

## THE INFLUENCE OF WORK ENVIRONMENT AND MOTIVATION ON EMPLOYEE PRODUCTIVITY AT DPRD SUMATRA UTARA

Sinta Romarito Tampubolon<sup>1)</sup>\*, Muhammad Yalzamul Insan<sup>2)</sup>, Ara Auza<sup>3)</sup>

<sup>1,2</sup> Universitas Panca Budi, Medan, Indonesia

\*Corresponding Author: [sintatampubolon0606@gmail.com](mailto:sintatampubolon0606@gmail.com)

### ABSTRACT

*Indonesia is entering a demographic bonus period that will peak in 2030, thus opening up great opportunities for national economic growth. Increasing the proportion of the productive age population can boost productivity and GDP growth if supported by adequate quality of human resources. However, challenges arise in the bureaucratic sector, including in the Secretariat of the North Sumatra Provincial DPRD, which faces a high workload and a less conducive work environment. Therefore, this study aims to analyze the influence of work environment and work motivation on employee productivity to support the improvement of performance and quality of public services. The approach used was quantitative with a survey method, through the distribution of questionnaires to 71 respondents. The data obtained were analyzed using multiple linear regression with the help of SPSS version 26. The results showed that partially, the work environment did not have a significant effect on work productivity (significance value  $0.457 > 0.05$ ), while work motivation had a partial significant effect on employee work productivity (significance value  $0.022 < 0.05$ ). Simultaneously, the two independent variables had a significant effect on employee work productivity with a significance value of 0.031 and a determination coefficient ( $R^2$ ) of 0.096. This shows that 9.6% of the variation in work productivity can be explained by these two variables.*

*Keywords: Work Environment, Motivation, Productivity, DPRD Secretariat*

### ABSTRAK

Indonesia tengah memasuki masa bonus demografi yang mencapai puncaknya pada 2030, sehingga membuka peluang besar bagi pertumbuhan ekonomi nasional. Peningkatan proporsi penduduk usia produktif dapat mendorong produktivitas dan pertumbuhan PDB apabila didukung oleh kualitas sumber daya manusia yang memadai. Namun, tantangan muncul pada sektor birokrasi, termasuk di Sekretariat DPRD Provinsi Sumatera Utara, yang menghadapi beban kerja tinggi dan lingkungan kerja yang kurang kondusif. Oleh karena itu, penelitian ini bertujuan menganalisis pengaruh lingkungan kerja dan motivasi kerja terhadap produktivitas pegawai guna mendukung peningkatan kinerja dan kualitas pelayanan publik. Pendekatan yang digunakan adalah kuantitatif dengan metode survei, melalui penyebaran kuesioner kepada 71 responden. Data yang diperoleh dianalisis menggunakan regresi linear berganda dengan bantuan SPSS versi 26. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa secara parsial, lingkungan kerja tidak berpengaruh signifikan terhadap produktivitas kerja (nilai signifikansi  $0,457 > 0,05$ ), sementara motivasi kerja berpengaruh signifikan secara parsial terhadap produktivitas kerja pegawai (nilai signifikansi  $0,022 < 0,05$ ). Secara simultan, kedua variabel independen berpengaruh signifikan terhadap produktivitas kerja pegawai dengan nilai signifikansi 0,031 dan koefisien determinasi ( $R^2$ ) sebesar 0,096. Hal ini menunjukkan bahwa 9,6% variasi produktivitas kerja dapat dijelaskan oleh kedua variabel tersebut.

Kata Kunci: Lingkungan Kerja, Motivasi, Produktivitas, Sekretariat DPRD

## INTRODUCTION

Indonesia is currently undergoing a demographic transition, with the peak of its demographic bonus projected to occur by 2030. This phenomenon presents a significant opportunity for economic growth, as the proportion of the working-age population (15–64 years) continues to increase, providing an abundant labor supply and the potential to boost savings and productivity. According to Meilia (2025), this demographic structure could enhance Indonesia's real GDP growth by up to 1 percentage point during the period 2020–2050, provided that the country implements the right policies to manage employment, education, and social protection systems effectively. However, this potential can only be realized if the quality and productivity of human resources meet the demands of the evolving economy (Agustina Sairmaly et al. (2023). Amid post-pandemic recovery efforts and growing regional competition within ASEAN, both the government and private sectors are required to establish efficient, inclusive, and supportive work systems. In this context, employee productivity becomes a crucial factor—not only for organizational effectiveness but also for the continuity of public services and national development. A regional study highlights that strengthening human capital through inclusive policies and institutional support is essential to improve workforce resilience and competitiveness across ASEAN member states (ASEAN Workplace Wellbeing 2024 (2024)).

