takuana
JURNAL PENDIDIKAN, SAINS, DAN HUMANIORA

e-ISSN: 2829-4831 | p-ISSN: 2829-4955

Vol. 5 No. 3, October-December 2026
Pages 2595-2604

Physical and Non-Physical Work Environments and Employee Performance at Pattimura University: A Documentary Analysis of the PKU Bureau

Willem Suila*, Aminah Bahasoan, Hendry Selanno

Master of Public Administration, Pattimura University, Ambon, Indonesia

* willemsuila@gmail.com (Primary Contact)

Keywords
physical work environment; non-physical work environment; employee performance; documentary analysis; university administration

Article History
Received: 2026-10-12
Accepted: 2026-11-10

ABSTRACT

This study examines the relevance of physical and non-physical work environments to administrative performance in Pattimura University's Planning, Finance and General Affairs (PKU) Bureau. Qualitative documentary analysis synthesizes two regulations, three university web sources, and 18 peer-reviewed publications. Regulation No. 24/2024 assigns the bureau eleven administrative functions; Regulation No. 6/2022 sets expectations for performance planning, feedback, and evaluation. A previous Pattimura study of 30 administrative employees reported coefficients of 0.026 for work climate and 0.819 for competence, but its cross-unit sample and model-fit limitations preclude bureau-specific inference. The synthesis identifies three plausible interactions: alignment of facilities with task allocation, coordination of digital resources with supervisory feedback, and joint management of interruptions and work demands. These propositions inform verifiable measures of service timeliness, error correction, and employee support. No workplace conditions or performance effects were measured in the PKU Bureau. The contribution is a transparent framework for subsequent institutional audits and empirical testing.

Copyright © 2026, Suila et al.
Published by MAN 4 Kota Pekanbaru
DOI: 10.56113/takuana.v5i3.754

1. INTRODUCTION

Public university administrative performance requires accurate, timely, and accountable services. Planning, finance, staffing, archiving, and asset management depend on sound information processing and coordination. Their physical conditions—noise, workspace layout, equipment, and records storage—interact with non-physical conditions such as supervision, role clarity, trust, and professional development. Examining either domain alone can misidentify work-design issues as individual underperformance (Vischer, 2007; Parker et al., 2017).

This analysis focuses on Pattimura University's Planning, Finance and General Affairs Bureau (Biro Perencanaan, Keuangan, dan Umum; PKU Bureau) in Ambon. Ministerial

BY-NC-SA
This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-SA 4.0 International License

Regulation No. 24/2024 assigns it planning, budgeting, financial affairs, legal services, organization, staffing, records, protocol, housekeeping, and state-asset functions (Arts. 43–47). These tasks make working conditions relevant to administrative services. The regulation documents responsibilities, not office conditions or individual performance.

Indonesia's Regulation of the Minister for Administrative and Bureaucratic Reform No. 6/2022 places employee performance management within expectations-setting, continual feedback, development, evaluation, and organizational results. It emphasizes both work results and work behavior as well as collaboration between managers and employees (Ministry of Administrative and Bureaucratic Reform, 2022). Consequently, performance should not be reduced to employee attendance or self-reported satisfaction. Document processing time, error rates, completion of agreed outputs, service quality, and evidence of feedback provide more relevant administrative indicators were recorded consistently.

Workplace studies report differing effects. De Croon et al. (2005) and James et al. (2021) identify privacy and other concerns in some open-office settings, but do not describe PKU offices. Allen et al. (2016) observed cognitive differences under experimentally varied indoor-air conditions. Job demands–resources theory links pressures and resources to functioning (Demerouti et al., 2001; Bakker & Demerouti, 2017), while psychological safety concerns team learning and speaking up (Edmondson, 1999). These studies identify possible mechanisms, not PKU findings.

Indonesian university findings also vary. Sagita (2016) reported links between competence, climate, and performance at the University of Riau; Nasrullah et al. (2019) found no individually significant climate effect in their regression. Sakalessy et al. (2025) reported a smaller direct climate than competence coefficient among 30 Pattimura administrative respondents. Distinct samples and models preclude pooling these estimates. Reviews distinguishing satisfaction from performance further caution against equating favorable attitudes with measured outputs (Judge et al., 2001).

