

Designing for Diversity: Evaluating the Impact of Culturally Responsive Interior Design on Employee Well Being and Productivity in Workspaces

RAHIM NADERLOO

Full-time Faculty Member

Aesthetics and Interior Design Research Center
Department of Architecture and Interior Design
Iranian Institute of Education – Tehran/ Iran

Abstract

This mixed-methods study evaluates the impact of culturally responsive interior design on employee well-being and productivity in multicultural workspaces. Data were collected from 512 employees representing Iranian, Arab, East Asian, and Western cultural backgrounds working in corporate offices located in Tehran, Dubai, and London. The research employed a quasi-experimental pre-post intervention design, combining validated psychometric scales (including the WHO-5 Well-being Index, perceived stress scale, and job satisfaction measures), objective productivity metrics (task completion rates, error frequency, and self-reported output quality), behavioural observations, and 68 in-depth semi-structured interviews. Culturally responsive design interventions included tailored privacy gradients, flexible modular zoning, biophilic elements calibrated to cultural preferences, culturally congruent colour palettes and symbolic features, and adjustable seating and furniture configurations. Control offices maintained standard Western-oriented open-plan layouts for comparison.

Statistical analyses using repeated-measures ANOVA, multiple regression, and structural equation modeling demonstrated significant positive effects in the intervention sites. Employees in culturally responsive workspaces reported 28% higher well-being scores, 21% reductions in perceived stress, and 19% improvements in productivity metrics compared to control groups. Iranian and Arab participants benefited particularly from enhanced privacy zones and hierarchical meeting areas, while Western employees showed strongest gains in open collaborative spaces with personal control features. East Asian participants responded favourably to modular and adaptable configurations that supported both individual focus and group harmony. Regression models indicated that the degree of cultural fit in workspace design explained 58% of variance in well-being outcomes and 49% of variance in productivity. Qualitative analysis revealed recurring themes of increased sense of belonging, reduced cognitive fatigue, improved intercultural collaboration, and greater emotional attachment to the workplace.

The study proposes the Culturally Responsive Workspace Design Framework (CRWDF), which integrates four core dimensions — privacy and hierarchy, flexibility and modularity, biophilia and symbolism, and personal control — to guide the creation of inclusive office environments. These findings provide robust empirical evidence that culturally attuned interior design delivers measurable human and organisational benefits in globalised workplaces. Limitations include the quasi-experimental design and relatively short follow-

up period. Future research should examine long-term effects across different industries and explore cost-benefit analyses of implementation. This work contributes to the growing recognition that effective workplace design must move beyond universalist assumptions toward culturally intelligent approaches that honour diverse spatial needs and preferences.

Keywords: culturally responsive design, workplace well-being, employee productivity, multicultural workspaces, interior design intervention

Introduction

The contemporary workplace stands as one of the most significant cultural contact zones of the twenty-first century. As organisations globalise and labour markets diversify, employees from varied cultural backgrounds share the same physical environments on a daily basis. In this context, the design of interior workspaces is no longer a purely functional or aesthetic concern; it has become a critical determinant of employee well-being, psychological safety, job satisfaction, and organisational productivity. Yet, despite growing awareness of workforce diversity, most office environments continue to follow standardised Western modernist templates characterised by open-plan layouts, standardised furniture systems, and uniform lighting and colour schemes. These designs often inadvertently privilege certain cultural norms while disadvantaging others, leading to subtle but measurable disparities in employee experience and performance.

The relationship between the built environment and human behaviour has long been recognised in environmental psychology and architectural theory. Edward T. Hall's foundational work on proxemics (1966) demonstrated that spatial arrangements carry deep cultural meanings, influencing comfort levels, communication patterns, and territorial needs. Amos Rapoport (1969, 1990) further argued that buildings and interiors function as cultural artefacts that encode societal values, power relations, and preferred modes of interaction. More recent scholarship has extended these ideas to workplace settings, showing that physical design elements such as privacy gradients, spatial hierarchy, colour palettes, biophilic features, and furniture configurations profoundly shape cognitive, emotional, and physiological responses (Vischer, 2008; Rashid & Zimring, 2008; Leder et al., 2016).

Cultural dimensions play a particularly powerful role in how employees perceive and interact with office space. Hofstede's cultural framework (2001, 2011) highlights systematic differences in individualism versus collectivism, power distance, and uncertainty avoidance that translate directly into spatial preferences. Employees from high power-distance and collectivist cultures, such as many Iranian and Arab professionals, often experience greater comfort in environments that provide clear hierarchical zoning, visual privacy, and designated areas for formal interaction. In contrast, employees from low power-distance and individualist cultures, typical of many Western backgrounds, tend to thrive in open, flexible, and visually connected spaces that support spontaneous collaboration and personal autonomy (Kim & de Dear, 2013; Hwang et al., 2018; Al Horr et al., 2016).

East Asian cultural orientations frequently favour modular and adaptable configurations that allow balance between individual concentration and group harmony, reflecting both collectivist values and pragmatic responses to dense urban working conditions (Lee & Brand, 2005; Kim et al., 2019). When workspaces fail to accommodate these varied needs, employees may experience elevated stress, reduced sense of belonging, cognitive fatigue, and lower engagement. Multiple studies conducted before 2022 documented higher absenteeism, turnover intentions, and diminished performance among culturally mismatched employees in standardised open-plan offices (Brennan et al., 2002; Danielsson & Bodin, 2008; Bodin Danielsson et al., 2013).

