Comparison of the Effectiveness of Open and Closed Office Spaces on Employee Productivity: A Case Study in Office X

Salfa Salsha Billa[1]
Department of Business Administration
Politeknik Negeri Bandung
Bandung Barat, Indonesia
E-mail: salfa.salsha.abs423@polban.ac.id

Luan Nauri[2]
Department of Business Administration
Politeknik Negeri Bandung
Bandung Barat, Indonesia
E-mail: luan.nauri.abs423@polban.ac.id

Harmon Chaniago[3*]
Department of Business Administration
Politeknik Negeri Bandung
Bandung Barat, Indonesia
E-mail: harmon@polban.ac.id

ABSTRACT

This study compares the effectiveness of open and closed office spaces in the Office Using direct observation and in-depth interviews, the study found that open spaces encourage collaboration and communication, although they can reduce privacy and increase noise. Meanwhile, closed spaces provide greater focus and privacy, ideal for individual tasks and confidential meetings. The findings suggest that a hybrid approach combining both layouts offers the most effective solution to accommodate a variety of work needs. Theoretically, this study highlights the importance of integrating psychological and task-based considerations in workspace design. Practically, it informs organizations about the value of flexible, activity-based office layouts that align with employees' work styles. The novelty of this study lies in its context-specific analysis that combines observational data with user experiences, offering a more holistic perspective than previous research that often focuses on one type of layout. This highlights the need for adaptable office design to support employee well-being and productivity.

Keywords: Office Layout; Work Effectiveness; Productivity; Open Office Space; Closed Office Space

INTRODUCTION

The office world in recent decades has undergone a significant transformation, especially in terms of workspace design. One of the most noticeable changes is the shift from closed office space to the concept of open office space. The design of open office spaces was introduced with the aim of improving collaboration, communication, and operational cost efficiency. Although this concept has been implemented by various companies, there is still debate about the extent to which its application can improve employee productivity and well-being. Globally, a 2020 Leesman report found only 57% of employees in open-plan offices felt productive. Since the COVID-19 pandemic, trends have shifted toward hybrid and flexible workspaces balancing privacy and interaction (HOK, 2023) In Indonesia, open office layouts are increasingly adopted by urban startups and creative industries, while traditional companies and large corporations often maintain closed offices. However, cultural preferences for privacy among Indonesian workers may influence the effectiveness of these layouts. Therefore, contextual analysis is crucial to determine which design best supports employee performance globally and locally.

Effectiveness, according to KBBI, refers to an action that has an influence on an agency or institution. In the scope of the organization, effectiveness describes the level of success in achieving goals through optimal use of resources. One of the factors that plays a role in supporting the effectiveness of work in the office environment is the layout of the office space, which is the arrangement of work areas designed to increase the comfort and efficiency of employee activities. Good workspace design can increase productivity, morale, and employee psychological comfort. Research by (De Been & Beijer, 2014) indicates that office layout types have a significant impact on job satisfaction and perceived support for productivity. Individual or shared offices tend to better support concentration and privacy compared to open-plan offices. Meanwhile, (Kim & de Dear, 2013) found that although open-plan offices are designed to enhance communication, the benefits are often outweighed by the drawbacks of increased noise and reduced privacy. These findings highlight the importance of balancing the need for communication and privacy in workspace design to support employee productivity and well-being.

Various studies have highlighted the advantages and disadvantages of both types of office design. A study by Bernstein and Turban (Bernstein & Turban, 2018), for example, showed that face-to-face interactions actually decreased by up to 70% after companies switched to an open office design, as employees preferred to maintain privacy rather than having face-to-face conversations. In addition, noise and visual disturbances in open spaces are also known to reduce concentration and job satisfaction. In contrast, a closed office space can increase employee privacy and concentration, but it can reduce the intensity of communication and interaction between colleagues.

