



Physical And Non-Physical Work Environment On Employee Performance

Josephus Noya¹

¹Universitas Kristen Indonesia Maluku, Indonesia

*Corresponding author: josephusnoya02@gmail.com

Abstract

This study aims to examine the impact of both physical and non-physical work environments on employee performance. Employing a descriptive-quantitative approach with a causal correlation design, the research was conducted at the Department of Housing and Settlement Areas in Buru Regency over a period of two months. The study population comprised all employees of the Buru Regency Housing and Settlement Area Service, totaling 105 individuals, including 35 civil servants and 60 honorary workers. Employing a full sampling method, data were analyzed using multiple linear regression analysis. The findings show that partially and simultaneously, the physical and non-physical work environment has a positive and significant effect on employee performance at the Housing and Settlement Area Office of Buru Regency.

Keywords: Physical Work Environment, Non-Physical Work Environment, Performance

1. INTRODUCTION

Every organization needs management in relation to initiatives to increase organizational effectiveness in order to accomplish its goals. While managing human resources can help an organization achieve its objectives, employee performance must also be raised. Employee performance can be impacted by a number of factors, including the workplace itself.

Human resources play a significant role in accomplishing corporate goals, necessitating their proper treatment and upkeep. A variety of factors can influence a person's performance, one of which is their work environment. The work environment is one of the most important factors influencing a person's success at work. An appropriate

908

AJMESC, Volume 04 Issue 02, 2024



Copyright at authors some right reserved this work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/).



work atmosphere will foster feelings of comfort and security. There are two types of work environments: physical and non-physical.

A secure and conducive workplace fosters positive outcomes for its employees. These include heightened productivity stemming from fewer absences, enhanced efficiency and quality from dedicated staff, reduced health and insurance expenses, minimized workers' compensation claims leading to lower direct payments, improved flexibility and adaptability through increased involvement and ownership, and an improved organizational image resulting in a better pool of potential employees. This assertion is made by (Norianggono, Hamid, & Ruhana, 2014).

Seeing the increasing demands for services to the community and under the demands of environmental change, the formulation of wishes by stakeholders regarding Housing and Settlement Area services, and the provision of city and fire department support facilities encourages the establishment of an agency that can handle and regulate this, which is then a mission that will be realized by the Housing and Settlement Office of Buru Regency.

The Housing and Settlement Office of Buru Regency was established based on Regional Regulation Number 17 of 2016 concerning the Establishment and Arrangement of Regional Apparatus of Buru Regency and Regent Regulation Number 71 of 2016 concerning the Establishment of the Organizational Structure and Work Procedures of the Housing and Settlement Office of Buru Regency, this determination is intended to be a guideline in the implementation of the duties of the Housing and Settlement Office of Buru Regency.

There are still many problems faced by the Housing and Settlement Office of Buru Regency, resulting in low organizational performance. As a result, one of the attempts to develop or improve employee performance is to provide a comfortable, safe, conducive, and enjoyable work environment. Employees will feel at ease in their work environment, which will improve their performance. The task will be finished well and on schedule, and the personnel will be satisfied with their work. The work environment is thought to have an impact on employee performance, and this is supported and reinforced by various theories that explain the relationship.

A favorable working environment is characterized by its ability to facilitate activities optimally, healthily, comfortably, and safely. Conversely, a substandard work environment can lead to inefficiencies in the design of work systems. This happens because the work environment setting influences the actions of individuals in the organisation, which in turn affects the effectiveness of the organisation directly or indirectly. Such influence encompasses aspects like performance and productivity, absenteeism, turnover rates, and organizational membership (Ekas, Sunoharyo, & Utmi, 2016).





The physical work environment of an organization is a working setting that provides a comfortable working atmosphere and scenario for employees in order to achieve the business's goals. Poor working circumstances can lead to people becoming ill more quickly, becoming stressed out, having difficulty concentrating, and decreasing job efficiency. If the workplace is unpleasant, air circulation is not good, the workspace is too crowded, dirty, and noisy, it will affect the work comfort of employees (Pradhanvati, 2013).

The physical state that surrounds employees and affects them directly or indirectly is known as the physical work environment (Benny et al., 2015). The physical work environment according to (Norianggono et al., 2014), encompasses all surrounding physical circumstances that have the potential to impact employees, whether directly or indirectly. A workplace's physical atmosphere and collection of physical elements make up the physical work environment.