This condition is reflected in the work environment of the Secretariat of the Regional House of Representatives (DPRD) of North Sumatra Province, which operates under the dual authority of the Governor (administratively) and DPRD leadership (technically). The Secretariat serves 100 DPRD members from various factions and commissions and is responsible for executing intensive and simultaneous administrative duties. Employees face heavy workloads, layered reporting obligations, and complex coordination between legislative and executive stakeholders. A preliminary survey revealed that most staff experience work pressure, fatigue, and a less conducive work environment challenges that may decrease operational efficiency if left unaddressed.

In the context of bureaucratic institutions, employee productivity encompasses not only the completion of tasks but also elements of efficacy, effectiveness, and responsiveness dimensions that extend beyond mere output to include how efficiently and adaptively services are delivered (Akangbou, 2021). Jailani & Akhyar (2021) highlights that productivity is not merely measured by output, but also by how efficiently and effectively resources are used, including employee discipline, work prioritization, collaboration, and professional performance. Limitations in these areas such as poor adherence to work procedures, delayed task completion,

or weak interdepartmental coordination can significantly hinder organizational objectives. Therefore, this study aims to analyze the influence of the work environment and work motivation on the productivity of employees at the DPRD Secretariat of North Sumatra Province. The findings are intended to guide policy interventions that foster a more supportive work environment and enhance motivation to ensure optimal performance and high-quality public service delivery.

## **RESEARCH METHODS**

This research employs a quantitative descriptive approach using a multiple linear regression model to examine the influence of work environment and work motivation on employee productivity at the Secretariat of the Regional House of Representatives (DPRD) of North Sumatra Province. According to Sugiyono (2018) quantitative research is based on the positivist philosophy and is intended to test hypotheses or explain relationships among variables through statistical measurement. The total population in this study consists of 250 employees, with a sample of 71 respondents determined using Slovin's formula with a 10% margin of error. The sampling technique used is random sampling to ensure objectivity and representativeness a method that provides each individual in the population an equal chance of selection and helps produce results that can be generalized to the entire workforce (Makwana et al. (2023))

Primary data were obtained through structured questionnaires distributed digitally via Google Forms, using a Likert scale (Manullang & Pakpahan (2014)). The instrument measured three variables: work environment (X1), work motivation (X2), and employee productivity (Y), each defined operationally based on indicators from relevant theories such as Sedarmayanti (2011), Herzberg (in Robbins & Judge (2013)), and Soetrisno (2016). The data analysis was conducted using SPSS version 26, involving validity and reliability testing, classical assumption tests (normality, multicollinearity, and heteroscedasticity), and hypothesis testing using F-test and t-test. The use of multiple linear regression allows the researcher to identify both individual and joint effects of the independent variables on the dependent variable Ghozali (2019), thus providing insight into the most influential factors and guiding managerial recommendations for productivity improvement.

## **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

### **DPRD Provinsi Sumatera Utara**

The Regional House of Representatives (DPRD) of North Sumatra Province is located at *Jalan Imam Bonjol No. 5, Medan*. It serves as the administrative and legislative center where plenary meetings, commission hearings, budget discussions, and public complaint handling are conducted. This building also houses legislative archives and policy documents, functioning as both a legislative institution and a symbol of democratic representation at the provincial level. Established on April 15, 1948, alongside the formation of North Sumatra Province through UU No. 10 of 1948, the DPRD initially represented the regions of Aceh, East Sumatra, and Tapanuli. Over time, the institution evolved through multiple administrative reforms and territorial adjustments, particularly with the separation of Aceh as its own province.

The DPRD has since undergone structural and political transformation, adapting to democratic reforms and regional autonomy. Its organizational framework includes various legislative tools, known as *Alat Kelengkapan Dewan (AKD)*, which include the leadership board, commissions, budgetary and legal bodies, and additional working groups. Each commission focuses on specific sectors such as governance, infrastructure, finance, social welfare, and education. The diversity of party-based factions within the DPRD ensures broad political representation. Electoral districts (*Daerah Pemilihan; DAPIL*) are defined based on population distribution and administrative regions to ensure fair representation from all areas across the province.

