

**Ratnaningtyas Yoga Wijayanti<sup>1</sup>**

Jakarta State University, Jakarta, Indonesia

ORCID 0000-0003-0628-1109

**Dewi Susita<sup>2</sup>**

Jakarta State University, Jakarta, Indonesia

ORCID 0000-0002-3654-8647

**Gatot Nazir Ahmad<sup>3</sup>**

Jakarta State University, Jakarta, Indonesia

ORCID 0000-0002-2274-9499

## The Effect of Work Environment and Work Attitude on Employees' Performance through Work Motivation

**Abstract.** Motivated and disciplined employees are an essential element in the success of any organization. Their attitude to work determines what the final result will be and how quickly the organization will achieve its planned goals. At the same time, the organizational environment affects employees' functional behaviour, tendencies, and motives. This study examines the effect of work environment and attitude on employees' performance through work motivation. The sample of this study is 108 employees from the Directorate General of Hindu Community Guidance and the Directorate General of Buddhist Community Guidance at the Ministry of Religious Affairs of the Republic of Indonesia. Data for analysis were collected by the questionnaire method. Testing the data in this study used the SEM (Structural Equation Modeling) statistical analysis tool Partial Least Square (PLS) method through the SmartPLS 3.0 application. The obtained results show that all the factors accepted by the researchers significantly positively impact employees' performance. This study recommends that government organizations pay more attention to their employees, namely: a) to make the workspace arrangement so that it customized to the needs of the employees; b) superiors should communicate more with their subordinates to solve work problems; c) it is advisable to combine the methods of punishments and incentives to increase employees' discipline. Since work motivation affects employee performance, organizations should keep paying attention to employee motivation to sustain employee performance. The role of work motivation is to mediate the work environment or attitude's direct effect on increasing employee performance.

**Keywords:** work environment, work attitude, work motivation, employee performance, personnel management.

### Suggested Citation

Wijayanti, R. Y., Susita, D., Ahmad, G. N. (2022). The Effect of Work Environment and Work Attitude on Employees' Performance through Work Motivation. *Oblik i finansi*, 2(96), 152-163. [https://doi.org/10.33146/2307-9878-2022-2\(96\)-152-163](https://doi.org/10.33146/2307-9878-2022-2(96)-152-163)

---

<sup>1</sup> **Ratnaningtyas Yoga Wijayanti**, Jakarta State University, Jakarta, Indonesia.

ORCID 0000-0003-0628-1109

E-mail: [na.ningtyas90@gmail.com](mailto:na.ningtyas90@gmail.com) (Corresponding author)

<sup>2</sup> **Dewi Susita**, Jakarta State University, Jakarta, Indonesia.

ORCID 0000-0002-3654-8647

<sup>3</sup> **Gatot Nazir Ahmad**, Jakarta State University, Jakarta, Indonesia.

ORCID 0000-0002-2274-9499

## Вплив робочого середовища та ставлення до роботи на продуктивність працівників через мотивацію до праці

**Анотація.** *Вмотивовані та дисципліновані співробітники є важливою складовою успіху будь-якої організації. Від їх ставлення до роботи залежить, яким буде кінцевий результат і наскільки швидко організація досягне запланованих цілей. У той же час організаційне середовище впливає на функціональну поведінку, схильності та мотиви працівників. Мета цього дослідження вивчити вплив робочого середовища та ставлення до роботи на продуктивність працівників через мотивацію до праці. Вибіркою цього дослідження є 108 працівників Генерального директорату індуїстської спільноти та Генерального директорату буддійської спільноти Міністерства у справах релігії Республіки Індонезія. Дані для аналізу зібрано методом анкетування. Для тестування даних у цьому дослідженні використовувався інструмент статистичного аналізу – метод часткових найменших квадратів (PLS) SEM (Modeling Structural Equation Modeling) з програмним забезпеченням SmartPLS 3.0. Отримані результати свідчать, що всі фактори, прийняті дослідниками, суттєво і позитивно впливають на продуктивність працівників. Це дослідження рекомендує державним організаціям приділяти більше уваги своїм працівникам, а саме: а) організувати робочий простір таким чином, щоб він відповідав потребам працівників; б) начальники повинні більше спілкуватися зі своїми підлеглими для вирішення робочих проблем; в) для підвищення дисциплінованості працівників доцільно поєднувати методи покарань і заохочення. Оскільки мотивація до праці впливає на продуктивність працівників, організації повинні вживати заходів для її підтримки.*

**Ключові слова:** *робоче середовище, ставлення до роботи, мотивація до праці, продуктивність співробітників, управління персоналом.*

### INTRODUCTION

The success of any organization cannot be separated from the successful performance of its employees. At the same time, the organizational environment affects the functional behaviour of the employees, their trends and motives. The organizational environment represents a complex combination of a large number of factors, each of which affects the employees' performance in its unique way. The environment sets legal, technical-technological, socio-cultural and other limitations for all employees. Thus the environment directly or indirectly affects the ways and the dynamics of work of the organization within it.