The study addresses two questions: (1) What does accessible secondary evidence establish about the institutional tasks and work-environment dimensions relevant to performance in the PKU Bureau? (2) Which physical, non-physical, and performance indicators require bureau-level verification before claims about relationships or effects are warranted? The contribution is a context-specific documentary appraisal that separates verified institutional facts, empirical findings from other populations, and recommendations requiring additional evidence. It does not attempt to reproduce the proposed survey-based causal study without its survey data.

2. METHODS

This article uses a qualitative secondary-data design combining documentary analysis with a targeted, non-systematic narrative synthesis. The PKU Bureau at Pattimura University is the institutional unit of interest; observational sources are public regulations, university web publications, and previously published studies. No staff were recruited, and no questionnaires, interviews, workplace inspections, or bureau performance data were generated. The initial source review was recorded as completed on 12 October 2026; institutional URLs and relevant citation details were rechecked on 4 November 2026.

The institutional corpus comprises two identifiable regulations and three named Pattimura University pages: Ministerial Regulation No. 24/2024 on the university's organization (Arts. 43–47); Ministerial Regulation No. 6/2022 on civil-service performance management; the university's undated leadership directory, *'Pimpinan Universitas Pattimura'* (Pattimura University, n.d.-b); the 5 December 2025 report, *'Universitas Pattimura Gelar Sosialisasi Program Jaminan Kesehatan bagi ASN dan Tenaga Kependidikan'* (Pattimura University, 2025); and the undated *'Layanan Aspirasi – WASPADA' reporting interface* (Pattimura University, n.d.-a). Full links appear in the references; the first two regulations are accessible through the government legal-document portal. These web pages respectively identify bureau leadership, report a health-benefits information event, and display a complaint channel. They do not measure employee experience or service effectiveness. Sakalessy et al. (2025) was analyzed as previously published empirical evidence, not as PKU-specific field data.

The final, purposively assembled scholarly corpus includes 18 peer-reviewed publications listed in the references. Studies were retained for their relevance to one or more of three areas: (i) physical office conditions and work outcomes; (ii) psychosocial resources, supervision, and organizational behavior; and (iii) competence, employee attitudes, and performance. Eligibility required identifiable authorship, traceable journal metadata (including a DOI where available), and an empirical or conceptual contribution to these areas. The cited publisher and DOI pages permit bibliographic checks; official legal and university websites identify the documentary sources. The original search history does not record the bibliographic databases queried, total records initially retrieved, duplicates, or screening exclusions. Those counts cannot be reconstructed from the reference list, and no systematic database coverage is claimed. This is a bounded narrative synthesis rather than a systematic review or meta-analysis; it cannot estimate the prevalence of PKU workplace problems or pooled effects.

Table 1. Public documentary sources and evidentiary limits

Secondary source	Directly verifiable content	What it cannot establish
Regulation No. 24/2024, Arts. 43–47	PKU Bureau mandate; eleven functions; general-affairs and facilities responsibilities	Condition of individual workspaces or staff-level performance
Regulation No. 6/2022	Expectations, feedback, evaluation, work results and behavior in ASN performance management	Compliance or SKP results at the bureau
Sakalessy et al. (2025), n = 30	Published coefficients: climate → performance 0.026; competence → performance 0.819	A PKU-only effect; statistically reliable causal inference
Pattimura leadership page (n.d.-b) and health-benefits news (5 Dec 2025)	'Pimpinan Universitas Pattimura': bureau leadership; health-benefits news: a reported event and bureau-head remarks	Employee health outcomes, participation quality, or bureau-wide workplace conditions
'Layanan Aspirasi – WASPADA' (n.d.-a)	PKU appears in the public reporting interface's destination list	Bureau complaint totals, handling time, or outcome quality

Source: Authors' extraction from two official regulations, the three named Pattimura University web pages, and Sakalessy et al. (2025). Institutional references and URLs are listed in full below; source details rechecked 4 November 2026. Previously reported coefficients are quoted without inferring statistical significance from their size. No PKU-specific employee outcomes, facilities conditions, or compliance results were found in the documentary corpus. Regulations and public communications describe obligations or activities, not verified staff performance.

