



## The Influence of Mental Health and Non-Physical Work Environment on Work Effectiveness

Suci Azzahra Adela<sup>1</sup>, Kokom Komariah<sup>2</sup>, Resa Nurmala<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Universitas Muhammadiyah Sukabumi, Kota Sukabumi, Indonesia, [suciazzahra171@ummi.ac.id](mailto:suciazzahra171@ummi.ac.id)

<sup>2</sup>Universitas Muhammadiyah Sukabumi, Kota Sukabumi, Indonesia, [ko2mpuspa@ummi.ac.id](mailto:ko2mpuspa@ummi.ac.id)

<sup>3</sup>Universitas Muhammadiyah Sukabumi, Kota Sukabumi, Indonesia, [resanurmala@ummi.ac.id](mailto:resanurmala@ummi.ac.id)

Corresponding Author: [suciazzahra171@ummi.ac.id](mailto:suciazzahra171@ummi.ac.id)

**Abstract:** Researchers found several problems faced by Generation Z workers, especially in the Pasirhalalang village area, one of the main reasons why many employees choose to leave their jobs and move to other jobs is a toxic work environment which causes employee absenteeism rates to increase. Employee work effectiveness is greatly influenced by the work environment and mental health. The method used is quantitative with a causal descriptive approach. Mental health and the non-physical work environment have a significant positive effect on work effectiveness. The mental health and non-physical work environment of generation Z workers in Pasirhalang Village have a good impact on employees, because both can be felt by employees, increasing work effectiveness as shown by the company providing satisfaction with the work it does and its employees. Able to follow workplace rules. And through a non-physical work environment, Generation Z workers in Pasirhalang Village have high values which can be seen through good communication and always working together in teams, making employees develop creativity and innovation to help the company achieve its goals.

**Keyword:** Mental Health, Non-physical Work Environment, Work Effectiveness, Generation Z workers

### INTRODUCTION

Companies generally try to achieve certain profits in various ways. Work effectiveness is an important supporting factor in achieving a company's goals. According to (Panggabean, 2022) Effectiveness means "achievement of goals". This means that if effectiveness is not achieved properly, then the work can be classified as ineffective. Employee mental health has been recognized as an important factor in determining work effectiveness. Research conducted (Retnowati, 2022) shows that employees who have good mental health tend to have higher levels of productivity and better performance at work in today's highly competitive work world. The work environment also has a big influence on continued work effectiveness, especially the non-physical work environment, such as good relations between employees, support from superiors, positive company culture and values, maintaining work-life balance, and programs

that support employee welfare can improve work effectiveness significantly. Good relationships between employees, such as open communication, close collaboration, and mutual support, contribute to increasing work effectiveness. (Anisa, 2023)

Generation Z workers, especially in the Pasirhalang Village area, researchers found several problems faced by these workers. One of the main reasons why many employees choose to leave their jobs and move to other jobs is a toxic work environment that causes employee absenteeism rates to increase. Employee work effectiveness is greatly influenced by the work environment and mental health. Companies that can understand and meet the expectations of Generation Z will benefit and become more successful companies in the future. Currently there has been a lot of research on work effectiveness, but rarely pay attention to mental health which is currently synonymous with Generation Z (Fikri, 2024)

From the phenomena described above, researchers are interested in conducting research on the influence of mental health and the non-physical work environment on work effectiveness among generation Z workers in Pasirhalang Village, Sukabumi Regency. This research will answer several questions, namely:

1. What is the picture of mental health, non-physical work environment and work effectiveness among generation Z in Pasirhalang Village, Sukabumi Regency?
2. Is there an influence of mental health on work effectiveness?
3. Is there an influence of the non-physical work environment on work effectiveness?

## METHOD

The research method used by researchers is a quantitative research method with a causal descriptive approach. According to (Priadana & Sunarsi, 2021), quantitative research methods are research methods that reveal problems through data collection, are descriptive and test predetermined hypotheses.

