

The Effect of Work Productivity and Work Facilities on Employee Performance at the Secretariat of the Regional Financial and Asset Management Agency of Barito Selatan Regency, 2024

Muhammad Bukhari Muslim Mahridi^{1*}, Yunita Pebrianti², Mariatul³, Enjelina Aulia Putri⁴

Department of Management, Sekolah Tinggi Ilmu Ekonomi Dahani Dahanai, Jl. Cut Nyak Dien No. 9A, Buntok, Central Kalimantan, Indonesia.

Received: 13/06/2026 | Accepted: 18/07/2026 | Published: 11/08/2026

Abstract: This study aims to analyze the effect of Work Productivity and Work Facilities on Employee Performance, partially. It seeks to determine how much influence Work Productivity and Work Facilities have on Employee Performance at the Secretariat of the Regional Financial and Asset Management Agency (BPKAD) of Barito Selatan Regency. This research uses a descriptive quantitative method. Primary and secondary data were used, collected through quota sampling and gathered via observation, interviews, documentation, and questionnaires. Instrument testing included validity and reliability tests, descriptive statistics and normality assessment, the initial PLS path model, convergent validity and internal consistency reliability, discriminant validity (cross loading), discriminant validity via the heterotrait-monotrait ratio (HTMT), and hypothesis testing using SmartPLS 4.0. Based on the hypothesis testing results, Work Productivity (X1) was found to have no significant effect on Employee Performance (Y), with a t-statistic of $0.562 < 1.68957$ and a p-value of $0.574 > 0.05$, indicating that the t-statistic is smaller than the t-table value; thus H_a is rejected and H_o is accepted. This means that Work Productivity (X1) partially has a negative and non-significant effect on Employee Performance (Y). The hypothesis testing further shows that Work Facilities (X2) have a significant effect on Employee Performance (Y), with a t-statistic of $2.044 > 1.68957$ and a p-value of $0.041 < 0.05$; thus H_a is accepted and H_o is rejected. This means that Work Facilities (X2) partially have a positive and significant effect on Employee Performance (Y).

Keywords: *Work Productivity; Work Facilities; Employee Performance; BPKAD Secretariat.*

1. Introduction

In line with the principle of the Unitary State of the Republic of Indonesia (NKRI) as set out in the 1945 Constitution, the implementation of regional autonomy and co-administration duties forms the basis for regional governments and regional legislative councils (DPRD) in administering government. One regional agency that plays a strategic role in Barito Selatan Regency is the Regional Financial and Asset Management Agency (BPKAD), established under Regional Regulation No. 5 of 2011. BPKAD is responsible for managing regional revenue, expenditure, financial reporting, and asset management. In carrying out its duties, the BPKAD Secretariat plays a key role in planning, staff development, financial administration, protocol affairs, and organizational evaluation.

The success of the BPKAD Secretariat in achieving its objectives is largely determined by employee performance. Employee performance reflects work achievement, both in quality and quantity, in line with the responsibilities

assigned (Mangkunegara, in Anandita et al., 2021). However, achieving optimal performance faces obstacles due to variation among employees in critical thinking, discipline, loyalty, and technological proficiency.

Two main factors believed to strongly influence employee performance at the BPKAD Secretariat of Barito Selatan Regency are:

- **Work Productivity:** Productivity reflects the efficiency of human resource use in achieving work targets (Sedarmayanti, in Waskito & Kartini, 2021). Preliminary observations indicate that employee productivity is often hindered by high workloads that trigger task accumulation, tight deadlines, and a lack of training and technological mastery.
- **Work Facilities:** Facilities encompass all physical resources and supporting infrastructure for work (Moenir, in Prawira, 2020). Field observations show that limited and cramped workspace, as well

*Corresponding Author

Muhammad Bukhari Muslim Mahridi*

E-mail: mahridi.stiedd@gmail.com

This is an open access article under the [CC BY-NC](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/) license



as a lack of complete operational equipment, can disrupt the smooth running of daily tasks.

Support from prior studies such as Andriani et al., which demonstrated a significant effect of work productivity on performance, and Fadilah & Al Banin, which confirmed the positive role of work facilities on employee performance further reinforces the urgency of testing both variables.