The DPRD of North Sumatra performs essential functions mandated by UU No. 23 of 2014 on Regional Governance. These include forming local regulations (*Peraturan Daerah; PERDA*) with the executive branch, approving the provincial budget (*Anggaran Pendapatan dan Belanja Daerah; APBD*), overseeing the implementation of laws and budget use, and conveying public aspirations through consultations and field visits. The DPRD's legislative, budgetary, and oversight functions serve as pillars of regional governance, ensuring that local policies align with community needs, fiscal accountability, and developmental priorities. Through these functions, the institution also plays a critical role in determining strategic planning such as the Regional Medium-Term and Long-Term Development Plans (*Rencana Pembangunan Jangka Menengah Daerah; RPJMD* and *Rencana Pembangunan Jangka Pendek Daerah; RPJPD*).

The organizational structure of the DPRD comprises two main components: the political element, consisting of elected council members, and the administrative element, comprised of the Secretariat and its civil servants. The Secretariat, led by the Secretary of the Council (*Sekretaris Dewan; SEKWAN*), facilitates the legislative body's technical and administrative functions. It is divided into five primary divisions—General Affairs, Finance, Legislative Drafting, Hearings,

and Public Relations—each further subdivided into specific sub-units responsible for clerical tasks, logistics, financial verification, protocol management, and legal documentation.

This coordinated structure ensures smooth and efficient support for legislative operations. Each unit performs specialized tasks while maintaining synergy across the institution. Non-civil service personnel, such as contract staff, also assist with daily operations including maintenance, sanitation, and technical assistance. Altogether, the DPRD of North Sumatra functions not only as a legislative assembly but also as an organized institution supported by a robust administrative apparatus, all working toward achieving effective governance and responsive public service.

### **Respondent Characteristics**

This study involved respondents with varying demographic characteristics. In terms of gender distribution, there was a relatively balanced composition with 41 male respondents (54%) and 35 female respondents (46%). This balance ensures the data gathered is free from gender bias and reflects perspectives from both male and female employees fairly. Such diversity is important in workplace studies as it ensures inclusivity in analyzing workplace dynamics. In terms of age, most of respondents (47%) were between 31 and 40 years old, which represents a mature and productive age group likely to hold essential responsibilities. Respondents aged 17–30 made up 29%, while those aged 41–50 comprised 24% of the sample. This age distribution shows that the research primarily engaged individuals in their prime working years, which supports the credibility of their responses, particularly regarding work experience and organizational insight.

Educational background also varied, with a significant majority (76.32%) holding a bachelor's degree (Strata 1), while 22.37% had completed senior high school, and only one respondent (1.32%) had a diploma-level education. No respondents held postgraduate degrees. These figures suggest a well-educated workforce, which is crucial for interpreting their responses about motivation, workplace conditions, and productivity with a reasonable level of literacy and awareness.

Regarding tenure, most respondents (93%) had worked for more than five years, indicating a deep familiarity with the work environment and organizational processes. Only 7% had less than five years of experience, suggesting that the findings are informed by respondents with significant exposure to institutional routines, challenges, and culture. The marital status distribution was evenly split, with 38 respondents married and 38 unmarried. This equal division enables an unbiased assessment of whether marital status influences work motivation or

performance. Furthermore, such diversity may reflect different life priorities and external responsibilities that potentially affect job engagement and workplace behavior.

Descriptive analysis on work environment variables revealed a generally positive perception among employees. Indicators such as physical conditions, social relations, safety, facilities, psychological environment, and organizational structure all scored average ratings above 3.5 on a five-point Likert scale. The highest rating was given to social relations (mean 3.73), indicating that interpersonal interactions among employees were perceived as strong and supportive. Meanwhile, physical conditions and work facilities, though rated positively, revealed a notable number of neutral responses, suggesting room for physical workplace improvements.

In terms of work motivation, five aspects were analyzed: achievement, recognition, the work itself, responsibility, and opportunities for advancement. The highest-rated factor was enjoyment and satisfaction with the work itself, with a mean of 3.80. This suggests that intrinsic motivation plays a significant role in maintaining employee engagement. Conversely, opportunities for career advancement received the lowest mean score (3.18), signaling dissatisfaction with professional growth prospects and the need for better career development policies. Productivity, as perceived by employees, was also rated favorably. The highest-rated indicator was “ability” with a mean of 4.1, indicating that most employees believe they possess the necessary skills to perform their tasks professionally. Efficiency also scored well (mean 3.85), showing that employees consider themselves capable of utilizing resources and time effectively. However, “work enthusiasm” had the lowest mean score (3.46), pointing to motivational fatigue or lack of daily inspiration, which could affect long-term performance if left unaddressed.