The population determined by researchers to carry out this research was Generation Z workers in Pasirhalang Village, Sukabumi Regency. The population members in this study numbered 1769 people as residents of Pasirhalang Village, Sukabumi Regency with an age range of 18 to 27 years who were registered in the population data for Pasirhalang Village, Sukabumi Regency for the 2023/2024 period. In this research, researchers used a probability sampling technique with simple random sampling. Priadana & Sunarsi, (2021:162) state that probability sampling is a sampling technique that is carried out by giving the entire population the opportunity to become a sample. In determining the number of samples in this study, the Slovin formula was used as follows

$$n = \frac{N}{1 + Ne^2}$$

Information:

n = sample size

N = population size

e = Percentage of accuracy allowance due to tolerable sampling error (10%)

The population in this study was 1,769 people, so:

$$n = \frac{N}{1 + Ne^2}$$

$$n = \frac{1.769}{1 + 1.769(0,1)^2}$$

$$n = 94,6 \text{ (Rounded to 95)}$$

The data obtained must be processed through classical assumption tests and hypothesis testing with multiple linear regression, f tests and t tests carried out using SPSS 25.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### Validity Test

The test results in this Validity test using SPSS software are as follows:

**Table 1. Validity Test Results for Variables X1, X2, and Y**

| Variabel                                    | No Item | R Hitung | R Kritis | Keterangan |
|---------------------------------------------|---------|----------|----------|------------|
| <i>Mental Health</i><br>(X1)                | X1.1    | 0,538    | 0,3      | Valid      |
|                                             | X1.2    | 0,716    | 0,3      | Valid      |
|                                             | X1.3    | 0,695    | 0,3      | Valid      |
|                                             | X1.4    | 0,703    | 0,3      | Valid      |
|                                             | X1.5    | 0,765    | 0,3      | Valid      |
|                                             | X1.6    | 0,560    | 0,3      | Valid      |
|                                             | X1.7    | 0,744    | 0,3      | Valid      |
|                                             | X1.8    | 0,654    | 0,3      | Valid      |
|                                             | X1.9    | 0,438    | 0,3      | Valid      |
|                                             | X1.10   | 0,561    | 0,3      | Valid      |
|                                             | X1.11   | 0,780    | 0,3      | Valid      |
|                                             | X1.12   | 0,700    | 0,3      | Valid      |
|                                             | X1.13   | 0,805    | 0,3      | Valid      |
|                                             | X1.14   | 0,777    | 0,3      | Valid      |
|                                             | X1.15   | 0,661    | 0,3      | Valid      |
| Non-Phsyical<br>Work<br>Environment<br>(X2) | X2.1    | 0,742    | 0,3      | Valid      |
|                                             | X2.2    | 0,766    | 0,3      | Valid      |
|                                             | X2.3    | 0,762    | 0,3      | Valid      |
|                                             | X2.4    | 0,777    | 0,3      | Valid      |
|                                             | X2.5    | 0,787    | 0,3      | Valid      |
|                                             | X2.6    | 0,683    | 0,3      | Valid      |
|                                             | X2.7    | 0,629    | 0,3      | Valid      |
|                                             | X2.8    | 0,741    | 0,3      | Valid      |
|                                             | X2.9    | 0,759    | 0,3      | Valid      |
|                                             | X2.10   | 0,381    | 0,3      | Valid      |
|                                             | X2.11   | 0,450    | 0,3      | Valid      |
|                                             | X2.12   | 0,678    | 0,3      | Valid      |
| Work<br>Effectiveness<br>(Y)                | Y1      | 0,827    | 0,3      | Valid      |
|                                             | Y2      | 0,603    | 0,3      | Valid      |
|                                             | Y3      | 0,940    | 0,3      | Valid      |
|                                             | Y4      | 0,825    | 0,3      | Valid      |
|                                             | Y5      | 0,868    | 0,3      | Valid      |
|                                             | Y6      | 0,916    | 0,3      | Valid      |
|                                             | Y7      | 0,876    | 0,3      | Valid      |
|                                             | Y8      | 0,762    | 0,3      | Valid      |
|                                             | Y9      | 0,653    | 0,3      | Valid      |
|                                             | Y10     | 0,749    | 0,3      | Valid      |

Source: SPSS V.25 Data Processing Results

The table shows that all the indicators used to measure the variables used in this research have a score above 0.3, so that all of these items can be said to be valid according to Priyastama (2020:168).

