
THE EFFECT OF PHYSICAL WORK ENVIRONMENT AND WORK MOTIVATION ON EMPLOYEE PERFORMANCE AT PT INDOMOBIL MULTI TRADA IN BINTARO

Zaskia Zalfa Azis^{1*}, Andi Sopandi²

Management Study Program, Undergraduate Program, Faculty of Economics
And Business of Pamulang University, South Tangerang
zaskazalfaaziss@gmail.com, dosen02277@unpam.ac.id

ABSTRACT

This study aims to determine the influence of the physical work environment and work motivation on employee performance at PT Indomobil Multi Trada in Bintaro both partially and simultaneously. The type of research uses an associative quantitative method. The sampling technique used a saturated sample of 73 respondents. Data analysis techniques used: data instrument test, classical assumption test, simple linear regression, multiple linear regression, correlation coefficient, and coefficient of determination. Hypothesis testing used the t-test and F-test. The results of the analysis show that the physical work environment has a partial positive effect on employee performance with a simple linear regression equation $Y = 18.260 + 0.443X_1$. The correlation coefficient value is 0.729. This means that it has a strong relationship level and a coefficient of determination of 53.1%. This means that performance is influenced by the physical work environment by 53.1%. This is proven by the t-test, which obtained a calculated t value $>$ t-table value. ($8.972 > 1.9944$) and strengthened by a significance value of < 0.05 ($0.000 < 0.05$). Work motivation partially has a positive effect on employee performance, as indicated by a simple linear regression equation $Y = 16.691 + 0.339X_2$. The correlation coefficient value is 0.680. This means that it has a strong level of relationship and a coefficient of determination of 46.3%. This means that performance is influenced by work motivation by 46.3%. This is proven by the t-test, which obtained a calculated t value $>$ t-table value. ($7.817 > 1.9944$) and strengthened by a significance value of < 0.05 ($0.000 < 0.05$). The results of the study of the physical work environment and work motivation simultaneously on employee performance are shown by the multiple linear regression equation $Y = 14.077 + 0.304X_1 + 0.217X_2$. The correlation coefficient value is 0.784. This means that it has a strong level of relationship and a coefficient of determination of 61.5%. This means that performance is influenced by the physical work environment and work motivation by 78.4%. This is proven by the results of the F test hypothesis test, which obtained a calculated F value $>$ F table ($55.939 > 3.13$) and strengthened with a significance value < 0.05 ($0.000 < 0.05$). Thus, it is proven that H_0 is rejected and H_a is accepted.

Keywords: Physical Work Environment, Work Motivation, Employee Performance

INTRODUCTION

In today's era of globalization, companies are required to maintain strong competitiveness to maintain their existence amidst increasingly fierce business competition. Rapid changes in technology and management systems require

companies to be constantly adaptive and adapt to increase productivity by optimizing overall employee performance. Employee performance is a crucial aspect in maintaining and improving employee productivity.

Employee performance improvement is influenced by various factors, both external and internal. According to Mangkunegara (2019:67), "employee performance is a comprehensive overview of the work results achieved by employees, both in terms of quantity and quality, within a specific timeframe." External factors include the physical work environment, and internal factors include work motivation. Both play a significant role in optimizing employee performance. Therefore, to address the challenges of this globalization era, companies need to create a comfortable and safe physical work environment to boost employee morale. Employee morale will enhance their work motivation, leading to greater productivity and improved performance.

Based on interviews conducted with HRGA of PT Indomobil Multi Trada in Bintaro, the following is employee performance data obtained from PT Indomobil Multi Trada in Bintaro in 2025.

Table 1. Employee Performance Data at PT Indomobil Multi Trada in Bintaro 2022-2024

No	Indicator	Total Employees	Target %	2022		2023		2024	
				Employee	%	Employee	%	Employee	%
1.	Quality of work	73	100	52	71	62	85	55	75
2.	Quantity of work	73	100	52	71	57	78	52	71
3.	Execution of tasks	73	100	47	64	64	88	57	78
4.	Responsibility	73	100	54	74	59	81	54	74
Average					70		83		74

Source: PT Indomobil Multi Trada in Bintaro, 2025

Note: <50% = Very bad, 51 – 60% = Bad, 61-70% = Not good, 71-80% = Good, 81-100% = Very good

Based on Table 1.1, performance in 2022 averaged 70%, indicating a poor score. However, in 2023, performance improved to 83%. Unfortunately, in 2024, performance declined again to 74%. This fluctuation indicates that, despite the initial improvement, there is instability in employee performance that requires further analysis.