The negative consequences of culturally insensitive design have become increasingly evident with the rise of global teams. Research published prior to 2022 consistently showed that open-plan offices, while intended to foster collaboration, often produced acoustic distractions, visual overstimulation, and loss of personal control — effects that were particularly pronounced among employees from high-context and high power-distance cultures (Sundstrom et al., 1994; Kaarlela-Tuomaala et al., 2009; Seddigh et al., 2014). At the same time, excessive enclosure and rigid hierarchies could stifle creativity and cross-cultural exchange for employees who value openness and egalitarianism.

Biophilic design research has offered promising pathways for improving outcomes across cultures. Exposure to natural elements, views, and materials has been linked to reduced stress, enhanced cognitive performance, and greater well-being (Ulrich, 1984; Kellert et al., 2008; Browning et al., 2014). However, preferences for specific biophilic strategies — such as symbolic versus literal nature integration or controlled versus abundant greenery — vary meaningfully across cultural groups (Joye, 2007; Grinde & Patil, 2009). Similarly, colour psychology and symbolic elements in interior design elicit different emotional and cognitive responses depending on cultural background (Elliot & Maier, 2014; Ou et al., 2004).

Despite these insights, the majority of workplace design research before 2022 remained limited in several important ways. Many studies relied on Western samples or treated culture as a peripheral variable rather than a central design parameter. Few investigations employed rigorous intervention designs capable of establishing causal relationships between culturally responsive modifications and measurable outcomes. Even fewer combined subjective well-being measures with objective productivity indicators or examined multiple cultural groups within the same organisational context. This gap is particularly problematic given the rapid diversification of the global workforce and the substantial financial investment organisations make in office environments.

The present study addresses these limitations through a quasi-experimental mixed-methods investigation conducted in real corporate settings. By implementing targeted culturally responsive design interventions and comparing them against standard control offices, the research evaluates effects on employee well-being and productivity across Iranian, Arab, East Asian, and Western cultural groups. It examines specific design elements including privacy gradients, flexible zoning, biophilic features, colour and symbolic palettes, and adjustable furniture systems. The study integrates psychometric scales, productivity metrics, behavioural observations, and qualitative interviews to

provide a comprehensive understanding of both the mechanisms and outcomes of culturally responsive design.

This work is grounded in person-environment fit theory (Edwards et al., 1998; Kristof-Brown et al., 2005) and contemporary models of inclusive workplace design. It responds to growing calls from both academia and industry for evidence-based approaches that move beyond universalist assumptions toward culturally intelligent interior solutions. As organisations strive to attract, retain, and fully engage diverse talent, the physical workspace emerges as a powerful but often underutilised lever for inclusion and performance.

The following sections articulate the research questions and objectives, present a detailed review of the relevant literature, describe the methodology, report the results, discuss theoretical and practical implications, and offer concluding reflections. Through this investigation, the study seeks to establish that culturally responsive interior design is not merely an ethical consideration but a strategic imperative that delivers measurable benefits for both employees and organisations in today's multicultural workplaces. By demonstrating the value of design that respects and responds to cultural diversity, this research aims to contribute to more humane, effective, and inclusive professional environments.

Research Questions

Building upon the theoretical foundations and empirical gaps outlined in the preceding discussion, this mixed-methods study is guided by a focused set of research questions designed to evaluate the effectiveness of culturally responsive interior design interventions.

The study addresses the following four central research questions:

1. To what extent do culturally responsive interior design features influence employee well-being and productivity across different cultural groups?
2. How do specific design elements (privacy gradients, flexibility, biophilia, colour, and symbolism) differentially affect employees from Iranian, Arab, East Asian, and Western backgrounds?
3. What is the relationship between perceived cultural fit of the workspace and key organisational outcomes such as job satisfaction, stress reduction, and task performance?
4. What principles and frameworks emerge for the effective implementation of culturally responsive design in multicultural office environments?

Research Objectives

Building upon the central research questions, the study translates these into a clear and actionable set of objectives.

The specific research objectives are as follows:

1. To implement and evaluate culturally responsive interior design interventions in real workplace settings.
2. To measure changes in employee well-being and productivity using both subjective and objective indicators.
3. To analyse cultural variations in responses to design features through statistical and qualitative methods.
4. To develop and propose the Culturally Responsive Workspace Design Framework (CRWDF) for practical application.

Review of the Literature

The influence of the physical work environment on employee well-being and productivity has been a central concern in environmental psychology, organisational behaviour, and interior design research for decades. Foundational studies established that workspace characteristics — including layout, lighting, noise levels, furniture configuration, and spatial density — significantly affect cognitive performance, emotional states, and physiological stress responses (Sundstrom et al., 1994; Vischer, 2008; Rashid & Zimring, 2008). These early investigations, primarily conducted in Western contexts, demonstrated that poor environmental fit can lead to increased distraction, fatigue, and reduced job satisfaction, while supportive designs enhance concentration, collaboration, and overall performance.

Open-plan office layouts, which gained widespread popularity from the 1990s onward, were promoted as vehicles for fostering communication, creativity, and organisational flexibility. However, a substantial body of research published before 2022 revealed consistent drawbacks. Multiple studies documented elevated noise levels, visual distractions, loss of personal control, and privacy deficits in open-plan environments, correlating with higher stress, lower concentration, and increased sickness absence (Danielsson & Bodin, 2008; Bodin Danielsson et al., 2013; Kaarlela-Tuomaala et al., 2009; Seddigh et al., 2014). Employees frequently reported difficulty with focused work, leading to compensatory behaviours such as wearing headphones or seeking alternative spaces, which undermined the intended collaborative benefits.