Evidence was extracted in three fields: what a source directly documents, its population and measurements, and the legitimate limits of applying it to PKU tasks. The 18 scholarly sources were compared by physical-setting, psychosocial, and performance constructs, while the two regulations and three public university pages were treated as institutional evidence. Convergence and differences were then organized into task–resource alignment, information–feedback coordination, and demand–support interaction. Institutional records substantiate mandates and the existence of public channels; comparative studies suggest mechanisms, not observed bureau outcomes. Tables 1 distinguish documented facts from proposed audit indicators.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1. Institutional demands and measurable performance

The first directly supported finding is institutional, not behavioral: the PKU Bureau holds a broad cross-functional mandate. Articles 43–44 of Regulation No. 24/2024 list eleven functions from program planning and budget monitoring to financial administration, personnel affairs, archives, housekeeping, protocol, and management of state assets. Articles 45–47 identify its general-affairs structure and responsibility for facilities and infrastructure. The breadth of this legal assignment means that performance is unlikely to be represented adequately by one generic productivity score. Financial accuracy and reporting timeliness differ materially from records retrieval, asset documentation, or internal service response.

Tasks have different resource needs. Budgeting requires dependable systems, records, concentration, and deadline coordination; archives demand retrievable information and suitable storage; asset services combine physical verification and interunit communication. These needs follow from formal functions, but the source set contains no authenticated PKU records of equipment, floor space, ventilation, workload, staffing, or individual work outputs. Environmental adequacy remains unmeasured.

Regulation No. 6/2022 provides a basis for subsequent measurement through agreed targets and supervisor feedback. Each indicator should correspond to a defined output and responsible role. Potential measures include on-time planning submissions, finance files returned for correction, response times, archive retrieval times, and closure of asset requests. These are future measures, not observed PKU results.

3.2. Physical workplace conditions: evidence and transferability

The physical domain concerns how the built and technological setting enables or interrupts administrative work. Vischer (2007) conceptualizes office characteristics as potential contributors to workspace stress. De Croon et al. (2005), reviewing 49 relevant studies, found strong evidence that open workplaces can reduce privacy and job satisfaction, while James et al. (2021) identified 31 comparative studies and reported more unfavorable outcomes across several measures in open-plan arrangements. Kim and de Dear (2013) further describe the trade-off between informal interaction and noise or loss of privacy. These findings justify assessing concentration needs for finance, budgeting, personnel, and confidential documents; they do not prove that PKU employees face such interruptions.

Indoor environmental quality requires separate consideration. In a controlled-exposure study, Allen et al. (2016) associated manipulated ventilation and indoor air conditions with office-worker cognitive scores. Physical resources should consequently not be understood simply as office furniture. A future bureau-level review could inspect ventilation, thermal comfort, lighting, electrical reliability, furniture ergonomics, noise, access to secure records, computer reliability, and usable digital applications. The importance of each indicator would depend on task type. For instance, privacy may have particular value when handling personal staff information or financial records, whereas meeting-room access may support coordinated planning.

A practical documentary weakness is the absence of a publicly retrieved facilities audit linked to the PKU Bureau's workload or performance records. The existence of a formally assigned facilities-management function is not evidence that facilities are deficient; equally, an organizational chart does not demonstrate that equipment is fit for purpose. Any administrative recommendation to change workspace allocation, maintain equipment, or improve ergonomics should be preceded by site-specific measurement and employee task analysis.

3.3. Non-physical environment: support, communication and competence

Non-physical working conditions concern management practices and interpersonal processes that shape how employees perform their duties. The job demands–resources literature distinguishes work pressures from resources that enable employees to cope, stay engaged, and develop (Demerouti et al., 2001; Bakker & Demerouti, 2017). In university administration, deadlines, rule changes, and simultaneous requests are plausible job demands; clear instructions, supervisory feedback, autonomy within authority, peer assistance, and access to training are potential resources. The fact that these mechanisms are well studied does not establish their distribution inside PKU.

Communication is also relevant: psychological safety supports team learning (Edmondson, 1999), organizational climate differs from deeper culture (Schneider et al., 2013), and autonomy, competence, and relatedness can affect motivation (Deci et al., 2017). These perspectives support examining whether staff can flag errors, clarify procedures, and obtain feedback. Only actual staff evidence or documented processes could establish these conditions at PKU.

National performance rules give the non-physical dimension a specific administrative meaning. Regulation No. 6/2022 requires expectations-setting, monitoring, continuous feedback, and employee development. It therefore provides a policy basis for assessing supervisory practices without importing a purely private-sector performance model. The regulation does not establish how often PKU supervisors conduct dialogue or whether employees experience fair task allocation. Such details would need service logs, performance conversations, competence-development records, or ethically conducted staff research.