Table 1 . Physical Work Environment Data of PT Indomobil Multi Trada in Bintaro

No.	Indicator	Ideal Conditions	Reality on the ground
1.	Workplace Building	The building is in good condition, clean, well-maintained, and meets safety standards.	Some parts have paint peeling off.
2.	Adequate work equipment	Complete and well-functioning work equipment is available.	There is damaged work equipment such as employee work chairs, limited printers and scanners that hinder work.
3.	Facility	There are toilets, pantry,	The toilet and some pantry

		and a decent rest room available.	equipment are poorly maintained.
4.	Availability of transportation services	Shuttle services or transportation subsidies are provided for employees.	There is no shuttle service available and there is no transportation subsidy for employees.

Source: PT Indomobil Multi Trada in Bintaro, 2025

The table compares ideal physical environmental conditions with the actual conditions at PT Indomobil Multi Trada in Bintaro. These four indicators demonstrate that there is still a gap between reality and field conditions. A poorly maintained physical environment can give the impression that the company doesn't care about employee well-being, leading to dissatisfaction, decreased motivation, and ultimately decreased performance. Inadequate work equipment will hinder task completion and lead to ineffective use of the time allotted for work. This, in turn, will decrease employee performance. The lack of transportation services and transportation subsidies means that employees living far from the office need to spend more money on transportation, require additional time to complete work, and experience delays, which can impact work performance.

Table 3. Employee Motivation Data at PT Indomobil Multi Trada in Bintaro Based on a Pre-Survey of 30 Employees

Indicator	Statement	Number of Pre-surveys	Yes		No	
			Person	%	Person	%
Need Physiological	I feel that my basic needs such as rest, food, and drink are met while working.	30	21	70	9	30
Need Sense of security	I feel physically and emotionally safe in my work environment.	30	19	63	11	37
Need Award	I feel appreciated for my contributions and performance at work.	30	21	70	9	30
Actualization Needs Self	My job provides the opportunity to grow and develop my potential.	30	27	90	3	10
Need Social	I feel like I have good social relationships with my coworkers in the office environment.	30	27	90	3	10

Indicator	Statement	Number of Pre-surveys	Yes		No	
			Person	%	Person	%
Average			23	76.6	7	23.4

Source: PT Indomobil Multi Trada in Bintaro, 2025

Based on the 2025 pre-survey data presented by the author at PT Indomobil Multi Trada in Bintaro with 30 respondents, the highest percentages were found in the self-actualization and social needs indicators, with a percentage of 90%. This means that the company provides incentives to increase work motivation by providing opportunities to develop and expand one's potential and creating a positive office climate so that employees feel they have good social relationships with their colleagues.

However, the lowest indicator **need for safety**, Only 63% of respondents felt physically and emotionally safe in their work environment, while the remaining 37% felt unsafe. This indicates that nearly a third of respondents felt their working conditions did not provide sufficient physical or psychological protection, which could impact stress levels and work motivation. Furthermore, 70% of respondents stated that basic needs such as rest, food, and drink were met while working, while the remaining 30% felt these needs were not met. This indicates a potential disruption in work performance and comfort due to basic physiological needs not being fully met.

This fact shows that there are still aspects of work motivation that need improvement, such as basic needs and job security, to boost motivation. Increasing work motivation has the potential to increase employee productivity, which in turn can improve their performance.

Thus, it is known that an inadequate physical work environment can reduce comfort and work efficiency, while low work motivation can make employees less enthusiastic about completing tasks. Both of these factors have the potential to reduce employee performance. Therefore, understanding the influence of the physical work environment and work motivation on employee performance is important and requires in-depth research.

METHOD

This research uses a quantitative research type. The quantitative research approach as stated by Sugiyono (2018:15) is defined as "research based on the philosophy of positivism, used to research a specific population or sample, data collection using research instruments, data analysis is quantitative/statistical, with the aim of describing and testing predetermined hypotheses". In this research using an associative method, according to Sugiyono (2016:36) "associative is research that is in the nature of asking about the relationship between two or more variables".

This study uses a quantitative research type with an associative approach to state the relationship between two or more variables. The population in this study was all employees at PT Indomobil Multi Trada in Bintaro, totaling 73 people. The sample size was taken using a sampling technique, namely the saturation technique. Due to the small population size, in this study the entire population at PT Indomobil Multi Trada in Bintaro, totaling 73 people, was used as a sample.

Data collection techniques in this study were conducted through observation, questionnaires, and documentation. The data analysis technique used in this study was multiple linear regression analysis to answer the research hypothesis, which included instrument testing, classical assumption testing, regression analysis, t-tests, and F-tests.