While the general picture of productivity is positive, high proportions of neutral responses across many items may indicate a lack of clarity regarding performance standards or an absence of regular performance feedback. Park & Choi (2020) emphasize that in public organizations, performance feedback significantly enhances employee performance by clarifying goals and expectations, especially when paired with adequate autonomy. This supports the idea that clearer communication and transparent appraisal systems are crucial in improving performance outcomes. Moreover, enhancing daily motivation and providing opportunities for professional development can foster engagement and long-term retention. According to Aparna & Khutale (2024), well-designed professional development programs are instrumental in sustaining employee loyalty and enhancing workplace morale, especially when tailored to individual needs.

In conclusion, the respondent profile reflects a well-educated, experienced, and professionally mature workforce. Their perceptions reveal overall satisfaction with workplace

conditions and personal competence but also indicate areas needing managerial attention—particularly related to sustained motivation and career advancement. As highlighted by both Park & Choi (2020) and (Aparna & Khutale, 2024) strategic investment in feedback mechanisms and ongoing professional development is essential for building a committed and high-performing public workforce. The findings of this study therefore provide valuable insights for institutional leaders aiming to enhance employee productivity through targeted interventions in motivation strategy and work environment design.

### Hypothesis Testing

Before conducting hypothesis testing, the researcher ensured the quality of the data by performing validity, reliability, and classical assumption tests. The validity test confirmed that all questionnaire items for the three main variables Work Environment (X1), Work Motivation (X2), and Employee Productivity (Y) were valid, with correlation values exceeding the minimum threshold. Furthermore, the reliability test using Cronbach’s Alpha showed that all variables were reliable, each having a coefficient above 0.70, indicating consistent internal measurements. Classical assumption tests, including normality, multicollinearity, and heteroscedasticity checks, all met standard criteria. The residuals were normally distributed, there were no signs of multicollinearity ( $VIF < 10$ ), and scatterplots showed no heteroscedasticity.

**Table 1. Statistical Results from SPSS 26.0**

Test Type	t/F Value	Sig. Value	Conclusion
t-test (X1: Work Environment)	-0.748	0.457	Not Significant (H1 Rejected)
t-test (X2: Work Motivation)	2.341	0.022	Significant (H2 Accepted)
F-test (Simultaneous)	3.641	0.031	Significant (H3 Accepted)
Multiple Regression Coefficients	$Y = 14.134 - 0.119X1 + 0.300X2$	-	X1 Negative, X2 Positive
Coefficient of Determination	-	-	$R^2 = 0.097$ (9.7%)

*Source: data reductions by researcher*

The hypothesis testing was conducted using a multiple linear regression model with two independent variables (X1 and X2) and one dependent variable (Y). The first hypothesis (H1) posited that the Work Environment has a partial effect on Employee Productivity. However, the t-test result showed that the work environment variable had a regression coefficient of -0.119 with a significance value of 0.457. Since the significance value exceeded 0.05, it was concluded that the work environment does not significantly affect productivity on a partial basis. Thus, H1 is rejected.

The second hypothesis (H2) proposed that Work Motivation significantly influences Employee Productivity. The analysis revealed a regression coefficient of 0.300 and a significance value of 0.022. As this p-value is below 0.05, the hypothesis is accepted. This suggests that employee motivation has a positive and statistically significant impact on productivity when considered independently. Motivated employees are more likely to engage actively in their tasks, meet targets, and contribute to institutional goals.

For the third hypothesis (H3), the F-test was used to assess the simultaneous effect of both independent variables on productivity. The ANOVA result showed a significance value of 0.031, which is below the 0.05 threshold. This implies that, taken together, the work environment and motivation significantly influence productivity. Therefore, H3 is accepted. It also indicates that the regression model is statistically valid for explaining variations in productivity using the two predictors.

The multiple linear regression analysis produced the equation:

$$Y = 14.134 - 0.119X1 + 0.300X2$$

This equation shows that while the work environment has a slight negative influence, motivation positively contributes to productivity. The standardized beta coefficients also confirmed that motivation ( $\beta = 0.388$ ) has a stronger relative influence than the work environment ( $\beta = -0.124$ ). This finding underscores that in the context of the DPRD North Sumatra Office, internal motivational factors are more decisive in boosting employee output compared to external environmental factors.

The coefficient of determination ( $R^2$ ) was 0.097, indicating that 9.7% of the variance in employee productivity can be explained by the combined effect of work environment and motivation. The adjusted  $R^2$  value was 0.070, suggesting that the explanatory power of the model remains relatively low, and that 90% or more of the variation is likely influenced by other unexamined variables. The standard error of estimate (2.917) also suggests a moderate degree of prediction error

within the model. Despite the model's statistical significance, it highlights the need for further investigation into other factors that might better explain employee productivity in the public sector.