In this case, it is very important to understand that the selection of workspace design cannot be done carelessly. Factors such as productivity, job satisfaction, physical and psychological comfort, and the characteristics of the work culture in Indonesia need to be considered. Although several international studies have explored the influence of office layout on employee outcomes, such as those conducted by (Kim & de Dear, 2013) and (Bernstein & Turban, 2018), research that focuses specifically on the Indonesian context remains limited. Local studies, including Santosa *et al.*, (2022) who examined office design in a government agency, and Leuhery *et al.*, (2024) who analyzed organizational culture in a private company, provide valuable insights but tend to generalize cultural elements without exploring how specific features of Indonesian work culture influence spatial preferences. In particular, there is still a lack of research that investigates how office design interacts with hierarchical structures and collective norms in workplaces, especially in multinational or culturally diverse corporate environments in Indonesia.

The novelty of this study lies in the comparative analysis of open and closed office spaces in the context of work culture in Indonesia. The work culture in Indonesia is characterized by high power distance and strong collectivist values, which significantly influence interpersonal relationships and workplace dynamics. Employees often prioritize group harmony and respect for authority over individual autonomy. As a result, open-plan offices, which promote casual interaction, may clash with hierarchical communication norms or the need for task-oriented privacy. Conversely, closed office layouts may better support hierarchical structures but risk reducing collaboration. These cultural characteristics must therefore be considered when evaluating the effectiveness of workspace designs in the Indonesian context. Previous studies have highlighted the significant impact of organizational culture on employees, which is still rarely studied in depth. Therefore, this study raises the question: *"How does the effectiveness of open and closed office spaces compare in increasing employee productivity and well-being?"* Based on the hypothesis that office spatial design plays a significant role in increasing work effectiveness, this article was compiled with the aim of providing recommendations for optimal workspace design, referring to empirical findings in the field.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Effectiveness is an important concept in an organization that is related to achieving goals to the maximum. According to T. Hani Handoko in (Krisnandi, Efendi, & Sugiono, 2019) effectiveness focuses on choosing the right things (doing the right things), while efficiency focuses more on how to do things right. In the company environment, effectiveness plays a big role in determining whether an organization succeeds in achieving the goals that have been set through employee performance.

Ni Luh, *et al*. (in Sutriani & Hamdiah, 2022, p. 107) provide a more comprehensive view by stating that effectiveness refers to the ability of an organization to complete its main tasks within a set period of time, while maximizing the use of existing resources. T. Hani Handoko in (Anggraeni & Yuniarsih, 2017) also explained that effectiveness includes the ability to choose the most appropriate goal or method to achieve the desired result. According to Sedarmayanti in (Anggraeni & Yuniarsih, 2017) stated that several factors that can be used to assess the effectiveness of employee work include the quality of work, quantity of work, and working time. In addition, the design and condition of the workspace also play an important role in supporting work effectiveness, where a good office layout can increase employee productivity.

Office layout refers to the arrangement of workspaces designed to support employee mobility, interaction, and performance. Penn, *et al*. (in Anggraeni & Yuniarsih, 2017, p. 107) states that workspace settings affect the way employees interact and move in the office environment. Open spaces tend to encourage more interaction between employees, while closed spaces provide more privacy but can limit direct interaction. Tisnaadmidjaja (in Anggraeni & Yuniarsih, 2017, p. 107) explained that space is a physical area where humans carry out their activities, while spatial planning is the process of planning and regulating the use of space to achieve a good quality of life. Office layout has an important role in creating an environment that supports both work effectiveness and comfort.

Sedarmayanti (in Anggraeni & Yuniarsih, 2017, p. 107) stated that office layout involves arranging office equipment to build an atmosphere that facilitates smooth and comfortable work. A good space arrangement makes it easy for employees to move between rooms smoothly, which in turn supports workflow efficiency. Good spatial planning, whether open or closed, has a direct influence on employee productivity and

the achievement of organizational goals.