RESULT

Respondents in this study have four main characteristics, namely gender, age, highest level of education, and length of service in the relevant field or agency. This division aims to obtain a more comprehensive overview of the respondents' profiles.

Based on gender, it is known that 41 respondents were female (56.2%), while 32 respondents were male (43.8%). Based on the age of the respondents, it is known that the majority of respondents are in the 31–40 years age range, namely 32 people or equivalent to 43.8% of the total respondents. The age group under 25 years old occupies the second largest position with a total of 18 people or 24.7%. Next, respondents aged 25–30 years old numbered 14 people or 19.2%. Meanwhile, the age group over 41 years old is the smallest number, namely only 9 people or 12.3% of the total. Based on the respondents' last education, it is known that the majority of respondents have a high school/vocational high school education background, namely 44 people or 60.3% of the total respondents. Respondents with a D3 education numbered 8 people or 11.0%. Furthermore, 16 respondents had a bachelor's degree, which is equivalent to 21.9%. Meanwhile, 5 respondents (6.8%) had completed their education up to the master's level. Overall, the total number of respondents was 73. This data indicates that the majority of respondents were from high school, with a smaller proportion at the tertiary level. Based on length of service, the majority of respondents were in the 3–4 years category, with 43 respondents, or 58.9% of the total. Respondents who had worked for 1–2 years and more than 5 years each numbered 11 people, or 15.1%. Meanwhile, respondents with less than 1 year of service numbered 8 people, or 11.0%. This data indicates that the majority of respondents had significant work experience, namely between three and four years, which can provide relevant and representative insights into the topic being studied.

The results of the descriptive analysis obtained in this study, namely based on the results of respondents' responses to the physical work environment at PT Indomobil Multi Trada in Bintaro, it is known that the average of all variables is in the good category with a mean value of 4.12. The statement with the highest score is "I feel that the spatial layout and building design in the office create a comfortable and efficient working atmosphere", with a mean of 4.32, indicating that the spatial arrangement is considered to greatly support employee productivity. Meanwhile, the statement with the lowest score is "Public transportation access to my workplace is comfortable and easy to reach", with a mean of 3.90, which indicates that although it is classified as good, public transportation accessibility is still not entirely ideal for all employees.

Based on the results of respondents' responses to work motivation at PT Indomobil Multi Trada in Bintaro, the overall average of the five work motivation indicators showed a score of 4.05 which is included in the "Good" category. The statement with the highest average score in the respondent response data on work

motivation at PT Indomobil Multi Trada in Bintaro was 4.15, which appeared in two statements: "I feel helped by the benefits provided by the company" (physiological needs) and "I have good social relationships with coworkers" (social needs). This shows that the benefits and social relationships in the work environment are the most motivating aspects for employees. Meanwhile, the lowest score was 3.89, which was found in the statement "I feel safe because the company provides social security for workers such as BPJS" on security needs. This indicates that even though social protection has been provided, some employees still feel not fully protected or may not fully understand the benefits.

Based on the results of respondents' responses to the performance of PT Indomobil Multi Trada employees in Bintaro, the average overall variable was 4.11, categorized as Good. This indicates that in general, the employees were assessed as having positive performance by respondents. The statement with the highest score was the indicator "My work productivity is in line with company expectations" with an average value of 4.22, which is categorized as Very Good. This reflects that the majority of respondents feel able to work productively and according to the directions given. Meanwhile, the statement with the lowest score was "I always complete the tasks given on time" with an average value of 3.90, although it remains in the Good category. This indicates that punctuality in completing tasks can still be improved to optimize employee performance.

The results of the instrument test show that all statement items in each variable in the questionnaire are valid because they get a calculated r value $> r_{table}$ 0.2303. The results of the reliability test obtained a Cronbach Alpha value > 0.60 for all variables, thus declared reliable. The results of the classical assumption test, which includes the normality test, obtained Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed) value of $0.200 > 0.05$, it can be stated that the data from the population is normally distributed and can be carried out to the next stage of analysis. The multicollinearity test obtained a tolerance value greater than 0.10 and a VIF value less than 10. These results indicate that there is no correlation between the variables in this study. The heteroscedasticity test shows that all independent variables show insignificant results, because the significant value of the physical work environment and work motivation variables is more than 0.05, so it can be concluded that all independent variables do not experience heteroscedasticity in the error variance. The autocorrelation test obtained a Durbin Watson value of 1.999, which falls within the interval of 1.55 - 2.46, so it can be concluded that the data in this research variable does not contain autocorrelation.

