syntax Analysis	65
3.4.5 Space Observations	66
3.5 Criteria to select cases	66
<b>4. The Applied Study – Case 1. PETROJET</b>	
4.1 The Sample of Study	67
4.2 Demographic attributes	69
4.3 Communication Tools and Rates	71
4.4 The Spaces where coworkers communicate	73
4.5. Workspaces and Circulation Spaces	80
4.6. The Space Syntax of the department	82
4.6.1. Workspaces Accessibility	82
4.6.2. Workspaces Visibility	83
4.6.3. Workspaces Axial Map:	86

4.7. Correlation between Workspace Proximity and Communication Tools and Rates	87
4.8. Correlation between Space syntax and Communication Tools and Rates	89
4.9. Correlation of Spatial Aspects with Communication Privacy and Distraction	91
4.10. Correlation of Spatial Aspects with Organizational Network communications	94
<b>5. The Applied Study – Case 2. ARADO</b>	
5.1 The Sample of Study	98
5.2 Demographic attributes	100
5.3 Communication Tools and Rates	102
5.4 The Spaces where coworkers communicate	104
5.5. Workspaces and Circulation Spaces	111
5.6. The Space Syntax of the department	113
5.6.1. Workspaces Accessibility	113
5.6.2. Workspaces Visibility	114
5.6.3. Workspaces Axial Map:	117
5.7. Correlation between Workspace Proximity and Communication Tools and Rates	118
5.8. Correlation between Space syntax and Communication Tools and Rates	120
5.9. Correlation of Spatial Aspects with Communication Privacy and Distraction	122
5.10. Correlation of Spatial Aspects with Organizational Network communications	125
<b>6. The Applied Study – Case 3. GOEIC</b>	
6.1 The Sample of Study	129
6.2 Demographic attributes	131
6.3 Communication Tools and Rates	133
6.4 The Spaces where coworkers communicate	135
6.5. Workspaces and Circulation Spaces	142
6.6. The Space Syntax of the department	144
6.6.1. Workspaces Accessibility	144
6.6.2. Workspaces Visibility	145
6.6.3. Workspaces Axial Map:	148
6.7. Correlation between Workspace Proximity and Communication Tools and Rates	149

6.8. Correlation between Space syntax and Communication Tools and Rates	151
6.9. Correlation of Spatial Aspects with Communication Privacy and Distraction	153
6.10. Correlation of Spatial Aspects with Organizational Network communications	156
<b>7. The Applied Study Comparative Analysis</b>	
7.1. Characteristics of the Cases:	160
7.2. Where and How Communications Occur:	162
7.3. Correlations of Workspaces and Communication Aspects:	168
<b>8. Findings and Recommendations</b>	
8.1. Research Findings	176
4.6.1 Communication Patterns and Spaces:	176
4.6.2 Proximity and Communication:	181
4.6.3. Workspace Syntax and Communication:	185
4.6.4. Workspace Spatial and Network Analysis:	187
8.2. Recommendations	190
8.2.1 Design Implications from Research Findings	190
8.2.1.1. Coworkers Proximity	191
8.2.1.2. Communication Equipment	192
5.2.1.3. Partitions and Furniture	193
8.2.1.4. Arrangement of Communication Spaces	194
8.2.1.5. Privacy Control	195
8.2.1.6. Network Degree and Centrality	196
8.2.1.7. Participatory and Flexible Design	196
8.2.2 Future Research	198
Appendices	
Appendix 1. Studies Comparison	200
Appendix 2. Interview & Questionnaire Forms	210
References	213