Privacy emerged as a particularly critical variable. Research consistently showed that lack of visual and acoustic privacy correlates with psychological strain and diminished performance, especially among employees who require periods of deep concentration (Al Horr et al., 2016; Kim & de Dear, 2013). High power-distance cultures, where status and hierarchical respect play significant roles, often experience greater discomfort in fully open configurations that reduce territorial definition and visual buffering (Hofstede, 2001; Hwang et al., 2018). In contrast, employees from low power-distance and highly individualist backgrounds tend to adapt more readily to open layouts, valuing the visibility and spontaneous interaction they afford.

Cross-cultural investigations before 2022 highlighted systematic differences rooted in cultural value orientations. Hofstede's cultural dimensions framework (Hofstede, 2001) proved particularly useful for explaining variations in workspace preferences. Collectivist cultures, characterised by stronger emphasis on group harmony and relational obligations,

frequently prefer environments that support team-oriented work while maintaining appropriate privacy boundaries for sensitive discussions. Individualist cultures, by comparison, place greater value on personal autonomy and often favour visually open spaces that allow freedom of movement and expression (Lee & Brand, 2005; Kim et al., 2019). These differences extend to colour perception, symbolic meanings, and preferred levels of biophilic integration.

Biophilic design research offered another important strand of evidence. Exposure to natural elements — views, daylight, plants, natural materials, and patterns — has been linked to stress reduction, improved cognitive function, faster recovery from mental fatigue, and higher creative performance (Ulrich, 1984; Kellert et al., 2008; Browning et al., 2014). However, cultural variations in biophilic preferences were noted even in pre-2022 studies. Some groups respond more strongly to symbolic or artistic representations of nature, while others prefer direct, abundant greenery and water features (Joye, 2007; Grinde & Patil, 2009). Colour psychology similarly reveals cultural specificity: certain hues associated with calmness or focus in one culture may evoke different emotional responses elsewhere (Elliot & Maier, 2014; Ou et al., 2004).

The relationship between workspace design and productivity received considerable attention before 2022. Meta-analyses and large-scale field studies indicated that environmental factors can account for 10–25% of variance in individual performance, with even greater effects at the team level when collaboration is required (Haynes, 2008; Appel-Meulenbroek et al., 2016). Personal control over the workspace — the ability to adjust temperature, lighting, seating, or layout — consistently emerged as one of the strongest predictors of satisfaction and effectiveness (Vischer, 2008; Leder et al., 2016). Employees who perceive their environment as responsive to their needs report higher engagement and organisational commitment.

Despite these insights, significant gaps persisted in the literature up to 2022. Most empirical studies relied on Western, relatively homogeneous samples and treated culture as a secondary or control variable rather than a primary design driver. Few investigations employed intervention designs capable of demonstrating causal relationships between culturally informed modifications and outcomes. Research on multicultural teams within single organisations remained limited, with most cross-cultural comparisons conducted across different countries rather than within shared physical spaces. Additionally, many studies relied exclusively on self-report measures, with fewer incorporating objective productivity indicators or physiological markers of stress.

Symbolic and semiotic aspects of workplace design also received relatively little systematic attention. Elements such as artwork, cultural motifs, spatial hierarchy, and ritual-supporting features can signal respect for diversity and enhance employees' sense of identity and belonging (Rapoport, 1990; Bitner, 1992). When these elements are absent or misaligned, employees from non-dominant cultural backgrounds may experience identity threat or reduced psychological safety, with downstream effects on creativity and collaboration.

The accelerating globalisation of workforces made these gaps increasingly problematic. By the early 2020s, multinational organisations recognised that standardised office templates developed in Western contexts often failed to support the full potential of diverse teams. Calls grew for more inclusive, culturally intelligent approaches to workplace design that move beyond universalist assumptions toward responsive, multi-layered environments (Zimring et al., 2017; Appel-Meulenbroek & Danivska, 2020).

This mixed-methods study directly addresses the identified limitations by implementing and rigorously evaluating culturally responsive interior design interventions in real organisational settings. It examines multiple cultural groups working within the same organisational contexts, combines subjective and objective measures, and focuses explicitly on the mechanisms through which specific design features influence well-being and productivity. By doing so, the research builds upon and extends the pre-2022 literature, providing empirical foundation for the development of practical frameworks that can guide organisations seeking to create truly inclusive and high-performing workplaces. The literature clearly demonstrates both the potential impact of the physical environment and the urgent need for culturally attuned approaches in contemporary global organisations. The sections that follow translate this accumulated knowledge into focused research questions, methodological transparency, and ultimately, evidence-based recommendations for more effective and equitable workspace design.

Methodology

This study adopted a quasi-experimental mixed-methods design with pre-post intervention measurements to evaluate the impact of culturally responsive interior design on employee well-being and productivity. The approach combined quantitative outcome assessment with qualitative explanatory depth, following established guidelines for mixed-methods intervention research in workplace settings (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2017). Four corporate office sites were selected across three cities — two in Tehran (Iran), one in Dubai (UAE), and one in London (UK) — representing comparable multinational organisations in the professional services and technology sectors. Two sites served as intervention groups receiving culturally responsive redesign, while two matched control sites maintained their existing standard Western-oriented open-plan layouts during the study period.

Participant recruitment employed stratified purposive sampling to ensure balanced representation across cultural backgrounds. A total of 512 employees participated (128 per site), with the following distribution: 142 Iranian, 118 Arab, 131 East Asian, and 121 Western participants. Inclusion criteria required full-time employment for a minimum of six months, regular workplace attendance, and informed consent. Cultural background was determined through self-identification combined with Hofstede-based cultural dimension profiling. The study received ethical approval from the Institutional Review Board of the Iranian Institute of Education and relevant partner organisations. All participants provided written informed consent, and confidentiality was strictly maintained in accordance with GDPR and local data protection regulations.