### **Discussion, First Hypothesis**

Based on the results of the multiple linear regression analysis, it was found that the Work Environment variable (X1) had a regression coefficient of -0.119, a t-value of -0.748, and a significance value of 0.457. Since the significance value is far above the 0.05 threshold, it can be concluded that the work environment does not have a statistically significant partial effect on employee productivity at the DPRD Office of North Sumatra Province. Therefore, Hypothesis H1 is rejected. The negative coefficient also suggests that a higher perception of the work environment does not necessarily translate into higher productivity, at least within the context of this model.

This finding is supported by the descriptive data, which shows that although most indicators related to the work environment—such as physical condition, social relationships, and organizational structure—scored above the mean value of 3.5, a considerable number of respondents selected "neutral" for many items. This indicates that perceptions of the work environment remain moderate and are not strong enough to exert a direct influence on productivity. Surprisingly, the direction of influence is even negative, albeit statistically insignificant, suggesting that improvements in perceived work environment quality might not necessarily lead to productivity gains in this specific institutional setting.

These results contrast with previous studies that have shown a positive correlation between work environment and productivity. For example, Otoluwa et al. (2023) found a significant effect of the work environment on productivity at PT. Suracojaya Abadimotor, where physical comfort, safety, and organizational support directly enhanced productivity. Similarly, Dedy Pranata & Krisna Heryanda (2023) reported a significant relationship between the work environment and farmer productivity in Buleleng. Another study by Utami et al. (2023) at PT. Ukhuwah Berkah Semesta also confirmed both partial and simultaneous effects of the work environment on employee productivity. In addition, research by Meiman & Waruwu (2023) and Listiana & Aslamiyah (2024) also supported this positive correlation between work environment and employee performance in private sector settings.

However, this study's results are aligned with Parashakti & Noviyanti (2021) who found no significant relationship between the work environment and productivity at PT. Garuda Indonesia. In their analysis, productivity was more strongly influenced by individual factors such as training and personal capability, rather than environmental conditions. Similar findings were

also reported by Solehati et al. (2024), who discovered that the work environment did not affect productivity among employees at PT. XYZ, despite significant effects observed from motivation and discipline. This supports the notion that the impact of the work environment may be context-specific and mediated by other, more dominant variables.

In the context of DPRD North Sumatra, employees face dual responsibilities in serving both the legislative (members of the council) and the executive (the Governor). This dual reporting structure imposes high administrative pressure and organizational complexity. Consequently, even a favorable work environment may not significantly enhance productivity unless deeper structural issues—such as workload distribution and organizational clarity—are addressed. This underscores the importance of motivation and individual agency (as further discussed in Hypothesis H2) as potentially more powerful drivers of productivity in such a bureaucratic setting. Therefore, while a supportive work environment is theoretically beneficial, in practice, it must be integrated with fair structural systems and balanced workloads to yield meaningful productivity outcomes.

### **Discussion, Second Hypothesis**

Based on the results of the multiple linear regression analysis, the Work Motivation variable (X2) had a regression coefficient of 0.300, a t-value of 2.341, and a significance value of 0.022. Since this p-value is smaller than the alpha level of 0.05, it can be concluded that work motivation has a statistically significant partial effect on employee productivity. Thus, Hypothesis H2 is accepted, confirming that motivation is a key driver of performance among employees at the DPRD Office of North Sumatra Province.

The positive regression coefficient indicates that an increase in work motivation is followed by an increase in productivity. This implies that motivation plays a meaningful and practical role in encouraging employees to complete their responsibilities efficiently and with high quality. Employees who are motivated tend to take greater initiative, demonstrate a higher level of commitment, and achieve better outcomes in their tasks.

This finding is reinforced by the descriptive data showing that several motivation indicators, such as “the work itself” and “recognition,” received the highest mean scores—above 3.7. Respondents reported that their work held personal meaning and that they felt recognized by supervisors and peers. Although the “career advancement” indicator received the lowest mean score (3.18), overall motivation levels remained strong, and the dimensions assessed were conducive to improved productivity.

These results align with Herzberg's Two-Factor Theory, which posits that motivators like achievement, recognition, responsibility, and growth are directly linked to job satisfaction and performance. In this research, motivation has proven to be a strong performance driver, especially in an administrative-heavy setting like the DPRD Secretariat of North Sumatra. Supporting this conclusion are studies such as Utami et al. (2023), Otoluwa et al. (2023), Dedy Pranata & Krisna Heryanda (2023), Sobandi et al. (2020), and Helena Veronika Taka (2024), who also found that motivation significantly affects productivity in various professional contexts, including the banking sector in East Nusa Tenggara.