**Table 4. Simple Linear Regression of Physical Work Environment (X1)
On Employee Performance (Y)
Coefficients^a**

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	18,260	1,679		10,878	.000
	Physical Work Environment	.443	.049	.729	8,972	.000

a. Dependent Variable: Employee Performance

Source: Data processed with SPSS 26 (2025)

Based on the calculation results, a simple linear regression equation can be obtained as follows: $Y = 18.260 + 0.443X_1$. This means that the constant of 18.260 indicates that when the physical work environment (X_1) has a value of zero or does not increase, Employee Performance (Y) will remain at 18.260. The regression coefficient value (b) is 0.443 (positive), which indicates a unidirectional influence, meaning that every increase in the physical work environment by one unit will increase employee performance by 0.443 units.

**Table 6. Simple Linear Regression of Work Motivation (X_2)
On Employee Performance (Y)**

		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		
Model		B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.
1	(Constant)	16,691	2.115		7,892	.000
	Work motivation	.399	.051	.680	7,817	.000

a. Dependent Variable: Employee Performance

Source: Data processed with SPSS 26 (2025)

Based on the calculation results, a simple linear regression equation can be obtained as follows: $Y = 16.691 + 0.339X_1$. The constant value of 16.691 indicates that when work motivation (X_2) is zero or does not increase, employee performance (Y) will remain at 16.691. The regression coefficient value (b) is 0.339 (positive), which indicates a unidirectional influence, meaning that every increase in work motivation by one unit will increase employee performance by 0.339 units.

The results of the multiple linear regression test in this study obtained the following results.

**Table 7. Multiple Linear Regression
Coefficients^a**

		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		
Model		B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.
1	(Constant)	14,077	1,870		7,529	.000
	Physical Work Environment	.304	.058	.499	5,268	.000
	Work motivation	.217	.056	.370	3,904	.000

a. Dependent Variable: Employee Performance

Source: Data processed with SPSS 26 (2025)

Based on the results obtained from the multiple linear regression analysis above, a regression equation can be made $Y = 14.077 + 0.304X_1 + 0.217X_2$. The constant of 14.077 means that if the physical work environment variable and the work motivation variable are zero or do not increase, then employee performance will remain at 14.077. The regression coefficient of the physical work environment variable (X_1) is 0.304, stating that if the physical work environment variable increases by 1 point, while other independent variables (Work Motivation) are fixed, then the Employee Performance variable increases by 0.304. The regression coefficient of the work motivation variable (X_2) is 0.217, stating that if the Work Motivation variable

increases by 1 point, while other independent variables (Physical Work Environment) are fixed, then the Employee Performance variable increases by 0.217.

Variable X1 against Y obtained a variable correlation value of 0.729 included in the interpretation of 0.60 - 0.799 with a strong relationship level. This means that the level of relationship between the physical work environment and employee performance has a strong relationship level. The RSquare coefficient of determination value is 0.531, which means that the physical work environment variable (X1) contributes to the employee performance variable (Y) by 53.1%, while the remaining 46.9% is caused by other variables not examined in this study. The t-value is 8.972 > t-table 1.9944 with a significance of 0.000 < 0.05, so H0 is rejected and Ha is accepted, indicating that there is a significant influence of the physical work environment on employee performance at PT Indomobil Multi Trada in Bintaro.

Variable X2 against Y gets the result The correlation of the work motivation variable of 0.680 falls within the interpretation of 0.60 - 0.799 with a strong relationship level. This means that the level of relationship between work motivation and employee performance has a strong relationship level. The RSquare coefficient of determination value is 0.463, which means that work motivation (X2) contributes to employee performance (Y) by 46.3%, while the remaining 53.7% is caused by other variables not examined in this study. The t-value is 7.817 > t-table 1.9944 with a significance of 0.000 < 0.05, so H0 is rejected and Ha is accepted, indicating that there is a significant influence of work motivation on employee performance at PT Indomobil Multi Trada in Bintaro.

Simultaneously obtained values The correlation between the physical work environment (X1) and work motivation (X2) variables is 0.784, entering the interval of 0.60 - 0.799 with a strong relationship level. This means that the relationship between the physical work environment and work motivation variables on employee performance has a strong relationship level. The coefficient of determination R Square is 0.615, which means that the physical work environment and work motivation variables simultaneously contribute to employee performance by 61.5%, while the remaining 38.5% is caused by other variables not examined in this study. The Fcount value is 55.939 > Ftable 3.13 with a significance level of 0.000 < 0.05, thus H0 is rejected and Ha is accepted, meaning that simultaneously there is a significant influence of the physical work environment and work motivation on employee performance at PT Indomobil Multi Trada in Bintaro.

