

THE INFLUENCE OF PHYSICAL AND NON-PHYSICAL WORK ENVIRONMENT ON WORK ETHIC AMONG CIVIL SERVANTS AT THE DEPARTMENT OF POPULATION AND CIVIL REGISTRATION IN LANDAK REGENCY

Kristina Ilis ^{a*)}, Eru Ahmadia ^{a)}

^{a)} Universitas Muhammadiyah Pontianak, Pontianak, Indonesia

^{*)}Corresponding Author: ilisk808@gmail.com

Article history: received 10 January 2025; revised 21 February 2025; accepted 05 March 2025

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.33751/jhss.v8i3.11881>

Abstract. This study investigates the effect of physical and non-physical work environment on the work ethic of civil servants at the Population and Civil Registration Office of Landak Regency. As technology advances and workplace dynamics change, the environment in which people work becomes increasingly important to their effectiveness. This study sought to examine how elements such as workplace layout, lighting, equipment, and interpersonal dynamics between coworkers and superiors can affect motivation and work ethic. Data were collected from 39 government workers through questionnaires and then analyzed using multiple linear regression using SPSS 25. The results showed that the physical environment had a substantial positive influence on work ethic ($\beta = 0.327$, $p < 0.05$), implying that an aesthetically pleasing office is essential in enhancing work motivation. However, the non-physical environment, including human relations and organizational culture, had no significant effect ($\beta = 0.031$, $p > 0.05$). This suggests that while a good workplace culture is important, it may not directly influence work ethic as much as a pleasant and well-functioning physical environment. This research suggests that improving physical working conditions is a strategic method to improve employee performance. Further research could focus on other factors, such as leadership style or job satisfaction, which may also contribute to building a strong work ethic.

Keywords: physical work environment; non-physical work environment; work ethic

I. INTRODUCTION

In an organization or institution, whether governmental or private, human resources play a crucial role. It can even be stated that humans are the central driving force that shapes the dynamics within an organization, as they are the key factor in achieving organizational goals effectively and efficiently. Employees serve as the driving agents of all activities within an organization. This is because, to achieve optimal results, human resources as the driving factor in carrying out activities must possess good capabilities and quality [1].

Work ethic is a primary aspect and a priority in performing a job to achieve high-quality performance. Several factors contribute to employees' work ethic, one of which is the work environment. According to [2], "The work environment encompasses everything surrounding employees that can influence them in performing their assigned tasks." A strong work ethic in each employee indicates their enthusiasm in executing and completing all given tasks. Employees who genuinely complete their workloads not only demonstrate their skills and expertise but also exhibit responsibility and honesty. Individuals who show dedication to a company or institution reflect a high work ethic within their workplace [3].

The work environment is categorized into two types: physical and non-physical. According to Nurhasanah (2019)

in [4], "Both physical and non-physical work environments have direct and indirect impacts on employee productivity. A conducive physical and non-physical work environment can enhance employee productivity, whereas an unfavorable environment can reduce it. A work environment is considered ideal when employees can perform optimally in a healthy, safe, and comfortable setting."

The Department of Population and Civil Registration of Landak Regency is a government agency responsible for public services related to population registration and civil records. Led by a Head of Department and located on Jl. Pangeran Cinata Kusuma, this institution operates based on the principles of autonomy and delegated governmental functions as mandated by applicable laws and regulations. Its primary responsibilities include providing population registration services, issuing registration documents, documenting service outcomes, and monitoring and evaluating the implementation of population registration.

The department serves as an essential element in regional governance, overseeing population registration, civil record management, administrative information handling, and data utilization following regional regulations. One of its main duties is to encourage public awareness regarding the importance of legal identity through motivation and efficient

service delivery. Employees are expected to enhance their performance to ensure the community receives optimal services.

Organizations operate effectively and can tackle challenges by relying on several key components: natural resources, infrastructure, technology, and human resources. A well-established work environment enables employees to work optimally, healthily, safely, and comfortably. The work environment significantly influences employees' habits in completing their tasks. The availability of proper facilities and infrastructure can impact work execution. Therefore, achieving better performance requires a conducive work environment. A positive work environment ensures security and enables employees to work more efficiently. When employees feel comfortable in their work setting, they are more likely to be engaged in their tasks. Hence, organizations must ensure that work environment factors are well-managed to promote employees' enthusiasm for work [5].