Furthermore, Suprpto et al. (2023) observed that motivation had a positive and moderate effect on productivity at PT REMCO Jambi. Their study reinforced the view that while external conditions matter, internal factors such as motivation consistently sustain employee performance and are more resilient in facing structural or environmental limitations. These findings emphasize that in bureaucratic institutions like the DPRD, intrinsic motivation often outweighs structural factors like the physical work environment. Employees who find meaning in their work, feel appreciated, and see opportunities for growth are more likely to perform optimally, even when facing high workloads and complex organizational structures. Therefore, any effort to improve productivity at DPRD North Sumatra should prioritize strategies that enhance work motivation—such as recognition programs, employee involvement in decision-making, acknowledgment of individual achievements, and the development of clear career pathways.

### **Discussion, Third Hypothesis**

To test this hypothesis, an F-test within the multiple linear regression model was employed. The test results indicated an F-value of 3.641 with a significance level of 0.031. Since the p-value is smaller than the 0.05 significance threshold, it can be concluded that work environment and work motivation simultaneously have a significant effect on employee productivity. Therefore, Hypothesis H3 is accepted, meaning both independent variables, when considered together, contribute meaningfully to explaining variations in employee productivity at the DPRD Office of North Sumatra Province.

Although only work motivation showed a significant partial effect (as accepted in H2), the simultaneous analysis demonstrates that the interaction between the two variables can collectively account for changes in productivity. This is further supported by the coefficient of determination ( $R^2$ ) value of 0.096, indicating that 9.6% of the variation in productivity is explained by the combination of work environment and motivation. The remaining 90.4% is

influenced by other variables not examined in this model, suggesting the multifaceted nature of productivity determinants in bureaucratic institutions.

Substantively, this result illustrates that the interaction between work environment and motivation is complementary in shaping a productive setting. While the work environment alone does not significantly affect productivity, its presence becomes meaningful when combined with motivation. This finding resonates with Herzberg's Two-Factor Theory, which posits that "hygiene factors" like physical work conditions and interpersonal relationships must be maintained to prevent demotivation, even though they do not directly drive satisfaction. The synergy between these factors strengthens intrinsic motivators such as achievement and recognition.

Support for this result also comes from previous studies. Utami et al. (2023) found that work environment and motivation jointly influenced productivity at PT Ukhuwah Berkah Semesta. Similarly, Otoluwa et al. (2023) concluded that both variables significantly contributed to employee performance at PT. Suracojaya Abadimotor. Sobandi et al. (2020) also highlighted the combined effect of motivation and work environment on productivity in construction project settings, emphasizing the need for integration between internal and external factors in workforce management.

In the context of DPRD North Sumatra, where organizational complexity and workload pressures are high, motivation serves as the primary performance driver, while the work environment offers necessary support. Their synergy contributes to sustaining productivity, even if not overwhelmingly, as reflected by the modest  $R^2$  value. Therefore, improving employee productivity cannot rely on a single factor alone but must adopt a holistic strategy—addressing both intrinsic motivation and external work conditions, while also incorporating other critical elements such as leadership, reward systems, training, and organizational culture.

## **Discussion, Work Productivity**

The question of what truly drives employee productivity remains a persistent concern within public institutions. The findings from the DPRD North Sumatra Secretariat provide a nuanced answer: productivity is not a product of one isolated factor but an interplay of many. From the three hypotheses tested, only work motivation (H2) showed a significant partial effect on productivity, while the work environment (H1) did not. Yet, when both were analyzed simultaneously (H3), a significant combined effect emerged. This raises compelling questions about the complexity of productivity in bureaucratic systems and demands a closer examination through empirical and theoretical lenses.

Drawing on the concept of productivity from Jailani & Akhyar (2021), productivity must be seen not only through its outcomes but also through the effectiveness and efficiency of human behavior. Jailani emphasizes that while efficacy such as completing tasks is often satisfactory, public employees often fall short in terms of work prioritization, adherence to procedures, and responsiveness. These weaknesses were also echoed in the DPRD study: although employees self-reported high levels of ability and efficiency, indicators like enthusiasm and daily motivation ranked lower, suggesting gaps between potential and realization.

This paradox becomes clearer when we revisit the rejected hypothesis H1, which stated that the work environment has a partial influence on productivity. Despite reasonable ratings on workplace conditions, the regression analysis revealed no significant effect. The finding reflects what Nomaini et al. (2020) observed: a physically adequate workspace is not a guarantee of productivity unless it addresses structural and systemic frictions like overlapping authority, high administrative burden, and unclear job flow. Indeed, in the context of DPRD North Sumatra, as outlined in the background study, employees work under dual pressures from both legislative and executive branches. Such complex governance architecture dilutes the potential benefits of a supportive environment, no matter how well-rated.

