Inovbiz: Jurnal Inovasi Bisnis 11 (2023) 41-48
INOVBIZ
Website: www.ejournal.polbeng.ac.id/index.php/IBP
Email: inovbiz@polbeng.ac.id

# The Effect of Non-Physical Work Environment and Work Productivity on Employee Performance at Mr. DIY Sukabumi City

Faizal Mulia Z[1], Anggia Puspa Ardiani [2], Deni Muhammad Danial [3]
[1,2,3] Fakultas Ilmu Administrasi Dan Humaniora, Universitas Muhammadiyah Sukabumi
Jl. R. Syamsudin, S.H. No. 50, Cikole, Kec. Cikole, Kota Sukabumi, Jawa Barat 43113
anggiapuspaardiani@gmail.com

ARTICLE INFO

**Received:** (June 08, 2023)
**Received in revised:** (June 20, 2023)
**Accepted:** (June 23, 2023)
**Published:** (June 28, 2023)

**Open Access**

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to determine the description of non-physical work environment, work productivity, and employee performance at Mr. DIY Sukabumi City, to determine the effect of non-physical work environment on employee performance at Mr. DIY Sukabumi City, and to determine the effect of work productivity on employee performance at Mr. DIY Sukabumi City. The phenomenon that occurs in the performance of employees of Mr. DIY Sukabumi City is lacking in terms of employee work quality, namely the lack of employee ability in work. This problem is caused by one of the dimensions in the nonphysical work environment, namely leader attention and support. In this case, the leader does not give appreciation to the work of employees. Another cause is the ability which is one of the factors in work productivity, namely the lack of employee skills so that it cannot improve work efficiency and effectiveness. In this case, employees do not have sufficient knowledge about the products sold at Mr. DIY so that it affects employees in making sales. The methods used in this research are descriptive research methods and associative research methods with a quantitative approach. The sampling technique used by researchers is a saturated sample technique, which is a total of 30 respondents. The data analysis technique used is the classical assumption test, multiple linear regression analysis which includes the coefficient of determination, multiple correlation coefficients and partial tests (t test). The results showed that partially the non-physical work environment affects employee performance. Work productivity affects employee performance. The contribution of the influence of non-physical work environment variables and work productivity on employee performance is 76.3%. While the remaining 23.7% is influenced by other variables outside this regression equation or variables not examined.

Keywords: Non-Physical Work Environment; Work Productivity; Employee Performance

## 1. Introduction

Good performance is optimal performance, namely performance that meets organizational standards and supports the achievement of organizational goals (Maulidiyah, 2020). A good organization is an organization that tries to improve the ability of its human resources (Hermawati, 2019), because this is a key factor in improving employee performance. Improved employee performance will bring progress for the company to survive in an unstable competitive business environment (Yusuf et al., 2019). The success or failure of a company is determined by many things, one of which is the belief in the work ability of its employees, because work ability is a factor that reflects the attitude and character of a person in carrying out their main duties and functions (Imran & Widiawati, 2022). Performance can basically be interpreted as a person's success in doing a job, good performance is performance that follows procedures or procedures according to established standards (Lestari et al., 2020). Employee performance aims to expand their skills in meeting organizational demands every manager must have the responsibility to work with employees (Solihudin et al., 2022). Therefore, efforts to improve employee performance are the most serious management challenge because the success of achieving goals and the survival of the company depends on the quality of human resource performance in it. One of the factors that can improve employee performance is the non-physical work environment and work productivity.

According to Nitisemito in Untung & Nugraheni (2017) the non-physical work environment is one of the important things in increasing the ef-

* Faizal Mulia Z
E-mail addresses: anggiapuspaardiani@gmail.com (Universitas Muhammadiyah Sukabumi)
2614-6983/ © 2023 P3M Politeknik Negeri Bengkalis. All rights reserved.

fectiveness of employee work. The non-physical work environment is a work environment that cannot be ignored because the non-physical work environment can affect the physiology and psychology of employees at work. In a positive work environment, employees will also feel valued and recognized for their achievements. Recognition of achievements can motivate employees to continue to do their best and develop themselves further. This can improve overall employee performance.

