

Work Environment and Work Stress Towards Employee Performance PT Lezax Nesia Jaya Kota Yogyakarta

Alfreda Bagus Prasetyo¹, Ignatius Soni Kurniawan^{2*}, Eko Yulianto³

¹Faculty of Economics, Sarjanawiyata Tamansiswa Yogyakarta University, Indonesia

*Corresponding author E-mail: soni_kurniawan@ustjogja.ac.id

Article History: Received: Oktober 18, 2024; Accepted: December 19, 2024

ABSTRACT

This study aims to examine how the physical work environment, non-physical work environment, and work stress affect employee performance at PT Lezax Nesia Jaya in Yogyakarta City. The study employs a quantitative method using questionnaires distributed through accidental sampling to a total of 60 respondents, calculated using the Slovin formula. The data obtained were then processed using SPSS 26 software. The analysis results reveal that the physical work environment, non-physical work environment, and work stress have a significant positive effect on employee performance. The findings from this study can serve as a reference for other researchers who wish to further explore employee performance. Additionally, the results provide information that can be used by the company as a basis for developing policies focused on improving employee performance.

Keywords: Employee, Environment, Performance, Stress, Workplace.

INTRODUCTION

Human Resources (HR) is a wealthy part of the company in supporting its sustainability. Human resources are not only as important role holders and operational drivers for the development of a company, but also as the main element to determine the quality of work produced. The company should be required to improve the quality of work to meet consumer expectations so that it is possible to optimize company goals. Then to achieve the realization of the expected wishes, the quality of the productive workforce is needed for the company. The quality of labor for the company is very important for the success and sustainability of the company.

The quality of labor is one of the benchmarks in determining the level of company success for the achievement of a goal. As stated by Thanh and Hau (2024) in the context of global competition, companies really need the quality of highly competent labor. According to Gravina et al. (2021) by managing the quality of the workforce, companies can significantly improve the performance of their employees. Employee performance itself reflects the results of a person's work measured in terms of quantity and quality according to job standards (Triansyah et al., 2023). Employee performance does not materialize alone but is related to other aspects, so it is necessary to review employee performance for company development (Pusparani, 2021).

Companies must improve the work environment to encourage employee performance in order to achieve the expected results. The suitability of the work environment can have an impact on business sustainability in the long term (Alawiyah et al., 2022). The work environment is generally defined as the place where workers do their jobs in implicit or explicit ways (Susanto et al., 2023). There are two categories of work environment, physical work environment and non-physical work environment (Miftahuljannah, 2020). The physical work environment includes all elements that can be observed and experienced by employees at the work site. On the other hand, the non-physical work environment includes various elements that are not directly visible to employees, but can be felt mentally (Hartawan & Lemiyana, 2020).

Work stress is another aspect that affects employee performance, in addition to the physical and non-physical work environment. This stress can be a challenge for employees in carrying out their duties (Buulolo et al., 2021). Job stress is a condition that appears to affect employee performance due to an imbalance in the ability to meet the demands of the responsibilities given by the company (Sugiarto & Nanda, 2020). If work stress is at a fairly low level, it can act as a driver in improving employee performance, on the other hand, if work stress is at a fairly high level, it can act as an obstacle in improving employee performance (Ilham & Prasetyo, 2022).

PT Lezax Nesia Jaya Kota Yogyakarta is a company that focuses on the sporting goods industry of golf equipment in the Special Region of Yogyakarta. The results of observations and interviews with researchers in the Personnel Section of PT Lezax Nesia Jaya Kota Yogyakarta, the phenomenon that occurs is related to employee performance that is still not optimal. One indication is in terms of work completion caused by delays in the receipt of production raw materials. This case resulted in a decrease in the company's productivity level which had an impact on employee performance. Thus, employees tend to be less able to plan and schedule time effectively and efficiently so that work becomes obstructed and then not completed according to the target.