The BPKAD Secretariat of Barito Selatan Regency carries out several core functions, including: (1) planning, staff development, reporting, and evaluation for the agency; (2) protocol and equipment matters; (3) organizational management; (4) public relations; (5) financial administration management, administrative services, and job analysis; and (6) legal documentation and regulatory compliance in accordance with relevant standards.

This study aims to analyze and demonstrate the effect of work productivity and work facilities, both partially and simultaneously, on employee performance at the BPKAD Secretariat of Barito Selatan Regency in 2024. The results are expected to contribute theoretically to the development of public-sector human resource management, as well as provide practical input for BPKAD in optimizing organizational performance.

2. Research Method

This study employs a quantitative method. In the quantitative approach, numerical data are processed and analyzed to produce scientific information contained within that data. This research explains the relationship between the independent and dependent variables namely the magnitude of the effect of Work Productivity and Work Facilities on Employee Performance at the Secretariat of BPKAD Barito Selatan Regency in 2024.

A research variable is a characteristic, attribute, or anything that forms and becomes the focus of attention in a study, thereby exhibiting variation between objects within a given group, from which conclusions can be drawn. This study therefore uses three variables: Work Productivity as the independent variable (X1), Work Facilities as the independent variable (X2), and Employee Performance as the dependent variable (Y).

2.1 Independent Variables

Work Productivity (X1)

Work productivity is a measure of the efficiency and effectiveness of an individual or group in carrying out specific tasks or work. It involves the relationship between output produced and the inputs or resources used to achieve that output, encompassing several factors considered when evaluating individual or team performance in the workplace.

According to Sedarmayanti, in Waskito & Kartini (2021:170), work productivity is highly important for employees within a company; with strong work

productivity, tasks are expected to be carried out effectively and efficiently, since an increase in employee performance does not necessarily mean an increase in employee productivity. The indicators used are:

- Efficiency (Ariani et al., 2020) the extent to which resources used in the production process to generate output reflect actual performance relative to established standards.
- Effectiveness (Ariani et al., 2020) carrying out the right actions to meet organizational needs, related to achieving maximum performance in terms of quality, quantity, and time.
- Quality (Ariani et al., 2020) the standard of output produced, influenced by an individual's skill and work experience.

Work Facilities (X2)

Work facilities refer to everything or any means provided by an organization to support the execution of tasks and operational activities. They include all tangible and intangible components that facilitate daily operations and improve workplace efficiency. To ensure effectiveness and employee well-being, facilities cover a range of factors including infrastructure, equipment, safety, and comfort.

Moenir, in Prawira (2020:32), defines facilities as anything used, occupied, or utilized by employees, either directly in connection with their work or to support the smooth running of their work. The indicators used are:

- Work-tool facilities (Wijaksono et al., 2022) all objects or items functioning as tools directly used by employees in production, including office equipment such as photocopiers, computers, projectors, and Wi-Fi, used to help complete work.
- Work-equipment facilities (Wijaksono et al., 2022) objects or items used in work but not directly for production, instead functioning to facilitate and refresh work.
- Social facilities (Wijaksono et al., 2022) facilities used by employees that serve a social function.

2.2 Dependent Variable

Employee Performance (Y)

Performance is the work outcome, in terms of both quality and quantity, that an employee can achieve in carrying out tasks in accordance with the responsibilities assigned. Employee performance relates to the results or achievements attained while performing duties and obligations in the workplace, encompassing the extent to which employees achieve goals, complete assigned tasks, and positively impact organizational success.

According to Mangkunegara, in Anandita et al. (2021:728), "performance is the work outcome, in terms of both quality

and quantity, that an employee can achieve in carrying out tasks in accordance with the responsibilities assigned” (Anandita et al., 2021). The indicators used are:

- Work quality (Anandita et al., 2021) how well an employee performs the tasks they are supposed to perform.
- Work quantity (Anandita et al., 2021) how long an employee works in a given day, which can be observed through each employee's individual work speed.
- Task execution (Anandita et al., 2021) the extent to which an employee is able to carry out their work accurately and without errors.
- Responsibility (Anandita et al., 2021) an employee's awareness of the obligation to carry out the work assigned by the organization.