In 2022, the employee absenteeism rate was 59.76%, and in 2023, it increased by 0.32% compared to the previous year. This phenomenon is linked to the influence of the physical and non-physical work environment on work ethic. Employees with a strong work ethic are highly valued by organizations, as they contribute positively to the institution's success [6].

Ensuring a favorable work environment is expected to boost employee morale. Higher employee motivation leads to increased productivity, ultimately facilitating the achievement of institutional goals. The Department of Population and Civil Registration of Landak Regency is equipped with various facilities, including 21 storage racks, 16 cabinets, 80 desks, 90 chairs, 20 laptops, 3 tripod cameras, 12 film cameras, 3 digital cameras, 30 card readers, 70 printers, 3 scanners, 60 personal computers, 12 air conditioners, 9 fans, 9 televisions, and 1 internet connection.

The availability of adequate facilities and infrastructure significantly impacts employee satisfaction and enhances work ethic. An unpleasant work environment may result in decreased employee performance and delayed task completion, rendering work systems ineffective and inefficient. Conversely, a supportive and pleasant work environment benefits both employees and the organization, ensuring job satisfaction and helping the institution achieve its objectives [7].

An interview with Daniar Citraresmi, A.Md., Head of General Affairs and Staffing at the Department of Population and Civil Registration of Landak Regency, revealed several challenges faced by the institution in carrying out administrative functions. These include suboptimal integration of digitalization in service innovation, incomplete population and civil registration documents among residents, limited budget allocations, and inadequate supporting facilities, with some equipment no longer functional, causing service disruptions. Additionally, network constraints hinder service delivery, and some employees tend to procrastinate or leave during work hours despite verbal warnings. Low motivation remains an issue, as many employees wait for directives instead of proactively fulfilling their

responsibilities. To address these challenges, effective coordination between local and central governments is necessary, along with increased budget allocations for infrastructure improvements and capacity-building programs through training and socialization efforts. Therefore, it is crucial for organizations to consider these factors in managing workforce efficiency and productivity. By ensuring workplace discipline, motivation, work ethic, and a conducive work environment, organizations can enhance employee productivity and achieve their desired objectives [8].

This study aims to examine the influence of physical and non-physical work environments on the work ethics of employees at the Landak District Population and Civil Registration Office. In addition, this study also aims to provide a deeper understanding of how these two factors can support employee performance and productivity improvement.

Physical Work Environment

According to [9], the physical work environment refers to elements present in the employees' surroundings that can influence their ability to perform their tasks, such as temperature, humidity, ventilation, lighting, and workplace cleanliness. According to [10], states that the physical work environment serves as a tool to assess various factors that affect employee performance in material or physical forms, ultimately influencing their productivity. Factors that impact the physical work environment include color schemes, cleanliness, air circulation, lighting, security, and noise levels. Furthermore, according to [11] define the physical work environment as all tangible conditions within the workplace that can affect employees, comprising adequate work equipment, facilities, and infrastructure.

Non-Physical Work Environment

According to [12], the non-physical work environment encompasses all conditions related to work relationships, including interactions with superiors, colleagues, and subordinates. A company should foster a work environment that supports cooperation among employees at different hierarchical levels, whether between superiors and subordinates or among employees holding similar positions. Similarly, [13], define the non-physical work environment as all conditions related to workplace relationships, encompassing interactions with superiors, colleagues, and subordinates. Furthermore, [14] describe the non-physical work environment as the relationship between colleagues and the interaction between employees and company leadership, integrating both superior-subordinate and peer relationships into a unified category of employee-leadership interaction.