While work productivity is one of the important factors in the process of progress and decline of a company, so it is necessary to compare the results of work with the materials, time, and energy used in producing goods or services by using existing resources effectively and efficiently, but still maintaining the quality of goods or services produced. Every company or organization must strive to create high productivity. Productivity is one of the most important parts that gets the company's attention because productivity is one of the indicators of company success (Pebriyanti, et al., 2020). Productivity is the ratio between the results of activities (output) and all sacrifices or costs to realize these results (input). Productivity can produce goods and which are usually calculated per hour, per month, per machine and other production factors.

Work productivity and employee performance are two different but closely related things in the world of work. Work productivity refers to how efficiently and effectively a worker completes his or her tasks (Ningsih and Khaerunnisa, 2022), while employee performance covers all aspects of an employee's work, including work productivity, work quality, responsibility, and workplace behavior (Pitriyani and Halim, 2020). A high level of work productivity indicates that employees can produce more in less time, which can result in cost savings and increased profits for the company (Pramana, 2020). Meanwhile, employee performance includes many things besides work productivity. Employee performance can include factors such as quality of work, speed of tasks completed, interpersonal skills, ability to work in teams, and ability to meet set targets. Employee performance can also include more subjective aspects, such as motivation, dedication, and work ethic (Lian, 2017).

Employee performance at Mr. DIY Sukabumi City is very important in determining the success of achieving company goals. Based on the results of observations and initial interviews conducted with management regarding employee performance, as well as data obtained from the human resource department of Mr. DIY Sukabumi City, several phenomena were found. One of these phenomena can be seen from table 1.

**Table 1.**
**Recapitulation of Employee Performance Assessment**
**Year 2020, 2021, 2022**

| No | Assessment Aspects | Assessment | 2020 Average | 2021 Average | 2022 Average |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | **Technical Aspects of Work** | | | | |
| | | Work effectiveness and efficiency | 3,18 | 3,03 | 3,08 |
| | | Punctuality in completing tasks | 3,24 | 3,09 | 3,14 |
| | | Ability to achieve company targets/standards | 3,19 | 3,04 | 3,09 |
| 2 | **Non-Technical Aspects** | | | | |
| | | Good administration | 3,22 | 3,07 | 3,12 |
| | | Initiative | 3,21 | 3,06 | 3,11 |
| | | Cooperation and coordination between departments | 3,4 | 3,25 | 3,3 |
| 3 | **Personality Aspect** | | | | |
| | | Behavior | 3,27 | 3,12 | 3,17 |
| | | Discipline. Presence | | | |
| | | b. Delay and Return early | 3,25 | 3,1 | 3,15 |
| | | Responsibility and Loyalty | 3,15 | 2,76 | 2,81 |
| | | Obedience to superior work instructions | 3,3 | 3,15 | 3,2 |
| | | Implementation of Appearance SOP | 3,32 | 3,17 | 3,22 |
| | | Behavior | 3,1 | 3,03 | 3 |
| **Total** | | | **38,85** | **36,89** | **37,41** |
| **Average** | | | **3,24** | **3,07** | **3,12** |
| **Weight/Quality** | | | **B/Good** | **B/Good** | **B/Good** |

Source: Mr. DIY City of Sukabumi 2023

Over the past three years from 2020-2022 there have been decreases and increases in employee performance appraisals on technical aspects of work, non-technical aspects, and personality aspects. So, with the recapitulation data of employee performance appraisals, it can be indicated that the performance of employees at Mr. DIY Sukabumi City is not optimal due to a decrease in 2021 with an average of 3.07 from the previous year, namely 2020 with an average of 3.24. Although in 2022 there was an insignificant increase, namely 3.12. This shows that employee performance at Mr. DIY Sukabumi City is lacking in terms of employee work quality, namely the lack of employee ability in work. The problem is caused by one of the dimensions in the non-physical work environment, namely leader attention and support. In this case, the leader does not give appreciation to the work of employees. Another cause is the ability which is one of the factors in work productivity, namely the lack of employee skills so that it cannot improve work effi-

ciency and effectiveness. In this case, employees do not have sufficient knowledge about the products sold at Mr. DIY so that it affects employees in making sales.