The university's undated leadership directory, 'Pimpinan Universitas Pattimura,' identifies the head of the PKU Bureau (Pattimura University, n.d.-b). Its 5 December 2025 news item on health-benefits information for ASN and education personnel quotes the bureau head (Pattimura University, 2025). The undated *'Layanan Aspirasi – WASPADA'* web interface lists PKU as a reporting destination (Pattimura University, n.d.-a). Each page has a

specific title and URL in the references. They establish an organizational listing, a reported activity, and an available reporting interface; none provides a measure of staff well-being, report-handling performance, or actual workplace conditions.

3.4. What Pattimura-specific prior research does and does not show

The closest identifiable published empirical comparison is Sakalessy et al. (2025), whose analysis involved 30 Pattimura University administrative staff selected purposively from multiple departments. The published model includes work climate, employee competence, work experience, and performance; it reports path coefficients of 0.026 for work climate to performance, 0.819 for competence to performance, 0.704 for experience to competence, and −0.015 for experience to performance. These numerical results are secondary observations extracted from that journal article, not new estimates calculated for this manuscript.

The coefficients require caution. Respondents came from several university units, not a PKU census; 'work climate' is not a separately validated measure of this article's physical and non-physical environments. The authors also reported an estimated-model SRMR of 0.155, above a commonly used desirable fit threshold. Coefficients alone cannot establish statistical significance, causality, or generalizability. The reported contrast informs future inquiry, not PKU effect sizes.

Other Indonesian university studies reinforce that caution. Sagita (2016) reported a positive role for competence and climate in University of Riau employee performance, whereas Nasrullah et al. (2019) did not find a statistically significant partial climate effect among administrative employees of an Islamic university in Banjarmasin. Divergence may reflect populations, constructs, analytic specifications, and institutional settings. It would be inappropriate to treat differences as evidence that PKU's non-physical environment has little importance. Indeed, psychosocial conditions may operate through learning, competence, engagement, or other processes rather than through a large direct regression path (Bakker & Bal, 2010; Christian et al., 2011).

3.5. Integrating physical and non-physical conditions in an evidence-based audit

Bringing the physical and non-physical evidence together yields three task-level propositions, not measured causal effects at PKU. First, resource–role alignment: functioning computers, records access, and private work areas can contribute to timely output only when tasks, authorization, and responsibilities are clear. Second, information–feedback coordination: shared systems can shorten rework when colleagues can flag errors and supervisors respond promptly; digital availability alone does not ensure coordination. Third, demand–support fit: noise, interruptions, and simultaneous deadlines may disrupt concentration, while agreed priorities, peer assistance, and supervisory discretion may moderate these pressures. Office-design evidence (Vischer, 2007; James et al., 2021), psychological-safety and job-resources research (Edmondson, 1999; Bakker & Demerouti, 2017), and integrated work-design studies (Dul & Ceylan, 2011; Parker et al., 2017) inform these propositions. Their value is to show where joint measurement should replace separate checklists.

For example, a delayed finance file could reflect a system outage coupled with uncertain approval responsibility; a missing archive could reflect storage constraints alongside an unclear handover process. Neither interaction can be inferred from the university's legal mandate alone. Table 2 converts these propositions into audit-ready measurement suggestions, indicating prospective records, collection methods, and units of analysis; all indicators await bureau-level verification.

Table 2. Proposed PKU indicators, verification sources and measurement methods

Domain / task	Verification method / proposed source	Prospective measure / source record
Physical: budgeting and finance	Desk/privacy checklist; spot noise readings; IT uptime and fault logs	On-time submissions / all due files (%); returned files / processed files (%) from workflow register
Physical: archives and asset services	Storage/access audit; timed retrieval trials; asset-system issue logs	Median retrieval minutes (request–delivery timestamps); reconciled assets / due assets (%)
Non-physical: supervision	Anonymous role-clarity and psychological-safety items; dated feedback logs	SKP target/actual review; documented feedback sessions per quarter; unresolved action items
Non-physical: team competence	Handover map; training register; brief post-training skill-use checklist	Median cross-unit handover days; error correction days from dated return and closure logs
Joint physical/social conditions	Pair incident/IT logs with task ownership and staff feedback	Median service response hours; complaints resolved / received (%); case-linked error frequency

Source: Proposed audit measures derived from Regulation No. 24/2024; Regulation No. 6/2022; Vischer (2007); Edmondson (1999); Bakker and Demerouti (2017); and Parker et al. (2017). These are illustrative definitions, not data collected at PKU.