According to Stanley & Remiasa (2022), there are 7 indicators of the physical work environment, namely: 1. Cleanliness of the workplace. 2. The level of illumination in the workplace. 3. Air circulation at work. 4. Arrange colors at work. 5. Music at work. 6. Air temperature at work. 7. Decoration at work. Similarly (Cahyani & Ardana, 2013) mention that the physical work environment is where employees carry out tasks, which is measured by indicators of space, arrangement of office equipment, lighting, and noise.

A non-physical work environment is a state that occurs related to an employment relationship. According to Indiyati (2020), a workplace's non-physical work environment has an impact on the interactions amongst coworkers. Norianggono et al., 2014), mention that the non-physical environment is made up of all circumstances pertaining to professional connections, such as those with coworkers, superiors, or subordinates. Indicators used to measure non-physical work environments put forward by Untung & Nugraheni (2017) include open and honest attitude, support between members, cooperation, good communication, and organizational commitment.

A pleasant workplace can make workers feel good, and this positive feeling will motivate them to work harder and more passionately. As a result, when employee morale is high, more effective work systems are designed (Benny et al., 2015). The physical features of the workplace may have an effect on how well employees perform (Norianggono et al., 2014). While an unsatisfactory work environment might lower employee performance, a comfortable work environment can increase it (4 May 2013). One element that can enhance worker performance is the physical workspace (Agastia, 2014).

An ideal non-physical work environment should promote harmonious relationships between co-workers, with the aim of avoiding conflict and enhancing collaboration between them. Open perception and communication can help prevent disputes and create a conducive





work environment (Indiyati, 2020). This will be bad for the organization (Priyono et al., 2018). According to (Norianggono et al., 2014), The non-physical work environment plays an important role in shaping interactions between employees, which can then have a significant impact on their performance at work. The quality of relationships between employees and a conducive work atmosphere can affect the motivation and productivity of individuals and the team as a whole (Stanley & Remiasa, 2022).

2. RESEARCH METHOD

This study employs a descriptive-quantitative methodology with a correlational kind of cause-and-effect analysis, indicating that there is a cause-and-effect relationship between the independent and dependent variables. The Buru Regency Housing and Settlement Office is where research is put into practice. April and May of 2023 were the two months that this study was conducted.

This study's population consisted solely of workers. There are 105 employees in the Buru Regency Housing and Settlement Office, 35 of whom are government servants and 60 of whom are honorary. Full sampling is the sampling technique used. In this study, the following equations are used as part of the descriptive and multiple linear regression data analysis techniques:

$$Y = b_0 + b_1X_1 + b_2X_2 + e$$

Where:

Y = Employee Performance

X1 = Physical work environment

X2 = Non-physical work environment

above, b_1, b_2 = Koefisin regresi

and = Faulty intruders (error term)

A 95% confidence interval or $\alpha = 0.05$ was used to examine the impact of the independent variable on the dependent variable. Testing both partially and simultaneously will reveal this.

3. RESULT

Multiple linear regression analysis is used to determine the impact of the independent factors of the physical and non-physical work environments on the dependent variable, which is the productivity of workers at the Housing and Settlement Office of Buru Regency (Y).



Table 1 Multiple Linear Regression Analysis Results

Variable	Koef.Reg	t.Calculate	t table df=102	Probability	r2 Parsial
Physical Work Environment (X1)	0,487	6,185	1,980	0,000	0,522
Non-Physical Work Environment (X2)	0,320	4,070	1,980	0,000	0,374
Konstantin : 11,314			F. Ratio		: 42,566
R square: 0,674			Prob.		: 0,000
Multiple R: 0,455			n		: 105

Source: Appendix 5

Based on the table above, a mathematical equation model can be arranged as follows:

$$Y = b_0 + b_1X_1 + b_2X_2 + b_3X_3 + e$$

$$Y = 11,314 + 0,487 X_1 + 0,320 X_2 + 2,388$$

Where:

And = Employee Performance

X1 = Physical work environment

X2 = Non-physical work environment

above, b1,b2 = Koefisin regresi

e = Faulty intruders (*error term*)

The aforementioned mathematical model can be explained as follows:

1. Employee performance at the Housing and Settlement Office of Buru Regency is measured by the value of b0, which is 11,314 and is unaffected by both physical and non-physical work conditions.
2. The X1 variable has a positive association, as indicated by the coefficient b1, which has a value of 0.487. This indicates that, assuming other factors stay the same, there will be an increase in employee performance of 0.487 units for every unit increase in the physical work environment variable.
3. The b2 value shows that the X2 variable is positive with a value of 0.320, this means that if every one unit increase in the non-physical work environment variable will increase 0.320 units of employee performance if other variables are constant.



a. First and Second Hypothesis Testing

The first hypothesis posits that the X1 and X2 variables significantly impact the employee performance (Y), partially. This hypothesis is tested by comparing the computed t-value against the tabulated t-value.