The research results of Susanto et al. (2023) revealed that the physical work environment has a positive and significant impact on employee performance. A work environment with a conducive atmosphere makes employees feel safe and comfortable, resulting in improved employee performance. However, inconsistencies were found, for example according to Alawiyah et al. (2022) which revealed that the physical work environment has a negative and significant effect on employee performance.

The research results of Miftahuljannah (2020) revealed that the non-physical work environment has a positive and significant impact on employee performance. A well-established non-physical work environment supports the participation of all parties in the relationship that the company has so that through the existence of good work attachment, the employees feel good.

Inconsistencies occur regarding the findings of Hartawan and Lemiyana (2020) which reveal that the non-physical work environment has a negative and significant effect on employee performance.

The research results of Umniyuda and Gilang (2020) stated that work stress has a positive and significant effect on employee performance. Companies must be able to manage employee work stress appropriately. Low levels of work stress can be a driver of work enthusiasm so that employees work more productively. Inconsistencies also occur based on the findings of Sugiarto and Nanda (2020) stating that work stress has a negative and significant effect on employee performance.

Previous research that has been found explores the direct relationship between physical work environment variables, non-physical work environment, and work stress on employee performance at PT Lezax Nesia Jaya Yogyakarta City, but there are still inconsistencies in the findings. The inconsistency of previous research regarding the influence of variables that affect employee performance opens up opportunities for testing through this research in different research places.

Hypothesis Development

The physical work environment is a part of the elements in the work location that have a physical form and have the potential to influence employees in the company in explicit or implicit ways. By creating favorable physical work environment conditions, companies are able to enable improvements in the performance of their workers (Susanto et al., 2023). Research that supports this is a study at PT Arwana Citra Mulia Tbk which states that the physical work environment has a positive and significant effect on employee performance (Wangi et al., 2020). In addition, research study Dewi et al. (2024) also proved that the physical work environment has a positive and significant effect on employee performance at Pesona Enasa Merak Hotel. It can be formulated that the physical work environment is important in a company to improve employee performance.
H1: Physical work environment has a significant positive effect on employee performance.

The non-physical work environment leads to situations related to interaction, in the context of relationships including social perspectives. Well-established communication can increase the passion to build a constructive work atmosphere (Miftahuljannah, 2020). Supporting research Suryani (2020) who conducted a study on employees of PT Bangkit Maju Bersama Jakarta proving that the non-physical work environment has a positive and significant effect on employee performance. In addition, a study was also conducted on employees of the South Jakarta Immigration Office which stated that the non-physical work environment had a positive and significant effect on employee performance (Nurwulandari & Irmawanti, 2023). It is formulated that the non-physical work environment is important in creating relationship attachment in optimal employee performance.

H2: Non-physical work environment has a significant positive effect on employee performance.

Work stress refers to a state of imbalance through the physical or psychological aspects of employees so that it can have a broad impact on various components including awareness, behavior, and health. Low levels of job stress can be a driving element for employees at work (Umniyuda & Gilang, 2020). Supporting research Panggabean et al. (2021) on the study of employees of PT Toba Pulp Lestari Tbk by obtaining the results that work stress has a positive and significant effect on employee performance. Likewise, research studies by Ilham and Prasetyo (2022) found that work stress has a positive and significant effect on the performance of employees of PT Bank Negara Indonesia. Thus, work stress to a certain level is able to encourage workers to improve their performance.

H3: Work stress has a significant positive effect on employee performance.

RESEARCH METHODS

This study was conducted at PT Lezax Nesia Jaya Yogyakarta City with 150 employees in the first building as a production site located on Jl. Noyokerten, Mojokerten, Sendangtirto, Kec. Berbah, Kab. Sleman, Special Region of Yogyakarta 55166. In this study, a sample of 60 respondents was obtained through calculation using the formula (Slovin, 1960). To collect data and maintain the quality of data collection, a questionnaire was used which was distributed through the Human Resources Department of PT Lezax Nesia Jaya Yogyakarta City. Data collection was carried out by accidental sampling, or on respondents who were willing to fill out the questionnaire. The available data was then processed using quantitative methods using SPSS 26 software. The researcher used a presentation based on a Likert scale with alternative answer assessments ranging from strongly disagree (score 1) to strongly agree (score 5). This study applies measurements sourced from Samson et al. (2015) with 5 statement items on the physical work environment such as “the equipment I use is comfortable, flexible to adjust, easy to rearrange or reorganize”, and 6 statement items on the non-physical work environment such as “I often meet with my supervisor about my personal development”. Measurement of work stress from Cedrone et al. (2024) with a statement of 13 items, for example “the work given to me is appropriate without excessive burden”. measurement of employee performance from Koopmans et al. (2014) with a statement of 7 items for example “I can do a good job with little effort and timeliness given”.