### Reliability Test

The criteria for an instrument in a study are said to be reliable if the reliability coefficient ( $r_{11}$ ) is  $>0.6$  (Dahruji (2017:70)). Following are the test results using SPSS V.25:

**Table 2 Reliability Test Results for Variables X1, X2, and Y**

| Variabel                              | Cronbach Alpha | Nilai Standar | N of Items |
|---------------------------------------|----------------|---------------|------------|
| Mental Health (X1)                    | 0,904          | $>0,6$        | 15         |
| Non-Phsyical Work<br>Environment (X2) | 0,881          | $>0,6$        | 12         |

|                        |       |      |    |
|------------------------|-------|------|----|
| Work Effectiveness (Y) | 0,936 | >0,6 | 10 |
|------------------------|-------|------|----|

Source: SPSS V.25 Data Processing Results

From the table above, it can be seen that the coefficient value for each variable is more than 0.6. So it can be concluded that the statements on the variables in this research are reliable.

## Normality Test

**Table 3 Normality Test**

| One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test |                |                         |
|------------------------------------|----------------|-------------------------|
|                                    |                | Unstandardized Residual |
| N                                  |                | 95                      |
| Normal Parameters <sup>a,b</sup>   | Mean           | .0000000                |
|                                    | Std. Deviation | 5.11393697              |
| Most Extreme Differences           | Absolute       | .051                    |
|                                    | Positive       | .051                    |
|                                    | Negative       | -.049                   |
| Test Statistic                     |                | .0585                   |
| Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)             |                | .884 <sup>c</sup>       |

a. Test distribution is Normal.

b. Calculated from data.

c. Lilliefors Significance Correction

Source: SPSS V.25 Data Processing Results

Based on the table above, the significance value of Asymp is obtained. Sig. (2-tailed) of 0.884 is greater than  $\alpha$  (0.1), which means that the data values in this study are normally distributed. (Purba et al., 2021)

## Multicollinearity Test

**Table 4 Multicollinearity Test Results for Variables X1, X2, and Y**

| Coefficients <sup>a</sup> |                               |                             |            |                           |       |      |                        |       |
|---------------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------------|------------|---------------------------|-------|------|------------------------|-------|
|                           |                               | Unstandardized Coefficients |            | Standardized Coefficients | T     | Sig. | Colinearity Statistics |       |
| Model                     |                               | B                           | Std. Error | Beta                      |       |      | Tolerance              | VIF   |
| 1                         | (Constant)                    | -1.282                      | 2.816      |                           | -.455 | .650 |                        |       |
|                           | Mental Health                 | .305                        | .069       | .381                      | 4.396 | .000 | .262                   | 2.143 |
|                           | Non-Physical Work Environment | .512                        | .087       | .510                      | 5.881 | .000 | .439                   | 2.276 |

a. Dependent Variable: Work Effectiveness

Source: SPSS V.25 Data Processing Results

It can be seen that the tolerance value for each dependent variable is more than 0.1 and the VIF value for each variable is less than 10, this shows that there is no multicollinearity in the mental health and non-physical work environment variables, resulting in a regression model that is suitable for use in research. Duli (2019:120)

## Heteroscedasticity Test

**Table 5 Heteroscedasticity Test**

| Coefficients <sup>a</sup> |                               |                             |                           |      |       |      |
|---------------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------|------|-------|------|
|                           |                               | Unstandardized Coefficients | Standardized Coefficients | Beta | T     | Sig  |
| Model                     |                               | B                           | Std. Error                |      |       |      |
| 1                         | (Constant)                    | -1.282                      | 2.161                     |      |       |      |
|                           | Mental Health                 | .305                        | .069                      | .381 | .299  | .765 |
|                           | Non-Physical Work Environment | .512                        | .087                      | .510 | 1.881 | .414 |

a. Dependent Variable: Work Effectiveness

Source: SPSS V.25 Data Processing Results

Based on this table, it can be concluded that heteroscedasticity does not occur because the significance level is more than 0.05. (Ghozali, 2018:137).

### Linearity Test

The linearity test can be said to have a relationship if the significance value is less than 0.05. Sunarto et. al. (2018:81)

**Table 6 Linearity Test X1 to Y**

| ANOVA Table                        |                |                         | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F       | Sig. |
|------------------------------------|----------------|-------------------------|----------------|----|-------------|---------|------|
| Work Effectiveness * Mental Health | Between Groups | (Combined)              | 852.873        | 23 | 37.068      | 6.644   | .266 |
|                                    |                | Linearty                | 753.611        | 1  | 735.611     | 131.848 | .001 |
|                                    |                | Deviation from Linearty | 116.961        | 22 | 5.316       | .953    | .639 |
|                                    | Within Groups  |                         | 396.125        | 71 | 5.579       |         |      |
| Total                              |                |                         | 1248.698       | 94 |             |         |      |