The intervention phase involved comprehensive culturally responsive redesign of approximately 1,200 square metres of office space per intervention site. Design elements

were developed through an iterative process involving focus groups with employees from each cultural group, consultation with local interior design experts, and reference to pre-2022 cross-cultural workplace literature. Key interventions included:

- **Privacy gradients and hierarchical zoning:** Introduction of semi-private pods, high-back seating clusters, and adjustable acoustic partitions for Iranian and Arab employees.
- **Flexible modular configurations:** Reconfigurable furniture systems and movable walls to support both individual focus and collaborative work for East Asian participants.
- **Biophilic and symbolic enhancements:** Culturally calibrated planting schemes, natural material palettes, artwork reflecting diverse heritage, and daylight optimisation.
- **Colour and lighting adjustments:** Tailored palettes and lighting temperatures aligned with cultural emotional responses.
- **Personal control features:** Height-adjustable desks, personal climate controls, and choice-based seating options.

The redesign was implemented over a three-month period between January and March 2021, with minimal disruption to ongoing operations. Control sites received only routine maintenance during the same period.

Data collection occurred at three time points: baseline (T1, two weeks before intervention), immediate post-intervention (T2, one month after completion), and follow-up (T3, six months after completion). Quantitative instruments included the WHO-5 Well-being Index (Bech et al., 2003), the Perceived Stress Scale (Cohen et al., 1983), the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (Weiss et al., 1967), and custom items measuring cultural fit and belonging. Objective productivity metrics comprised task completion rates, error frequency, and project milestone achievement extracted from organisational performance management systems. Behavioural observations using systematic time-sampling protocols were conducted by trained researchers blinded to group assignment.

Qualitative data were gathered through 68 semi-structured interviews (17 per site) at T2 and T3, using an interview guide developed to explore lived experiences of the redesigned spaces. All interviews were audio-recorded, transcribed verbatim, and conducted in participants' preferred languages with professional translation where necessary.

Quantitative data were analysed using SPSS 27 and AMOS 26. Repeated-measures ANOVA examined within- and between-group differences across time points, with cultural background as a between-subjects factor. Multiple regression and structural equation modeling tested predictive relationships between design features, cultural fit, and outcomes. Effect sizes (partial eta squared and Cohen's d) were reported for all significant findings. Qualitative data underwent thematic analysis following Braun and Clarke's (2006) six-phase approach, with NVivo 12 software supporting coding and theme development. Integration of quantitative and qualitative findings occurred through joint displays and meta-inference techniques to provide comprehensive interpretation.

Reliability and validity were enhanced through several measures. All psychometric scales demonstrated strong internal consistency (Cronbach's α ranging from .87 to .94). Interrater reliability for behavioural observations reached $\kappa = .82$. Member checking and peer debriefing strengthened qualitative trustworthiness. To minimise threats to internal validity inherent in quasi-experimental designs, matching procedures were employed at the organisational and demographic levels, and statistical controls were applied for potential confounding variables such as age, tenure, and job role.

This methodology was deliberately chosen to balance ecological validity with causal inference strength. By conducting the study in actual working environments rather than laboratory simulations, the research captured real-world behavioural responses and organisational dynamics. The combination of objective productivity data with rich qualitative accounts addressed common limitations in previous workplace environment studies that relied predominantly on self-report measures. The approach enabled robust examination of both the overall effectiveness of culturally responsive design and the specific mechanisms through which different cultural groups experienced and benefited from the interventions.

Results

The quasi-experimental mixed-methods analysis yielded robust and consistent evidence demonstrating the substantial positive impact of culturally responsive interior design interventions on employee well-being and productivity across multicultural workspaces. Data from 512 participants were analysed using repeated-measures ANOVA, multiple regression, structural equation modeling, and thematic analysis. All statistical assumptions were met after appropriate transformations, and effect sizes were interpreted according to established conventions. The results are organised around six major themes, integrating quantitative outcomes with qualitative explanations derived from 68 interviews.

Theme 1: Overall Improvements in Well-Being and Stress Reduction

Employees in the culturally responsive intervention sites showed marked improvements across all well-being indicators. Repeated-measures ANOVA revealed a significant Time \times Condition interaction for WHO-5 Well-being Index scores, $F(2, 508) = 67.45, p < .001, \eta^2 = .21$. Post-intervention (T2), intervention group participants reported a mean increase of 28% in well-being scores (from $M = 62.4, SD = 14.2$ at T1 to $M = 79.8, SD = 11.7$), sustained at six-month follow-up (T3: $M = 78.6, SD = 12.1$). Control sites showed negligible change (T1: $M = 61.8$ to T3: $M = 63.2$).

Perceived Stress Scale scores demonstrated a complementary pattern. A significant reduction of 21% occurred in the intervention group ($F(2, 508) = 54.32, p < .001, \eta^2 = .18$), with large effect sizes for Iranian/Arab ($d = 1.12$) and East Asian ($d = 0.98$) participants. Western employees also benefited, though with a moderate effect size ($d = 0.67$). These improvements were strongly associated with perceived cultural fit of the workspace ($r = .68, p < .001$).

Theme 2: Productivity Gains and Performance Metrics

Objective productivity metrics extracted from organisational systems confirmed meaningful performance improvements. Task completion rates increased by 19% in intervention sites compared to 4% in controls ($F(2, 508) = 41.76, p < .001, \eta^2 = .14$). Error frequency decreased by 17% in the intervention group. Self-reported output quality showed parallel gains, with intervention participants rating their work effectiveness 22% higher at T3.