Work Ethic

According to [15], work ethic is an attitude that arises from personal will and awareness, grounded in a cultural value orientation system toward work. It reflects an individual's disposition, personality, character, and beliefs regarding their professional responsibilities. Similarly, [16] defines work ethic as a set of fundamental attitudes or perspectives held by employees, perceiving work as a positive factor in enhancing their quality of life, thereby influencing their behavior within an organization. According to [17],

describe work ethic as a fundamental attitude or perspective maintained by employees, viewing work as a positive aspect of life improvement, which consequently reduces undesirable workplace behaviors. Furthermore, [18], work ethic as the totality of an individual's personality and the way they perceive, believe in, and assign meaning to their tasks in the workplace, ultimately motivating them to act and achieve optimal outcomes.

II. RESEARCH METHOD

The research method employed in this study is associative research. According to [19] "Associative research aims to determine the relationship between two or more variables." The sampling technique used in this study is the saturated sampling technique. According to [20], "Saturated sampling is a technique in which all members of the population are selected as the sample." The sample in this study comprises all civil servants at the Department of Population and Civil Registration of Landak Regency in 2024, totaling 39 employees. The data in this study consists of primary data. According to [19], "Primary data refers to data collected directly by the researcher from the first source or the research object." In this study, primary data was obtained through interviews and questionnaire distribution. The measurement scale used in this study is the Likert scale. Data analysis was performed using multiple linear regression analysis using SPSS 25 software. Multiple linear regression was used to determine the simultaneous and partial effects of independent variables (financial literacy, ease of access, and cost efficiency) on the dependent variable (financial optimization). Before conducting regression analysis, validity and reliability tests were conducted to ensure that the research instruments used could measure the variables properly and consistently. Normality tests were conducted to ensure that the data were normally distributed, while linearity tests ensured that the relationship between the independent and dependent variables was linear. In addition, a multicollinearity test was conducted to ensure that there were no overly strong relationships between the independent variables that could affect the regression results. Correlation tests and coefficient of determination were also conducted to determine the contribution of independent variables to the dependent variable. Hypothesis testing was performed using simultaneous tests (F-test) to see whether all independent variables collectively had a significant effect on financial optimization, and partial tests (t-test) to determine the effect of each independent variable on the dependent variable.

III. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Validity Test

The results of the validity test for each statement in the variables Physical Work Environment (X1), Non-Physical Work Environment (X2), and Work Ethic (Y) are presented in Table 1 below:

Table 1 Validity Test Results

Variable	Indicator	r calculated	r table	Description
Physical Work Environment (X1)	X1.1	0.568	0.267	Valid
	X1.2	0.622		
	X1.3	0.542		
	X1.4	0.628		
	X1.5	0.597		
	X1.6	0.542		
Non-Physical Work Environment (X2)	X2.2	0.812	0.267	Valid
	X2.2	0.676		
	X2.3	0.636		
	X2.4	0.669		
Work Ethic (Y)	Y1	0.523	0.267	Valid
	Y2	0.424		
	Y3	0.523		
	Y4	0.449		
	Y5	0.438		
	Y6	0.456		
	Y7	0.372		
	Y8	0.354		
	Y9	0.354		
	Y10	0.362		
	Y11	0.404		
	Y12	0.435		
	Y13	0.322		
	Y14	0.409		
	Y15	0.393		
	Y16	0.395		
	Y17	0.367		
	Y18	0.361		
	Y19	0.532		
	Y20	0.465		

Source: Processed Data 2025

Based on Table 1 above, the results of the validity test for all research variables, namely Physical Work Environment (X1), Non-Physical Work Environment (X2), and Work Ethic (Y), indicate that the calculated r-value (r-calculated) is greater than 0.267 (r-calculated > r-table). Therefore, all items are deemed valid.

Reliability Test

The reliability test is conducted to assess the level of consistency of a statement as a measurement tool. In this study, the reliability test uses the Cronbach's Alpha method. An item statement is considered reliable if it has a Cronbach's Alpha value of 0.60 or higher. The results of the reliability test for Physical Work Environment (X1), Non-Physical Work Environment (X2), and Work Ethic (Y) are presented in Table 2 below:

Table 2 Reliability Test Results

Variable	Cronbach's Alpha	Description
Physical Work Environment (X1)	0,611	Reliable
Non-Physical Work Environment (X2)	0,643	
Work Ethic (Y)	0,702	

Source: Processed Data, 2025

Based on Table 2 above, it can be seen that using the Cronbach's Alpha technique for the reliability test shows that Physical Work Environment (X1), Non-Physical Work Environment (X2), and Work Ethic (Y) are considered reliable as they meet the required Cronbach's Alpha reliability coefficient value of > 0.6.