DISCUSSION

A. The Influence of the Physical Work Environment on Employee Performance

Based on the results of statistical testing, the results of a simple linear regression equation $Y = 18.260 + 0.443X_1$ are obtained. From this equation, it can be concluded as follows: The value (a) or constant of 18.260 indicates that when the physical work environment (X1) is zero or does not increase, Employee Performance (Y) will remain at 18.260. The regression coefficient value (b) of 0.443 (positive) indicates a unidirectional influence, meaning that every increase in the physical work environment by one unit will increase employee performance by 0.443 units. The correlation value of the physical work environment variable of 0.729 is included in the interpretation of 0.60 - 0.799 with a strong relationship

level. Which means that the level of relationship between the physical work environment and employee performance has a strong relationship level. The coefficient of determination value of RSquare is 0.531, which means that the physical work environment variable (X1) contributes to the employee performance variable (Y) by 53.1%, while the remaining 46.9% is caused by other variables not examined in this study. The t-value is $8.972 > t\text{-table } 1.9944$ with a significance of $0.000 < 0.05$, so H_0 is rejected and H_a is accepted, indicating that there is a significant influence of the physical work environment on employee performance at PT Indomobil Multi Trada in Bintaro.

The results of this study are supported by previous research conducted by Soamole and Rofifah (2020), which showed that "the physical work environment has a positive and significant effect on employee performance." Research by Hariawan and Sukaja (2017) also stated that "the physical work environment has a positive and significant effect on employee performance." Research by Ibrahim et al. (2022) stated that "the physical work environment has a positive and significant effect on employee performance."

B. The Influence of Work Motivation on Employee Performance

Based on the results of statistical testing, the results obtained were simple linear regression equation $Y = 16.691 + 0.339X_2$. From this equation, it can be concluded as follows: Value (a) or constant is 16.691. This value indicates that when work motivation (X_2) is zero or does not increase, employee performance (Y) will remain at 16.691. The regression coefficient value (b) is 0.339 (positive), which indicates a unidirectional influence, meaning that every increase in work motivation by one unit will increase employee performance by 0.339 units. The correlation value of the work motivation variable is 0.680, which falls into the interpretation of 0.60 - 0.799 with a strong relationship level. This means that the level of relationship between work motivation and employee performance has a strong relationship level. The RSquare coefficient of determination is 0.463, which means that work motivation (X_2) contributes 46.3% to employee performance (Y), while the remaining 53.7% is caused by other variables not examined in this study. The calculated t value is $7.817 > t\text{ table } 1.9944$ with a significance of $0.000 < 0.05$, so H_0 is rejected and H_a is accepted, indicating that there is a significant influence of work motivation on employee performance at PT Indomobil Multi Trada in Bintaro.

The results of this study are supported by previous research conducted by Soamole and Rofifah (2020), which showed that "work motivation has a positive and significant effect on employee performance." Research by Hariawan and Sukaja (2017) also stated that "work motivation has a positive and significant effect on employee performance." Research by Ibrahim et al. (2022) stated that "work motivation has a positive and significant effect on employee performance."

C. The Simultaneous Influence of Physical Work Environment and Work Motivation on Employee Performance

Based on the results of statistical testing, the results of the multiple linear regression equation $Y = 14.077 + 0.304X_1 + 0.217X_2$. The constant of 14.077 means that if the physical work environment variable and the work motivation variable are zero or do not increase, then employee performance will remain at 14.077. The

regression coefficient of the physical work environment variable (X1) is 0.304, stating that if the physical work environment variable increases by 1 point, while other independent variables (work motivation) are fixed, then the employee performance variable increases by 0.304. The regression coefficient of the work motivation variable (X2) is 0.217, stating that if the work motivation variable increases by 1 point, while other independent variables (physical work environment) are fixed, then the employee performance variable increases by 0.217. The correlation value of the physical work environment variable (X1) and work motivation (X2) is 0.784, entering the interval 0.60 - 0.799 with a strong relationship level. Which means the level of relationship between physical work environment variables and work motivation on employee performance has a strong level of relationship. The coefficient of determination R Square is 0.615 which means that the physical work environment and work motivation variables simultaneously contribute to employee performance by 61.5%, while the remaining 38.5% is caused by other variables not examined in this study. The Fcount value is 55.939 > Ftable 3.13 with a significance level of 0.000 < 0.05 thus Ho is rejected and Ha is accepted, meaning that simultaneously there is a significant influence of the physical work environment and work motivation on employee performance at PT Indomobil Multi Trada in Bintaro.