This study aims to find out and further analyze the factors that influence employee performance at the Ministry of Religious Affairs, especially the Directorate General of Hindu Community Guidance and the Directorate General of Buddhist Community Guidance.

### LITERATURE REVIEW

The results of previous studies can be summarized: (1) Putri et al. (2019), Siddiqi (2018) and Gardjito et al. (2014) concluded that employee performance is influenced by the work environment; (2) Tambak et al. (2021), Nwosu et al. (2018), Shahab & Nisa (2014) concluded that employee performance is influenced by work attitude; and (3) Chmielewska et al. (2020), Kapantow et al. (2020), Rosmaini & Tanjung (2019)

concluded that employee performance is influenced by work motivation. Griffin et al. (2020) defined that to provide positive performance towards the organizational mission, components are needed: (1) motivation, employees do a good job; (2) ability, employees can do work effectively; and (3) environment, the organization has the materials, resources, equipment, and information needed to do the job. Therefore, all three conditions must be met to achieve high performance.

This is supported in terms of work environment factors by Robbins & Judge (2022) who claim that a controlled, peaceful, and safe work environment likely to have an influence on job satisfaction among employees. The fact that a metalworking foundry's hot, noisy, and hazardous working environment is unsatisfactory for employees is the main reason why most workers prefer to work there rather than there.

Furthermore, regarding work attitude, Griffin et al. (2020) define attitudes as complex beliefs and feelings that people have about certain ideas, situations, or other people. Attitude is important because it is the mechanism most people use to express feelings. The statement of an employee who feels underpaid by the organization reflects his feelings about his salary. According to Luthans et al. (2021), employee attitudes are related to job satisfaction and organizational commitment, which are a major concern in organizational behavior and human resource management practices.

Regarding work motivation, Robbins & Judge (2022) define motivation as a process that explains the strength, direction, and persistence of employees in an effort to achieve organizational goals because motivated employees will last long enough with their duties to achieve their goals. According to Griffin et al. (2020), motivation is a set of forces that cause people to engage in one behavior rather than several alternative behaviors and become one of the factors that influence the achievement of employee performance. Colquitt et al. (2019) also explained that motivation is a set of energetic forces originating both inside and outside employees, initiating work-related efforts, and determining their direction, intensity, and persistence.

It can be concluded that the work environment, work motivation, and work attitude in carrying out daily operational tasks can affect employee performance. On the other hand, there are research results that show that there is no effect of the work environment, work attitude, and work motivation on employee performance: (1) Badrianto & Ekhsan (2019), Bukhari & Pasaribu (2019) concluded that the work environment has no significant effect on employee performance; (2) Murti & Srimulyani (2013), Marjaya & Pasaribu (2019) concluded that work motivation has no significant effect on employee performance; and (3) Chin-Wen Liao (2012) concluded that there is a positive but not significant relationship between employee work attitude and employee performance.

### HYPOTHESIS DEVELOPMENT

#### The effect of work environment on employee performance

Research indicates that a positive work environment and the availability of comfort support could influence employee performance. The majority of employees choose to work close to their homes in facilities that are clean, efficient and equipped with all the necessary tools and equipment (Langford et al., 2020). The work environment, which includes adequate tools, equipment, materials, and equipment, could be used to establish an employee's optimal performance. Employees can positively affect performance by providing favourable conditions, helpful coworkers, supportive work standards and procedures, sufficient knowledge to make well-informed choices, and enough time to accomplish a task properly (Robbins & Judge, 2014). Likewise, research demonstrates that stress challenges boost performance in a supportive work environment, but stress barriers hinder it across the board (Robbins & Judge, 2022).

*H1: Work environment has a positive effect on employee performance*

#### The effect of work attitude on employee performance

Human resource management aims to improve participation, teamwork, and work attitude since changing employee behaviour provide measurable performance results. Increasing employee involvement at work is a way of implementing a high-performance organizational culture that improves performance (Ross,

2021). Interacting with colleagues can improve work performance for the organization's benefit, based on a theory (Robinson et al., 2004) that describes employees' positive work attitude towards the organization and its beliefs (Beardwell & Thompson, 2017). Employee attitudes are considered a mediating variable in performance improvement, evaluating employees' discretionary behaviour level (high contributions and exceeding the minimum threshold). High performance is significantly correlated with the presence of high-commitment management practices. Therefore, it may be inferred that rules owned by the corporation to influence employee attitudes are a factor in increased performance since high-commitment work practices result in discretionary conduct (Torrington et al., 2020).