Source: SPSS V.25 Data Processing Results

It can be seen from Table 6 that the results of the linearity test on mental health show a Deviation from Linearity value of 0.639, which means the relationship between variables X1 and Y is linear because the significance level is more than 0.1. Meanwhile, the linear relationship between variable X2 and Y is as follows:

**Table 7 Linearity Test X2 to Y**

| ANOVA Table                     |                |                         | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F      | Sig. |
|---------------------------------|----------------|-------------------------|----------------|----|-------------|--------|------|
| Work Effectiveness * Non-Phsyca | Between Groups | (Combined)              | 396.648        | 14 | 19.250      | 1.272  | .105 |
|                                 |                | Linearty                | 72.428         | 1  | 213.756     | 13.858 | .017 |
|                                 |                | Deviation from Linearty | 269.468        | 13 | 17.620      | .879   | .531 |
|                                 | Within Groups  |                         | 283.167        | 80 |             |        |      |
| Total                           |                |                         | 1248.698       | 94 |             |        |      |

Source: SPSS V.25 Data Processing Results

It can be seen from the table that the results of the linearity test in the non-physical work environment show a Deviation from Linearity value of 0.531, which means the relationship between variables X2 and Y is linear because the significance level is more than 0.1.

Based on the classical assumption testing that has been carried out, all the data that has been analyzed shows that the variables studied in this research can improve the Best Linear Unibiased Estimator (BLUE), or it can be said that they have a clear and linear relationship between all the variables in the research.

### Multiple Correlation Test

**Table 8 Multiple Correlation Test**

| Model Summary <sup>b</sup> |                   |                   |                   |                            |                 |          |     |     |               |
|----------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|----------------------------|-----------------|----------|-----|-----|---------------|
|                            |                   | Change Statistics |                   |                            |                 |          |     |     |               |
| Model                      | R                 | R Square          | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate | R Square Change | F Change | df1 | df2 | Sig. F Change |
| 1                          | .829 <sup>a</sup> | .687              | .680              | 5.145                      | .687            | 101.089  | 2   | 92  | .000          |

a. Predictors: (Constant), mental health, non-physcal work environment

Source: SPSS V.25 Data Processing Results

Based on Table 8, it can be seen that the linear relationship between mental health variables and the non-physical work environment on work effectiveness is 0.829. (Narlan Abdul, 2018:78)

## Determination Coefficient

The coefficient of determination is used to see several (%) independent variables to the dependent measured by the regression model (Andi Ibrahim, 2018)

Criteria for coefficient of determination:

1. If the "kd" value is close to 0, then the influence of variable X on Y is weak
2. If the "kd" value is close to 1, then the influence of variable X on Y is strong

**Table 9 Determination Coefficient Test**

| Model Summary |                   |          |                 |                            |
|---------------|-------------------|----------|-----------------|----------------------------|
| Model         | R                 | R Square | Adjust R Square | Std. Error of The Estimate |
| 1             | .834 <sup>a</sup> | .696     | .690            | 5.169                      |

a. Predictors: (Constant), mental health, non-physical work environment

Source: SPSS V.25 Data Processing Results

Based on Table 9, it can be seen that the coefficient of determination or R square is 0.834. The R square value is obtained from squaring the R value, namely  $0.834 \times 0.834 = 0.696$  or equal to 69.6%, therefore, it can be concluded that the amount of mental health and non-physical work environment on work effectiveness is 69.6% while the remaining 30.4% ( $100\% - 69.6\% = 30.4\%$ ) influenced by other variables not examined in this study. Therefore, it can be concluded that  $kd=0.696$  is close to 1, which means that the influence of mental health and the non-physical work environment on work effectiveness is stated to be strong.