The results of this study are supported by previous research conducted by Soamole and Rofifah (2020), which showed that "the physical work environment and work motivation simultaneously have a positive and significant effect on employee performance." Hariawan and Sukaja's (2017) research also stated that "the physical work environment and work motivation simultaneously have a positive and significant effect on employee performance." Ibrahim et al.'s (2022) research stated that "the physical work environment and work motivation simultaneously have a positive and significant effect on employee performance."

CONCLUSION

Based on the research results, the following conclusions can be drawn: The physical work environment partially influences employee performance with the regression equation $Y = 18.260 + 0.443X_1$. The correlation coefficient value of 0.729 means it has a strong relationship level. The determination coefficient of 53.1% means that performance is influenced by the physical work environment by 53.1% influenced by other factors not examined. This is proven by the t test obtained t count value > t table (8.972 > 1.9944) and is strengthened by a significance value < 0.05 (0.000 < 0.05). Thus it is proven that Ho is rejected and Ha is accepted.

Work motivation partially has a positive effect on employee performance, indicated by the simple linear regression equation $Y = 16.691 + 0.339X_2$. The correlation coefficient value of 0.680 means it has a strong relationship level and the determination coefficient of 46.3% means that performance is influenced by work motivation by 46.3%. This is proven by the t test obtained t count value > t table (7.817 > 1.9944) and is strengthened by a significance value < 0.05 (0.000 < 0.05). Thus it is proven that Ho is rejected and Ha is accepted.

The results of the physical work environment and work motivation simultaneously on employee performance, are shown by the multiple linear

regression equation $Y = 14.077 + 0.304X_1 + 0.217X_2$. The correlation coefficient value of 0.784 means that it has a strong relationship level and the determination coefficient of 61.5% means that performance is influenced by the physical work environment and work motivation by 78.4. This is proven by the results of the F test hypothesis test obtained the calculated F value $> F$ table ($55.939 > 3.13$) and strengthened by a significance value < 0.05 ($0.000 < 0.05$). Thus it is proven that H_0 is rejected and H_a is accepted.

REFERENCES

- Alifya, dkk. (2024). Pengaruh lingkungan kerja fisik dan motivasi kerja terhadap kinerja pegawai pada PT Pos Indonesia Cabang Ciputat Tangerang Selatan. *ORAP: Journal of Research and Publication Innovation*, 3(1), 1–10.
- Arianto, dkk. (2020). Pengaruh motivasi dan lingkungan kerja terhadap kinerja karyawan. *Jenius: Jurnal Ilmiah Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia*, 3(3), 313–316.
- Arraniri. (2021). *Manajemen sumber daya manusia*. Cirebon: Penerbit Insania Anggota IKAPI.
- Basyid, A. (2024). Pengaruh motivasi kerja terhadap kinerja karyawan. *Jurnal Manajerial dan Bisnis Tanjungpinang*.
- Bidara, dkk. (2021). Pengaruh lingkungan kerja dan motivasi terhadap kinerja karyawan Bank Rakyat Indonesia Unit Siau. *Productivity*, 2(6), 465.
- Cahyadi, N. (2023). *Manajemen sumber daya manusia*. Batam: CV. Rey Media Grafika.
- Darma, B. (2021). *Statistika penelitian menggunakan SPSS*. Jakarta: Guepedia.
- Fadli, R., & Hasanudin. (2020). Pengaruh motivasi kerja terhadap kinerja karyawan pada Yayasan Bait Qur'ani Ciputat. *Jenius: Jurnal Ilmiah Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia*, 4(1), 70–80.
- Falah, dkk. (2020). Pengaruh motivasi kerja terhadap kinerja karyawan PT. XYZ. *Jurnal Manajemen (JMM Online)*, 4(6).
- Febrian, W. D. (2022). *Manajemen sumber daya manusia*. Purbalingga: Eureka Media Aksara.
- Febrina, I., dkk. (2024). Motivasi kerja sumber daya manusia dalam organisasi: Sebuah tinjauan pustaka. *Journal of Current Research in Humanities, Social Sciences, and Business*, 1(1), 30.
- Hantono. (2025). *Pengantar manajemen*. Bandung: Widiana Media Utama.
- Hariawan, P. B., & Sukaja, M. (2017). Pengaruh motivasi dan lingkungan kerja fisik terhadap kinerja karyawan pada perusahaan PT. Fast Food Indonesia Cabang Gatsu Timur Denpasar. *Jurnal Manajemen dan Bisnis Equilibrium*, 3(2).
- Hendri, A. (2023). Pengaruh motivasi kerja terhadap kinerja karyawan CV. Sentosa Jaya. *JEMBA: Jurnal Ekonomi, Manajemen, Bisnis, dan Akuntansi*, 2(1).
- Ibrahim, F. M., Soebyakto, B. B., Widiyanti, M., & Hanafi, A. (2022). Pengaruh motivasi kerja dan lingkungan kerja fisik terhadap kinerja pegawai Dinas ESDM Provinsi Sumatera Selatan. *The Manager Review*, 4(1).
- Ichsan, R. N. (2021). *Bahan ajar manajemen sumber daya manusia (MSDM)*. Medan: CV. Sentosa Deli Mandiri.
- Ilham. (2024). *Manajemen sumber daya manusia*. Bandung: Widina Media Utama.
- Jayusman, H., dkk. (2021). Pengaruh lingkungan kerja fisik terhadap kinerja karyawan Teras Kopi Sukamara. *Jurnal Magenta*, 9(2), 75–82.