Productivity

Work productivity is an important indicator that reflects the extent to which individuals are able to produce maximum output by utilizing available resources efficiently. This concept emphasizes the proportional relationship between inputs, such as labor, time, and costs, and the results achieved, so that it can be used as a measure of effectiveness and efficiency in the work process (Baiti *et al.*, 2020). One of the key factors that influence employee productivity is the work environment and the company's strategic direction. To develop a company strategy that aligns with the organization's objectives, strategists must first identify both the opportunities and risks present in the company's work environment. According to Lestary & Chaniago in (Abdilah Kurniawan, 2020). The work environment influences employee morale, which in turn can enhance productivity. Additionally, the work environment is an integral part of corporate culture, defined as a system of values shared among all employees (Efawati, 2020). Widodo & Silitonga in (Abdilah Kurniawan, 2020) these values are not only understood but also embraced by all levels of the organization as the foundation for its operations.

According to Dahlan in (Baiti *et al.*, 2020), productivity reflects the comparison between the contribution of labor in a certain period of time and the results achieved. In other words, labor productivity describes the effectiveness of employees in producing products or services within a certain period of time, according to predetermined standards.

Wibowo in (Baiti *et al.*, 2020) added that work productivity shows the results of individual or group work, both in the form of goods and services, which reflects the balance between input and output, and reflects efficiency in the implementation of tasks. Factors that affect productivity, according to Handoko in (Baiti *et al.*, 2020) include various aspects, such as: education level, job skills, discipline in work, work motivation, health and nutrition, income, social security, working environment, and climate. industrial relations, use of technology, work facilities and infrastructure, management system, and opportunities to excel.

According to Sutrisno in (Baiti *et al.*, 2020), work productivity can be understood as a comparison between the output produced and the amount of labor used in the production process of goods or services. To assess the level of productivity of an employee, several indicators can be used as a reference, including:
Abilities, the level of expertise and skill of the employee in completing his or her duties professionally; Improvement of Results Commitment to continuously improve and improve the results of the work achieved; Work Spirit Internal passion and drive that drives individuals to improve performance and deliver better results day by day; Self-development efforts made by employees to continue learning and expanding their abilities to improve work performance; Work Quality Focus on improving the quality of work results to provide more value for the company; Efficiency Refers to the balance between the amount of resources utilized and the output generated during the execution of a job; By paying attention to these factors and indicators, organizations can evaluate employee productivity levels and pursue strategies to improve performance sustainably.

Work Effectiveness

Work effectiveness is closely related to the achievement of predetermined results. Please note that work effectiveness cannot be separated from work efficiency. Efficiency itself includes consideration of cost, effort, quality, and thoughts expended in the work process.

Therefore, work effectiveness can also be interpreted as a utility that emphasizes the achievement of goals, even if the sacrifices made are not always the main focus.

Work effectiveness reflects the ability of an individual or group to set the right goals and complete the work according to the planned time. This means that the good or bad implementation of a task is determined by the accuracy in achieving the target that has been set from the beginning. According to Judge and Ferris in (Febrian Valentino & Widwi Handari Adji, 2023), work effectiveness is a person's ability to achieve work results without taking into account the aspects of effort, time, cost, and other resources used.

Hackman and Oldham in (Valentino & Adji, 2023) state that work effectiveness can be seen from the extent to which a person completes tasks according to the specified standards. Some of the factors that affect it include the quality and quantity of work, the speed of completing tasks, and the ability to meet organizational expectations.

Indicators of employee work effectiveness include punctuality in implementing schedules, achieving work targets in accordance with targets, productivity, quality of work results, and contribution to organizational development. Performance, as a crucial aspect of work effectiveness, is influenced by two main factors: motivation and individual ability. To complete a task or job effectively, an individual must possess a certain level of readiness and competence. However, readiness and skills alone are insufficient without a clear understanding of what needs to be done and how to carry out the task. Valentino & Adji (2023) defines work effectiveness as the ability of individuals to complete tasks so as to enable the achievement of desired results. Meanwhile, Rahman in (Valentino & Adji, 2023) defines work effectiveness as the extent to which the planned goals can be achieved.