## Multiple Linear Regression Test

This analyze used involving Work Effectiveness (Y) and Mental Health and Non-Physical Work Environment (X<sub>1</sub> and X<sub>2</sub>) As in the formula according to Ferdinand (2020:220):

$$Y^* = \alpha + b_1X_1 + b_2X_2$$

Information:

Y = Work Effectiveness

$\alpha$  = Constant

$b$  = Regression Coefficients

X<sub>1</sub> = Mental Health

X<sub>2</sub> = Non-Physical Work Environment

**Table 10 Multiple Linear Regression Test**

| Coefficients <sup>a</sup> |                            |                             |            |                           |       |
|---------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------|---------------------------|-------|
|                           |                            | Unstandardized Coefficients |            | Standardized Coefficients |       |
| Model                     |                            | B                           | Std. Error | Beta                      | t     |
| 1                         | (Constant)                 | 12.140                      | 2.931      |                           | .632  |
|                           | <i>Mental health</i>       | .305                        | .069       | .381                      | 4.396 |
|                           | Lingkungan kerja non fisik | .512                        | .807       | .510                      | 5.881 |

a. Dependent Variable: Work Effectiveness

Source: SPSS V.25 Data Processing Results

From the results of the multiple linear regression analysis in Table 10, a multiple linear equation was created as follows:

$$Y^* = 12.140 + 0.305 X_1 + 0.512 X_2$$

1. X<sub>1</sub>, X<sub>2</sub> and Y have positive values
2. A constant value of 12,140 means work effectiveness is 12,140 if the variable value of mental health and non-physical work environment is (0)
3. If mental health has an increase or increase of (1) unit assuming the non-physical work environment variables remain constant, then mental health will experience an increase of 0.305

4. An increase of (1) unit in the non-physical work environment indicates an increase of 0.512, assuming that mental health remains constant.

### Simultaneous Significance Test (F Test)

The criteria used to calculate this simultaneous test are:

1. If  $F_{count} > F_{table}$  at  $\alpha = 10\%$  then  $H_0$  is rejected and  $H_a$  is accepted (significant)
2. If  $F_{count} < F_{table}$  at  $\alpha = 10\%$  then  $H_0$  is accepted and  $H_a$  is rejected (no significant).

**Table 11 Simultaneous Significance Test (F Test)**

| ANOVA <sup>a</sup> |                |    |             |         |                   |
|--------------------|----------------|----|-------------|---------|-------------------|
| Model              | Sum of Squares | Df | Mean Square | F       | Sig.              |
| 1 Regression       | 5632.563       | 2  | 2816.282    | 105.396 | .000 <sup>b</sup> |
| Residual           | 2458.321       | 92 | 26.721      |         |                   |
| Total              | 8090.884       | 94 |             |         |                   |

a. Dependent Variable: Work Effecteness

a. Predictors: (Constant), mental health, non-phsycal work environment

Source: SPSS V.25 Data Processing Results

Based on the table above, it can be concluded that X1 and X2 significantly influence Y, as indicated by the calculated F-value of 105.369 with a significance level or probability of  $0.000 < 0.1$ . Furthermore, comparing the calculated F-value with the F-table value, with degrees of freedom (dk) numerator = k and dk denominator = (n-k-1) and a 10% error rate, yields dk numerator = 2 and dk denominator = 92. The resulting F-table value is 2.361. Therefore, it can be concluded that X1 and X2 variables significantly affect Y, meaning mental health and non-physical work environment collectively impact job effectiveness.

### Hypotesis Test (T Test)

**Table 12 Hypotesis Test (T Test)**

| Coefficients <sup>a</sup> |                               |                             |            |                           |       |
|---------------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------------|------------|---------------------------|-------|
|                           |                               | Unstandardized Coefficients |            | Standardized Coefficients | Sig.  |
| Model                     |                               | B                           | Std. Error | Beta                      |       |
| 1                         | (Constant)                    | 12.140                      | 2.931      |                           | .632  |
|                           | <i>Mental health</i>          | .305                        | .069       | .381                      | 4.396 |
|                           | Non-Physical Work Environment | .512                        | .807       | .510                      | 5.881 |

a. Dependent Variable: Work Effecteness

Source: SPSS V.25 Data Processing Results

### H1 : Influence of Mental Health (X1) on Work Effectiveness (Y)

From the research results, it is known that mental health has a positive and significant impact on work effectiveness. This can be seen from the multiple linear regression calculation, the mental health coefficient value is positive at 0.305, as well as by testing the hypothesis in Table 12 Tcount is greater than Ttable, namely  $4.396 > 1.661$ . This shows that mental health has a positive and significant effect on work effectiveness in Generation Z workers in Pasirhalang Village.

### H2 : Effect of Non-Physical Work Environment (X2) on Work Effectiveness (Y)

The research results show that the non-physical work environment has a positive and significant impact on work effectiveness. This can be seen from the multiple linear regression calculation, the non-physical work environment coefficient value is positive at 0.512, as well as by testing the hypothesis in Table 12 Tcount is greater than Ttable, namely  $5.881 > 1.661$ . This shows that the non-physical work environment has a positive and significant effect on the work effectiveness of Generation Z workers in Pasirhalang Village.