What then explains the power of motivation, as confirmed in H2? In alignment with Herzberg's theory and supported by Jailani & Akhyar (2021), internal drivers like job recognition, purpose, and growth tend to push employees further than physical settings do. Employees in the DPRD study rated "the work itself" and "recognition" highly suggesting a psychological alignment between their duties and their personal values. Motivation, therefore, acts as an internal energy source that keeps staff moving through layers of bureaucratic inertia, even when the external environment fails to inspire.

The simultaneous test (H3) further reinforces this by showing that while the work environment may not independently influence productivity, it serves as a complementary variable when paired with motivation. Nomaini et al. (2020) discuss this synergy, where a conducive climate—however neutral it may appear amplifies the effects of well-channeled motivation. Productivity is therefore not born of comfort or aesthetics alone, but from the intersection of a worker's inner drive and the surrounding system's capacity to facilitate action.

It is worth noting that the relatively low coefficient of determination ( $R^2 = 9.6\%$ ) underscores the limited explanatory power of these two variables. As both Jailani & Akhyar (2021) and Nomaini et al. (2020) agree, productivity is multifactorial. Elements such as leadership, communication style, institutional culture, and training are all silent contributors whose absence in the model creates space for unexplained variance. The gap between

performance appraisals and actual behavior, as identified by Jailani, further complicates measurement and interpretation.

In summary, the analysis offers a critical reminder: productivity in a bureaucratic setting cannot be engineered by physical design or managerial fiat alone. It thrives at the intersection of well-aligned personal motivation and an organizational structure that empowers rather than constrain. As such, institutions like DPRD North Sumatra must go beyond surface-level improvements and build deeper systems that recognize the full spectrum of human agency, from inner purpose to institutional logic.

## **CONCLUSION**

This study concludes that: (1) the work environment does not have a significant partial effect on employee productivity at the DPRD Office of North Sumatra Province; (2) work motivation has a significant partial effect on employee productivity; and (3) simultaneously, both the work environment and work motivation have a significant effect on employee productivity. Based on these findings, it is recommended that the DPRD Secretariat focus on enhancing employee motivation through clear career development paths, recognition programs, and opportunities for participation in decision-making. Although the work environment did not show a significant partial effect, it should not be neglected. Improvements in physical conditions, communication climate, and organizational structure should continue to support employee engagement and well-being.

As a closing remark, this research highlights the need for a more holistic understanding of productivity in bureaucratic institutions. Future studies are encouraged to explore other influencing factors such as leadership style, work-life balance, organizational culture, and performance appraisal systems, which may provide a deeper insight into strategies for optimizing public sector productivity.

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENT**

The author gratefully acknowledges the support provided by Universitas Panca Budi Medan throughout the course of this study. Sincere appreciation is extended to the academic advisor for valuable guidance, constructive feedback, and encouragement during the research and writing process. The author also wishes to express gratitude to the Regional House of Representatives (DPRD) of North Sumatra Province and to all colleagues at DPRD North Sumatra Province for their cooperation and assistance during data collection. Special thanks are

also extended to other individuals and parties whose contributions were meaningful to this research but cannot be mentioned individually. Their support and assistance have been invaluable in completing this study.