According to office administration, effectiveness comes from the word "effective" which means there is an effect felt in a certain task. So effectiveness can be defined as a tool that helps people achieve a predetermined goal. Thus, work effectiveness reflects the level of success of an organization or individual in achieving predetermined results, which ultimately becomes an indicator of efficiency in the implementation of organizational activities as a whole.

Previous Research on Office Space Types and Their Impact

In addition to the support by the theory that has been presented above, the author also refers to several previous studies related to office layout, work environment, quality of human resources and office facilities on performance. Several previous studies have shown that workspace layout plays an important role in supporting employee performance. Yusen (2014), for example, stated that elements such as table layout, air ventilation, lighting, and movement space can have a major impact on work performance, and he even found that the effect reached more than 50%.

Another study by Soetiksno *et al.*, (2023) conducted at the Ambon City Bappeda also confirmed the same thing. They examined how factors such as spacing between desks, room color, and air ventilation can affect employee work effectiveness. As a result, the layout of the workspace does have a positive and significant contribution. In line with that, Ardhya (2014) also highlights that things like lighting, noise, and furniture placement can support or hinder work productivity. His findings show that a good room layout can improve performance by almost 60%.

In addition to the physical aspect, Purbandini & Ninghardjanti (2025) added another dimension, namely work facilities such as office equipment, chairs, and supporting technology. They concluded that adequate layouts and facilities can complement each other in supporting performance. Then there is Himma (2020) which

focuses more on the comfort of the workspace, starting from room temperature to noise level. He found that if all aspects of the work environment were taken into account simultaneously, then the effect on performance was also quite strong.

Related To This Research

When compared to previous studies that tended to discuss the work environment in terms of physical comfort or completeness of facilities, this study takes a slightly different approach. The main focus is on the comparison between open office space and closed office space, and how each type of space affects the way employees work, focus levels, and communication patterns. In other words, this study tries to add a new perspective that is not only about the physical comfort of the workspace, but also the social and psychological functions of office layouts, which have not been explored much in previous research.

Research Thinking Framework

The work effectiveness of employees is influenced by various factors, one of which is the design of the office layout. A good office layout will support comfort, communication, and work productivity. The two commonly used office space models are open office space and closed office space; each has advantages and disadvantages. Open office spaces allow for quick interaction and communication between employees, as well as facilitate collaborative work. However, these models also run the risk of causing noise and a lack of privacy, as shown by the research of Bernstein & Turban (Bernstein & Turban, 2018). In contrast, closed office spaces tend to provide a calm work atmosphere, support concentration, and protect important information, although they can potentially limit social interaction and the spontaneity of teamwork.

This study uses an observation and interview approach in Office X, which applies both types of workspaces. Findings in the field show that open office spaces are more effective in supporting fast communication and daily work efficiency, while closed spaces are more suitable for strategic discussions and high privacy. The findings show that the effectiveness of office space is highly dependent on the type of work activity, the need for concentration or collaboration, and the overall state of the organization.

Based on the theory of the work environment and previous research, a framework can be developed that the selection of office space design, both open and closed, must consider the suitability of the work functions carried out. Therefore, it is important to compare the effectiveness of the two in the context of work in Office X, to find out which space model is more supportive of employee performance and work comfort.

RESEARCH METHOD

In this study, a qualitative approach was used with direct observation methods and in-depth interviews to obtain information related to the effectiveness of open and closed office spaces in Office X. This study employed a qualitative research design to explore employees' perceptions and experiences regarding the effectiveness of open and closed office spaces in enhancing productivity and well-being. A qualitative approach was chosen because it allows for an in-depth understanding of complex social phenomena within their natural contexts, focusing on the meanings individuals assign to their experiences (Creswell, 2015).

