THE EFFECT OF ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE AND NON-PHYSICAL WORK ENVIRONMENT ON EMPLOYEE PERFORMANCE AT KSP PINTU AIR ROTAT, SIKKA REGENCY, EAST NUSA TENGGARA

Bernadus Jagong[1], Elly Lay[2], Soleman Nub[3], Frans Gana[4]
[1,2,3,4]Business Administration Study Program, Faculty of Social and Political Sciences, Nusa Cendana University, Indonesia
Corresponding author: Bernadus Jagong
E-mail: iyendmanis@gmail.com

Abstract:
This empirical investigation was conducted at KSP Pintu Air Rotat, Sikka Regency, to evaluate the individual and collective impact of organisational culture and non-physical work environment on employee performance. By employing a saturated sampling approach, data were gathered from 45 respondents through a combination of structured questionnaires, field observations, in-depth interviews, and archival documentation. Descriptive results, employee organizational culture is categorized as good. the non-physical work environment is very good, and employee performance is very good. effect of organizational culture: organizational culture has a positive and significant partial effect on employee performance. higher levels of organizational culture lead to higher employee performance. effect of non-physical work environment: non-physical work environment has a positive and significant partial effect on employee performance. an improved work environment leads to improved performance. both variables together significantly affect employee performance. the coefficient of determination shows that most variation in performance is explained by these two variables, while the remainder is influenced by other factors such as motivation, discipline, leadership, workload, and compensation.
Keywords: Organizational Culture, Non-Physical Work Environment, Employee Performance

INTRODUCTION

In the era of globalization and increasingly complex work competition, organizational success no longer depends solely on capital and technology, but also on the quality of human resources available. Dessler (2015) emphasizes that human resources constitute a competitive advantage that is difficult to imitate because they involve individuals' knowledge, skills, and attitudes. However, globally, the State of the Global Workplace report by Gallup (2024) highlights a significant challenge where only 21 percent of employees worldwide are actively engaged in their work, while the remainder experience reduced productivity, resulting in an estimated global economic loss of 438 billion US dollars. In Indonesia, Katadata (2023) reports that only 23 percent of workers feel fully engaged in their jobs, indicating serious issues in national human resource management effectiveness.

Optimizing human resource capabilities is often constrained if it is not accompanied by adequate standardization of the internal work environment. Organizational culture, understood as the manifestation of shared values, rules, and collective beliefs, plays a central role in shaping employee behavior to foster loyalty and work dedication (Schein, 2010). Meanwhile, non-physical dimensions of the work environment, such as the quality of coworker relationships, managerial

support, and psychological safety, serve as key determinants that drive employee motivation and energy (Robbins and Judge, 2019). Previous literature confirms that the synchronization of cultural strengths and a supportive work environment is a prerequisite for accelerating employee performance both qualitatively and quantitatively (Nugroho and Haryanto, 2021).

This phenomenon is particularly relevant in the context of cooperative-based economic development in Sikka Regency, East Nusa Tenggara, where approximately 538 cooperatives operate. One of its main pillars, KSP Kopdit Pintu Air Rotat, has demonstrated remarkable growth with total assets reaching 2.016 trillion Indonesian Rupiah and 341,251 members in 2023. However, this quantitative growth contrasts with internal productivity conditions. Evaluations show a declining human resource productivity trend from 78 percent in 2021 to 70 percent in 2025. It is further reinforced by an increase in employee turnover from 6.8 percent to 9.8 percent and a rise in tardiness rates from 10 percent to 15 percent during the same period.

Field observations indicate inconsistencies between the proclaimed work culture, PINTAR, which stands for Professionalism, Integrity, Innovation, Devotion, Trustworthiness, and Diligence, and its actual implementation. Human resource department data reveal that 42 percent of employee resignations are triggered by a rigid work atmosphere and high pressure, while 25 percent are related to less harmonious coworker relationships. These indications suggest that organizational culture has not been fully internalized and that the non-physical work environment remains suboptimal.

Based on this background, this study aims to empirically analyze and explain the effects of organizational culture and the non-physical work environment on employee performance at KSP Kopdit Pintu Air Rotat with the objective of formulating appropriate strategies to enhance organizational effectiveness amid rapid growth.