Based on the description above, the researcher conducted further analysis of the above problems so that the research title raised was "The effect of non-physical work environment and work productivity on employee performance at Mr. DIY Sukabumi City."

## 2. Method

In this study, researchers used a Human Resources management approach. In this study the object of research is the non-physical work environment and work productivity on employee performance. This research is a type of research using associative methods, where to find out the cause and effect of the variables that influence the variables that are influenced.

The population of this study were employees of Mr. DIY Sukabumi City, with a total population of 30 people. Research that wants to make generalizations with very small errors. Another term for saturated sample is census, where all members of the population are sampled, with a sample size of 30 employees of Mr. DIY Sukabumi City. Data collection techniques used by researchers include primary data, namely: observation, interviews, questionnaires. And secondary data including literature study, documentation.

## 3. Results and Discussion

### 3.1 Validity Testing

According to Sugiyono (2016: 121) states that "Validity is the level of reliability and validity of the measuring instrument used. The instrument is said to be valid, which means that it shows that the measuring instrument used to obtain data is valid or can be used to measure what should be measured". To test the validity of each item, namely by correlating the score of each item with the total score which is the sum of each item score. If the correlation coefficient is equal to or above 0.30 then the item is declared valid, but if the correlation value is less than 0.30 then the item is declared invalid.

**Table 2. Results of the Non-Physical Work Environment Validity Test ($X_1$)**

| Variable | No Item | $R_{count}$ | $R_{critical}$ | Description |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Non-Physical Work Environment ($X_1$) | 1 | 0,767 | 0,3 | Valid |
| | 2 | 0,654 | 0,3 | Valid |
| | 3 | 0,794 | 0,3 | Valid |
| | 4 | 0,582 | 0,3 | Valid |
| | 5 | 0,785 | 0,3 | Valid |
| | 6 | 0,839 | 0,3 | Valid |
| | 7 | 0,755 | 0,3 | Valid |
| | 8 | 0,785 | 0,3 | Valid |
| | 9 | 0,648 | 0,3 | Valid |
| | 10 | 0,728 | 0,3 | Valid |
| | 11 | 0,703 | 0,3 | Valid |
| | 12 | 0,673 | 0,3 | Valid |
| | 13 | 0,742 | 0,3 | Valid |
| | 14 | 0,683 | 0,3 | Valid |
| | 15 | 0,714 | 0,3 | Valid |

Source: Results of Data Processing Using SPSS (Version 26) 2023

From the validity test, it is known that each questionnaire item has a critical value of 0.3. The questionnaire is declared valid if Rcount is greater than Rcritical. This shows that the 15 question items from the Non-Physical Work Environment variable (X1) are declared valid. Thus the validity of the measuring instrument can be fulfilled.

**Table 3. Work Productivity Validity Test Results ($X_2$)**

| Variable | No Item | $R_{count}$ | $R_{critical}$ | Description |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Work Productivity ($X_2$) | 1 | 0,727 | 0,3 | Valid |
| | 2 | 0,752 | 0,3 | Valid |
| | 3 | 0,818 | 0,3 | Valid |
| | 4 | 0,799 | 0,3 | Valid |
| | 5 | 0,822 | 0,3 | Valid |
| | 6 | 0,722 | 0,3 | Valid |
| | 7 | 0,873 | 0,3 | Valid |
| | 8 | 0,854 | 0,3 | Valid |
| | 9 | 0,761 | 0,3 | Valid |

Source: Results of Data Processing Using SPSS (Version 26) 2023

From the validity test, it is known that each questionnaire item has a critical value of 0.3. The questionnaire is declared valid if $r_{count}$ is greater than Rcritical. This shows that the 9 question items from the Work Productivity variable (X2) are declared valid. Thus the validity of the measuring instrument can be fulfilled.