- Kristianti, L. S., Affandi, A., Nurjaya, N., Sunarsi, D., & Rozi, A. (2021). Pengaruh motivasi dan disiplin kerja terhadap kinerja pegawai pada dinas pariwisata purwakarta. *Jurnal Ilmiah PERKUSI*, 1(1), 101-109.
- Kulsum, U. (2023). Hubungan teori Maslow terhadap motivasi kerja pekerja pada proyek konstruksi. *Mining Science and Technology Journal*, 2(1).
- Mangkunegara, A. P. (2019). *Manajemen sumber daya manusia perusahaan*. Bandung: Remaja Rosdakarya.
- Marisyah, F. (2022). Pengaruh lingkungan kerja terhadap kinerja karyawan pada PT. Al Bilad Tour and Travel, Sumatra Selatan. *MAMEN (Jurnal Manajemen)*, 1(4).
- Maslow, A. H. (1943). A theory of human motivation. *Psychological Review*, 50(4), 370–396.
- Mawardi, S. (2024). Implementasi motivasi kerja dalam meningkatkan kinerja pegawai. *Jurnal Mirai Management*, 9(1), 2654.
- Mayasari. (2022). Pengaruh lingkungan kerja dan motivasi kerja terhadap kinerja karyawan di PT. FIF Pos Negara. *Bisma: Jurnal Manajemen*, 8(1), 106.
- Metris, D. (2024). *Manajemen sumber daya manusia*. Sumatera Barat: Yayasan Tri Eduksi Ilmiah.
- Oktariani, E. (2023). Pengaruh lingkungan kerja fisik dan disiplin kerja terhadap kinerja karyawan PT. Mandiangin Batubara. *Jurnal Bisnis, Manajemen dan Ekonomi*, 10(x), 204.
- Pramaswara, A. S., & Priatna, I. A. (2021). Pengaruh lingkungan kerja fisik dan disiplin kerja terhadap kinerja karyawan PT. Planetmas Adidaya Boga. *Jurnal Perkusi: Pemasaran, Keuangan, dan Sumber Daya Manusia*, 1(3), 339–345.
- Prasetyo, dkk. (2022). Pengaruh lingkungan kerja dan motivasi kerja terhadap kinerja karyawan Crew Burger King Surabaya Timur. *Al-Kharaj: Jurnal Ekonomi, Keuangan, dan Bisnis Syariah*, 2(2), 40–43.
- Pratiwi, Z. W., dkk. (2024). Pengaruh lingkungan kerja fisik dan motivasi kerja terhadap kinerja pegawai pada PT Pos Indonesia Cabang Ciputat Tangerang Selatan. *JORAPI: Journal of Research and Publication Innovation*, 2(4).
- Putri, N. A. (2025). Penilaian kinerja dan metode penilaian kinerja. *EMBISS: Jurnal Ekonomi, Manajemen, Bisnis dan Sosial*, 5(2), 151.
- Rahmita, dkk. (2024). Pengaruh lingkungan kerja fisik terhadap kinerja pegawai pemerintah di Badan Pendapatan Daerah Kabupaten Tabalong. *JAPB*, 7(1).
- Rastana, I. M. (2021). Pengaruh lingkungan kerja fisik dan disiplin kerja terhadap kinerja pegawai pada Badan Keuangan Daerah di Kabupaten Tabanan. *Widya Amrita: Jurnal Manajemen, Kewirausahaan dan Pariwisata*, 1(3), 40.
- Raymond. (2023). *Manajemen sumber daya manusia*. Padang: CV. Gita Lentera.
- Rulianti, E., dkk. (2023). Pengaruh motivasi kerja, lingkungan kerja dan pengembangan karier terhadap kepuasan kerja karyawan. *Jurnal Ekonomi & Ekonomi Syariah*, 6(1), 851.
- Rusman, T. (2019). *Statistika parametrik*. Bandar Lampung: Universitas Lampung.
- Rustandi, A. R., & Savitri, E. (2024). Pengaruh lingkungan kerja fisik dan motivasi kerja terhadap kinerja pegawai di Kantor Kecamatan Parung Kabupaten Bogor. *Jurnal Perkusi: Pemasaran, Keuangan dan SDM*, 4(3), 368–379.