*H2: Work attitude has a positive effect on employee performance*

#### The effect of work motivation on employee performance

The AMO theory (ability, motivation, opportunity to perform) is described by Beardwell & Thompson (2017). It defines individual performance as a function of employee abilities, motivation, and opportunities, which affect high performance. Thus, according to Purcell et al. (2003), organizational commitment, motivation, and performance satisfaction influence performance and improve descriptive behaviour, rendering them important contributors to the relationship between individual and organizational performance (Appelbaum et al., 2000). According to McShane & Glinow (2018), ability and motivation – two factors that are most usually mentioned as direct predictors of a person's behaviour and performance-have an impact on employee performance. Following this, Colquitt et al. (2019) describe motivation as a process of how hard an employee works, how intensively they exert themselves, and how long they persist in exerting themselves. Therefore, motivation is essential because effective job performance frequently involves high levels of ability and motivation.

*H3: Work motivation has a positive effect on employee performance*

#### The effect of work environment on work motivation

Employee motivation is related to the work environment. High-quality employees can be attracted to the organization, or high-performing employees can be maintained. Motivation is more valuable than money in an organization with a positive work environment (Robbins & Judge, 2014). The requirements that must be fulfilled by the organization in order to manage employee stress at work include the work environment, workload, and work patterns. Encouraging the workplace as a source of health improvement to improve health at work is one approach that can be implemented to reduce stressors in the workplace. A healthy workplace attempts to decrease illness-related absenteeism. Employees that are in good health are much more motivated at work (Torrington et al., 2020). One aspect of intrinsic motivation is the motivation to accomplish something

because it is personally interesting, pleasurable, or challenging. It transforms creative potential into actual creative ideas and determines the extent to which a person fully engages skills and abilities. Although creative individuals are completely concerned with their work, the work environment and organizational culture greatly impact intrinsic motivation (Robbins et al., 2020).

*H4: Work environment has a positive effect on work motivation*

### **The effect of work attitude on work motivation**

Motivation is a physiological activity, and it is considered that knowing motivation is critical to understanding behaviour. The environmental, additional mediating elements and motivation all engage together in concert. The concept of self-efficacy is created to support and explain conduct. The essential procedure involves the requirements that motivate the satisfaction of the requirements. Primary and secondary motivations are used to classify desires. Hunger, thirst, pain, and other basic human needs cannot be learned. Power, achievement, affiliation, security, and prestige are the primary driving reasons behind conduct in organizations (Luthans et al., 2021). When colleagues have a positive attitude, it motivates them to provide their all at work, and the reverse is also true when there are unmotivated colleagues or work teams, which could also drain (decrease) the motivation of other colleagues (Robbins & Judge, 2014). According to this statement, attitude is a crucial component of organizational behaviour since it is associated with perception, learning, emotions, and motivation (DuBrin, 2019). For instance, how well an employee believes the quality of his work is influenced by how he treats his coworkers. Attitudes are formed in part by emotions like happiness and hatred. Understanding the components of attitudes and how these connect to organizational behaviour, as well as describing how emotions influence behaviour in the workplace, is particularly important.

*H5: Work attitude has a positive effect on work motivation*

### **The effect of work environment on employee performance through work motivation**

The work environment impacts employee performance through job motivation. Getting paid while working is one of employee motivation. Organizations or team managers must comprehend that, in addition to paying attention to high salaries, paying attention to a satisfying work environment is also important. Inappropriate salaries will not create higher employees in the organization or retain employees to continue to show high performance. When employees dislike their workplace environment, another possible response is to quit their jobs (Robbins & Judge, 2014).

Langford et al. (2020) describe several steps organizations can take to create a motivating work environment based on research and consulting experience conducted by Kohn. One method to accomplish this is by modifying how employees are treated to improve their performance. This could be done by promoting authentic

motivations such as helping employees instead of placing them under supervision, paying enough attention to their concerns and considering issues from their perspective, and giving them encouraging feedback about enhancing their abilities.

Torrington et al. (2020) provide strategies that reduce social inequality at work, including promoting the work environment as a source of better health and enhancing workplace health. A healthy workplace attempts to reduce illness-related absences. Employees with a healthy life are more likely to be motivated to work much harder and deliver good performance.