Slovin formula
$$n = \frac{N}{1+Ne^2}$$
.....(1)

Description:

n = Sample size in research

N = Population size in the study (150 employees)

e = Tolerance for Error (determined with a 10% error rate)

Through the formula above, the total sample size is 60 employees.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Respondent Characteristics

This study involved 60 employees as participants, with a composition of 17 people (28.3%) male and 43 people (71.7%) female, this is due to company policies that prefer female employees who are considered to have traits such as perseverance, skills, and better accuracy. From an age perspective, the majority of employees are in the range of 21 to 30 years, with a total of 28 people (46.7%), which indicates that young employees have better potential capabilities, contributing to increased productivity. Regarding the latest education, 38 people (63.3%) have a high school education, which indicates that companies prefer employees with such educational backgrounds to reduce salary costs, and value work experience and practical skills more than formal education.

The data obtained is processed through several tests, following the visualization of the results:

Instrument Test

Table 1. Instrument Test Results

Variable	Rxy Calculated	Rxy Table	Cronbach's Alpha on Standarized Item
PWE	0.571-0.714	0.214	0.652
NPWE	0.562-0.657		0.672
WS	0.522-0.657		0.848
EP	0.606-0.776		0.825

PWE= Physical Work Environment; NPWE= Non-Physical Work Environment; WS= Work Stress; EP= Employee Performance.

(Source: data processed 2024).

The results of the instrument testing in Table 1 show that to evaluate validity, the correlation coefficients between the table rxy and the calculated rxy were compared. The table rxy value for the one-way test category is 0.214 ($n = 60$; $\alpha 5\%$; 1-tailed). The table rxy value is considered valid if the calculated rxy value has a value greater than the table rxy value. The study results show where the calculated rxy of physical work environment is 0.571-0.714, non-physical work environment is 0.562-0.657, work stress is 0.522-0.675, and employee performance is 0.606-0.776. Since the value is greater than 0.214, all items are declared valid. To test reliability, the Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standarized Item value is more than 0.60. The Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standarized Item value for physical work environment is 0.652; non-physical work environment is 0.672; work stress is 0.848; and employee performance is 0.825. All instruments are declared reliable because the value is above 0.60.

Classical Assumption Test

Table 2. Classical Assumption Test Results

Ind.	Dep.	Multi.		Glej. Test	Kol-Smir Test
		Tol.	VIF	Sig.	Asymp. Sig.
PWE	EP	0.742	1.347	0.431	0.200
NPWE		0.522	1.917	0.134	
WS		0.519	1.926	0.638	

PWE= Physical Work Environment; NPWE= Non-Physical Work Environment; WS= Work Stress; EP= Employee Performance.

(Source: data processed 2024).

The results of the classical assumption testing in Table 2 show that there is no multicollinearity in the regression model equation, as the tolerance value is more than 0.10 and VIF is below 10. In addition, the regression model equation also does not show heteroscedasticity (Glejser test, p more than 0.05), and normality is also met with a normal distribution (Kolmogorov-Smirnov test, asymp. sig. more than 0.05).

Hypothesis Testing and Discussion

Table 3. Multiple Linear Regression Analysis Results

Ind.	Dep.	Unst. Coef.		t	Sig.	Adj. R ²
		B	Std. Err.			
LKF	KK	0.303	0.144	2.111	0.039	0.541
LKNF		0.323	0.149	2.163	0.035	
SK		0.243	0.073	3.343	0.001	

PWE= Physical Work Environment; NPWE= Non-Physical Work Environment; WS= Work Stress; EP= Employee Performance.