Employee Performance. Fundamentally, employee performance represents the individual achievement of work in terms of both quality and quantity in fulfilling assigned responsibilities (Sutrisno, 2020). Beyond mere output, performance within an organizational context is viewed as a harmonious combination of personal competence, motivational drive, and work behavior patterns directed toward achieving the organization's vision (Wibowo, 2021). Based on the theoretical synthesis developed in this study, employee performance is measured using the following parameters (Rahmawati & Hidayat, 2023; Prasetyo & Indrawati, 2022): output quantity, timeliness, productivity, work quality, creativity, work attitude, and procedural compliance.

Organizational Culture. Conceptually, organizational culture represents an ecosystem of values, beliefs, and collective norms that form a unique identity and key differentiator among institutions (Sedarmayanti, 2019; Wibowo, 2020). A strong culture plays a strategic role as a social integration instrument and as a behavioral compass for all members to optimize work effectiveness. This study refers to organizational culture characteristics according to Robbins and Judge (2011) and the specific PINTAR values at KSP Pintu Air Rotat, with indicators including innovation and risk-taking, attention to detail, result orientation, people orientation, team orientation, aggressiveness, and stability.

Non-Physical Work Environment. Conceptually, the non-physical work environment represents the psychological dimension and social dynamics within an organization that directly influence personnel comfort (Robbins & Judge, 2022). The critical focus of this non-physical aspect lies in fostering harmonious relationships, both in peer interactions and hierarchical relations between subordinates and management. Indicators of the non-physical work environment in this

study include social interaction, role clarity, communication, and psychological support (Sari & Nugroho, 2024; Prasetyo & Indrawati, 2022).

Theoretical Framework and Hypotheses. Theoretically, a positive organizational culture serves as a fundamental value system guiding employee behavior, while the availability of a supportive non-physical work environment acts as an external stimulus for optimizing productivity. The integration of a strong culture with a conducive work atmosphere is believed to create synergy that drives substantial performance improvement (Luthans, 2021). Based on the theoretical review and conceptual framework, the hypotheses of this study are formulated as follows:

H1: Organizational culture has a significant partial effect on employee performance.

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

H3: Organizational culture and non-physical work environment have a significant simultaneous effect on employee performance.

METHODS

Research Approach. A quantitative approach with an associative research design was applied in this study to identify the degree of relationships among variables. According to Sugiyono (2019), associative research focuses on explaining causal relationships and analyzing the influence of independent variables on dependent variables through empirical hypothesis testing. In this study framework, organizational culture (X1) and non-physical work environment (X2) are treated as independent variables, while employee performance (Y) serves as the dependent variable.

Research Location and Time. The study was conducted at KSP Kopdit Pintu Air Rotat Branch, Sikka Regency, East Nusa Tenggara, selected for its established organizational governance and work culture. The research was carried out over two months, from September to October 2025, including preparation, data collection, and analysis.

Population and Sample. The population consisted of all 45 permanent employees of KSP Kopdit Pintu Air Rotat. A census sampling method was applied, involving the entire population to ensure data representativeness.

Data Collection Techniques. This study employed a triangulation method using both primary and secondary data. Primary data were collected through a five-point Likert scale questionnaire, in-depth interviews, and direct observation of operations and social interactions. Secondary data were obtained from organizational documentation, including profiles, structures, and administrative records.

Data Analysis Techniques. Data were analyzed using descriptive statistics to describe the distribution and characteristics of the variables and inferential statistics to test hypotheses. Inferential analysis was conducted through multiple linear regression to assess the significance, direction, and magnitude of the influence of independent variables on the dependent variable, both partially (t-test) and simultaneously (F-test).

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Validity Test. Instrument validity was analyzed using SPSS. The correlation coefficient (r) for each indicator of organizational culture (X1), non-physical work environment (X2), and employee performance (Y) exceeded the r table threshold of 0.294 ($\alpha = 0.05$). This result confirms that the instruments used possess adequate validity for data collection in this study.

Reliability Test. To ensure internal consistency, instrument reliability was tested using Cronbach's Alpha. All variables produced values greater than 0.70, indicating that the instruments are reliable and capable of generating consistent data throughout the research process.