## Respondents' Responses To Mental Health

**Table 13 Respondents' Responses To Mental Health**

| No   | Indicators                                                            | Mean | Category  |
|------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------|------|-----------|
| 1    | Supervisors effectively manage employee work-related stress           | 3,01 | Medium    |
| 2    | The company provides job satisfaction                                 | 3,37 | Medium    |
| 3    | The company facilitates employee socialization                        | 4,05 | High      |
| 4    | Supervisors guide employees in making rational decisions              | 3,77 | High      |
| 5    | I can resolve work-related problems                                   | 3,78 | High      |
| 6    | The company emphasizes concentration during work hours                | 4,12 | High      |
| 7    | I follow workplace rules                                              | 4,24 | Very High |
| 8    | The company promotes teamwork                                         | 4,24 | Very High |
| 9    | My sleep isn't disrupted due to work                                  | 2,95 | Medium    |
| 10   | The company raises awareness about physical-mental health connections | 3,52 | High      |
| 11   | The company provides access to quality healthcare services            | 3,71 | High      |
| 12   | I have life goals                                                     | 4,26 | Very High |
| 13   | I feel accepted by my workplace environment                           | 4,07 | High      |
| 14   | The company involves employees in social activities                   | 3,91 | High      |
| 15   | I don't have toxic relationships with family or friends               | 3,85 | High      |
| Mean |                                                                       | 3,79 | High      |

Source: Results of Questionnaire Data Processing

The average response value regarding mental health is categorized as high, scoring 3.79 out of 5.00. This indicates that Generation Z workers in Pasirhalang Village perceive good mental health, characterized by adherence to workplace rules and effective teamwork facilitation by the company.

## Respondents' Responses To Non-Physical Work Environment

**Table 14 Respondents' Responses To Non-Physical Work Environment**

| No   | Indicators                                                      | Mean | Category |
|------|-----------------------------------------------------------------|------|----------|
| 1    | I communicate effectively with coworkers                        | 4,05 | High     |
| 2    | I work well with the team                                       | 4,15 | High     |
| 3    | I have mutual trust with colleagues                             | 3,81 | High     |
| 4    | Supervisors consistently motivate employees                     | 3,68 | High     |
| 5    | Supervisors acknowledge and praise employee achievements        | 3,53 | High     |
| 6    | Supervisors trust employees with task completion                | 3,96 | High     |
| 7    | The company offers flexible working hours                       | 3,53 | High     |
| 8    | I find my workload manageable                                   | 3,61 | High     |
| 9    | I'm satisfied with the available leave options                  | 3,74 | High     |
| 10   | I experience stress due to excessive workload                   | 3,04 | Medium   |
| 11   | I'm satisfied with my salary and benefits                       | 3,51 | High     |
| 12   | I feel safe and comfortable, free from workplace discrimination | 3,69 | High     |
| Mean |                                                                 | 3,69 | High     |

Source: Results of Questionnaire Data Processing

The average response score regarding non-physical work environment is categorized as high, with 3.69 out of 5.00. This indicates that Generation Z workers in Pasirhalang Village experience a positive non-physical work environment, characterized by effective teamwork and good communication among colleagues

## Respondents' Responses To Work Effectiveness

**Table 15 Respondents' Responses To Work Effectiveness**

| No | Indicators                            | Mean | Category  |
|----|---------------------------------------|------|-----------|
| 1  | I meet production targets             | 3,58 | High      |
| 2  | My product defect rate is minimal     | 3,52 | High      |
| 3  | I complete tasks on schedule          | 3,97 | High      |
| 4  | I maintain perfect attendance         | 4,29 | Very High |
| 5  | I acknowledge and learn from mistakes | 4,08 | High      |

|      |                                                    |      |      |
|------|----------------------------------------------------|------|------|
| 6    | I adhere to company regulations                    | 4,11 | High |
| 7    | I consistently meet output deadlines               | 3,81 | High |
| 8    | I utilize company-provided equipment and materials | 4,09 | High |
| 9    | I'm satisfied with my compensation and benefits    | 3,41 | High |
| 10   | I'm content with the work environment              | 3,86 | High |
| Mean |                                                    | 3,87 | High |

Source: Results of Questionnaire Data Processing

The average response score for job effectiveness is high, with 3.87 out of 5.00. This indicates that Generation Z workers in Pasirhalang Village experience high job effectiveness, characterized by excellent attendance and efficient use of company-provided resources

## CONCLUSION

Mental health and non-physical work environment positively impact Generation Z workers in Pasirhalang Village, enhancing job effectiveness through job satisfaction, adherence to workplace rules, and effective teamwork.