(Source: data processed 2024).

The analysis results for the first hypothesis (H1) contained in Table 3 show that the physical work environment has a t value of 2.111 with a probability of 0.039 lower than 0.05. This indicates that H2 has a significant positive impact on employee performance. This finding is in accordance with the studies revealed by Wangi et al. (2020) and Dewi et al. (2024), which also found that the physical work environment contributes positively and significantly to employee performance. The respondents' two highest answers on the physical work environment item were “the equipment I use is comfortable, flexible to adjust, easy to rearrange or reorganize” (mean = 4.35) and “the office where I operate is well lit” (mean = 4.15). Meanwhile, the two lowest responses were “the office is without unnecessary noise” (mean = 3.78) and “the temperature in the room or office where I work is appropriate” (mean = 3.10). The suitability of a good working environment, supported by adequate facilities, will improve employee performance in carrying out their duties

The analysis results for the second hypothesis (H2) show that the non-physical work environment has a t value of 2.163 with a probability of 0.035 lower than 0.05. This indicates that H2 has a significant positive impact on employee performance. This finding is in accordance with the study revealed by Suryani (2020) supported by Nurwulandari and Irmawanti (2023), which also found that the non-physical work environment contributed significantly to improving employee performance. The two highest answers of respondents on non-physical work environment items were “my roles and responsibilities are clearly stated” (mean = 4.32) and “I can rely on my supervisor to help me with work problems” (mean = 4.08). The two lowest responses were “my supervisor respects my coworkers” (mean = 3.77) and “I often meet with my supervisor about my personal development” (mean = 3.22). Good relationships in the work environment can facilitate communication in achieving company goals.

The analysis results for the third hypothesis (H3) show that work stress has a t value of 3.343 with a probability of 0.001 lower than 0.05. This indicates that H3 has a significant positive impact on employee performance. This finding is in accordance with the study revealed by Panggabean et al. (2021), supported by Ilham and Prasetyo (2022) who also found that work stress contributes positively and significantly to employee performance. The two highest answers of respondents on work stress items were “in my workplace there are many colleagues who respect various diversities” (mean = 4.43) and “I feel comfortable with the work given” (mean = 4.18). Meanwhile, the two lowest responses were “I have the freedom to decide when to take a break” (mean = 2.93) and “at work I have to express my true emotions to others” (mean = 2.68). Stress encourages employees to maximize their potential in meeting various job demands, which in turn can improve performance.

The most significant variables affecting employee performance at PT Lezax Nesia Jaya Yogyakarta City are work stress, physical non-work environment, then the physical work environment is in the last position. Managing work stress so that it is not too light and not felt very heavy is important to stimulate employees. In addition, the physical and non-physical work environment provides a comfortable work atmosphere that makes employees feel at home and solid relationships between employees build chemistry in communication. The two respondents' answers with the lowest scores related to employee performance were on items stating “I can do a good job with little effort and on time given” (mean = 3.65) and “I can remember the results to be achieved in doing the job” (mean = 3.95). Meanwhile, the two answers with the highest scores were found in the items “cooperation with others is very productive in my work” (mean = 4.18) and “I can do optimal work planning” (mean = 4.17). Overall, employee performance scores are at 3 or above in all aspects, indicating employees feel adequate with good work results during their time with the company.

The update of this study lies in its more comprehensive approach in studying the influence of the work environment (physical work environment and non-physical work environment) on employee performance. The previous study conducted by Miftahuljannah (2020), focused more on non-physical work environment factors without considering the role of the physical work environment. Meanwhile, this study shows that both the physical work environment and the non-physical work environment have a significant role in influencing employee performance. This expands the understanding of how various aspects of the work environment simultaneously affect employee performance, which has not been explored in previous studies.