<b>1. Introduction</b>	
Fig 1.1. The topics of research in workspace design and organizational behavior	2
Fig 1.2. The three stages of the research	5
<b>2. Literature Review</b>	
Fig. 2.1. The four quadrants for the culture of an organization	13
Fig 2.2. workspace physical settings that affect work processes	16
Fig 2.3. Organization physical Structures that affect work processes	17
Fig 2.4. The Conceptual Model of the Organization	27
Fig 2.5. layout solutions in the contemporary workspaces	31
<b>3. The Applied Study - Methodology</b>	
Fig.3.1. Communicate reduces with the increase of distance	54
Fig.3.2. Spatial and Communicational Study Variables.	63
Fig.3.3. Criteria to select cases	66
<b>4. The Applied Study – Case 1. PETROJET</b>	
Fig 4.1: The engineering department plan	68
Fig 4.2: The types of tasks inside the department	69
Fig 4.3:. Percentages of respondents classified by work positions	70
Fig 4.4 Daily Communication Rate within 4 coworkers	71
Fig 4.5. The Spaces where coworkers prefer to communicate	75
Fig 4.6. The Spaces where coworkers prefer to communicate	75
Fig 4.7. Boxplot for the communication distance classified by work positions	76
Fig 4.8. The communication distance observed between coworkers	77
Fig 4.9. Self-reporting survey for why to communicate at a specific space	79
Fig 4.19. paths of movement inside the department	80
Fig 4.11. Accessibility Values presented by UCL depth map software	84
Fig 4.12. Visibility Values presented by UCL depth map software	85

Fig 4.13. Axial Map Connectivity by UCL depth map software	86
Fig 4.14. Department employees' links with the most contacted colleagues	95
Fig 4.15. Department employees' links presented by NodeXL	95
<b>5. The Applied Study – Case 2. ARADO</b>	
Fig 5.1: The floor plan of the department of planning	99
Fig 5.2: The types of tasks inside the department	100
Fig 5.3: Percentages of respondents classified by work positions	101
Fig 5.4 Daily Communication Rate within 4 coworkers	102
Fig 5.5. The Spaces where coworkers prefer to communicate	106
Fig 5.6. The Spaces where coworkers prefer to communicate	106
Fig 5.7. Boxplot for the communication distance classified by work positions	107
Fig 5.8. The communication distance observed between coworkers	108
Fig 5.9. Self-reporting survey for why to communicate at a specific space	110
Fig 5.10. paths of movement inside the department	111
Fig 5.11. Accessibility Values presented by UCL depth map software	115
Fig 5.12. Visibility Values presented by UCL depth map software	116
Fig 5.13. Axial Map Connectivity by UCL depth map software	117
Fig 5.14. Department employees' links with the most contacted colleagues	126
Fig 5.15. Department employees' links presented by NodeXL	126
<b>6. The Applied Study – Case 3. GOEIC</b>	
Fig 6.1: The exports department plan	130
Fig 6.2: The types of tasks inside the department	131
Fig 6.3: Percentages of respondents classified by work positions	133
Fig 6.4 Daily Communication Rate within 4 coworkers	133
Fig 6.5. The Spaces where coworkers prefer to communicate	137
Fig 6.6. The Spaces where coworkers prefer to communicate	137
Fig 6.7. Boxplot for the communication distance classified by work positions	138
Fig 6.8. The communication distance observed between coworkers	139
Fig 6.9. Self-reporting survey for why to communicate at a specific space	141

Fig 6.19. paths of movement inside the department	142
Fig 6.11. Accessibility Values presented by UCL depth map software	146
Fig 6.12. Visibility Values presented by UCL depth map software	147
Fig 6.13. Axial Map Connectivity by UCL depth map software	148
Fig 6.14. Department employees' links with the most contacted colleagues	157
Fig 6.15. Department employees' links presented by NodeXL	157
<b>7. The Applied Study – Comparative Analysis</b>	
Fig 7.1. The spaces where communications occur and why there	164
Fig 7.2. communication distance in case 1 - PETROJET	165
Fig 7.3. communication distance in case 2 - ARADO	166
Fig 7.4. communication distance in case 1 - GOEIC	166
Fig 7.5. Mean values of communication distances according to communication tools	168
<b>8. Findings and Recommendations</b>	
Fig 8.1. The percentage of daily communications regarding the tools	177
Fig 8.2. The spaces where communications occur and why there	179
Fig 8.3. The reasons to communicate at a specific space.	180
Fig 8.4. The communication distance between coworkers	181
Fig 8.5. Communication distance regarding the tools	182
Fig 8.6. Correlation of proximity with face to face and telephone communications	184
Fig 8.7. Correlations between communication tools	184
Fig 8.8. Spatial Variables that influence Workspace Communications	189