2.3 Instrument Testing Techniques

According to Sugiyono (2022:121–122), a distinction should be drawn between valid and reliable research results and a valid and reliable instrument. Research results are valid when the collected data correspond to what actually occurs in the object under study. Using a valid and reliable instrument for data collection is therefore expected to produce valid and reliable research results. Researchers must accordingly be able to control the object under study and improve their ability to use the instrument to measure variables.

Validity Test

The validity test in this study aims to measure whether a questionnaire is valid. The technique used is the Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient. If the correlation between indicators is significant (< 0.05), each indicator is declared valid. Testing uses a two-tailed test with a significance level of 0.05. The testing criteria are: (a) if $r\text{-count} > r\text{-table}$ (two-tailed test, sig. 0.05), the instrument or statement items are significantly correlated with the total score (declared valid); (b) if $r\text{-count} < r\text{-table}$, the instrument or statement items are not significantly correlated with the total score (declared invalid).

Reliability Test

The reliability test aims to determine the consistency of a measuring instrument that is, whether the instrument produces consistent results when used to measure the same object more than once (Sugiyono, 2017:121). In this study, reliability is determined using Cronbach's alpha. An alpha value greater than 0.70 indicates adequate reliability, while a value greater than 0.80 indicates high reliability for each item and test subject (Ghozali, 2016).

2.4 Data Analysis Technique: Structural Equation Modeling (SEM)

Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) is a second-generation multivariate data analysis technique that helps researchers test relationships between latent variables. There are two approaches to estimating relationships between variables in SEM: Covariance-Based SEM (CB-SEM) and Partial Least Squares SEM (PLS-SEM). CB-SEM is used when the research aims to test a theory, confirm a theory, or compare several alternative theories, and requires a large, normally distributed sample.

Partial Least Squares SEM (PLS-SEM), on the other hand, is a non-parametric method that does not require assumptions about data distribution. PLS-SEM is used with non-normally distributed data because the PLS algorithm can accommodate non-normal data with small sample sizes (Marliana, 2019).

The analysis proceeds through several stages: descriptive statistics and normality assessment; the initial PLS path model (a reflective model, in which the direction of causality runs from the latent variable to its indicators) (Nisa et al., 2021); convergent validity and internal consistency reliability, assessed via the Average Variance Extracted (AVE), which should exceed 0.5 (Hair et al., 2014, in Nisa et al., 2021), alongside Cronbach's alpha and composite reliability, which should fall between 0.6 and 0.9 (Hair et al., 2014, in Anuraga et al., 2017); discriminant validity via cross loading, where an indicator's correlation with its own latent variable should exceed its correlation with other latent variables (Ghozali, 2008, in Nisa et al., 2021); discriminant validity via the heterotrait-monotrait ratio (HTMT) (Setiawan & Tan, 2021); and hypothesis testing, a statistical method used to determine whether there is sufficient evidence in a sample to draw conclusions about a population. All analyses were conducted using SmartPLS, a technique used to predict models involving multiple factors and collinear relationships, to test relationships between constructs, confirm theory, and clarify the presence or absence of relationships between latent variables.

3. Results and Discussion

3.1 Data Validity Test

Validity was tested using loading factors via SmartPLS version 4, with items considered valid when the loading value exceeds the table value at a significance level greater than 0.05. The research instrument, in the form of a questionnaire, was administered to 35 respondents employees of the BPKAD Secretariat, Barito Selatan. The results of the convergent validity test for each variable are presented below.

Table 1. Convergent Validity Loading Factors

Indicator	Work Facilities	Employee Performance	Work Productivity
FK1	0.723		
FK2	0.772		
FK3	0.742		
FK4	0.793		
FK5	0.797		
FK6	0.827		
FK7	0.838		
FK8	0.734		
K1		0.815	
K2		0.798	
K3		0.876	
K4		0.806	
K5		0.692	
K6		0.825	
K7		0.879	
K8		0.795	
PK1			0.769
PK2			0.770
PK3			0.823
PK4			0.784
PK5			0.798
PK6			0.829

Source: researcher-generated data, August 2026, using SmartPLS.