- 1) The computed t-value for the physical work environment variable is 6.185, exceeding the tabulated t-value (df=102) of 1.980, indicating that the physical work environment significantly influences employee performance to some extent. (Hypothesis 1 accepted).
- 2) The computed t-value for the non-physical work environment variable is 4.070, surpassing the tabulated t-value (df=102) of 1.980, indicating that the non-physical work environment significantly contributes partially to employee performance. (Hypothesis 2 accepted).

b. Third Hypothesis Testing

The third hypothesis posits that both the X1 and X2 variables collectively influence the employee performance (Y). This is assessed by comparing the computed F-value of 42.566 exceeds the tabulated value of 19.5. Consequently, the variables of X1 and X2 jointly impact employee performance significantly. The combined influence of these two variables amounts to 67.4% of the variance in employee performance at the Housing and Settlement Office of Buru Regency. The remaining 32.6% (100% - 67.4%) is attributed to other variables not included in the research model.

The findings of multiple linear regression analysis are shown in Table 10, where the variable representing the physical work environment has the greatest regression coefficient value. Furthermore, the computed t-value and partial r-squared value show that the physical work environment variable, which has a major influence of 52.2%, is the source of the greatest impact. Because of its higher correlation coefficient value than other factors, it is thought to be more dominant. Regression coefficients show how much of an impact each independent variable (X1, X2) has on the dependent variable (Y), presuming that the other independent variables in the model have the same magnitudes.

4. DISCUSSION

4.1 The Effect of Physical Work Environment on Employee Performance

The positive marking of the X1 variable indicates that an enhancement in the physical work environment will lead to a corresponding improvement in employee performance. The partial coefficient of determination explains how the independent variable (X) impacts the dependent variable (Y). From the results of data analysis, the partial coefficient value (r) is





0.487. This indicates that the physical work environment variable is able to explain 48.7% of the variation in changes in employee performance. In conclusion, there is a strong correlation between the physical work environment and employee performance, assuming other variables do not change.

The physical work environment variable (X1) was tested for significance or insignificance by calculating the regression coefficients of these variables, which also tested the significance of the t price. The physical work environment variable has a considerable influence on employee performance, as seen from the figures listed above, which among other things can be explained by the fact that the calculated t value is greater than the t table value, so the variable coefficient is significant.

The findings of this study are supported by (Benny et al., 2015) showing that happy workers are more likely to work harder and more enthusiastically, which in turn leads to higher employee morale and more opportunities to design effective work systems. It's crucial to take note of both types of work environments: real and virtual. Similar to this, an employee's performance may have an effect on their performance (Norianggono et al., 2014).

The organization's physical workspace is a significant aspect to consider. Employees will feel more at ease at work in organizations that provide a secure and cozy physical workspace. In the end, improved working circumstances and a decrease in boredom and exhaustion result from giving employees a sense of comfort in finish work. Workplace comfort has the potential to boost productivity, whereas workplace discomfort has the potential to lower productivity (4 May 2013). (Agastia, 2014) states that one element that can enhance worker performance is the physical workspace.

Optimising the physical work environment is important because each employee has different needs such as space, lighting, air, security, and cleanliness, which if improved can encourage employee productivity (Hasan, Bachri, & Hasanuddin, 2017).

A comfortable, organised, and well-designed work environment can improve employee concentration, motivation, and work efficiency. Conversely, an uncomfortable, cluttered or unergonomic environment can result in decreased productivity, increased stress and even physical injury. Therefore, it is important for organisations to pay attention to factors such as lighting, temperature, noise, and other physical facilities in creating a work environment that supports employee well-being and optimal performance.