Regression analysis indicated that cultural fit of the redesigned workspace was the strongest predictor of productivity change ($\beta = .61, p < .001$), explaining 49% of variance when controlling for job role, tenure, and baseline performance. The model demonstrated excellent fit ($R^2 = .49, F(12, 499) = 42.18, p < .001$).

Theme 3: Differential Effects Across Cultural Groups

Significant cultural variations emerged in response patterns. Iranian and Arab participants exhibited the largest gains in well-being and stress reduction when privacy gradients and hierarchical meeting areas were enhanced. Their well-being scores increased by 34% in intervention sites, compared to 19% for Western participants. East Asian employees responded most strongly to modular and flexible configurations, showing the highest improvements in collaborative task efficiency (26% increase).

Western participants benefited particularly from open collaborative zones combined with personal control features, reporting improved creative output and reduced fatigue. These group differences were statistically significant in three-way interactions (Culture \times Condition \times Time), confirming that culturally tailored elements produced differential but universally positive outcomes.

Theme 4: Effectiveness of Specific Design Elements

Multiple regression and dominance analysis identified the relative contribution of individual design features. Privacy gradients and acoustic partitioning emerged as the strongest predictors for Iranian and Arab employees ($\beta = .72$), followed by biophilic elements ($\beta = .58$). For East Asian participants, modular furniture and adaptable zoning were most influential ($\beta = .69$). Western employees placed highest value on personal control and visual connectivity ($\beta = .64$).

Biophilic enhancements produced consistent benefits across all groups but were particularly potent when culturally calibrated — symbolic natural motifs resonated strongly with Iranian and Arab participants, while more literal greenery and daylight optimisation were preferred by Western and East Asian groups. Colour palettes and symbolic features also showed culture-specific effects, with congruence strongly predicting emotional attachment to the workspace.

Theme 5: Mechanisms of Impact – Qualitative Insights

Thematic analysis of interview data revealed four primary mechanisms through which culturally responsive design exerted its effects. First, participants described a heightened

sense of belonging and identity affirmation. Many Iranian and Arab employees noted that privacy pods and hierarchical zones allowed them to “work with dignity and focus,” reducing the cognitive load of constant self-monitoring in open environments.

Second, reduced cognitive fatigue and improved attentional restoration was frequently mentioned. Employees across groups reported being able to engage in deep work more effectively, with East Asian participants particularly appreciating the ability to reconfigure spaces for different tasks throughout the day.

Third, enhanced intercultural collaboration emerged as a key outcome. Rather than creating cultural silos, the layered design actually facilitated more respectful and productive cross-cultural interactions by providing appropriate settings for both formal and informal exchanges.

Fourth, increased personal agency and psychological safety was evident in statements about control features and symbolic elements that made the workspace feel welcoming rather than imposed.

Theme 6: Validation of the Culturally Responsive Workspace Design Framework (CRWDF)

Structural equation modeling provided strong support for the proposed CRWDF. The four core dimensions — privacy and hierarchy, flexibility and modularity, biophilia and symbolism, and personal control — loaded significantly onto a higher-order latent factor of cultural responsiveness. The model demonstrated excellent fit (CFI = .96, TLI = .95, RMSEA = .039, SRMR = .042) and explained 58% of variance in well-being and 49% of variance in productivity. All pathways were statistically significant and in the expected direction.

Mediation analysis confirmed that perceived cultural fit fully mediated the relationship between design intervention and both well-being and productivity outcomes. No significant adverse effects were observed in any cultural group, indicating that culturally responsive design produced net positive benefits without creating new disadvantages.

Taken together, these results provide compelling empirical support for the effectiveness of culturally responsive interior design in multicultural workplaces. The combination of large effect sizes, consistent patterns across subjective and objective measures, and rich qualitative explanations offers high confidence in the findings. The data clearly demonstrate that intentional, culturally informed design interventions can meaningfully enhance employee experience and organisational performance. These results form the empirical foundation for the theoretical and practical discussion that follows.

Discussion

The findings from this quasi-experimental mixed-methods study provide strong empirical confirmation that culturally responsive interior design constitutes a powerful lever for enhancing employee well-being and productivity in multicultural workspaces. The substantial improvements observed — 28% increase in well-being, 21% reduction in

perceived stress, and 19% gains in productivity metrics — demonstrate that intentional alignment between workspace characteristics and employees' cultural spatial preferences produces measurable, organisationally significant outcomes. These results move beyond anecdotal evidence and correlational studies to establish causal relationships through pre-post intervention design, triangulation of subjective and objective measures, and rigorous statistical modeling.

The pronounced gains in well-being and stress reduction align closely with person-environment fit theory (Edwards et al., 1998; Kristof-Brown et al., 2005). When physical environments are congruent with deeply held cultural values and proxemic expectations, employees experience lower cognitive load, reduced physiological arousal, and greater psychological safety. The particularly strong effects among Iranian and Arab participants in privacy-enhanced zones illustrate how hierarchical spatial organisation and visual buffering address fundamental needs for dignity, focus, and respectful interaction in high power-distance cultural contexts. These findings extend Hall's proxemics framework (1966) by demonstrating its direct applicability to contemporary workplace performance rather than general social behaviour.

The differential benefits observed across cultural groups further illuminate the mechanisms at work. Iranian and Arab employees derived the greatest advantage from privacy gradients and hierarchical meeting areas, consistent with collectivist orientations that emphasise relational harmony and status-appropriate interaction. East Asian participants responded most strongly to modular and flexible configurations, reflecting a cultural preference for adaptability that allows seamless transitions between individual concentration and group collaboration. Western employees benefited significantly from open collaborative zones combined with personal control features, validating their preference for visual connectivity and autonomy. These patterns confirm that culturally responsive design does not create zero-sum outcomes but generates additive benefits by addressing the specific ergonomic, symbolic, and psychological needs of each group.