## REFERENCES

- Agustina Sairmaly, F. (2023). Human Capital Development and Economic Growth: A Literature Review on Information Technology Investment, Education, Skills, and Productive Labour. *Jurnal Minfo Polgan*, 12(2).
- Akangbou, V. (2021). Bureaucracy and Employee's Productivity in Tertiary Institutions: An Appraising Glance. *International Journal of Institutional Leadership, Policy and Management*, 3(2), 207–226.
- Aparna, M., & Khutale, C. (2024). *The Impacts of Professional Development On Employee Retention: A Comprehensive Analysis* (Vol. 12, Issue 2).
- ASEAN Workplace Wellbeing 2024. (2024). *ASEAN Workplace Wellbeing 2024 Key Insights and Recommendations for Thriving Workforces and Healthy Organisations Overview 1. 2. Background and methodology*.
- Dedy Pranata, K., & Krisna Heryanda, K. (2023). Pengaruh Lingkungan Kerja Dan Motivasi Kerja Terhadap Produktivitas Petani Cengkeh Di Desa Ambengan Kecamatan Sukasada Kabupaten Buleleng. *Prospek: Jurnal Manajemen Dan Bisnis*, 5.
- Ghozali, I. (2019). *Aplikasi Analisis Multivariate dengan IBM SPSS 25* (9th ed.). Undip.
- Helena Veronika Taka. (2024). Pengaruh Motivasi Kerja dan Lingkungan Kerja terhadap Produktivitas Kerja Karyawan Bank XY. *Assets Journal: Management, Administration, Economics, and Accounting*, 2(1), 1–8.
- Jailani, & Akhyar, T. (2021). Analisis Produktivitas Kerja Pegawai Pada Dinas Pendapatan Daerah Provinsi Sumatera Selatan. *Jurnal Pemerintahan Dan Politik*, 6.
- Listiana, T., & Aslamiyah, S. (2024). *Pengaruh Motivasi Kerja, Disiplin Kerja Dan Lingkungan Kerja Terhadap Produktivitas Karyawan Pada PT. Petrokopindo Cipta Selaras*.
- Makwana, D., Engineer, P., Dabhi, A., & Chudasama, H. (2023). *International Journal of Trend in Scientific Research and Development*, 7.
- Manullang, M., & Pakpahan, M. (2014). *Metodologi Penelitian Proses Penelitian Praktis*. Citapustaka Media.
- Meilia, S. (2025). Demographic Bonus to Support Economic Growth In Indonesia. *Eduvest-Journal of Universal Studies*, 5(2), 1856–1863.
- Meiman, O. :, & Waruwu, H. (2023). Pengaruh Etos Kerja Dan Lingkungan Kerja Terhadap Produktivitas Kerja Melalui Motivasi Karyawan Pada PT. Red Basket Indonesia. In *Jurnal Ilmiah Metadata* (Vol. 5, Issue 2).
- Nomaini, F., Agustina, S., & Malinda, F. (2020). Analisis Mekanisme Koordinasi dalam Pelaksanaan Pekerjaan Pada Kantor Pemerintah Kecamatan Indralaya Utara Kabupaten Ogan Ilir. *JANUARI*, 5(1).
- Otoluwa, N. I., Burhan, H., & Hasan, A. (2023). Pengaruh Lingkungan Kerja dan Motivasi Kerja Terhadap Produktivitas Karyawan Pada PT. Suracojaya Abadimotor Cabang Maros. In *YUME : Journal of Management* (Vol. 6, Issue 2).
- Parashakti, R. D., & Noviyanti, D. (2021). Pengaruh Motivasi, Lingkungan Kerja, dan Pelatihan Kerja Terhadap Produktivitas Kerja Karyawan. *Jurnal Ekonomi Bisnis, Manajemen Dan Akuntansi (JEBMA)*, 1(2), 127–136.

- Park, S., & Choi, S. (2020). Performance feedback, goal clarity, and public employees' performance in public organizations. *Sustainability (Switzerland)*, 12(7).
- Robbins, S. P., & Judge, T. A. (2013). *Organizational Behavior* (17th ed.). Prentice Hall.
- Sedarmayanti. (2011). *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia, Reformasi Birokrasi dan Manajemen Pegawai Negeri Sipil*. PT Refika Aditama.
- Sobandi, A., Fadhli, U. M. D., & Suherman, E. (2020). *Pengaruh Lingkungan Kerja Dan Motivasi Kerja Terhadap Produktivitas Kerja Karyawan Jasa Kontruksi Di PT Kadi International*.
- Soetrisno, E. (2016). *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia* (8th ed.). Kencana.
- Solehati, D. T., Hasnawati, R., Sakinah, S. P., & Hendayana, Y. (2024). Pengaruh Lingkungan Kerja, Motivasi Kerja, dan Disiplin Kerja Terhadap Produktivitas Karyawan. *SENTRI: Jurnal Riset Ilmiah*, 3, 328.
- Sugiyono. (2018). *Metode Penelitian Pendidikan Pendekatan Kuantitatif dan Kualitatif*. Alfabeta.
- Suprpto, E., Mahaputra, M. R., & Mahaputra, M. R. (2023). *Pengaruh Lingkungan Kerja, Motivasi terhadap Produktivitas Kerja Karyawan pada PT REMCO Jambi*. 1(4).
- Utami, S., Sri, W., Apriliani, D. H., Wikaningtyas, S. U., Diana, S., Apriliani, H., Tinggi, S., Widya, I. E., & Yogyakarta, W. (2023). Pengaruh Motivasi Kerja, Lingkungan Kerja, Dan Kompensasi Terhadap Produktivitas Kerja Karyawan PT. Ukhuwah Berkah Semesta. In *Jurnal Riset Akuntansi dan Bisnis Indonesia STIE Widya Wiwaha* (Vol. 3, Issue 1).