This study shows that both physical work environment and non-physical work environment factors have a significant influence on employee performance. The innovation of this study lies in a more comprehensive approach in combining both factors, in contrast to previous studies that only emphasized one of the factors. Research by Alawiyah et al. (2022) shows that only the non-physical environment has a significant effect on employee performance, while this study confirms that both factors have an important role. Therefore, the results of this study make a new contribution in understanding the complexity of the relationship between the work environment (physical work environment and non-physical work environment) towards employee performance.

CONCLUSIONS

Study conducted at PT Lezax Nesia Jaya Yogyakarta City shows that employee performance has not reached the expected level. The results of this study revealed findings that physical work environment, non-physical work environment, as well as work stress contribute positively and significantly to employee performance. From these findings, companies are advised to make improvements to aspects that get low ratings so that employee performance can be improved. Future studies can increase the coefficient of determination by adding other variables to expand the analysis of employee performance such as Herawati et al. (2022) on job satisfaction which is expected to provide more information related to factors that affect employee performance.

REFERENCE

- Alawiyah, T., Sinto, S., & Kalsum, E. U. (2022). Lingkungan Kerja Fisik Dan Non Fisik Serta Motivasi Kerja Terhadap Kinerja Karyawan Pada Az-Zahra Bakery and Cake Shop Kelurahan Tangkahan. *BONANZA : Jurnal Ilmiah Ekonomi, Bisnis Dan Keuangan*, 2(2), 97–108. <https://doi.org/10.54123/bonanza.v2i2.198>
- Buulolo, F., Dakhi, P. & Erasma, F. Z. (2021). Pengaruh Stres Kerja Terhadap Kinerja Pegawai Pada Kantor Camat Aramo Kabupaten Nias Selatan. *Jurnal Ilmiah Mahasiswa Nias Selatan*, 4(2), 191–202.

- Cedrone, F., Stacchini, L., Torre, G. L. A., Berselli, N., Nicolò, V. D. E., Caminiti, M., Sio, S. D. E. (2024). Work-Related Stress Questionnaire: confirmatory factor analysis for construct validation by the PHRASI study. *European Review for Medical and Pharmacological Sciences*, 28(1), 392–401. https://doi.org/10.26355/eurrev_202401_34928
- Dewi, S. R., Amalia, A. R., & Huddin, M. N. (2024). Peran Disiplin Kerja, Kompetensi, dan Lingkungan Kerja Fisik terhadap Kinerja Karyawan. *Al Qalam: Jurnal Ilmiah Keagamaan Dan Kemasyarakatan*, 16(5), 2393–2406. <https://doi.org/10.35931/aq.v17i4.2301>
- Gravina, N., Nastasi, J., & Austin, J. (2021). Assessment of Employee Performance. *Journal of Organizational Behavior Management*, 41(2), 124–149. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01608061.2020.1869136>
- Hartawan, D., Lemiyana. (2020). Pengaruh Lingkungan Fisik, Lingkungan Non Fisik, dan Keterampilan terhadap Produktivitas Kerja Karyawan CV Semeru Jaya Teknik Palembang. *Jurnal Keuangan Dan Bisnis*, 17(2), 52. <https://doi.org/10.32524/jkb.v17i2.542>
- Herawati, J., Kurniawan, I. S., & Setyaningsih, I. (2022). Pengaruh kepuasan kerja, motivasi kerja, keadilan prosedural, dan budaya organisasi terhadap kinerja pegawai. *Akuntabel*, 19(1), 109–116. <https://doi.org/10.30872/jakt.v19i1.10639>
- Ilham, N. R., & Prasetyo, A. P. (2022). Pengaruh Stres Kerja Terhadap Kinerja Karyawan Pada PT Telkom Surakarta. *Jurnal Penelitian IPTEKS*, 7(2), 96–104.
- Koopmans, L., Bernaards, C. M., Hildebrandt, V. H., van Buuren, S., van der Beek, A. J., & de Vet, H. C. W. (2014). Improving the Individual Work Performance Questionnaire using Rasch analysis. *Journal of Applied Measurement*, 15(2), 160–175. <https://doi.org/10.1136/oemed-2013-101717.51>
- Miftahuljannah, M. (2020). The effect of individual personality of the big five model and the non physical work environment on employee performance in PT Bank Syariah Mandiri in Pontianak. *Jurnal Manajemen Motivasi*, 14(1), 9–16. <https://doi.org/10.29406/jmm.v14i1.953>
- Nan Wangi, V. K. Bahiroh, E., & Imron, A. (2020). Dampak Kesehatan Dan Keselamatan Kerja, Beban Kerja, Dan Lingkungan Kerja Fisik Terhadap Kinerja. *Jurnal Manajemen Bisnis*, 7(1), 40–50. <https://doi.org/10.33096/jmb.v7i1.407>
- Nurwulandari, A., & Irmawanti, M. T. (2023). The Effect Of Leadership Style, Non-Physical Work Environment, Organizational Culture On Employee Performance Through Motivation at The Immigration Office At The Immigration Office. *International Journal of Economics Development Research*, 4(2), 446–462.
- Panggabean, D., Rangguti, D. A., Damanik, H., Ginting, R. B. S., & Angelia, E. B. (2021). Pengaruh Lingkungan Kerja Fisik, Lingkungan Kerja Non Fisik Dan Stres Kerja Terhadap Kinerja Karyawan Selama Pandemi Covid-19 Pt Toba Pulp Lestari Tbk Sektor Aek Nauli. *Jurnal Manajemen Terapan Dan Keuangan*, 10(03), 633–644. <https://doi.org/10.22437/jmk.v10i03.15867>
- Pusparani, M. (2021). Faktor Yang Mempengaruhi Kinerja Pegawai (Suatu Kajian Studi Literatur Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia). *Jurnal Ilmu Manajemen Terapan*, 2(4), 534–543. <https://doi.org/10.31933/jimt.v2i4.466>