Implementation would begin by defining each service, its unit owner, the expected completion date, and an observation period (for example, one quarter). A task and equipment checklist should be paired with dated IT fault logs, document registers, and de-identified staff feedback. Role clarity and psychological safety may be assessed through brief anonymous multi-item questionnaires, with wording pilot-tested and results reported only in aggregates; these are perceptions, not verified performance. Feedback frequency requires dated meeting records, while error-correction time comes from logged initial return and verified closure dates. On-time completion is the number of outputs finished by their agreed deadline divided by all due outputs; median turnaround should use documented timestamps. Results should be disaggregated by task before considering comparisons across employees.

The proposed integration can be examined using matched incidents: a finance file's start and finish dates, relevant system outage, designated approver, and any recorded clarification or correction. Persistent delays during system downtime would support a resource concern; delays without assigned approval authority would suggest a coordination concern; both occurring together would motivate a joint intervention. Likewise, archive retrieval time should be read alongside the storage register and documented handover responsibilities. These comparisons can identify competing explanations but would not prove causality without a stronger research design. Regulation No. 6/2022 supplies a

procedural basis for relating such evidence to role-specific goals and developmental feedback.

Audit design should protect confidentiality. Employee survey responses and SKP-related records must be accessed with authorization, separated from identifiers where possible, and reported in aggregate. Timeliness and error rates need explicit denominators and consistent periods; platform availability should be checked against actual incident logs. A staged process—baseline verification, employee consultation, targeted improvement, and repeat measurement—would permit practical evaluation while avoiding unsupported claims about PKU's present conditions.

3.6. Boundaries of the secondary-data evidence

The study has three substantive limits. Published laws and organizational documents specify expected arrangements, not implementation. Existing employee research is informative but not a bureau-specific dataset, and the closest local model contains reported fit concerns. Finally, comparative literature differs by country, office configuration, job category, and performance measure. The article consequently cannot establish the direction, statistical significance, or magnitude of the effects of physical or non-physical workplace conditions on PKU employee performance. Nor can it report prevalence of workplace discomfort, staff absence, low productivity, or inadequate facilities at the bureau.

Secondary evidence can establish formal duties, identify plausible work-environment mechanisms, and specify measurements that would distinguish resource constraints from coordination problems. It cannot provide a historical total of literature-search hits or substitute for direct PKU workplace measurements. Future research should document database searches prospectively, obtain authorization for aggregated service records, and combine task-specific environmental checks with protected staff feedback before testing statistical or causal relationships.

4. CONCLUSION

Public secondary evidence confirms that Pattimura University's PKU Bureau performs a diverse set of administrative functions for which physical workspace support and non-physical organizational conditions are analytically relevant. The 2024 institutional regulation establishes eleven functional responsibilities, while the 2022 ASN performance regulation provides a basis for linking work expectations, feedback, development, outcomes, and behavior. Existing office-design studies justify attention to privacy, air quality, equipment, and task-specific workspace conditions; organizational scholarship justifies attention to supervisory dialogue, trust, learning, job resources, and competence.

The locally published 2025 analysis found a larger competence-to-performance path coefficient than work-climate-to-performance coefficient among 30 cross-unit respondents, but the sample and model-fit concerns prevent PKU-level inference. The present synthesis instead proposes three complementary mechanisms—resource–role alignment, information–feedback coordination, and demand–support fit—to be assessed against recorded service outputs. Table 2 provides prospective measurement definitions rather than a performance score. Subsequent fieldwork is necessary to determine which

mechanisms operate at PKU and whether changes in either work-environment domain accompany improved administrative outcomes.