<b>2. Literature Review</b>	
Table: 2.1 Mechanistic and Organic structure terms	10
Table: 2.2 Bureaucracy and Adhocracy terms	12
Table: 2.3 Conventional and New Ways of Working, (Worthington, 2006)	30
Table: 2.4. The Four Basic Workspace Patterns, (Duffy 1997)	32
Table: 2.5 Comparison of methods and outcomes for studies that analyzed workspaces and their changing communication patterns	47
<b>4. The Applied Study – Case 1. PETROJET</b>	
Table: 4.1 Communication Tools and Rates	72
Table: 4.2 Statistics of face to face conversations inside the department	74
Table: 4.3 Space syntax Values calculated by UCL depth map software	83
Table: 4.4 Correlations between Coworkers Distance and Communication Rate	88
Table: 4.5 Correlations between Space Syntax values and Communication Rate	90
Table: 4.6 Responses for privacy and distraction classified by workspace enclosure	91
Table: 4.7 Correlation of Space syntax with Privacy and Distraction	93
Table: 4.8 Values of Node Degree and Betweenness Centrality by NodeXL	94
Table: 4.9 Correlation of Spatial and network characteristics	96
Table: 4.10 Correlation of Spatial and network characteristics	97
<b>5. The Applied Study – Case 2. ARADO</b>	
Table: 5.1 Communication Tools and Rates	103
Table: 5.2 Statistics of face to face conversations inside the department	105
Table: 5.3 Space syntax Values calculated by UCL depth map software	114
Table: 5.4 Correlations between Coworkers Distance and Communication Rate	119
Table: 5.5 Correlations between Space Syntax values and Communication Rate	121
Table: 5.6 Responses for privacy and distraction classified by workspace enclosure	122
Table: 5.7 Correlation of Space syntax with Privacy and Distraction	124
Table: 5.8 Values of Node Degree and Betweenness Centrality by NodeXL	125

Table: 5.9 Correlation of Spatial and network characteristics	127
Table: 5.10 Correlation of Spatial and network characteristics	129
<b>6. The Applied Study – Case 3. GOEIC</b>	
Table: 6.1 Communication Tools and Rates	134
Table: 6.2 Statistics of face to face conversations inside the department	136
Table: 6.3 Space syntax Values calculated by UCL depth map software	145
Table: 6.4 Correlations between Coworkers Distance and Communication Rate	150
Table: 6.5 Correlations between Space Syntax values and Communication Rate	152
Table: 6.6 Responses for privacy and distraction classified by workspace enclosure	153
Table: 6.7 Correlation of Space syntax with Privacy and Distraction	155
Table: 6.8 Values of Node Degree and Betweenness Centrality by NodeXL	156
Table: 6.9 Correlation of Spatial and network characteristics	158
Table: 6.10 Correlation of Spatial and network characteristics	159
<b>7. The Applied Study – Comparative Analysis</b>	
Table: 7.1 Study cases similarities in the Spatial and organizational aspects	161
Table: 7.2 Usage percentages of daily communication tools	162
Table: 7.3 Comparison of face to face communication conditions	163
Table: 7.4 Communication distances according to the communication tools	167
Table: 7.5 Correlations between Coworkers Proximity and Communication Rates and tools	169
Table: 7.6 Correlations between Space Syntax values and Communication Rate	171
Table: 7.7 Correlation of Space syntax with Privacy and Distraction	172
Table: 7.8 Correlation of Spatial and network characteristics	164
Table: 7.9 Correlation of Spatial and network characteristics	175
<b>8. Findings and Recommendations</b>	
Table: 4.1. face to face communication conditions	178

Appendices	
Appendix 1. Studies Comparison	
Table: 9.1: Overview of empirical studies on organizational behaviors in workplace environments that Steele (1973) referred to.	200
Table: 9.2: Overview of studies on organizational behaviors in workplace environments that Becker (1981) referred to.	202
Table: 9.3: Overview of studies on organizational behaviors in workplace environments that Sundstrom (1986) referred to.	206

# **1. Introduction**

1.1 Preface

1.2 Research Problem

1.3 Research Objectives

1.4 Research Questions

1.5 Research Hypotheses

1.6 Research Structure