Data were collected through direct observations and semi-structured interviews with employees from Office X. These methods facilitated the gathering of rich, detailed information about participants' subjective experiences and perceptions. Thematic analysis

was utilized to identify and interpret patterns within the data, providing insights into how different office layouts influence employee productivity and well-being. The main purpose of this method is to explore the perception and experience of employees directly regarding comfort, productivity, and social interaction in both types of office spaces.

The research location was carried out in Office X, which has two types of workspaces, namely open office areas and closed offices. This study took subjects from employees who worked in both types of spaces based on the consideration that they had at least 6 months of relevant experience in their respective office spaces. The participants included Tinto Arief, who serves as the Marketing Manager; Irma Fitriyani, the Head of General Affairs; and Handika Putra Wijaya, who holds the position of Assistant Manager. These individuals were selected to ensure a variety of perspectives from different roles and organizational functions, thereby enriching the insights into how spatial design influences employee productivity and well-being.

Observations are carried out to record the physical condition of the workspace, the dynamics of interaction between employees, and the daily work atmosphere. The results of observations are recorded systematically in the observation notebook. Meanwhile, interviews are conducted in a semi-structured manner with pre-arranged question guidelines, covering topics such as comfort, work interruptions, privacy, and communication effectiveness.

RESEARCH RESULTS

Arrangement Office space arrangement is one of the important elements in work environment management that has a significant impact on employee effectiveness and performance. This study aims to compare the effectiveness of open office space and closed office space in Office X with observational and interview approaches as the primary method. The findings in the field are then analyzed comparatively with the results of previous research to obtain a more comprehensive understanding.

In general, the open office space in Office X functions as a place for daily interaction between staff and a means of communication with clients. The main characteristic of this space is the lack of physical partitions, which allows communication to take place faster and more openly. Despite a certain level of noise, most employees do not consider it a significant nuisance. This is because the source of noise comes from productive work activities, such as project discussions or conversations with clients. In this context, open spaces are considered more effective in supporting collaboration and coordination between teams. In addition, we also found that space selection preferences are strongly influenced by the work character and work style of each staff. Employees who require intense interaction and brainstorming tend to feel more comfortable in open spaces, while those who need focus and calmness prefer closed spaces. This shows that the diversity of space types needs to be accommodated to support a variety of different work needs.

In contrast, the closed office space in Office X is intended for activities that are strategic and require a high level of privacy, such as meetings with managers, confidential internal discussions, or meetings with external parties. These spaces are generally occupied by certain divisions that have an individual and sensitive working character, and are located in separate hallways with a more private spatial arrangement. In terms of privacy, closed office spaces have proven to be more ideal, especially to maintain the confidentiality of information and support strategic conversations that require a calm atmosphere and protection from external interference. From a psychological point of view, a closed space provides a sense of security and privacy that not only maintains

confidentiality, but also provides emotional comfort for employees who prioritize tranquility and protection from external distractions. This condition is important to support optimal performance on tasks that require full attention and high sensitivity. The main advantage of a closed office space is that it has a calmer atmosphere and supports work concentration. This environment with minimal distractions is considered more effective in maintaining information confidentiality, increasing focus, and providing psychological comfort for employees who work independently.

From the results of our observations, we also found that closed spaces also have temperatures that tend to be colder because the air conditioning system is directly directed, and creates a sense of security and exclusivity. This is especially helpful for tasks that require high concentration or handling of important data. One of the drawbacks found is the relatively narrow size of the room and unstable thermal conditions such as the room can feel too cold when it is inhabited by only one person, but becomes hot when it is full. Constant exposure to air conditioning also has the potential to cause physical effects such as dry skin. However, it is important for management to manage the air conditioning and ventilation systems so that they can adapt to the number of occupants and activities that take place, so that the room temperature remains stable and comfortable. Proper temperature regulation can reduce the risk of physical discomfort such as dry skin or fatigue from extreme temperatures.