The table shows that the loading factor value for every item exceeds the r-table threshold of 0.50. It can therefore be concluded that each statement item for Work Productivity (X1), Work Facilities (X2), and Employee Performance (Y) is convergently valid, meaning the questionnaire is valid for use.

3.2 Reliability Test

Table 2. Reliability Test

Variable	Cronbach's Alpha	Composite Reliability (rho-c)
X1 (Work Productivity)	0.907	0.925
X2 (Work Facilities)	0.926	0.939
Y (Employee Performance)	0.884	0.912

Source: researcher-generated data, August 2026, using SmartPLS.

The table shows that Cronbach's alpha and composite reliability values for Work Productivity (X1), Work Facilities (X2), and Employee Performance (Y) all exceed 0.70, indicating that the research instrument is reliable and that the questionnaire can be used in the study.

3.3 Descriptive Statistics and Normality Assessment

The normality assessment results, based on skewness values for all measurement indicators/items, indicate normal distribution, as the skewness values fall within the range of -2 to +2.

3.4 Initial PLS Path Model

The initial PLS path model used in this study is a reflective model, in which the direction of causality runs from the latent variable to its indicators. The model shows a path coefficient of 0.275 from Work Productivity to Employee Performance, and 0.016 from Work Facilities to Employee Performance, with an R^2 of 0.787 for Employee Performance.

3.5 Convergent Validity and Internal Consistency Reliability

Convergent validity refers to the extent to which a set of indicators represents, and is grounded in, a single underlying latent variable. In this study, convergent validity was used to establish the validity of the relationship between each indicator and its construct. As shown in Table 1 above, all convergent validity values exceed 0.5, and are therefore declared valid. As shown in Table 2, all Cronbach's alpha and composite reliability values exceed 0.70, and all variables are therefore reliable.

3.6 Discriminant Validity: Cross Loading

Cross loading is another method for assessing discriminant validity: an item is considered discriminant-valid when its loading on its own construct is higher than its cross loading on other constructs. In PLS analysis, cross loading is used to confirm that the correlation between a construct and its measurement items is stronger than the correlation with other constructs. A cross loading value greater than 0.5 is expected; the higher the cross loading, the stronger the discriminant validity.

Table 3. Cross Loading

Indicator	Work Facilities	Employee Performance	Work Productivity
FK1	0.723	0.669	0.712
FK2	0.772	0.748	0.679
FK3	0.742	0.693	0.690
FK4	0.793	0.645	0.758
FK5	0.797	0.663	0.723
FK6	0.827	0.719	0.767

effect of Work Productivity and Work Facilities on Employee Performance. The results are presented below.

Table 5. Summary of Hypothesis Testing

Path	Original Sample (O)	Sample Mean (M)	Std. Dev.	T-Statistic	P-Values
Work Facilities → Employee Performance	0.697	0.684	0.341	2.044	0.041
Work Productivity → Employee Performance	0.200	0.218	0.356	0.562	0.574

Source: researcher-generated data, August 2026, using SmartPLS.

- Work Productivity (X1) produced a t-statistic of $0.562 < 1.69389$ and a p-value of $0.574 > 0.05$; H1 is therefore rejected. Work Productivity does not have a significant effect on Employee Performance.
- Work Facilities (X2) produced a t-statistic of $2.044 > 1.69389$ and a p-value of $0.041 < 0.05$; H2 is therefore accepted. Work Facilities have a significant effect on Employee Performance.

3.9 Hypothesis Discussion

H1: The Effect of Work Productivity (X1) on Employee Performance (Y)

The hypothesis testing results show that Work Productivity has no significant effect on Employee Performance, evidenced by a t-statistic of $0.562 < 1.69389$ and a p-value of $0.574 > 0.05$. The t-statistic is smaller than the t-table value. The first research hypothesis, which proposed that Work Productivity affects Employee Performance, is therefore not supported: partially, Work Productivity has no significant effect on Employee Performance (Y) at the BPKAD Secretariat, Barito Selatan.