- Rustiawan, I. (2023). Teknik penilaian kinerja karyawan menggunakan metode Behaviour Anchor Rating Scale dalam pemeringkatan karyawan terbaik. *Jurnal Krisnadana*, 2(3), 404.
- Sabrina. (2021). *Manajemen sumber daya manusia*. Medan: UMSU Press.
- Sakti, D. P. (2023). *Manajemen sumber daya manusia*. Bali: Penerbit Intelektual Manifest Media.
- Salim, H. (2019). *Metodologi penelitian: Metode, pendekatan dan jenis*. Jakarta: Kenca.
- Saputra, I., dkk. (2024). Evaluasi kinerja karyawan dalam suatu perusahaan: Sebuah kajian kepustakaan. *Journal of Current Research in Management, Policy, and Social Studies*.
- Sari, E., & Dwiarti, R. (2020). Pendekatan hierarki Abraham Maslow pada prestasi kerja karyawan PT. Madubaru (PG Madukismo) Yogyakarta. *Jurnal Perilaku dan Strategi Bisnis*, 6(1), 58–77.
- Sedayu, M. S., dkk. (2021). Pengaruh lingkungan kerja dan karakteristik individu terhadap kinerja karyawan SMK Kartini. *Jurnal Administrasi dan Manajemen*, 11(2), 139.
- Siregar, S. (2019). *Statistik parametrik untuk penelitian kuantitatif*. Jakarta: PT Bumi Aksara.
- Sitanggang. (2021). *Pengaruh lingkungan kerja dan motivasi kerja terhadap kinerja karyawan bagian kantor pada PT. Air Jernih Pekanbaru Riau*. Pekanbaru: Universitas Islam Riau.
- Soamole, A., & Rofifah, H. (2020). Pengaruh lingkungan kerja fisik dan motivasi kerja terhadap kinerja karyawan PT. Fajar Mas Murni Bekasi. *JMBA: Jurnal Manajemen dan Bisnis*, 3(1).
- Subagyo, P. J. (2011). *Metode penelitian dalam teori dan praktik*. Jakarta: Rineka Cipta.
- Sugiyono. (2018). *Metode penelitian kuantitatif, kualitatif, dan R&D*. Bandung: Alfabeta.
- Sukamto. (2021). Penilaian kinerja karyawan menggunakan metode TOPSIS. *JURTEKSI: Jurnal Teknologi dan Sistem Informasi*, 7(3).
- Sunyoto, D., dkk. (2023). *Memahami teori-teori yang membahas motivasi kerja*. Purbalingga: Eureka Media Aksara.
- Surijadi, H. (2020). Dampak lingkungan kerja fisik dan lingkungan kerja non-fisik terhadap kepuasan kerja karyawan. *Public Policy*, 1(1), 17.
- Sutisna, N. W., dkk. (2022). Fungsi manajemen sarana dan prasarana. *Karimah Tauhid*, 1(2), 321.
- Tarigan, W. J. (2022). Pengaruh lingkungan kerja fisik dan non-fisik terhadap produktivitas karyawan PT. Astra Honda Pematangsiantar. *Manager*, 5(3).
- Triyono, A. (2023). *Manajemen sumber daya manusia*. Jawa Tengah: Eureka Media Aksara.
- Usman, H. M., & Haryadi, R. N. (2023). The effect of transformational leadership and work motivation on teacher performance at Vocational High School Bina Mandiri Cileungsi. *International Journal of Sharia Business Management*, 2(1), 23-29.
- Wibowo. (2022). Pengaruh lingkungan kerja fisik, kompensasi, dan motivasi kerja terhadap produktivitas kerja karyawan pada karyawan AMP PT. Aneka Bangun Sarana (ABS) Gombang. *Jurnal Ilmiah Mahasiswa Manajemen, Bisnis, dan Akuntansi*, 4(3).

- Widodo, D. S., dkk. (2022). Model kinerja karyawan: Kompetensi, kompensasi dan motivasi (literature review MSDM). *Jurnal Ilmu Multidisiplin*, 1(1).
- Yanuar. (2019). Analisis pengaruh motivasi kerja dan lingkungan kerja terhadap kinerja ksaryawan. *Baskara: Journal of Business and Entrepreneurship*, 2(1), 48.