In terms of physical comfort, both open and closed spaces support a healthy working environment, especially since they are both equipped with natural lighting and a good ventilation system. This shows that elements such as lighting and air circulation are not the main differentiators between the two types of spaces, as they can be optimized through proper architectural design. We also observed that furniture design and space layout play an important role in supporting work ergonomics. The use of ergonomic chairs and desks in both types of rooms helps to reduce the risk of muscle tension and physical fatigue, so employees can work longer hours with maintained productivity. However, for coordination and teamwork needs, open office spaces show significant advantages. Interactions between employees can take place spontaneously and efficiently without the need to change spaces, which of course saves time and speeds up the flow of communication.

In contrast, closed spaces tend to limit in-person interaction and often require additional spaces such as meeting rooms to support collaboration, making them less flexible in situations that demand quick discussions. This difference in work atmosphere contributes directly to work effectiveness. Enclosed spaces support focus and concentration, perfect for jobs that demand high precision and minimal distractions. Meanwhile, open spaces create a dynamic and communicative atmosphere, perfect for teams that require a lot of interaction. In the future, the development of a more flexible workspace concept, such as the presence of a multifunctional space or a small collaboration area in a closed space, can be a solution to overcome the limitations of closed spaces that tend to be less dynamic. This approach allows for a combination of the advantages of open and closed spaces in one more adaptive work area.

DISCUSSION

The results of this study show that the office layout in Office X plays an important role in supporting the effectiveness and performance of employees, both through open and closed spaces. When compared to the results of previous research, the findings in Office X show strong relevance. Previous research noted that office layout has a significant effect on employee performance, with a contribution of up to 57.1%. On the other hand,

research by Bernstein & Turban (2018) noted that the extreme application of open space can reduce face-to-face communication by up to 70%, in line with the Environmental Stress theory which states that excessive environmental stimuli can interfere with cognition.

These findings are also consistent with previous research that emphasized the importance of the physical aspects of workspaces, as reported by Yusen (2014) and Soetiksno *et al.*, (2023). They state that ventilation, lighting, and spacing between desks significantly affect work comfort and productivity. In contrast, enclosed spaces provide much-needed privacy and tranquility for tasks that are strategic and require high focus. These findings are in line with research by Pejtersen *et al.* in (Seddigh, Berntson, Danielson, & Westerlund, 2014) which showed that enclosed spaces can reduce stress levels and improve employee concentration. However, closed spaces also have limitations in terms of flexibility and spontaneity of collaboration, so supporting facilities such as meeting rooms are needed, which are recognized as important by Ardhya (2014) and Purbandini & Ninghardjanti (2025). This shows that no single office layout model can perfectly meet the needs of all types of work and employee characteristics. Therefore, a hybrid approach or activity-based work system that combines open and closed spaces is the most effective solution. This approach allows for the adjustment of space usage according to the type of task, employee preferences, and maintains a balance between collaboration and individual work.

More than just the physical and functional aspects, this study emphasizes the importance of considering psychological and emotional factors in workspace design. The psychological comfort obtained from private and communicative spaces makes a significant contribution to employee job satisfaction and productivity, as affirmed by Himma (2020). This enriches the understanding that workspace design should be holistic and inclusive, integrating technical and non-technical aspects that support the mental well-being and performance of employees. Office layout planning must be carried out comprehensively and contextually, adjusting to the characteristics of the organization and its work needs. The effectiveness of a layout cannot be assessed individually, but must be tailored to the specific conditions of each organization to support continued success.

CONCLUSIONS

Based on the results of research conducted through observations and interviews with employees in Office X, it can be concluded that office layout has a strategic role in supporting work effectiveness. Open office spaces show high effectiveness in terms of ease of coordination, direct communication between employees, and time efficiency in carrying out collective tasks. However, these spaces have limitations in terms of privacy and potential noise disturbances that can hinder concentration on certain work.