REFERENCES

Allen, J. G., MacNaughton, P., Satish, U., Santanam, S., Vallarino, J., & Spengler, J. D. (2016). Associations of cognitive function scores with carbon dioxide, ventilation, and volatile organic compound exposures in office workers. *Environmental Health Perspectives, 124*(6), 805–812. https://doi.org/10.1289/ehp.1510037

Bakker, A. B., & Bal, P. M. (2010). Weekly work engagement and performance: A study among starting teachers. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 83*(1), 189–206. https://doi.org/10.1348/096317909X402596

Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2017). Job demands–resources theory: Taking stock and looking forward. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 22*(3), 273–285. https://doi.org/10.1037/ocp0000056

Christian, M. S., Garza, A. S., & Slaughter, J. E. (2011). Work engagement: A quantitative review and test of its relations with task and contextual performance. *Personnel Psychology, 64*(1), 89–136. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.2010.01203.x

de Croon, E. M., Sluiter, J. K., Kuijer, P. P. F. M., & Frings-Dresen, M. H. W. (2005). The effect of office concepts on worker health and performance: A systematic review of the literature. *Ergonomics, 48*(2), 119–134. https://doi.org/10.1080/00140130512331319409

Deci, E. L., Olafsen, A. H., & Ryan, R. M. (2017). Self-determination theory in work organizations: The state of a science. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior, 4*, 19–43. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-032516-113108

Demerouti, E., Nachreiner, F., Bakker, A. B., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2001). The job demands–resources model of burnout. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 86*(3), 499–512. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.86.3.499

Dul, J., & Ceylan, C. (2011). Work environments for employee creativity. *Ergonomics, 54*(1), 12–20. https://doi.org/10.1080/00140139.2010.542833

Edmondson, A. (1999). Psychological safety and learning behavior in work teams. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 44*(2), 350–383. https://doi.org/10.2307/2666999

James, O., Delfabbro, P., & King, D. L. (2021). A comparison of psychological and work outcomes in open-plan and cellular office designs: A systematic review. *SAGE Open, 11*(1). https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244020988869

Judge, T. A., Thoresen, C. J., Bono, J. E., & Patton, G. K. (2001). The job satisfaction–job performance relationship: A qualitative and quantitative review. *Psychological Bulletin, 127*(3), 376–407. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.127.3.376

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

Ministry of Administrative and Bureaucratic Reform. (2022). *Regulation No. 6 of 2022 on the management of civil-service employee performance*. https://peraturan.bpk.go.id/Details/202232/permen-pan-rb-no-6-tahun-2022

Ministry of Education, Culture, Research and Technology. (2024). *Regulation No. 24 of 2024 on the organization and work procedures of Pattimura University*. https://peraturan.bpk.go.id/Details/294515/permendikbudriset-no-24-tahun-2024

Nasrullah, N., Sulastini, S., & Harlie, M. (2019). Pengaruh motivasi kerja dan iklim organisasi terhadap kinerja pegawai tata usaha Universitas Islam Kalimantan Muhammad Arsyad Al Banjari Banjarmasin. *At-Tadbir: Jurnal Ilmiah Manajemen, 3*(2). https://doi.org/10.31602/atd.v3i2.1937

Parker, S. K., Morgeson, F. P., & Johns, G. (2017). One hundred years of work design research: Looking back and looking forward. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 102*(3), 403–420. https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000106

Pattimura University. (2025, December 5). Universitas Pattimura gelar sosialisasi program jaminan kesehatan bagi ASN dan tenaga kependidikan. https://unpatti.ac.id/universitas-pattimura-gelar-sosialisasi-program-jaminan-kesehatan-bagi-asndan-tenaga-kependidikan/

Pattimura University. (n.d.-a). *Layanan aspirasi – WASPADA* [Public reporting interface]. https://waspada.unpatti.ac.id/

Pattimura University. (n.d.-b). *Pimpinan Universitas Pattimura* [University leadership directory]. https://unpatti.ac.id/pimpinan-universitas-pattimura/

Sagita, D. A. (2016). Kompetensi, iklim organisasi dan kinerja pegawai. *Jurnal Ilmu Administrasi Negara, 14*(1), 337–349. https://doi.org/10.46730/jiana.v14i1.3398

Sakalessy, A., Rahangiar, A., & Suripatty, F. P. (2025). Competence as a key driver of administrative performance in universities. *Academia Open, 10*(1). https://doi.org/10.21070/acopen.10.2025.10813

Schneider, B., Ehrhart, M. G., & Macey, W. H. (2013). Organizational climate and culture. *Annual Review of Psychology, 64*, 361–388. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-psych-113011-143809

Vischer, J. C. (2007). The effects of the physical environment on job performance: Towards a theoretical model of workspace stress. *Stress and Health, 23*(3), 175–184. https://doi.org/10.1002/smi.1134