Descriptive Statistical Analysis.

Table 1. Organizational Culture Variable

Indicators / Items		Score					∑	Achievement %	Category
		SS	S	N	TS	STS			
X1.1	F	15	19	11	0	0	184	81.78%	Very Good
	%	33.3	42.2	24.4	0	0	100		
X1.2	F	11	33	1	0	0	170	75.56%	Good
	%	24.4	73.3	2.2	0	0	100		
Innovation and Risk-Taking								**78.67%**	**Good**
X1.3	F	12	27	6	0	0	171	76.00%	Good
	%	26.7	60.0	13.3	0	0	100		
X1.4	F	10	25	10	0	0	170	75.56%	Good
	%	22.2	55.6	22.2	0	0	100		
Attention to Detail								**75.78%**	**Good**
X1.5	F	12	27	6	0	0	171	76.00%	Good
	%	26.7	60.0	13.3	0	0	100		
X1.6	F	11	28	6	0	0	170	75.56%	Good
	%	24.4	62.2	13.3	0	0	100		
Result Orientation								**75.78%**	**Good**
X1.7	F	8	31	6	0	0	167	74.22%	Good
	%	17.8	68.9	13.3	0	0	100		
X1.8	F	7	32	6	0	0	166	73.78%	Good
	%	15.6	71.1	13.3	0	0	100		
People Orientation								**74.00%**	**Good**
X1.9	F	8	31	6	0	0	167	74.22%	Good
	%	17.8	68.9	13.3	0	0	100		
X1.10	F	7	32	6	0	0	166	73.78%	Good
	%	15.6	71.1	13.3	0	0	100		
Team Orientation								**74.00%**	**Good**
X1.11	F	7	25	13	0	0	164	72.89%	Good
	%	15.6	55.6	28.9	0	0	100		
X1.12	F	8	30	7	0	0	166	73.78%	Good
	%	17.8	66.7	15.6	0	0	100		
Aggressiveness								**73.34%**	**Good**
X1.13	F	3	36	6	0	0	159	70.67%	Good
	%	6.7	80.0	13.3	0	0	100		
X1.14	F	3	34	8	0	0	155	68.89%	Good
	%	6.7	75.6	17.8	0	0	100		
Stability								**69.78%**	**Good**
Total Average Achievement of Organizational Culture								**74.48%**	**Good**

Table 2. Descriptive Analysis of Non-Physical Work Environment Variable

	Score		∑	Achievement	Category

Indicators / Items		SS	S	N	TS	STS		%	
X2.1	F	11	34	0	0	0	184	81.78%	Very Good
	%	24.4	75.6	0	0	0	100		
X2.2	F	12	33	0	0	0	185	82.22%	Very Good
	%	26.7	73.3	0	0	0	100		
Social Interaction								**82.00%**	**Very Good**
X2.3	F	17	28	0	0	0	193	85.78%	Very Good
	%	37.8	62.2	0	0	0	100		
X2.4	F	12	23	10	0	0	179	79.56%	Good
	%	26.7	51.1	22.2	0	0	100		
Role Clarity								**85.78%**	**Very Good**
X2.5	F	4	41	0	0	0	169	75.11%	Good
	%	8.9	91.1	0	0	0	100		
X2.6	F	2	40	3	0	0	169	75.11%	Good
	%	4.4	88.9	6.7	0	0	100		
Communication Openness								**75.11%**	**Good**
X2.7	F	1	42	2	0	0	174	77.33%	Good
	%	2.2	93.3	4.4	0	0	100		
X2.8	F	16	29	0	0	0	191	84.89%	Very Good
	%	35.6	64.4	0	0	0	100		
Psychological Organizational Support								**81.11%**	**Very Good**
Total Average Achievement of Non-Physical Work Environment								**80.22%**	**Very Good**