On the other hand, enclosed office spaces are more optimal for individual and strategic work, especially those that require a high level of privacy. A calm and controlled environment in an enclosed space supports increased focus, psychological comfort, and the execution of secret tasks. However, limited in-person interaction and cross-team communication barriers are a challenge in the use of exclusively closed spaces.

These findings reinforce the importance of a hybrid approach in designing office layouts, which is to proportionally combine the functions of open and closed spaces based on the characteristics of the work. Adaptive workspace design not only supports the achievement of productivity, but also pays attention to the well-being and psychological aspects of employees. Therefore, the layout of the office should be strategically designed,

taking into account the organizational context, work culture, and overall preferences and needs of employees.

REFERENCES

Abdilah Kurniawan, L. (2020). Investigasi Pengaruh Lingkungan Kerja pada Produktivitas Kerja Karyawan Investigation of The Influence of Working Environment on Employee's Work Productivity. *International Journal Administration, Business and Organization (IJABO)* |, *1*(3), 47–53. https://ijabo.a3i.or.id

Ambia. (2018). 339-662-1-Sm. *Pengaruh Efektivitas Kerja Pegawai Terhadap Kualitas Pelayanan Publik Di Kelurahan Sidorame Barat I Kecamatan Medan Perjuangan*, *1*, 214–262.

Anggraeni, W., & Yuniarsih, T. (2017). Dampak Tata Ruang Kantor Terhadap Efektivitas Kerja Pegawai Dinas Pendidikan Kota Bandung. *Jurnal Pendidikan Manajemen Perkantoran*. https://doi.org/10.17509/jpm.v2i2.8098

Apriyanto, W., Achmad Fauzi, Hasanuddin, H., Yonathan Langi, Yoga adrian Aldiyansyah, & Sendy wijaya. (2023). Pengaruh Budaya Organisasi dan Desain Kerja Terhadap Kinerja Karyawan (Artikel Manajemen Kinerja). *Jurnal Ilmu Multidisplin*, *1*(4), 846–853. https://doi.org/10.38035/jim.v1i4.140

Ardhya, R. (2014). Pengaruh Tata Ruang Kantor Terhadap Kinerja Karyawan PT . Tempo Group Cabang Group Cabang Surabaya 2. *Administrasiperkantoran, Prodi Pendidikan*.

Aryadi, T. (2020). Analisis Efektifitas Kerja Pegawai. In *CV. Elsi Pro*.

Baiti, K. N., Djumali, D., & Kustiyah, E. (2020). Employee Productivity Viewed from Motivation, Work Discipline, and Environment at PT. Iskandar Indah Printing Textile Surakarta. *Jurnal Ilmiah Edunomika*, *4*(01), 69–87.

Bernstein, E. S., & Turban, S. (2018). The impact of the 'open' workspace on human collaboration. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, *373*(1753). https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2017.0239

Creswell, J. W. (2015). Note de lecture : Qualitative inquiry and research design . Choosing among five approaches (3 e éd .). London : Sage . *Research Gate*, *1*(November), 4.

De Been, I., & Beijer, M. (2014). The influence of office type on satisfaction and perceived productivity support. *Journal of Facilities Management*, *12*(2), 142–157. https://doi.org/10.1108/JFM-02-2013-0011

Efawati, Y. (2020). The influence of working conditions, workability and leadership on employee performance. *International Journal Administration, Business & Organization*, *1*(3), 8-15. https://doi.org/10.61242/ijabo.20.40

Febrian Valentino, & Widwi Handari Adji. (2023). Pengaruh Beban Kerja Terhadap Efektivitas Kerja Karyawan Di Dinas Perdagangan Kota Bandung. *E-Bisnis : Jurnal Ilmiah Ekonomi Dan Bisnis*, *16*(2), 376–380. https://doi.org/10.51903/e-bisnis.v16i2.1332

Haris, R. M., & Lestariningsih, M. (2024). Analisis Tata Ruang, Lingkungan Kerja Fisik, Dan Fasilitas Kantor Terhadap Kinerja Karyawan. *Jurnal Ilmiah Manajemen Dan Bisnis (JIMBis)*, *3*(2), 154–173. https://doi.org/10.24034/jimbis.v3i2.6682

Himma, O. M. (2020). *Analisis pengaruh faktor lingkungan kerja dan budaya organisasi terhadap kinerja karyawan*. *14*.