4.2 The Effect of Non-Physical Work Environment on Employee Performance

The X2 variable is positively correlated with a regression coefficient of 0.320, indicating that for every one unit increase in the Non Physical Work Environment variable, it will simultaneously be followed by an increase of 0.320 units in employee performance.





According to the data analysis, the partial coefficient (r) for the X2 variable is 0.320. This signifies that the Non-Physical Work Environment variable can elucidate 32.0% of the variations in employee performance alterations, assuming other variables remain constant.

When testing the regression coefficients of variables, the calculated t-value for the X2 variable is 4.070, exceeding the critical t-value of 1.980 at the 5% confidence level. This implies that partially, the Non-Physical Work Environment variable significantly influences employee performance. In addition, since the calculated t-values place the independent variables within the region of rejection of the null hypothesis (H_0), this indicates the significance of the variable coefficients in the model.

The findings of this investigation do not support (Indiyati, 2020) which concludes that if leaders and employees can coordinate and superiors can carry out their leadership well, support from leaders is a factor of success in work. Relationships between colleagues are considered minimal conflicts related to communication and can blend between colleagues. Consequently, it is perfect for a non-physical work environment to foster cordial relationships and prevent conflicts among coworkers.

The work environment can increase the comfort and concentration of employees to improve their performance. While a work environment that is less comfortable for employees and is considered inadequate will cause a decrease in employee performance, employees will feel uncomfortable and not enthusiastic about carrying out their obligations and completing the work given. This will be bad for the organization (Priyono et al., 2018). The non-physical work environment refers to aspects of employee relations that can impact employee performance (Norianggono et al., 2014).

The quality of the non-physical work environment influences employee conditions, consequently affecting their performance. A favorable non-physical work environment is pivotal in driving work performance and ultimately impacts employee effectiveness positively. Therefore, it is important for organisations to pay attention to and improve the quality of the non-physical work environment in order to create conditions that support optimal growth, well-being and performance for employees (Stanley & Remiasa, 2022).

In a non-physical work environment, fostering good relationships between colleagues, subordinates and superiors needs to be done because they need each other and this becomes the most important role. This is very grounded because the working relationship that is formed greatly affects the psychology of employees (Retrieved 2017).

A supportive culture, where employees feel valued, heard and have room to grow, can increase their motivation and engagement at work. Effective communication between leaders and employees, as well as between co-workers, can also facilitate productive collaboration and quick problem-solving. Inspiring and team-building-orientated leadership





can also motivate employees to achieve common goals. Meanwhile, fair and sustainable company policies, such as flexibility in working hours or employee welfare programmes can increase job satisfaction and loyalty to the company, which in turn can improve overall performance.

Aspects such as company culture, management policies, inter-employee communication, and career development opportunities have a significant impact on employees' levels of satisfaction, motivation, and psychological well-being. A work environment that is supportive, open and promotes collaboration and professional growth encourages employees to feel valued and actively engaged in their work. Conversely, environments that are unsupportive, conflictual, or lack transparency are likely to create dissatisfaction, stress, and lack of motivation, which can ultimately be detrimental to individual and overall team performance.

4.3 Influence of Physical Work Environment Variables (X1) and Work Environment Non-Physical (X2) to employee performance (Y) simultaneously

The combined impact of the X1 and X2 variable on the employee performance (Y), is evident from the R-squared value of 0.674. This value indicates that both variables collectively contribute significantly to employee performance, explaining 67.4% of its variance. Other factors that are not part of the research model have an impact on the remaining fraction. This statement is supported by the computed F value of 42.566 > F table of 19.5. Therefore, it indicates that the physical work environment variable (X1) and the non-physical work environment (X2) have a significant effect on employee performance simultaneously.

The findings of this study indicate that the interaction between the two independent variables significantly improves employee performance. When a supportive physical work environment is coupled with an adequately conducive non-physical work environment, performance tends to improve, and vice versa. This aligns with the perspective of Indiyati (2020), who emphasizes that the work environment encompasses everything within the workplace that impacts employees in executing their duties. The physical work environment comprises tangible elements surrounding workers that can influence their work, and its significance lies in its role as a determinant of employee health, performance, job satisfaction, and interpersonal relationships. Similarly, as stated by Norianggono et al., (2014), refers to the non-physical aspects of the workplace, such as employee relations, corporate culture, organisational policies, and internal communications. It includes factors that influence employees' experiences and perceptions of their work environment, as well as their interactions with co-workers, management, and the overall organisational structure.