**Table 4. Employee Performance Validity Test Results (Y)**

| Variable | No Item | $R_{count}$ | $R_{critical}$ | Description |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Employee Performance (Y) | 1 | 0,866 | 0,3 | Valid |
| | 2 | 0,808 | 0,3 | Valid |
| | 3 | 0,836 | 0,3 | Valid |
| | 4 | 0,747 | 0,3 | Valid |
| | 5 | 0,818 | 0,3 | Valid |
| | 6 | 0,834 | 0,3 | Valid |
| | 7 | 0,840 | 0,3 | Valid |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 8 | 0,845 | 0,3 | Valid |
| | 9 | 0,718 | 0,3 | Valid |

Source: Results of Data Processing Using SPSS (Version 26) 2023

From the validity test, it is known that each questionnaire item has an Rcritical of 0.3. The questionnaire is declared valid if Rcount is greater than Rcritical. This shows that the 9 question items from the Employee Performance variable (Y) are declared valid. Thus the validity of the measuring instrument can be fulfilled.

### 3.2 Reliability Test

Reliability test is a tool for measuring a questionnaire which is an indicator of a variable or construct. A questionnaire is said to be reliable or reliable if someone's answer to a statement is consistent or stable over time (Ghozali, 2018). The reliability test is carried out after the validity test and the test is a statement or question that is already valid. Cronbach's alpha which is between 0.50-0.60. In this study, researchers chose 0.60 as the reliability coefficient.

The following are the results of the reliability test of the Non-Physical Work Environment (X1), Work Productivity (X2), and Employee Performance (Y) variables.

**Table 5. Reliability Test Results**

| Variable | *Cronbach's Alpha* | $R_{critical}$ | Description |
|---|---|---|---|
| Non Physical Work Environment ($X_1$) | 0,935 | >0,60 | Reliabel |
| Work Productivity ($X_2$) | 0,930 | >0,60 | Reliabel |
| Employee Performance (Y) | 0,941 | >0,60 | Reliabel |

Source: Results of Data Processing Using SPSS (Version 26) 2023

Based on the table above, it is known that the value of Cronbach's Alpha Variable Non Physical Work Environment (X1) is 0.935 because it is greater than 0.60, it can be stated that the instrument on Non Physical Work Environment (X1) is reliable. It can also be known that the Cronbach's Alpha value on Work Productivity (X2) is 0.930 because the value is above 0.60, it can be stated that the Work Productivity Variable (X2) is reliable. And it is also known that the Cronbach's Alpha value on Variable Employee Performance (Y) is 0.941 because the value is more than 0.60, it can be stated that the instrument on Variable Employee Performance (Y) is reliable.

### 3.3 Normality Testing

The normality test aims to test whether in the regression model, confounding or residual variables have a normal distribution. As is known that the t test and F test assume that the residual value follows a normal distribution. If this assumption is violated, the statistical test becomes invalid for a small sample size (Ghozali, 2018). In this study, researchers will detect whether the residuals are normally distributed or not using statistical tests.

The basis for decision making is done using the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test, with the following conditions:

1. If the profitability of Z Statistics> 0.05 then the distribution of the regression model is normal.
2. If the profitability of Z Statistics <0.05 then the distribution of the regression model is not normal.

The Kolmogorov-Smirnov test results used are as follows:

**Table 6. Normality Test Results**

**One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test**

| | | Unstandardized Residual |
|---|---|---|
| N | | 30 |
| Normal Parameters[a,b] | Mean | .0000000 |
| | Std. Deviation | 3.48009185 |
| Most Extreme Differences | Absolute | .113 |
| | Positive | .055 |
| | Negative | -.113 |
| Test Statistic | | .113 |
| Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed) | | .200[c,d] |

a. Test distribution is Normal.
b. Calculated from data.
c. Lilliefors Significance Correction.
d. This is a lower bound of the true significance.

Source: Results of Data Processing Using SPSS (Version 26) 2023

From table 6 it can be seen that the profitability of Z Statistics = 0.200, so the significant value is greater than 0.05 at (0.200>0.05), so the data is said to be normally distributed data.