Based on these results, the researchers conclude that work productivity does not contribute to improving employee performance; in other words, the data show no strong or meaningful relationship between work productivity and employee performance in this case. This suggests that, in this context, work productivity is partially not a dominant or decisive variable in determining strong employee performance. Field observations indicate that some BPKAD Secretariat employees still frequently lose focus on their primary tasks and are distracted by less relevant matters, consuming time that should be devoted to core duties on secondary tasks that may be neither important nor urgent. This appears to explain why work productivity does not have a positive effect on employee performance. Applying sound time management focusing on primary tasks first and using remaining time for secondary tasks could help achieve greater effectiveness, for example by creating a

FK7	0.838	0.718	0.754
FK8	0.734	0.642	0.760
K1	0.666	0.815	0.650
K2	0.669	0.798	0.775
K3	0.723	0.876	0.681
K4	0.779	0.806	0.650
K5	0.706	0.692	0.761
K6	0.779	0.825	0.715
K7	0.730	0.879	0.666
K8	0.670	0.795	0.634
PK1	0.678	0.562	0.769
PK2	0.785	0.674	0.770
PK3	0.804	0.782	0.823
PK4	0.719	0.712	0.784
PK5	0.764	0.623	0.798
PK6	0.712	0.683	0.829

Source: researcher-generated data, August 2026, using SmartPLS.

Since each indicator's correlation with its own construct exceeds its correlation with the other constructs, every statement item is declared discriminant-valid.

3.7 Discriminant Validity: Heterotrait-Monotrait Ratio (HTMT)

The heterotrait-monotrait ratio (HTMT) compares between-trait correlation with within-trait correlation. HTMT is the mean of all indicator correlations across constructs measuring different constructs (heterotrait-monotrait correlations), relative to the mean of all average indicator correlations measuring the same construct (Setiawan & Tan, 2021).

Table 4. Heterotrait-Monotrait Ratio (HTMT)

Construct Pair	HTMT Value
Employee Performance ↔ Work Facilities	0.961
Work Productivity ↔ Work Facilities	1.045
Work Productivity ↔ Employee Performance	0.934

Source: researcher-generated data, August 2026, using SmartPLS.

The HTMT results indicate that all indicators/items in the measurement model fall within a normal range.

3.8 Hypothesis Testing

Hypothesis testing is a statistical method used to determine whether there is sufficient evidence in a sample of data to draw conclusions about a population. This study tests the

regular daily schedule and prioritizing the most important tasks to avoid delays and improve productivity.

H2: The Effect of Work Facilities (X2) on Employee Performance (Y)

The hypothesis testing results show that Work Facilities have a significant effect on Employee Performance, evidenced by a t-statistic of $2.044 > 1.69389$ and a p-value of $0.041 < 0.05$; H2 is accepted. Work Facilities affect Employee Performance. The second research hypothesis, which proposed that Work Facilities partially affect Employee Performance, is therefore supported.

Field observations and interviews indicate that the work facilities available at the BPKAD Secretariat greatly assist employees in carrying out their work efficiently and effectively. This underscores the importance of high-quality work facilities and the application of relevant technology to support employee productivity and efficiency, as well as the importance of using equipment correctly according to instructions and performing regular maintenance and inspection to keep it in optimal condition thereby improving efficiency and work quality going forward.

4. Conclusion

Based on the theoretical review and the research findings regarding the Effect of Work Productivity and Work Facilities on Employee Performance at the Secretariat of the Regional Financial and Asset Management Agency of Barito Selatan Regency in 2024, obtained using SmartPLS 4, the following conclusions can be drawn:

- Work Productivity (X1) has no significant effect on Employee Performance (Y), with a t-statistic of $0.562 < 1.68957$ and a p-value of $0.574 > 0.05$, indicating that the t-statistic is smaller than the t-table value; H_a is rejected and H_o is accepted. Partially, Work Productivity (X1) has a negative and non-significant effect on Employee Performance (Y). Field observations suggest that some BPKAD Secretariat employees in Barito Selatan Regency frequently lack focus on their primary tasks and are distracted by irrelevant matters, which diverts time away from core duties toward less important or less urgent secondary tasks. This appears to explain why work productivity does not have a positive effect on employee performance. Applying sound time management prioritizing primary tasks and using remaining time efficiently for secondary tasks can help achieve optimal effectiveness, including through a structured daily schedule that prioritizes the most important tasks in order to avoid delays and improve productivity.
- Work Facilities (X2) have a significant effect on Employee Performance (Y), with a t-statistic of

$2.044 > 1.68957$ and a p-value of $0.041 < 0.05$; H_a is accepted and H_o is rejected. Partially, Work Facilities (X2) have a positive and significant effect on Employee Performance (Y). Field observations and interviews indicate that the work facilities at the BPKAD Secretariat substantially support efficient and effective task performance. This highlights the importance of high-quality work facilities and relevant technology in supporting employee productivity and efficiency, as well as the importance of using equipment correctly and performing regular maintenance to keep it in optimal condition, thereby improving future efficiency and work quality.

References

1. Ambarwati, Y., & Suryani, N. (2014). Pengaruh Komunikasi Internal, Motivasi Kerja Dan Fasilitas Kerja Terhadap Kinerja Perangkat Desa Di Kecamatan Wonobojo Kabupaten Temanggung. *Economic Education Analysis Journal*, 3(2), 299–306.
2. Andriani, Musseng, A., & Iqbal. (2020). Analisis Disiplin Pegawai Dan Produktivitas Kerja Terhadap Kinerja Direktorat Jenderal Bea Dan Cukai Sulawesi Bagian Selatan Di Makassar. *Master of Management Journal*, 1, 71–79.
3. Anuraga, G., Sulistiyawan, E., & Munadhiroh, S. (2017). Structural Equation Modeling – Partial Least Square Untuk Pemodelan Indeks Pembangunan Kesehatan Masyarakat (IPKM) Di Jawa Timur. Universitas.
4. Chasanah, I., & Rustiana, A. (2017). Pengaruh Kemampuan Kerja, Fasilitas Kerja, Dan Prinsip Prosedur Kerja Terhadap Kinerja Pegawai Di Kantor Kecamatan Se Kabupaten Batang. *Economic Education Analysis Journal*, 6(2), 433–446.
5. Ela Elliyana, S. E. (2021). *LEMBAGA KEUANGAN DAN PASAR MODA*. Ahlimedia Book.
6. Fadilah, F., & Al Banin, Q. (2022). Pengaruh Pelatihan, Lingkungan Kerja, Dan Fasilitas Kerja Terhadap Kinerja Pegawai Di Puskesmas Bantarkawung. *Jurnal Ilmiah Manajemen Dan Bisnis (JIMBis)*, 1(2). <https://doi.org/10.24034/jimbis.v1i2.5362>
7. Fajriansyah, Taufiq, I. M., Sasmita, H., Hamdat, A., & Singkeruang, F. T. W. A. (2022). Pengaruh Lingkungan Kerja Dan Produktivitas Kerja Terhadap Kinerja Pegawai Rumah Sakit Umum Daerah Daya Di Masa Covid-19. *Jurnal Sains Manajemen Nitro*, 1(2), 150–160. <https://doi.org/10.56858/jsmn.v1i2.95>
8. Haang, P., Ahkmad, F. A. P., & Hamid, E. (2020). Pengaruh Produktivitas Kerja dan Motivasi Kerja