*H6: Work environment has a positive effect on employee performance through work motivation*

### **The effect of work attitude on employee performance through work motivation**

Long-term employees generally view their work as a separate motivation, such as a need or reward. One factor that influences both excellent and low employee performance is attitude. Employee motivation and work attitude that influence employee performance are significantly associated. Financial performance indicators have historically influenced employee attitudes and greater levels of organizational performance (Wagner III & Hollenbeck, 2010).

The design of the Organizational Culture Inventory describes the behaviours and standards that influence the culture that prevails within the organization, and the outcomes are organized into three cultures. High-performance organizations are often associated with constructive cultures, where people are encouraged to collaborate in ways that suit human needs and improve motivation, satisfaction, teamwork, and performance within the workforce. The culture is passive and aggressive, with inadequate motivation and work attitude generally negative. It is thought that by behaving in this manner, excellent performance results and personal fulfilment can be achieved (Schermerhorn et al., 2010).

*H7: Work attitude has a positive effect on employee performance through work motivation*

## **RESEARCH METHODS**

This research was conducted in two directorates of the Ministry of Religious Affairs of the Republic of Indonesia located at Jalan MH Thamrin Number 6 Menteng District, Central Jakarta, DKI Jakarta Province. This study has a population of 149 employees from the Directorate General of Hindu Community Guidance and the Directorate General of Buddhist Community Guidance. Sekaran & Bougie (2016) define a population as all groups of people, events, or interesting things that will be processed to make conclusions (based on statistical samples) as a result of research. Sampling in this study used a purposive sampling design by considering the following criteria: (1) the sample is civil servants due to the performance measurement results listed in Employee Performance Targets; (2) the samples are civil servants at the Directorate General of Hindu Community Guidance and the Directorate General of Buddhist Community Guidance; and (3) the sample is

civil servants with general functional positions, certain functional positions, and structural positions. Determining the number of samples using the proportional random sampling technique using the Slovin formula with a significance level of 5%. The larger the sample size and the closer it is to the population, the smaller the generalized error. Based on the Slovin formula, the number of samples is 108 respondents. This

study uses a quantitative method through the calculation of a Likert scale in which each response is given a numerical score, indicating likes or dislikes, and the score is added to measure the respondents' attitude. Testing the data in this study used the SEM (Structural Equation Modeling) statistical analysis tool Partial Least Square (PLS) method through the SmartPLS 3.0 application.

## RESULT AND DISCUSSION

### Evaluation of Measurement (Outer) Model

#### a. Validity and Reliability

The result of the convergent validity test can be seen in the table 1.

Table 1. Test Result for Convergent Validity

Variable	Item	Outer Loading	Cut Off	Criteria
<b>Work Environment</b>	LK1	0,785	0.700	Valid
	LK2	0,785	0.700	Valid
	LK3	0,869	0.700	Valid
	LK4	0,890	0.700	Valid
	LK5	0,811	0.700	Valid
	LK6	0,787	0.700	Valid
	LK7	0,793	0.700	Valid
	LK8	0,758	0.700	Valid
	LK9	0,854	0.700	Valid
	LK10	0,773	0.700	Valid
	LK11	0,744	0.700	Valid
	LK12	0,712	0.700	Valid
	LK13	0,709	0.700	Valid
	LK14	0,701	0.700	Valid
<b>Work Attitude</b>	SK1	0,801	0.700	Valid
	SK2	0,765	0.700	Valid
	SK3	0,825	0.700	Valid
	SK4	0,863	0.700	Valid
	SK5	0,876	0.700	Valid
	SK6	0,806	0.700	Valid
<b>Work Motivation</b>	MK1	0,838	0.700	Valid
	MK2	0,860	0.700	Valid
	MK3	0,828	0.700	Valid
	MK4	0,912	0.700	Valid
	MK5	0,878	0.700	Valid
	MK6	0,831	0.700	Valid
<b>Employee Performance</b>	KP1	0,813	0.700	Valid
	KP2	0,888	0.700	Valid
	KP3	0,898	0.700	Valid
	KP4	0,897	0.700	Valid
	KP5	0,849	0.700	Valid
	KP6	0,881	0.700	Valid
	KP7	0,799	0.700	Valid
	KP8	0,868	0.700	Valid
	KP9	0,830	0.700	Valid
	KP10	0,789	0.700	Valid
	KP11	0,798	0.700	Valid
	KP12	0,820	0.700	Valid

All indicators meet convergent validity tests using outer loading, obtaining values above 0.7 and being compatible with the hypothesis put out (Hair et al., 2021).