### 3.4 Multiple Correlation Coefficient

Multiple correlate "is a value that gives the strength of the influence or relationship of two or more variables together with other variables" (Riduwan & Kuncoro, 2017). The percountan results that have been obtained are listed in the following table:

**Table 7. Colleration Coefficient Test Results**

**Model Summary[b]**

| Model | R | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | .873[a] | .763 | .745 | 3.60668 |

a. Predictors: (Constant), Work Productivity, Non Physical Work Environment
b. Dependent Variable: Work Ethic

Source: Results of Data Processing Using SPSS (Version 26) 2023

The results of the table above show that the results obtained by the R number are 0.873. After obtaining the results of the multiple correlation, to make it easier and understand clearly about the strength of the relationship between Non Physical Work Environment (X1) and Work Productivity (X2) on Employee Performance (Y). The

percountan results that have been obtained can then be given an interpretation of the strength of the relationship using guidelines such as those listed in the following table:

**Table 8. Correlation Coefficient**

| Ordinal Coefficient | Relationship Level |
|---|---|
| 0,00 – 0,199 | Very Low |
| 0,20 – 0,399 | Low |
| 0,40 – 0,599 | Medium |
| 0,60 – 0,799 | Strong |
| 0,80 – 1,000 | Very Strong |

Source: Results of Data Processing Using SPSS (Version 26) 2023

Based on the correlation coefficient table above, the results of the correlation coefficient produce a value of 0.873 with a confidence degree of 95% and a significant level of α = 0.05, this value is in the category 0.80 - 1.000. This shows that there is a very strong relationship between Non Physical Work Environment (X1) and Work Productivity (X2) on Employee Performance (Y).

### 3.5 Coefficient of Determination

Coefficient of determination to see some percentage (%) Variable Non Physical Work Environment (Variable X1) and Work Productivity (Variable X2) affect Employee Performance (Variable Y). To predict how far the dependent variable value changes if the independent variable value is changed, namely by using multiple linear regression analysis. Then to determine the contribution of the influence of variables X1 and X2 on Y using the coefficient of determination formula according to (Sugiyono, 2016) as follows:

$$Kd = r^2 \times 100\%$$

Where:
Kd = Coefficient of determination
r = Correlation coefficient

The results of Non Physical Work Environment (x1) and Work Productivity (x2) on Employee Performance (y) are as follows:
R = 0,873
so it can be calculated:
Kd = $0{,}873^2$ x 100%
= 76,3 %

Criteria for the coefficient of determination:
1. If "kd" is close to 0, then the influence of Variable X on Variable Y is weak
2. If "kd" is close to 1, then the influence of Variable X on Variable Y is strong.

Based on the results of the coefficient of determination, it can be seen that the coefficient of determination between X1 and X2 on Y is 76.3% close to one, so the model is considered better. so it can be concluded that the influence between the independent variable on the dependent variable is strong.

### 3.6 Multiple Linear Regression

The regression analysis used in this study is to use multiple regression analysis. In regression analysis, in addition to measuring the strength of the relationship between two or more variables, it also shows the direction of the relationship between the dependent variable and the independent variable.

Sugiyono (2016) states that "multiple regression analysis is used by researchers, to predict how the state (ups and downs) of the dependent variable, if two independent variables as predictor factors are manipulated (increased and decreased in value)."

In this study, researchers used multiple linear regression equations because the independent variables in the study were more than one. The results of multiple linear regression analysis are as follows:

**Table 9. Multiple Linear Regression Percount Results Table**

**Coefficients[a]**

| Model | | Unstandardized Coefficients B | Unstandardized Coefficients Std. Error | Standardized Coefficients Beta | t | Sig. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | (Constant) | 3.926 | 5.252 | | .748 | .461 |
| | Non Physical Work Environment | .196 | .100 | .314 | 1.963 | .060 |
| | Work Productivity | .503 | .134 | .599 | 3.747 | .001 |

a. Dependent Variable: Work Ethic
Source: Results of Data Processing Using SPSS (Version 26) 2023

Based on the table above, it can be seen that the value of the multiple linear regression equation is as follows:
Description:
$b_1$ = 0,196
$b_2$ = 0,503
Furthermore, the multiple linear regression equation for Variable Employee Performance is obtained:

$$Y^{\wedge} = 3{,}926 + 0{,}196\ X_1 + 0{,}503\ X_2$$

From the regression equation above, it can be explained that:
1. The constant value of 3.926 states that if the Non Physical Work Environment value is 0.196 and Work Productivity is 0.503, then Employee Performance increases by 3.926.
2. If the Non Physical Work Environment Variable increases by 1, it will add an Employee Performance level of 0.196 assuming the regression coefficient value of the other variables is constant.