A comfortable and well-designed physical work environment can improve employee concentration and efficiency, while a non-physical work environment that supports a positive organisational culture, effective communication, inspiring leadership, and fair policies can motivate employees to perform better. These two factors are intertwined and interact, creating a holistic work environment that supports optimal employee performance. By paying attention to both the physical and non-physical aspects of the work environment, organisations can create conditions that support well-being and better performance for employees.

4.4 The Dominant Influence of the Physical Work Environment on Performance

The physical work environment variable exhibits the highest regression coefficient value, along with the calculated t-value and partial r-squared value, indicating its predominant influence. This variable holds a significant impact of 45.2%, owing to its larger correlation coefficient compared to other variables.

The dominant influence of the physical work environment on employee performance Housing and Settlement Office of Buru Regency A conducive physical work environment that meets employees' needs enhances their work performance. Conversely, an unsatisfactory work environment can hinder employee productivity. Hence, organizations must prioritize creating a favorable work environment that meets established standards. An employee expects good working conditions that are not boring. If working conditions are not as expected, this will have a major effect on employee performance (Cahyani & Ardana, 2013).

The correlation between the physical workspace and comfort at work holds immense significance. Comfort is a deeply personal feeling that resonates within each individual. The physical office environment directly interacts with our bodies, engaging our five senses, and ultimately influencing our emotional state. A well-designed office environment induces a sense of comfort. For instance, cleanliness and tidiness, harmonious colors on walls or office equipment, and sufficient lighting contribute to a pleasant atmosphere. Furthermore, a quiet workspace devoid of disruptive noise fosters concentration, while the option to listen to inspiring music can enhance comfort and stimulate creativity (Eka S et al., 2016).

The physical form of a good work environment includes adequate lighting, clean places, the availability of safety equipment, good air circulation, noise that can be suppressed to a minimum, the availability of other supporting facilities, and the existence of facilities provided by the organization. So this has a very direct effect on employee performance so that it can make a good contribution to the organization (Putra & Subudi, 2015).

Different aspects related to the physical work environment can significantly enhance employee performance if they adhere to indicators that promote a conducive work





environment (Retrieved 2017). The physical work environment plays a crucial role in enhancing employee performance. Ensuring a favorable and comfortable physical work environment for employees is essential as it can foster passion and directly impact their performance. Therefore, special emphasis should be placed on the physical work environment. As highlighted in Quantity & in Revision (2013), organizations aiming to enhance their operations must prioritize factors such as air quality, sound levels, lighting, and color schemes in their physical work environment.

These comfortable environmental conditions create a strong foundation for employees to perform tasks well, increase motivation, reduce fatigue, and avoid distractions that can hinder productivity. Therefore, a good physical work environment is often the factor that most directly affects employee performance, although it is also important not to overlook the non-physical aspects that can also have a significant impact.

5. CONCLUSION

From the analysis and discussion, the following conclusions can be drawn:

1. The physical work environment significantly and positively influences the performance of employees at the Housing and Settlement Office of Buru Regency. Factors such as space design, facilities and other physical environmental conditions were found to play an important role in improving employee productivity and satisfaction.
2. The non-physical work environment also has a positive and significant impact on the performance of employees at the Housing and Settlement Office of Buru Regency. Aspects such as corporate culture, management policies, and social interactions in the workplace play a crucial role in shaping employee perceptions and motivation.
3. Both the physical and non-physical work environments collectively contribute positively and significantly to the performance of employees at the Housing and Settlement Office of Buru Regency. This confirms the importance of paying attention to both aspects in an effort to improve organisational effectiveness and employee satisfaction.

REFERENCES

- Agastia, N. (2014). Pengaruh Lingkungan Kerja Fisik, Komunikasi, Dan Kepemimpinan Terhadap Kinerja Pegawai PT.BPR Merta Sedana Badung. E-Jurnal Manajemen Universitas Udayana, 3(1), 243569.
- Anugrah, P. G., & Priyambodo, B. A. (2021). Peran Work-Life Balance terhadap Kinerja Pegawai yang Menerapkan Work From Home (WFH) di Masa Pandemi COVID-19 :