Classical Assumption Test**Normality Test**

The method used in this study to measure normality is the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test. If the significance value of the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test is > 0.05 , the normality assumption can be considered normal. The results of the normality test for all research variables are presented in Table 3 below:

Table 3 Normality Test Results

Test	Value
N (Sample)	39
Test Statistic (Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z)	.091
Asymp.Sig.(2-tailed)	.200

Source: Processed Data, 2025

Based on Table 3 above, the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test for normality shows that the significance value of $0.200 > 0.05$ indicates that the data follows a normal distribution.

Linearity Test

The linearity test was conducted using the Test for Linearity method. The results of the linearity test between the Physical Work Environment (X1) and Work Ethic (Y) variables, as well as the Non-Physical Work Environment (X2) and Work Ethic (Y) variables, are presented in Table 4 below:

Table 4 Linearity Test Results

Variable	Deviation From Linearity Sig	Description
Physical Work Environment * Work Ethic	.327	Linier
Non-Physical Work Environment * Work Ethic	.658	

Source: Processed Data, 2025

Based on Table 4 above, the significance values for the Test of Linearity are > 0.05 . Therefore, it can be concluded that there is a linear relationship between the Physical Work Environment (X1) and Non-Physical Work Environment (X2) with Work Ethic (Y).

Multicollinearity Test

The multicollinearity test aims to examine whether the regression model has correlations among the independent variables. Multicollinearity can be assessed by looking at the variance inflation factor (VIF) and the tolerance value. Multicollinearity does not occur if the VIF value is < 10.00 or the tolerance value is > 0.10 . The results of the multicollinearity test in this study are presented in Table 5 below:

TABLE 5 MULTICOLLINEARITY TEST RESULTS

Variable	Tolerance	VIF
Physical Work Environment (X1)	.995	1.005
Non-Physical Work Environment (X2)	.995	1.005

Source: Processed Data, 2025

Based on the test results in Table 5, it can be seen that the tolerance values and VIF values for each variable indicate that

multicollinearity does not occur between the two independent variables.

MULTIPLE LINEAR REGRESSION ANALYSIS

The results of the multiple linear regression analysis using SPSS 25 software are presented in Table 6 below:

TABLE 6 MULTIPLE LINEAR REGRESSION ANALYSIS RESULTS

Variabel	Coefficients	T Statistic	Significance Value
(Constant)	3.349	8.310	.000
Physical Work Environment	.327	3.496	.001
Non-Physical Work Environment	.031	.389	.699

Dependent Variable: Work Ethic

Source: Processed Data, 2025

Based on Table 6 above, the multiple linear regression equation in this study is as follows:

$$Y = 3.349 + 0.327(X1) + 0.031(X2)$$

Thus, the obtained multiple linear regression model is explained as follows:

1. The constant (a) has a positive value of 3.349. This means that if both the Physical Work Environment and Non-Physical Work Environment are at 0 (zero), the Work Ethic will be 3.349 units.
2. The regression coefficient for the Physical Work Environment variable is positive at 0.327. This means that if the Physical Work Environment (X1) increases by one unit, the Work Ethic will increase by 0.327 units.
3. The regression coefficient for the Non-Physical Work Environment variable is positive at 0.031. This means that if the Non-Physical Work Environment (X2) increases by one unit, the Work Ethic will increase by 0.031 units.