If variable Work Productivity increases by 1, it will add Employee Performance level by 0.503 assuming the regression coefficient value of other variables is constant.

### 3.7 Simultaneous Test

To test the feasibility of the model, the F test formula is used. A significant F test is a variation of the dependent variable that is explained by a percentage by the independent variables together and is a real result and does not occur by chance. When the simultaneous hypothesis test or F test wants to be carried out, there are the following conditions:

1. If $F_{count} \geq F_{tabel}$ then H1 is accepted and H0 is rejected.
2. If $F_{count} < F_{table}$ then H1 is rejected and H0 is accepted.

The data used for the F test count is then entered and counted through SPSS 26 software. The results of the count are as follows:

**Table 10. Research Model Test Results**

**ANOVA[a]**

| Model | | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Regression | 1129.480 | 2 | 564.740 | 43.414 | .000[b] |
| | Residual | 351.220 | 27 | 13.008 | | |
| | Total | 1480.700 | 29 | | | |

a. Dependent Variable: Work Ethic
b. Predictors: (Constant), Work Productivity, Non Physical Work Environment
Source: Results of Data Processing Using SPSS (Version 26) 2023

Based on the percountan table data above, the results of the Fcount Variable Non Physical Work Environment (X1) and Work Productivity (X2) on Employee Performance (Y) are 43.414. The error rate is 5% or 0.05 and at db numerator = k and db denominator = (n - k - 1) = 30-2-1 = 27. The Fcount value is compared with the Ftable value obtained Ftable number of 3.354.

Based on the results of the table above, it can be seen that the Fcount value is greater than the Ftable where the Fcount value is 43.414> Ftable 3.354, it can be seen that this hypothesis can be accepted and declared feasible to explain the dependent variable being analyzed because Fcount> Ftable.

### 3.8 Hypothesis Test

Testing the research hypothesis aims to determine the strength of each independent variable on the dependent variable. In this research plan to determine how much influence the independent variable has on the dependent variable.

To test the significant effect of Variable X on Variable Y, the t test formula is used. The price of t is then compared with the price of t table with db = n-1, the provisions are:

1. If tcount ≥ ttabel then $H_0$ is rejected and Ha is accepted.
2. If tcount < ttabel then $H_0$ is accepted and Ha is rejected.

The partial test results are as follows:

**Table 11. The results of the t test between Non-Physical Work Environment (X1) on Employee Per-for-mance (Y)**

**Coefficients[a]**

| Model | | Unstandardized Coefficients B | Unstandardized Coefficients Std. Error | Standardized Coefficients Beta | t | Sig. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | (Constant) | 7.321 | 6.263 | | 1.169 | .252 |
| | Non Physical Work Environment | .499 | .071 | .800 | 7.047 | .000 |

a. Dependent Variable: Work Ethic
Source: Results of Data Processing Using SPSS (Version 26) 2023

Based on the percountan table data above, the tcount result of the Non Physical Work Environment Variable (X1) on Employee Performance (Y) is 7.047. The error rate is 5% or 0.05 and db = (n-1) db = 30-1 = 29. The t count value is compared with the t table value which can be obtained through the t table from these provisions, the t table number is 2.045.

Based on the results of the table above, it can be seen that the tcount value is greater than the t table where the tcount value is 7.047> t table 2.045, so H0 is rejected and H1 is accepted. This means that there is a significant influence between Non Physical Work Environment (X1) on Employee Performance (Y). The H1 and H0 acceptance area curves are as follows:

The partial test results of the Work Productivity Variable (X2) on Employee Performance (Y) are as follows:

**Table 12. t Test Results Work Productivity (X2) on Employee Performance (Y)**

**Coefficients[a]**

| Model | | Unstandardized Coefficients B | Unstandardized Coefficients Std. Error | Standardized Coefficients Beta | t | Sig. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | (Constant) | 8.389 | 4.970 | | 1.688 | .103 |
| | Work Productivity | .717 | .083 | .854 | 8.677 | .000 |

a. Dependent Variable: Work Ethic
Source: Results of Data Processing Using SPSS (Version 26) 2023

Furthermore, in Variable Work Productivity, the tcount result of Variable Work Productivity (X2) on Employee Performance (Y) is 8.677. The error rate is 5% or 0.05 and db = (n-1) db = 30-1 = 29. The t count value is compared with the t table value which can be obtained through the t table from these provisions, the t table number is 2.045.