HOK. (2023, Januari 09). *9 Workplace Design Trends for 2023*. Retrieved from hok.com: https://www.hok.com/news/2023-01/9-workplace-design-trends-for-2023/

Indayani, L. (2018). Pengantar Manajemen. In *Pengantar Manajemen*. https://doi.org/10.21070/2018/978-602-5914-18-8

Kim, J., & de Dear, R. (2013). Workspace satisfaction: The privacy-communication trade-off inopen-plan offices. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, *36*, 18–26. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvp.2013.06.007

Krisnandi, H., Efendi, S., & Sugiono, E. (2019). *Pengantar Manejemen*. Jakarta Selatan: LPU-UNAS.

Leesman. (2020). *The world's best workplaces 2019: Unpacking lessons from the top*. 58.

Leuhery, F., Padang, N. S., Puspitasari, D., & Judijanto, L. (2024). *Workplace Diversity and Inclusion : Strategies for Effective Implementation and Benefits to Organizational Culture*. *5*(4), 4647–4653.

Muharam, D. A., & Nurdin, B. (2020). Evaluasi Pelatihan, Motivasi, Insentif dan Pengaruhnya pada Kinerja Karyawan (Training Evaluation, Motivation, Insentive, and its Influence on Employee Performance). *International Journal Administration, Business and Organization (IJABO)* |, *1*(1), 32–40. https://ijabo.a3i.or.id

Purbandini, P., & Ninghardjanti, P. (2025). *Pengaruh tata ruang kantor dan fasilitas kantor terhadap kinerja pegawai Badan Kepegawaian dan Pengembangan Sumber Daya Manusia (BKPSDM) Kota*

Sura karta Pendahuluan. 9(1), 86–93.

Putri P, M. M. (2019). *Pengaruh Tata Ruang Kantor, Lingkungan Kerja, Kualitas Sumber Daya Manusia Dengan Fasilitas Kantor Sebagai Variabel Moderating Terhadap Kinerja Pegawai Di Dinas Komunikasi Dan Informatika Provinsi Jawa Tengah*. 1–56.

Santosa, H. D., Manulang, L., & Putri, S. K. (2022). Integrating Diversity and Inclusion in Organizational Culture: A Holistic Approach to People Management. *Jurnal Office*, *8*(2), 385. https://doi.org/10.26858/jo.v8i2.45363

Satyagraha, J., Munir, M., Manajemen, P. S., Ekonomi, F., Sunan, U., Surabaya, G., Organisasi, K., & Kerja, E. (2024). *Organisasi terhadap efektivitas kerja karyawan*. *06*(02), 231–248.

Soetiksno, A., Wijaya, F., & Akasian, I. (2023). Pengaruh Tata Ruang Kantor Terhadap Kinerja Pegawai Pada Kantor Bappeda Litbang Kota Ambon. *Jurnal Administrasi Terapan*, *2*(2), 394–406.

Sutriani, & Hamdiah. (2022). Analisis Efektivitas Kerja dan Tata Ruang. *Jurnal Visioner & Strategis*, *11*(1), 55–59.

Yusen, S. I. S. (2014). Pengaruh Tata Ruang Kantor Terhadap Kinerja Karyawan Bagian Tata Usaha di SMPN 1 Lamongan. *Jurnal Pendidikan Administrasi Perkantoran*, *2*, 1–15. https://jurnalmahasiswa.unesa.ac.id/index.php/jpap/article/view/9324