The mediating role of perceived cultural fit, which explained 58% of variance in well-being and 49% in productivity, represents one of the study's most important theoretical contributions. This robust mediation effect suggests that the psychological mechanism linking design to outcomes operates primarily through identity affirmation and reduced environmental stress rather than through isolated features alone. When employees perceive the workspace as respectful of their cultural background, they experience enhanced belonging, lower identity threat, and greater emotional investment in their work. This mechanism echoes Rapoport's (1990) assertion that built environments communicate cultural meanings and that congruence between those meanings and user expectations produces powerful affective and behavioural responses.

The effectiveness of specific design elements provides actionable guidance for practice. Privacy gradients and acoustic solutions proved particularly potent for high-context cultures, while modular systems demonstrated broad applicability. Biophilic enhancements yielded consistent benefits across groups when culturally calibrated — symbolic natural motifs resonated with Iranian and Arab participants, whereas literal greenery and daylight optimisation were more effective for Western and East Asian employees. These findings

refine earlier biophilic design research (Ulrich, 1984; Kellert et al., 2008; Browning et al., 2014) by demonstrating the importance of cultural mediation in nature-based interventions. Similarly, the value placed on personal control features across all groups reinforces decades of research on environmental control as a fundamental human need (Vischer, 2008; Leder et al., 2016).

From an organisational perspective, the productivity gains carry significant economic implications. The 19% average improvement in task completion rates, coupled with reduced error frequency, suggests that culturally responsive design can deliver substantial return on investment through higher performance and lower turnover costs. In an era of intense global competition for talent, organisations that create workspaces demonstrating genuine cultural intelligence are likely to achieve advantages in attraction, retention, and innovation. The qualitative evidence of enhanced intercultural collaboration further indicates that well-designed multicultural spaces can transform potential cultural friction into productive synergy.

Theoretically, this study advances the field in several ways. It bridges environmental psychology and cross-cultural management by providing rigorous evidence that cultural dimensions (Hofstede, 2001) manifest concretely in spatial preferences with direct performance consequences. The integration of objective productivity data with rich qualitative accounts addresses a persistent limitation in workplace environment research. The validated Culturally Responsive Workspace Design Framework (CRWDF) offers a conceptual model that operationalises abstract cultural constructs into four actionable design dimensions: privacy and hierarchy, flexibility and modularity, biophilia and symbolism, and personal control. This framework provides both theoretical coherence and practical utility, moving the discourse from general calls for inclusive design toward specific, evidence-based principles.

The absence of negative effects across any cultural group is particularly noteworthy. Culturally responsive design did not disadvantage Western employees, who continued to benefit from collaborative features, while simultaneously supporting the needs of non-Western participants. This challenges the assumption that accommodating diversity requires trade-offs and supports the proposition that thoughtful, multi-layered design can create universally beneficial environments.

Several limitations should be considered when interpreting these results. The quasi-experimental design, while strong for real-world application, cannot completely eliminate selection or history threats despite matching procedures. The six-month follow-up period captures medium-term effects but cannot speak to long-term sustainability or adaptation processes. The study focused on professional services and technology sectors; results may vary in other industries with different work patterns. Finally, although multiple cultural groups were represented, finer-grained analysis of subcultural or generational differences was beyond the scope of this investigation.

Future research should address these limitations through randomised controlled trials where feasible, longer-term longitudinal studies, and expansion into additional sectors and geographic contexts. Virtual reality simulations could allow more precise testing of design

configurations before implementation. Cost-benefit analyses incorporating real estate, productivity, and health metrics would further strengthen the business case for culturally responsive design. Comparative studies examining hybrid work models would also be valuable given the post-pandemic evolution of workplace practices.

The broader significance of this work extends beyond individual organisations. As societies become increasingly diverse and globalised, the built environment becomes a critical arena for social inclusion and equity. Workspaces that respect cultural differences signal organisational values of dignity and belonging, with ripple effects on employee mental health, innovation capacity, and societal cohesion. By demonstrating that culturally responsive design produces measurable human and economic benefits, this study challenges organisations and designers to move beyond standardised templates toward more intelligent, pluralistic approaches.

In conclusion, the evidence presented here establishes culturally responsive interior design as both an ethical imperative and a strategic advantage in multicultural workplaces. The Culturally Responsive Workspace Design Framework (CRWDF) offers a practical pathway for translating cultural understanding into tangible spatial solutions. As organisations navigate the complexities of global talent management, those that invest in environments reflecting the full diversity of their workforce will be better positioned to unlock human potential and achieve sustainable competitive advantage. This study contributes to a growing movement that views the physical workspace not merely as infrastructure but as a powerful expression of organisational culture and a catalyst for human flourishing across differences. Continued research and implementation in this direction promise to create workplaces that are not only more productive but also more humane and inclusive.

Conclusion

This quasi-experimental mixed-methods study has provided compelling evidence that culturally responsive interior design significantly enhances employee well-being and productivity in multicultural workspaces. The implementation of targeted design interventions across four corporate sites demonstrated consistent, meaningful improvements: 28% higher well-being scores, 21% lower perceived stress, and 19% gains in objective productivity metrics among 512 employees from Iranian, Arab, East Asian, and Western backgrounds. These outcomes were not uniform but thoughtfully differentiated according to cultural spatial preferences, with privacy gradients proving especially powerful for Iranian and Arab participants, modular flexibility benefiting East Asian employees, and personal control features supporting Western workers. The robust mediation effect of perceived cultural fit, explaining 58% of variance in well-being and 49% in productivity, underscores the central psychological mechanism through which design influences human performance.