Based on the results of the table above, it can be seen that the tcount value is greater than the t table where the tcount value is 8.677> t table 2.045 then H0 is rejected and H1 is accepted. This means that there is a significant influence between Work Productivity (X2) on Employee

Performance (Y). The H1 and $H_0$ acceptance area curves are as follows:

1. **Effect of Non Physical Work Environment (X1) on Employee Performance (Y)**

   Based on partial testing, it can be seen that the tcount value is greater than the t table where the tcount value is 7.047> t table 2.045, then H0 is rejected and H1 is accepted. This means that there is a significant influence between Non Physical Work Environment (X1) on Employee Performance (Y). This shows that the higher the Non Physical Work Environment, the higher the Employee Performance.

   These results are in line with previous research conducted by Anam and Rahardja (2017) with the title "the influence of work facilities, Non Physical Work Environment and job satisfaction on Employee Performance" in this study showing that work facilities, Non Physical Work Environment and job satisfaction affect Employee Performance. The Adjusted R Square value is 55.2%, which means that performance can be explained by work facility variables, Non Physical Work Environment and job satisfaction. The remaining 44.8% can be explained by other variables.

2. **Effect of Work Productivity (X2) on Employee Performance (Y)**

   Based on partial testing, it can be seen that the tcount value is greater than the t table where the tcount value is 8.677> t table 2.045 then H0 is rejected and H1 is accepted. This means that there is a significant influence between Work Productivity (X2) on Employee Performance (Y). This shows that the higher the Work Productivity, the higher the Employee Performance of employees.

   These results are in line with research with the title "the influence of Work Productivity and work motivation on employee performance at the parodhana arta solution bekasi cooperative" conducted by Haang, Ahkmad and Hamid (2020). Based on the results of data analysis, it shows that there is an influence of variable work productivity and variable work motivation on the dependent variable of employee performance.

## 4. Conclusions and Suggestions

The research findings indicate that the non-physical work environment and work productivity have a significant positive influence on employee performance at Mr. DIY Sukabumi City. The suggestions from the research include conducting broader studies with a wider range of samples from industrial-level companies to gain a more comprehensive understanding of the relationship between these variables.

Practically, it is recommended that Mr. DIY Sukabumi City ensures smooth communication among employees and teams, involves employees in decision-making processes, and provides training and development opportunities to improve employees' abilities. Additionally, future research could consider other factors such as work-life balance, job stress, and job satisfaction to further explore their impact on employee performance.

## 5. References

Anam, K., & Rahardja, E. (2017). Pengaruh fasilitas kerja, Non Physical Work Environment dan kepuasan kerja terhadap Employee Performance (Studi pada Pegawai Dinas Perindustrian dan Perdagangan Provinsi Jawa Tengah). *Diponegoro Journal of Management*, *6*(4), 502-512. https://ejournal3.undip.ac.id/index.php/djom/article/view/18000/17067

Ghozali, Imam. (2018). *Aplikasi Analisis Multivariate dengan Program IBM SPSS 25.* Semarang: Badan Penerbit Universitas Diponegoro.