- Studi Literatur. Fakultas Pendidikan Psikologi Universitas Negeri Malang, 19(April), 340–349.
- Benny, S., Hamidah, N. U., & Gunawan, E. N. (2015). Pengaruh Lingkungan Kerja Fisik dan Non Fisik terhadap Motivasi Kerja dan Kinerja Pegawai (Studi Pada Pegawai PT. Bank BRI, Tbk. Cabang Bogor). *Jurnal Administrasi Bisnis S1 Universitas Brawijaya*, 21(1), 85766.
- Cahyandani, P. T. (2021). Pengaruh Kepemimpinan Transformasional dan Employee Engagement terhadap Kinerja Pegawai PT Taspen (Persero) Kantor Cabang Utama Surabaya. *Jurnal Ilmu Manajemen*, 9(1), 19. <https://doi.org/10.26740/jim.v9n1.p19-27>
- Cahyani, P. N., & Ardana, I. K. (2013). Pengaruh Lingkungan Kerja Fisik, Gaya Kepemimpinan Dan Insentif Finansial Terhadap Kinerja Pegawai Non Medis Pada Rumah Sakit Balimed Denpasar. *E-Jurnal Manajemen Universitas Udayana*, 2(4), 423–435.
- Eka S, D. S., Sunoharyo, B. S., & Utami, H. N. (2016). Pengaruh Lingkungan Kerja Fisik dan Non Fisik Terhadap Kepuasan Kerja dan kinerja Pegawai. *Administrasi Bisnis*, 40(1), 76–85.
- Febriani, N. M. T., & Indrawati, A. D. (2013). Pengaruh Motivasi, Kompensasi, Serta Lingkungan Kerja Fisik Terhadap Kinerja Kerja Pegawai Hotel the Niche Bali. *E-Jurnal Manajemen Universitas Udayana*, 2(5), 541–551.
- Gunasti, A., & Pratama, A. D. (2021). Pengaruh Mental Workload , Komunikasi , Quality Of Work Life , Job Satisfaction Terhadap Kinerja Manajer Konstruksi. *JDM - Jurnal Dinamika Manajemen*, 2(1), 23–34.
- Hasan, D., Bachri, S., & Hasanuddin, B. (2017). Pengaruh Kepemimpinan Kepala Sekolah Dan Lingkungan Kerja Fisik Terhadap Kinerja Guru SMA Negeri 1 Ampana. *Jurnal Katalogis*, 5(10), 75–81.
- Hasni, P., Noviantoro, D., & Septianti, D. (2020). Pengaruh Kepemimpinan Terhadap Kinerja Pegawai Pada PT. Win Acces Telecommunicatin Palembang Dengan Kepuasan Kerja Sebagai Variabel Intervening. *Jurnal Aplikasi Manajemen & Bisnis*, 1(1), 27–35.
- Indiyati, D. (2020). Pengaruh Lingkungan Kerja Fisik Dan Non Fisik Terhadap Kinerja Pegawai Pada Sektor Jaminan Sosial Nasional (studi Kasus BPJS Ketenagakerjaan Bandung). *EProceedings of Management*, 7(2), 2416–2423. Retrieved from <https://openlibrarypublications.telkomuniversity.ac.id/index.php/management/article/view/12186>
- Lewiuci, P., G., & Mustamu, R., G. (2017). Pengaruh Employee Engagement Terhadap Kinerja Pegawai Pada Organisasi Keluarga Produsen Senapan Angin. *Agora*, 4(2), 101–107.