Table 3. Descriptive Analysis of Non-Physical Work Environment Variable

Indicators / Items		Score					$\sum$	Achievement %	Category
		SS	S	N	TS	STS			
Y.1	F	8	37	0	0	0	190	84.44%	Very Good
	%	17.8	82.2	0	0	0	100		
Y.2	F	8	37	0	0	0	190	84.44%	Very Good
	%	17.8	82.2	0	0	0	100		
Total Output								**84.44%**	**Very Good**
Y.3	F	6	39	0	0	0	186	82.67%	Very Good
	%	13.3	86.7	0	0	0	100		
Y.4	F	10	35	0	0	0	190	84.44%	Very Good
	%						100		
Timeliness of Task Completion								**83.56%**	**Very Good**
Y.5	F	9	36	0	0	0	189	84.00%	Very Good
	%	20.0	80.0	0	0	0	100		
Y.6	F	10	35	0	0	0	190	84.44%	Very Good
	%	22.2	77.8	0	0	0	100		
Productivity								**84.22%**	**Very Good**
Y.7	F	4	41	0	0	0	184	81.78%	Very Good
	%	8.9	91.1	0	0	0	100		
Y.8	F	9	36	0	0	0	189	84.00%	Very Good
	%	20.0	80.0	0	0	0	100		
Work Quality								**82.89%**	**Very Good**

									Rating
Y.9	F	3	42	0	0	0	186	82.67%	Very Good
	%	6.7	93.3	0	0	0	100		
Y.10	F	6	39	0	0	0	186	82.67%	Very Good
	%	13.3	86.7	0	0	0	100		
Creativity								**82.67%**	**Very Good**
Y.11	F	5	40	0	0	0	185	82.22%	Very Good
	%	11.1	88.9	0	0	0	100		
Y.12	F	7	38	0	0	0	189	84.00%	Very Good
	%	15.6	84.4	0	0	0	100		
Work Attitude								**83.11%**	**Very Good**
Y.13	F	6	39	0	0	0	186	82.67%	Very Good
	%	13.3	86.7	0	0	0	100		
Y.14	F	10	35	0	0	0	190	84.44%	Very Good
	%	22.2	77.8	0	0	0	100		
Compliance with Procedures								**83.56%**	**Very Good**
Total Average Achievement of Employee Performance								**83.0%**	**Very Good**

Inferential Statistical Analysis.

Table 4. Multiple Linear Regression Analysis

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
1 (Constant)	5,356	1,901		2,817	,007
X1 ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE	,484	,071	,583	6,865	,000
X2 NON-PHYSICAL WORK ENVIRONMENT	,790	,162	,415	4,884	,000
a. Dependent Variable: Y EMPLOYEE PERFORMANCE					

The resulting multiple linear regression equation (Sugiyono, 2017) is:

$$Y = 5.356 + 0.484 \, X_1 + 0.790 \, X_2$$

Where:
Y = Employee Performance (dependent variable)
X_1 = Organizational Culture (first independent variable)
X_2 = Non-Physical Work Environment (second independent variable)
β_0 = 5.356 (constant/intercept)
β_1 = 0.484 (regression coefficient for Organizational Culture)
β_2 = 0.790 (regression coefficient for Non-Physical Work Environment)

The regression equation indicates that both Organizational Culture and Non-Physical Work Environment have a positive effect on Employee Performance. An increase in each independent variable corresponds to an increase in employee performance, assuming the other variable remains constant.

t-Test Results. The t-test results show that Organizational Culture (X1) significantly contributes to the model, with t = 6.865 exceeding the t-table value of 2.018 (df = 42, α = 0.05). Similarly, Non-Physical Work Environment (X2) shows t = 4.884, significant at p < 0.05. Both variables positively and significantly affect employee performance individually.

Table 5. F-Test Results

ANOVAa					
Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1 Regression	1008,886	2	504,443	1264,201	,000b
Residual	16,759	42	,399		
Total	1025,644	44			

a. Dependent Variable: Y EMPLOYEE PERFORMANCE

b. Predictors: (Constant), X2 NON-PHYSICAL WORK ENVIRONMENT, X1 ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE

The F-test indicates a very high model fit (F = 1264.201, p = 0.000), confirming that Organizational Culture and Non-Physical Work Environment simultaneously have a significant positive effect on Employee Performance.