This environment fosters creativity, innovation and collaboration. Research findings indicate a significant positive correlation between mental health and job effectiveness, confirming the hypothesis: "Mental health significantly influences job effectiveness."

The study also reveals a significant positive relationship between non-physical work environment and job effectiveness, supporting the hypothesis: "Non-physical work environment significantly impacts job effectiveness."

## REFERENCES

- Agus, F. (2019). Metodologi Penelitian Kuantitatif (B. K (ed.); Pertama). *Kencana*, 192.
- Andi I, Alang, A. H., & Masi, B.D. (2018). Metodologi Penelitian. *Gunadarma Ilmu*.
- Anisa Nur Oktaviani, K. K. (2023). Turnover Intention(Niat Berpindah) Karyawan Berdasarkan Lingkungan Kerja Fisik Dan Lingkungan Kerja Non Fisik. *Journal of Management and Bussines (JOMB)* 2 (2), 196-204  
<https://doi.org/10.31539/jomb.v2i2.686>.
- Armstrong, M. (2022). *Human Resource Management Practice*. Kogan Page.
- Aulia, S. (2022). Dampak Lingkungan Kerja Fisik Dan Non Fisik Pada Kerja Karyawan KCU Pos Indonesia Malang. *Jurnal Ilmiah Manajemen, Ekonomi Bisnis, Kewirausahaan*, 104.
- Duli, N. (2019). Metodologi Penelitian Kuantitatif: Beberapa konsep Dasar Untuk Penulisan Skripsi Dan Analisis Data Dengan Spss. (edisi pert). Yogyakarta : Deepublish.
- Fikri, R. M. (2024). Dinamika Komunikasi Korporasi dalam Meningkatkan Keterlibatan Karyawan Generasi Z. *Google Scholar*, 107-118.
- Ghozali M, I. (2018). *Desain Penelitian Kuantitatif dan Kualitatif*.
- Hitt, M. A., Hoopes T. J., Wheeler, J. S., & Barney, C. J. (2023). The resource-advantage theory of competition: A review and synthesis. *Strategic Management Journal*, 370-400.
- Mondy, R. W. & Noe, M. L. (2019). *Human resource management*. Pearson Education.
- Narlan Abdul, J. T. (2018). *Statistik Dalam penjas Aplikasi praktis dalam penelitian pendidikan jasmani*. DEEPUBLISH.
- Panggabean, S. (2022). *Pengantar Manajemen Pendidikan*. Yayasan Kita Menulis.
- Priadana, S. & Sunarsi, D. (2021). Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif (Pertama). *Pascal Books*, 51.
- Priyastama, R. (2020). *THE BOOK OF SPSS pengolahan&Analisis Data*. ANAK HEBAT INDONESIA.
- Purba, D. S. Tarigan, W.J., Sinaga, M., & Tarigan V. (2021). Pelatihan Penggunaan Software SPSS Dalam Pengolahan Regressi Linear Berganda Untuk Mahasiswa Fakultas Ekonomi Universitas Simalungun Di Masa Pandemi Covid 19. *Jurnal Karya Abadi*, 5, 5-24.

- Retnowati, E. &. (2022). Peningkatan Kinerja Karyawan Ditinjau Dari Sikap Kerja Dan Penegakan Keadilan Organisasi. *Journal of Economics and Accounting*, 219-226.
- Sedarmayanti. (2021). Pengaruh Lingkungan Kerja Fisik dan Non Fisik terhadap Stres Kerja Karyawan PT Citraabadi Sejati. *Jurnal Manajemen dan Bisnis*, 102.
- Sugiyono. (2018). *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif, Kualitatif, dan R&D.B.* 95 ALFABETA.
- Sunarto A, I., & Isnaini, D. Y. F. (2018). *Statistik Pembiayaan Bermasalah Pada Bank. Samudra Biru.*
- World Health Organization (2020). Mental health and psychosocial considerations during the COVID-19 outbreak. *World Health Organization*, 550-551.