- Mallafi, F. R., & Silvianita, A. (2021). Pengaruh Flexible Working Arrangement Dan Work Life Balance Terhadap Kinerja Pegawai (Studi Pada Pegawai Department Internal Audit PT . Telkom Indonesia , Tbk Bandung). E-Proceeding of Management ISSN : 2355-9357, 8(6), 8596–8602.
- Nisa, I. C., Rooswidjajani, R., & Fristin, Y. (2019). Pengaruh Komunikasi Dan Lingkungan Kerja Fisik Terhadap Kinerja Pegawai. *Jurnal Bisnis Dan Manajemen*, 5(2), 198–203. <https://doi.org/10.26905/jbm.v5i2.2663>
- Noorainy, F. (2017). Pengaruh Lingkungan Kerja Fisik Dan Non Fisik Terhadap Kinerja Pegawai Pada Sekretariat Daerah Kabupaten Pangandaran. *Journal of Management Review*, 1(2), 75. <https://doi.org/10.25157/jmr.v1i2.701>
- Norianggono, Y. C. P., Hamid, D., & Ruhana, I. (2014). Pengaruh Lingkungan Kerja Fisik dan Non Fisik Terhadap Kinerja Pegawai (studi pada Pegawai PT. Telkom Area III Jawa-Bali Nusra di Surabaya). *Jurnal Administrasi Bisnis (JAB)*, 8(2), 1–10.
- Pradhanawati, A. (2013). Pengaruh Stres Kerja Dan Lingkungan Kerja Fisik Terhadap Kinerja Pegawai Outsourcing Pada PT. Bank Jateng Cabang Koordinator dan Cabang Pembantu Wilayah Kota Semarang. *Jurnal Administrasi Bisnis*, 2(1), 98–104.
- Pramana, A., & Sudharma, I. (2013). Pengaruh Kompensasi, Lingkungan Kerja Fisik Dan Disiplin Kerja Terhadap Kinerja Pegawai. *E-Jurnal Manajemen Universitas Udayana*, 2(9), 254023.
- Priyono, B. H., Qomariah, N., & Winahyu, P. (2018). Pengaruh Gaya Kepemimpinan, Motivasi Guru dan Lingkungan Kerja Fisik Terhadap Kinerja Guru SMAN 1 Tanggul Jember. *Jurnal Manajemen Dan Bisnis Indonesia*, 4(2), 144. <https://doi.org/10.32528/jmbi.v4i2.1758>
- Putra, I., & Subudi, M. (2015). Pengaruh Gaya Kepemimpinan Transformasional Dan Lingkungan Kerja Fisik Terhadap Kinerja Pegawai PT BPR Pedungan. *E-Jurnal Manajemen Universitas Udayana*, 4(10), 250245.
- Riana, I Gede, Made Suprpta, K. S. D. (2015). Pengaruh Kepemimpinan Terhadap Kepuasan Kerja dan Kinerja Pegawai (Studi Pada Wake Bali Art Market Kuta-Bali). *E-Jurnal Ekonomi Dan Bisnis Universitas Udayana* 4.06, 4(6), 430–442.
- Rumondor, R. B., Tumbel, A., & Sepang, jantje l. (2016). Pengaruh Kepemimpinan, Motivasi, dan Disiplin Kerja terhadap Kinerja Pegawai pada Kanwil Ditjen Kekayaan Negara Suluttenggomlut. *Emba*, 4(2), 10.
- Saifullah, F. (2020). Pengaruh Work-Life Balance dan Flexible Work Arrangement Terhadap Kinerja Karyawati Muslimah Konveksi. *BISNIS : Jurnal Bisnis Dan Manajemen Islam*, 8(1), 29. <https://doi.org/10.21043/bisnis.v8i1.6762>





- Setiyadi, Y. W., & Wartini, S. (2016). Pengaruh Kualitas Kehidupan Kerja terhadap Kinerja Pegawai dengan Kepuasan Kerja sebagai Variabel Intervening. *Management Analysis Journal*, 5(4), 315–324.
- Stanley, & Remiasa, M. (2022). Pengaruh Lingkungan Kerja Fisik dan Non Fisik terhadap Kinerja Pegawai melalui Kreativitas Pegawai sebagai variabel mediasi Pada Toko Emas di Pasar Atom Surabaya. *Agora*, 10(1). Retrieved from <https://www.neliti.com/id/publications/358491/pengaruh-lingkungan-kerja-fisik-dan-non-fisik-terhadap-kinerja-pegawai-melalui>
- Untung, D., & Nugraheni, R. (2017). Pengaruh Lingkungan Kerja Fisik Dan Lingkungan Kerja Non Fisik Terhadap Kinerja Pegawai Dengan Kepuasan Kerja Sebagai Variabel Intervening. *Diponegoro Journal of Management*, 6, 1–12. Retrieved from <http://ejournal-s1.undip.ac.id/index.php/dbr>
- Yantje Uhing, Greis M. Sendow, R. R. L. (2019). Pengaruh Work Life Balance, Kesehatan Kerja Dan Beban Kerja Terhadap Kepuasan Kerja Pegawai Pt. Tirta Investama (Danone) Aqua Airmadidi. *Jurnal EMBA: Jurnal Riset Ekonomi, Manajemen, Bisnis Dan Akuntansi*, 7(4), 4671–4680.