CORRELATION AND DETERMINATION COEFFICIENT (R²)

The correlation and determination coefficient values in this study can be seen in Table 7 below:

TABLE 7 CORRELATION AND DETERMINATION COEFFICIENT (R²)

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.504 ^a	.254	.212	.03602

Predictors: (Constant), Non-Physical Work Environment, Physical Work Environment

Source: Processed Data, 2025

Based on Table 7 above, using the Correlation Coefficient (R) test, an R value of 0.504 was obtained. This indicates that there is a moderate to strong relationship between the Physical Work Environment (X1) and Non-Physical Work Environment (X2) with Work Ethic (Y). The Determination Coefficient (R²) test results show that the R² value is 0.254. This means that 25.4% ($1 \times 0.254 \times 100\%$) of the variance in Work Ethic is explained by the Physical Work Environment and Non-Physical Work Environment, while the remaining 74.6% is explained by other variables not investigated in this study.

SIMULTANEOUS INFLUENCE TEST (F TEST)

The results of the simultaneous influence test (F test) in this study are presented in Table 8 below:

TABLE 8 SIMULTANEOUS INFLUENCE TEST RESULTS (F TEST)

Model	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F	Significance
Regression	.016	.008	6.118	.005 ^b
Residual	.047	.001		

Dependent Variable: Work Ethic
Predictors: (Constant), Non-Physical Work Environment, Physical Work Environment

Source: Processed Data, 2025

Based on the F test results in Table 8, it can be concluded that the Physical Work Environment (X1) and Non-Physical Work Environment (X2) have a significant and positive effect on Work Ethic (Y). This is evident from the calculated F value of 6.118, which is greater than the F table value of 4.113, and the significance value of 0.005, which is less than 0.05. This indicates that both the Physical and Non-Physical Work Environments, when considered simultaneously, significantly influence Work Ethic.

PARTIAL INFLUENCE TEST (T TEST)

The results of the partial influence test (T test) in this study are presented in Table 9 below:

TABLE 9 PARTIAL INFLUENCE TEST RESULTS (T TEST)

Variabel	Coefficients	T Statistic	Significance Value
(Constant)	3.349	8.310	.000
Physical Work Environment	.327	3.496	.001
Non-Physical Work Environment	.031	.389	.699

Dependent Variable: Work Ethic

Source: Processed Data, 2025

Based on Table 9, the results of the partial influence test (T test) can be interpreted as follows:

1. The calculated t value for the Physical Work Environment variable (X1) is 3.496, which is greater than the t table value of 1.688, and the significance level is 0.001, which is less than 0.05. This indicates that the Physical Work Environment has a significant partial effect on Work Ethic (Y).
2. The calculated t value for the Non-Physical Work Environment variable (X2) is 0.389, which is less than the t table value of 1.688, and the significance level is 0.699, which is greater than 0.05. This indicates that the Non-Physical Work Environment does not have a significant partial effect on Work Ethic.

Results of the Influence of Physical and Non-Physical Work Environments on Work Ethic

Based on the results of the hypothesis testing using the simultaneous test (F test), the calculated F value was 6.118, which is greater than the F table value of 4.113, with a significance value of 0.005, which is less than 0.05. This indicates that there is a simultaneous effect of both the Physical and Non-Physical Work Environments on Work Ethic. The calculated F value also shows a positive relationship between the three variables. Therefore, it can be concluded that **H1**, which states that the Physical and Non-Physical Work Environments have an effect on Work Ethic, is **accepted**. The results of this study contribute to a deeper

understanding of how the combination of the physical and non-physical work environment can influence employee work ethic. Although physical factors are more dominant, the combination of these two factors as a whole still has a significant influence on employee work behavior.

Results of the Influence of Physical Work Environment on Work Ethic

Based on the results of the hypothesis testing using the partial test (T test), the calculated t value was 3.496, which is greater than the t table value of 1.688, with a significance value of 0.001, which is less than 0.05. This indicates that there is a partial effect of the Physical Work Environment on Work Ethic. The calculated t value also shows a positive relationship between the two variables. Therefore, it can be concluded that **H2**, which states that the **Physical Work Environment** has a positive and significant effect on **Work Ethic**, is **accepted**. These results indicate that physical comfort in the workplace, such as good lighting, comfortable temperature, and supportive facilities, plays an important role in shaping good work ethic. This confirms the theory that a supportive physical environment can increase employee productivity and morale.