- Terhadap Kinerja Pegawai pada Koperasi Parodhana Arta Solution Bekasi. *Al-Misbah*, 1(1), 119–129.
9. Hage, A. A., & Damayanti, E. (2020). The Effect Of Work Discipline And Work Productivity Through Organizational Culture On Employee Performance In Samsung WTC Surabaya Apollo. *IJESS International Journal of Education and Social Science*, 1(2), 67–74. <https://doi.org/10.56371/ijess.v1i2.29>
 10. Ilham, & Aqfir. (2022). Pengaruh Kemampuan, Disiplin Dan Lingkungan Kerja Terhadap Kinerja Aparatur Sipil Negara. *Economics And Business Management Journal (EBMJ)*, 1(3), 169–179.
 11. Manurung, E., Nura, E. T. P., Metia, T. A., et al. (2021). Pengaruh Fasilitas Kerja, Kedisiplinan Dan Pengawasan Terhadap Kinerja Pegawai Dinas Perikanan Kota Tanjungbalai. *JMB (Jurnal Manajemen Dan Bisnis)*, 3(1), 38–47. <https://doi.org/10.30743/jmb.v3i1.3628>
 12. Marliana, R. R. (2019). Partial Least Square-Structural Equation Modeling Pada Hubungan Antara Tingkat Kepuasan Mahasiswa Dan Kualitas Google Classroom Berdasarkan Metode WebQual 4.0. *Jurnal Matematika, Statistika Dan Komputasi*, 16(2), 174. <https://doi.org/10.20956/jmsk.v16i2.7851>
 13. Nisa, M., Sudarno, S., & Sugito, S. (2021). Moderating Structural Equation Modeling Dengan Partial Least Square Pada Pemodelan Penerimaan Dan Penggunaan Dompot Digital Di Kota Semarang. *Jurnal Gaussian*, 10(1), 66–75. <https://doi.org/10.14710/j.gauss.v10i1.30044>
 14. Rajab, M. (2021). Literature Review Factors Affecting Leadership: Quality of Work, Work Effectiveness and Work Communication. *Dinasti International Journal of Economics, Finance & Accounting*, 2(2), 151–159. <https://doi.org/10.38035/dijefa.v2i2.1275>
 15. Rangkuti, A. E., Thasya, B., & Yanti, A. (2021). Pengaruh Fasilitas Kerja dan Lingkungan Kerja Terhadap Kinerja Pegawai Pada Kantor Wilayah DJBC Sumatera Utara. *Konferensi Nasional Sosial Dan Engineering Politeknik Negeri Medan 2021*, 553–564.
 16. Sayoto, B., & Winarto, H. (2018). Pengaruh Disiplin Kerja Dan Fasilitas Kerja Terhadap Produktivitas Kerja Karyawan MNCTV Bagian Produksi. *Jurnal Manajemen Bisnis Krisnadwipayana*, 6(2), 2338–4794.
 17. Sitompul, R. (2018). Pengaruh Fasilitas Kerja Terhadap Kinerja Pegawai Di Dinas Pendidikan Kota Palangka Raya. *JISPAR Jurnal Ilmu Sosial, Politik Dan Pemerintahan*, 7(1), 31–37.
 18. Sri, W. (2018). Pengaruh Lingkungan Kerja Terhadap Produktivitas Kerja Karyawan. *Jurnal Manajemen*, 3(2), 1–5.
 19. Sugiyono, P. D. (2022). *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif, Kualitatif, dan R&D*. Alfabeta.
 20. Suwanto, S. (2020). Faktor-faktor yang Mempengaruhi Kinerja Pegawai. *Eksis: Jurnal Ilmiah Ekonomi Dan Bisnis*, 11(1), 15. <https://doi.org/10.33087/eksis.v11i1.180>
 21. Widiani, M. E. (2020). *Pengantar Manajemen* (Y. Sutarto, Ed.). CV. Pena Persada.
 22. Wijaksono, B. E., Sutapa, H., & Fajariah, N. (2022). Pengaruh Fasilitas Kerja Dan Motivasi Kerja Terhadap Kinerja Karyawan Perum Jasa Tirta I Wilayah Sub Dja II/I Kediri. *Jurnal Publikasi Sistem Informasi Dan Manajemen Bisnis*, 1(3), 89–105. <https://doi.org/10.55606/jupsim.v1i3.659>
 23. Wijaya, C., & Manurung, O. (2021). Produktivitas Kerja: Analisis Faktor Budaya Organisasi, Kepemimpinan Spiritual, Sikap Kerja, dan Motivasi Kerja untuk Hasil Kerja Optimal (R. Hidayat, Ed.). Kencana.