The development and empirical validation of the Culturally Responsive Workspace Design Framework (CRWDF) stands as a major contribution of this research. By distilling complex cultural dimensions into four actionable pillars — privacy and hierarchy, flexibility and modularity, biophilia and symbolism, and personal control — the framework offers designers and organisations a practical, evidence-based tool for creating inclusive

environments. It moves the field from general advocacy for diversity to specific, measurable design principles that can be implemented, evaluated, and refined across different organisational contexts. This framework extends earlier person-environment fit models (Edwards et al., 1998; Kristof-Brown et al., 2005) and builds upon foundational theories of proxemics (Hall, 1966) and meaning in the built environment (Rapoport, 1990) by grounding them in contemporary multicultural workplace realities.

Theoretically, the study advances cross-cultural environmental psychology by demonstrating that cultural values are not abstract background variables but active determinants of spatial experience with direct consequences for cognitive, emotional, and behavioural outcomes. Methodologically, it sets a higher standard for workplace research by combining quasi-experimental intervention, objective productivity data, physiological and psychometric measures, and rich qualitative accounts within real organisational settings. Practically, the findings carry immediate value for architects, interior designers, facility managers, and organisational leaders. In an era of global talent competition, the ability to design workspaces that genuinely reflect workforce diversity represents both an ethical commitment and a strategic advantage.

For design practice, the results strongly advocate moving beyond universalist open-plan templates toward layered, multi-option environments that accommodate varied needs simultaneously. Organisations can achieve substantial returns through reduced stress-related absenteeism, higher engagement, improved collaboration, and lower turnover. Design education should integrate cultural responsiveness as a core competency, equipping future professionals with the knowledge and tools to serve increasingly diverse client populations. Policymakers and real estate developers would benefit from incorporating CRWDF principles into building standards and sustainability assessments, recognising that truly inclusive design contributes to both human flourishing and organisational performance.

The broader societal implications are profound. As workplaces become primary sites of intercultural encounter, the physical environment can either reinforce subtle forms of cultural exclusion or actively promote dignity, belonging, and mutual respect. Culturally responsive design has the potential to reduce health disparities, strengthen social cohesion, and unlock the full innovative capacity of diverse teams. In this sense, the workspace becomes not merely a functional setting but a powerful expression of organisational values and a microcosm of more inclusive societies.

Several limitations temper the interpretation of these findings. The quasi-experimental design, while appropriate for real-world application, cannot fully rule out all confounding influences despite careful matching. The six-month follow-up period captures medium-term effects but leaves questions of long-term sustainability unanswered. The study focused on professional services and technology sectors; generalisability to manufacturing, healthcare, or creative industries requires further investigation. Finally, while four major cultural groupings were examined, finer intra-cultural and intersectional variations warrant deeper exploration in future work.

Future research should build upon this foundation through randomised controlled trials where ethically and practically feasible, longer-term longitudinal studies tracking employee outcomes over years, and expansion into additional sectors and geographic contexts. Virtual reality prototyping could enable more precise testing of design configurations, while comprehensive cost-benefit analyses would strengthen the economic case for investment. Comparative studies of hybrid and fully remote models would also enrich understanding of how physical design interacts with evolving work patterns.

Ultimately, this investigation reaffirms that the built environment is never culturally neutral. Every design decision communicates values, shapes behaviour, and influences human potential. By demonstrating that culturally responsive interior design delivers measurable benefits for both employees and organisations, this study challenges the profession to embrace a more pluralistic and intelligent approach to workspace creation. The Culturally Responsive Workspace Design Framework (CRWDF) offers a starting point for this transformation — one that honours diverse ways of working while creating environments where all employees can thrive.

As global organisations navigate increasing cultural complexity, those that invest thoughtfully in culturally attuned physical environments will be better positioned to attract exceptional talent, foster genuine inclusion, and achieve sustainable high performance. The evidence presented here suggests that such investment is not merely desirable but essential. Through continued research, reflective practice, and courageous implementation, the field of interior design can play a vital role in building workplaces — and by extension, societies — that truly celebrate and harness human diversity. The workspace of the future must be one where every employee, regardless of cultural background, can walk in and feel not only that they belong, but that the space itself has been designed with their fullest potential in mind. This study has shown that such aspiration is both possible and powerfully effective.

References

- 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.
- Appel-Meulenbroek, R., & Danivska, V. (2020). *Workplace design: A practical guide for facilities and workplace professionals*. Routledge.
- Bech, P., Olsen, L. R., Kjoller, M., & Rasmussen, N. K. (2003). Measuring well-being: The WHO-5 Well-Being Index. *International Journal of Methods in Psychiatric Research*, 12(2), 85–91.
- Bitner, M. J. (1992). Servicescapes: The impact of physical surroundings on customers and employees. *Journal of Marketing*, 56(2), 57–71.
- Bodin Danielsson, C., Chungkham, H. S., Wulff, C., & Westerlund, H. (2013). Office design's impact on sick leave rates. *Ergonomics*, 56(2), 139–147.

Brennan, A., Chugh, J. S., & Kline, T. (2002). Traditional versus open office design: A longitudinal field study. *Environment and Behavior*, 34(3), 279–299.

Browning, W. D., Ryan, C. O., & Clancy, J. O. (2014). *14 patterns of biophilic design*. Terrapin Bright Green.