- Samson, G. N., Waiganjo, M., & Koima, J. (2015). Effect of Workplace Environment on the Performance of Commercial Banks Employees in Nakuru Town. *International Journal of Managerial Studies and Research (IJMSR)*, 3(12), 76–89.
- Slovin, E. (1960). Slovin's formula for sampling technique. Retrieved July 21, 2021, from <https://prudencexd.weebly.com/>
- Sugiarto, A., & Nanda, A. W. (2020). Stres Kerja: Pengaruhnya Terhadap Motivasi Kerja Dan Kinerja Karyawan. *Jurnal Ilmu Sosial Dan Humaniora*, 9(2), 276. <https://doi.org/10.23887/jish-undiksha.v9i2.21302>
- Suryani, N. L. (2019). Pengaruh Lingkungan Kerja Non Fisik Dan Komunikasi Terhadap Kinerja Karyawan Pada PT. Bangkit Maju Bersama Di Jakarta. *JENIUS (Jurnal Ilmiah Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia)*, 2(3), 419–435. <https://doi.org/10.32493/jjsdm.v2i3.3017>
- Susanto, A. B., Prajitiasari, E., Awwaliyah, I. N., Titisari, P., & Agustin, D. N. (2023). The Effect of Work Rotation, Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB), and Physical Work Environment on Hospital Employee Performance. *Quality - Access to Success*, 24(196), 215–220. <https://doi.org/10.47750/QAS/24.196.27>
- Thanh, T., & Hau, N. Van. (2024). Analyzing Theories of the Employee Performance in Firms. *International Journal of Advanced Multidisciplinary Research and Studies*, 4(2), 357–360.
- Umniyuda, I., & Gilang, A. (2020). Pengaruh Stres Kerja Terhadap Kinerja Karyawan Pada PT Bank Negara Indonesia (Persero). *Journal of Chemical Information and Modeling*, 53(9), 1689–1699
- Triansyah, F. A., Hejin, W., & Stefania, S. (2023). Factors Affecting Employee Performance: A Systematic Review. *Journal Markcount Finance*, 1(2), 118–127. <https://doi.org/10.55849/jmf.v1i2.102>