Table 6. Coefficient of Determination

Model Summary				
Model	R	R Square (r^2)	Adjusted R-Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	,992a	,984	,983	,632

a. Predictors: (Constant), X2 NON-PHYSICAL WORK ENVIRONMENT, X1 ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE

The R value shows a very strong linear relationship, and R² indicates that Organizational Culture and Non-Physical Work Environment explain 98.4% of the variance in Employee Performance. The remaining 1.6% is influenced by other factors, such as compensation, work motivation, job satisfaction, and leadership style (Robbins & Judge, 2021).

CONCLUSION

1. Overview: Employee Organizational Culture is categorized as good. The Non-Physical Work Environment is very good, and Employee Performance is very good.
2. Effect of Organizational Culture: Organizational Culture has a positive and significant partial effect on Employee Performance. Higher levels of Organizational Culture lead to higher Employee Performance.
3. Effect of Non-Physical Work Environment: Non-Physical Work Environment has a positive and significant partial effect on Employee Performance. An improved work environment leads to improved performance.
4. Simultaneous Effect: Both variables together significantly affect Employee Performance. The coefficient of determination shows that most variation in performance is explained by these two

variables, while the remainder is influenced by other factors such as motivation, discipline, leadership, workload, and compensation.

REFERENCES

Apriansyah. (2020). The influence of organizational culture on employee performance at PT Indotex Indonesia. *Jurnal Ekonomi Efektif, 1*(1), 33–41.

Balau, L. L., Goni, S., & Mawikere, H. (2021). The effect of organizational culture on employee performance at PT Sinar Pure Foods International, Bitung. *Journal of Productivity, 8*(2), 262–269.

Dessler, G. (2020). *Human Resource Management (16th ed.).* Pearson.

Fajar, A., & Luturlean, B. S. (2023). The effect of a non-physical work environment on employee performance at PT Kimia Farma Diagnostika. *Jurnal Komitmen, 4*(1). https://doi.org/10.15575/jim.v4i2.28155

Ghozali, I. (2018). *Multivariate Analysis Application with IBM SPSS 25 (9th ed.).* Semarang: Universitas Diponegoro Press.

Heykal, M, Prasetya, S., & Harsanti, P. S. (2024). Pengaruh Kualitas Pelayanan terhadap Kepuasan Pelanggan pada Jasa Wisata (Open Trip) CV Tidung Island. *Jurnal Ekonomi Manajemen Akuntansi, 30*(1), 250-265. https://doi.org/10.59725/ema.v30i1.226

Luthans, F. (2021). *Organizational Behavior: An Evidence-Based Approach (14th ed.).* New York: McGraw-Hill Education. https://doi.org/10.1108/978-1-64802-127-5

Mangkunegara, A. A. A. P. (2011). *Corporate Human Resource Management.* Bandung: Remaja Rosdakarya.

Prasetyo, A., & Indrawati, R. (2022). *Employee Performance Measurement in Modern Organizations.* Jakarta: Pustaka Utama.

Rifai, A. R., & Haryoto, T. (2025). The effect of organizational culture and leadership on employee performance with job satisfaction as a mediating variable at PT Carsurin Tbk. *E-Jurnal Manajemen Universitas Udayana, 14*(4), 214–231 https://doi.org/10.24843/EJMUNUD.2025.v14.i3.p01

Robbins, S. P., & Judge, T. A. (2022). *Organizational Behavior (19th ed.).* New York: Pearson.

Schein, E. H. (2020). *Organizational Culture and Leadership (6th ed.).* Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.

Sedarmayanti. (2019). *Human Resource Management and Work Productivity.* Bandung: Refika Aditama.

Sugiyono. (2019). *Quantitative, Qualitative, and R&D Research Methods.* Bandung: Alfabeta.

Surya, J. E. (2022). The effect of organizational culture and work environment on employee performance. *Jurnal Ilmu Manajemen, 10*(3), 759–768. https://doi.org/10.26740/jim.v10n3.p759-768

Suryadi, I., & Yusuf, S. (2023). The effect of the work environment on employee performance at PT Prima Abadi Jakarta. *Jurnal Ekonomi Efektif, 6*(1), 1–10.

Wibowo. (2020). *Performance Management.* Jakarta: Rajawali Pers.