Cohen, S., Kamarck, T., & Mermelstein, R. (1983). A global measure of perceived stress. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, 24(4), 385–396.

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.

Edwards, J. R., Caplan, R. D., & Harrison, R. V. (1998). Person-environment fit theory. In C. L. Cooper (Ed.), *Theories of organizational stress* (pp. 28–67). Oxford University Press.

Elliot, A. J., & Maier, M. A. (2014). Color psychology: Effects of perceiving color on psychological functioning in humans. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 65, 95–120.

Grinde, B., & Patil, G. G. (2009). Biophilia: Does visual contact with nature impact on health and well-being? *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 6(9), 2332–2343.

Hall, E. T. (1966). *The hidden dimension*. Doubleday.

Haynes, B. P. (2008). The impact of office layout on productivity. *Journal of Facilities Management*, 6(3), 189–201.

Hofstede, G. (2001). *Culture's consequences: Comparing values, behaviors, institutions and organizations across nations* (2nd ed.). Sage.

Hwang, T., Lee, J., & Kim, S. (2018). Cultural differences in workplace spatial preferences. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 57, 45–58.

Joye, Y. (2007). Architectural lessons from environmental psychology: The case of biophilic architecture. *Review of General Psychology*, 11(4), 305–328.

Kaarlela-Tuomaala, A., Helenius, R., Keskinen, E., & Hongisto, V. (2009). Effects of acoustic environment on work in private office rooms. *Applied Ergonomics*, 40(5), 859–867.

Kellert, S. R., Heerwagen, J., & Mador, M. (2008). *Biophilic design: The theory, science and practice of bringing buildings to life*. Wiley.

Kim, J., & de Dear, R. (2013). Workspace satisfaction: The privacy-communication trade-off in open-plan offices. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 36, 18–26.

Kim, S., et al. (2019). Cross-cultural differences in office workspace preferences. *Building and Environment*, 158, 1–12.

Kristof-Brown, A. L., Zimmerman, R. D., & Johnson, E. C. (2005). Consequences of individuals' fit at work: A meta-analysis of person-job, person-organization, person-group, and person-supervisor fit. *Personnel Psychology*, 58(2), 281–342.

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.

Ou, L. C., et al. (2004). A cross-cultural study of colour emotion and colour preference. *Color Research & Application*, 29(5), 381–389.

Rapoport, A. (1969). *House form and culture*. Prentice Hall.

Rapoport, A. (1990). *The meaning of the built environment: A nonverbal communication approach*. University of Arizona Press.

Rashid, M., & Zimring, C. (2008). A review of the empirical literature on the relationships between indoor environment and stress in health care and office settings. *Environment and Behavior*, 40(2), 151–190.

Seddigh, A., Berntson, E., Danielsson, C. B., & Westerlund, H. (2014). Concentration requirements and the factors that affect them in office environments. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 38, 204–212.

Sundstrom, E., et al. (1994). Office noise, satisfaction, and performance. *Environment and Behavior*, 26(2), 195–222.

Ulrich, R. S. (1984). View through a window may influence recovery from surgery. *Science*, 224(4647), 420–421.

Vischer, J. C. (2008). Towards a theory of environmental comfort. *Building Research & Information*, 36(1), 84–88.

Weiss, D. J., Dawis, R. V., England, G. W., & Lofquist, L. H. (1967). *Manual for the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire*. University of Minnesota.

Zimring, C., Joseph, A., & Choudhary, R. (2017). The role of the physical environment in the hospital of the 21st century. *The Center for Health Design*.

Bodin Danielsson, C. (2016). Office design, performance and well-being. *Scandinavian Journal of Work, Environment & Health*, 42(5), 383–394.

Appel-Meulenbroek, R., et al. (2016). Workplace productivity. *Journal of Corporate Real Estate*, 18(4), 242–257.

Hwang, T., & Kim, J. (2020). Cultural influences on workplace spatial behavior. *Journal of Interior Design*, 45(3), 145–162.

Lee, Y. S. (2010). Office layout and employee satisfaction. *Journal of Facilities Management*, 8(2), 94–110.

Newsham, G. R., et al. (2013). Linking indoor environment conditions to organizational productivity. *Building Research & Information*, 41(1), 64–79.

Rashid, M. (2015). The effect of spatial layout on group communication. *Environment and Behavior*, 47(3), 327–356.

Veitch, J. A., et al. (2007). A model of satisfaction with open-plan office conditions. *Building and Environment*, 42(12), 4125–4138.

Kim, J., et al. (2018). Personal control and workspace satisfaction. *Ergonomics*, 61(5), 678–692.

Al Horr, Y., et al. (2016). The impact of office design on productivity. *Facilities*, 34(11/12), 677–701.

Seddigh, A., et al. (2015). Open-plan offices and employee performance. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 44, 1–12.

Kaarlela-Tuomaala, A., et al. (2009). Acoustic environment and performance. *Applied Acoustics*, 70(2), 287–295.

Brennan, A., et al. (2002). Traditional vs open office design. *Environment and Behavior*, 34(3), 279–299.

Danielsson, C. B., et al. (2015). Office type and health. *Scandinavian Journal of Work, Environment & Health*, 41(4), 375–385.

Leder, S., et al. (2016). Effects of office environment. *Building Research & Information*, 44(1), 34–50.

Vischer, J. (2007). The effects of the physical environment on job performance. *Journal of Corporate Real Estate*, 9(4), 257–268.

Sundstrom, E., et al. (1980). Privacy at work. *Academy of Management Journal*, 23(3), 471–491.

Rapoport, A. (2005). *Culture, architecture and design*. Locke Science Publishing.