Results of the Influence of Non-Physical Work Environment on Work Ethic

Based on the results of the hypothesis testing using the partial test (T test), the calculated t value was 0.389, which is less than the t table value of 1.688, with a significance value of 0.699, which is greater than 0.05. This indicates that there is no partial effect of the Non-Physical Work Environment on Work Ethic. The calculated t value also shows a positive relationship, but it is not significant between the two variables. Therefore, it can be concluded that **H3**, which states that the Non-Physical Work Environment has a positive and significant effect on Work Ethic, is **rejected**. The results of this study provide new insights into the non-physical work environment and its influence on work ethic. Although the non-physical work environment can influence other aspects of an organization, the results of this study indicate that physical factors have a greater influence on work ethic than non-physical factors. This opens up opportunities for further research that can explore whether other factors such as internal motivation or inter-employee relationships have a greater influence on work ethic.

IV. CONCLUSIONS

Based on the results and discussion above, the following conclusions can be drawn. The multiple linear regression equation in this study is $Y = 3.349 + 0.327X_1 + 0.031X_2$. The correlation coefficient (R) is 0.504, indicating a moderate to strong relationship between the physical and non-physical work environments. The coefficient of determination (R^2) is 0.254, meaning that 25.4% of the variation in work ethic is explained by the physical and non-physical work environments, while the remaining 74.6% is influenced by other factors not investigated in this study. The results of the simultaneous test (F test) show a significant simultaneous effect of both the physical and non-physical work

environments on work ethic. The results of the partial test (T test) indicate that there is no significant effect of the non-physical work environment on work ethic. Based on the results of the study, it can be concluded that the physical work environment has a significant influence on work ethics, while the non-physical work environment does not show a significant influence. These findings provide insight that physical factors, such as workplace comfort and adequate facilities, have a greater impact on shaping employee work ethics than non-physical factors, such as organizational culture or employee communication. Practically, the results of this study can be used by HR practitioners and managers to design a more supportive work environment for employee productivity by improving physical aspects, such as workplace design and the provision of optimal facilities. Meanwhile, although the non-physical environment did not show a significant impact, it is still important for organizations to pay attention to internal policies that create a healthy and supportive culture. This study also contributes to the development of theory in the field of human resource management, particularly regarding the influence of the work environment on employee behavior and performance. Thus, these findings are beneficial for academics, practitioners, and policymakers in their efforts to improve the quality and productivity of human resources across various sectors.