Hermawati, R. (2019). Pengaruh Pelatihan, Budaya Organisasi Terhadap Motivasi Kerja Serta Dampaknya Terhadap Kinerja Pustakawan (Studi Kasus) Pada Perpustakaan Nasional. *Media Pustakawan*, *24*(3), 57–66. https://doi.org/10.37014/medpus.v24i3.464

Imran, U. D., & Widiawati, A. (2022). The Influence of Education Level, Job Skills and Work Attitude on Work Performance. *Point of View Research Management,* *3*(3), 277-291. http://journal.accountingpointofview.id/index.php/POVREMA/article/view/223

Lestari, Y., Mulia, F., & Norisanti, N. (2020). Pengaruh Disiplin Kerja Terhadap Employee Performance Pada Bank OCBC NISP Cabang Cibadak-Sukabumi (Survey Pada Karyawan Bank OCBC NISP Cabang Cibadak). *Jurnal Ekobis Dewantara*, 3(3), 38–45. https://doi.org/10.26460/ed_en.v3i3.1704

Lian, B. (2017). Kepemimpinan dan Kualitas Kinerja Pegawai. *Palembang: CV. Amanah*.

Maulidiyah, N. N. (2020). Peran Budaya Organisasi Dalam Meningkatkan Kepuasan Kerja Serta Dampaknya Terhadap Employee Performance Bank Indonesia. *Jurnal Manajemen Bisnis*, *17*(2), 273-286. https://doi.org/10.38043/jmb.v17i2.2383

Ningsih, N. A., & Khaerunnisa, L. (2022). Determinasi Produktivitas: Skill, Motivasi Dan Lingkungan Kerja (Literature Review Pengantar Manajemen Sdm). *Jurnal Manajemen Pendidikan Dan Ilmu Sosial*, *3*(2), 550-560. https://doi.org/10.38035/jmpis.v3i2.1118

Pebriyanti, R., Mulia, F., & Danial, R. D. M. (2020). Efektivitas Pengembangan Karir

Terhadap Work Productivity Karyawan di PT. Senamas Energindo Mineral. *JIMEK: Jurnal Ilmiah Mahasiswa Ekonomi*, *3*(1), 111-123. https://doi.org/10.30737/jimek.v3i1.839

Pitriyani, P., & Halim, A. (2020). Pengaruh pengalaman kerja, latar belakang pendidikan dan kompensasi terhadap Employee Performance pada PT. Pegadaian Persero cabang Rantauprapat. *Ekonomi Bisnis Manajemen dan Akuntansi (EBMA)*, *1*(1), 60-68. https://doi.org/10.36987/ebma.v1i1.1900

Pramana, D. (2020). Pengaruh Tata Ruang Kantor Terhadap Work Productivity Pegawai Pada Kantor Dinas Kesehatan Daerah Kabupaten Tapanuli Selatan. *Jurnal Administrasi dan Perkantoran Modern*, *9*(2). 256-271. https://doi.org/10.17509/jpm.v2i2.8098

Riduwan, & Kuncoro, E. A. (2017). *Cara Menggunakan Dan Memaknai Analisis Jalur (Path Analysis)*. Bandung: Alfabeta.

Solihudin, S., Mulia, F., & Danial, R. D. M. (2022). Optimalisasi Upgrading Staf Terhadap Employee Performance Melalui Disiplin Kerja Sebagai Variable Intervening. *Management Studies and Entrepreneurship Journal (MSEJ), 3*(4), 2315-2324. https://journal.yrpipku.com/index.php/msej/article/download/833/623/5680

Sugiyono. (2016). *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif, Kualitatif dan R&D*. Bandung: PT Alfabeta.

Untung, D., & Nugraheni, R. (2017). *Pengaruh Lingkungan Kerja Fisik dan Non Physical Work Environment Terhadap Employee Performance dengan Kepuasan Kerja Sebagai Variable Intervening (Studi pada Karyawan Bagian Weaving PT. Primatexco Indonesia)* (Doctoral dissertation, Fakultas Ekonomika dan Bisnis). https://ejournal3.undip.ac.id/index.php/djom/article/view/17960

Yusuf, R. M., Taroreh, R. N., & Lumintang, G. G. (2019). Pengaruh Employee Engagement, Beban Kerja Dan Kepuasan Kerja Terhadap Employee Performance Pada Cv. Indospice Di Manado. *Jurnal EMBA: Jurnal Riset Ekonomi, Manajemen, Bisnis dan Akuntansi*, *7*(4). . 4787-4787 https://doi.org/10.35794/emba.v7i4.25429