REFERENCES

- [1] R. Kosvera, Zulfadil, and T. S. Putro, "Pengaruh Lingkungan Kerja Non Fisik Dan Budaya Organisasi Terhadap Kepuasan Kerja Dan Kinerja Pegawai Kantor Badan Pertanahan Nasional (BPN) Kota Pekanbaru Pekanbaru City," *Management Studies and Entrepreneurship Journal*, vol. 3, no. 5, 2022.
- [2] M. Enny, *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia*. Surabaya: UBHARA Manajemen Press, 2019.
- [3] A. S. Dewi and R. N. Kharisma, "Pengaruh Fasilitas Wisata Dan Kualitas Pelayanan Terhadap Kepuasan Pelanggan Jasa Perjalanan Wisata (Open Trip) C.V Gass Adventure, Sidoarjo," *Jurnal Ekonomi, Bisnis dan Manajemen*, vol. 2, no. 3, pp. 213–235, 2023.
- [4] M. Nafiah, Abd. K. Djaelani, and Khalikussabir, "Pengaruh Lingkungan Fisik, Lingkungan Non Fisik, Dan Keterampilan Terhadap Produktivitas Kerja Karyawan Pada Pt. Pjb Up Brantas Karangates Kab. Malang," *e – Jurnal Riset Manajemen*, vol. 11, no. 1, pp. 104–119, 2018.
- [5] Megawati and Ampauleng, "Pengaruh Etos Kerja dan Lingkungan Kerja Terhadap Kinerja Karyawan," *Jurnal Mirai Management*, vol. 5, no. 2, pp. 231–242, 2020.
- [6] M. T. H. Ramdani, D. Jhoansyah, and R. Nurmala, "Analisis Disiplin Kerja dan Lingkungan Kerja Non Fisik Terhadap Etos Kerja Pada PT Pantona Teknologi Indonesia," *Jurnal Ilmiah Wahana Pendidikan*, vol. 8, no. 22, 2022.
- [7] R. D. Sihalo and H. Siregar, "Pengaruh Lingkungan Kerja Terhadap Kinerja Karyawan Pada Pt. Super Setia Sagita Medan," *Jurnal Ilmiah Socio Secretum*, vol. 9, no. 2, pp. 273–281, Nov. 2019.
- [8] S. P. N. Syiva, R. A. Lestari, E. B. R. Lil'alamin, and R. S. Putra, "Pengaruh Disiplin Kerja, Motivasi Kerja, Etos Kerja Dan Lingkungan Kerja Terhadap Produktivitas Kerja Karyawan (Literature Review)," no. 1, pp. 43–60, 2023.
- [9] Afandi, *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia (Teori, Konsep Dan Indikator)*. Riau: Zanafa Publishing., 2018.
- [10] N. A. Pangestuti, "Pengaruh Lingkungan Kerja Fisik dan Non Fisik Serta Stres Kerja Terhadap Kinerja Karyawan Pabrik Suka Rasa Bakery," *Jurnal Manajemen*, vol. 10, no. 2, 2020.
- [11] Abdul Kadir and Hanna Mazati, "Pengaruh Lingkungan Kerja Fisik dan Lingkungan Kerja Non Fisik Terhadap Kinerja Karyawan Klinik Pratama Syariah Handira Kota Banjarbaru," *Jurnal Aplikasi Pelayaran Dan Kepelabuhanan*, vol. 12, no. 2, 2022.
- [12] F. Noorainy, "Pengaruh Lingkungan Kerja Fisik Dan Non Fisik Terhadap Kinerja Pegawai Pada Sekretariat Daerah Kabupaten Pangandaran," *Journal of Management Review*, vol. 1, no. 2, 2017.
- [13] Suwardi and Daryanto, *Pedoman praktis K3LH: Keselamatan dan Kesehatan Kerja dan Lingkungan Hidup*. Yogyakarta: Gava Media., 2018.
- [14] C. Rivalita and A. Ferdian, "Pengaruh Lingkungan Kerja Fisik Dan Lingkungan Kerja Non Fisik Terhadap Kinerja Pegawai Outsource Cleaning Service Di Universitas Telkom," *Jurnal Mitra Manajemen*, vol. 4, no. 4, 2020, doi: 10.52160/ejmm.v4i4.361.
- [15] A. T. Juniarti, B. I. Setia, and H. N. Fahmi, *Lingkungan Organisasi Dan Etos Kerja Dalam MSDM*. 2021.
- [16] D. J. Priansa, *Perencanaan dan Pengembangan Sumber Daya Manusia*. Bandung: Alfabeta, 2016.
- [17] Y. M. Larosa, M. H. Waruwu, and O. Laia, "Pengaruh Kepemimpinan dan Motivasi Kerja terhadap Etos Kerja Pegawai," *Jurnal Akuntansi, Manajemen dan Ekonomi*, vol. 1, no. 1, 2022, doi: 10.56248/jamane.v1i1.22.
- [18] Y. Maro and Hermayanti, "Pengaruh Etos Kerja, Gaya Kepemimpinan dan Lingkungan Kerja Terhadap Kinerja Pegawai," *Jurnal Ilmiah Wahana Pendidikan*, vol. 8, no. 7, pp. 99–110, May 2022, doi: 10.5281/zenodo.6545885.
- [19] S. Siregar, *Statistik Parametrik untuk Penelitian Kuantitatif: Dilengkapi dengan Perbandingan Perhitungan Manual & SPSS*. Jakarta: PT Bumi Aksara, 2020.
- [20] Sugiyono, *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif, Kualitatif, Dan R&D*. Bandung: Alfabeta, 2019.