#### b. Composite Reliability and Cronbach's Alpha

The result of the reliability test using Composite Reliability and Cronbach's Alpha test can be seen in the table 2.

Table 2. Test Result for Composite Reliability and Cronbach's Alpha

Variable	Composite Reliability	Cronbach's Alpha	Criteria
Work Environment	0,957	0,952	Reliable
Work Attitude	0,927	0,905	Reliable
Work Motivation	0,944	0,928	Reliable
Employee Performance	0,968	0,963	Reliable

The value obtained during the reliability test reflects the reliability of all indicators in the measurement model and the value obtained is greater than 0.7 (Hair et al., 2021).

c. Discriminant Validity

A discriminant validity test is a reflective test between cross-loading and all its indicators and construct. Test of discriminant validity using *cross-loadings* and *Fornell-Larcker* criterion.

Table 3. Test Result for Cross-Loadings

Variable	Item	Work Environment	Work Attitude	Work Motivation	Employee Performance
<b>Work Environment</b>	LK1	<b>0,785</b>	0,505	0,622	0,623
	LK2	<b>0,785</b>	0,417	0,539	0,568
	LK3	<b>0,869</b>	0,524	0,601	0,647
	LK4	<b>0,890</b>	0,525	0,588	0,649
	LK5	<b>0,811</b>	0,430	0,494	0,580
	LK6	<b>0,787</b>	0,393	0,515	0,500
	LK7	<b>0,793</b>	0,561	0,561	0,632
	LK8	<b>0,758</b>	0,543	0,556	0,583
	LK9	<b>0,854</b>	0,585	0,610	0,643
	LK10	<b>0,773</b>	0,482	0,499	0,568
	LK11	<b>0,744</b>	0,563	0,546	0,459
	LK12	<b>0,712</b>	0,566	0,553	0,658
	LK13	<b>0,709</b>	0,638	0,624	0,543
	LK14	<b>0,701</b>	0,661	0,644	0,588
<b>Work Attitude</b>	SK1	0,597	<b>0,801</b>	0,639	0,649
	SK2	0,601	<b>0,765</b>	0,641	0,621
	SK3	0,369	<b>0,825</b>	0,634	0,439
	SK4	0,541	<b>0,863</b>	0,649	0,495
	SK5	0,622	<b>0,876</b>	0,698	0,690
	SK6	0,572	<b>0,806</b>	0,630	0,712
<b>Work Motivation</b>	MK1	0,586	0,636	<b>0,838</b>	0,702
	MK2	0,651	0,710	<b>0,860</b>	0,683
	MK3	0,560	0,638	<b>0,828</b>	0,583
	MK4	0,697	0,705	<b>0,912</b>	0,662
	MK5	0,651	0,693	<b>0,878</b>	0,665
	MK6	0,591	0,679	<b>0,831</b>	0,658
<b>Employee Performance</b>	KP1	0,636	0,652	0,654	<b>0,813</b>
	KP2	0,638	0,671	0,678	<b>0,888</b>
	KP3	0,665	0,674	0,662	<b>0,898</b>
	KP4	0,681	0,705	0,645	<b>0,897</b>
	KP5	0,636	0,609	0,635	<b>0,849</b>
	KP6	0,634	0,667	0,664	<b>0,881</b>
	KP7	0,623	0,536	0,557	<b>0,799</b>
	KP8	0,624	0,596	0,626	<b>0,868</b>
	KP9	0,634	0,616	0,646	<b>0,830</b>
	KP10	0,574	0,542	0,560	<b>0,789</b>
	KP11	0,617	0,590	0,697	<b>0,798</b>
	KP12	0,785	0,505	0,622	<b>0,623</b>

Cross-loading is an approach used in assessing discriminant validity indicators. Loading indicators to the measured consent is greater than loading to other consent (Hair et al., 2021).

Table 4. Test Result for Fornell-Larcker criterion

Variable	Work Environment	Work Attitude	Work Motivation	Performance
Work Environment	<b>0,786</b>			0,755
Work Attitude	0,677	<b>0,824</b>	0,789	0,741
Work Motivation	0,727		<b>0,858</b>	0,768
Employee Performance				<b>0,845</b>

Fornell-Larcker Criterion compares the root of the Average Variance Extracted (AVE) with a correlation between latent/construct variables. The square correlation value of each variable must be higher than the square correlation with another consent (Hair et al., 2021).

Table 5. Test Result for AVE (Average Variance Extracted)

Variable	AVE	Fornell-Larcker
Work Environment	<b>0,669</b>	<b>0,818</b>
Work Attitude	<b>0,700</b>	<b>0,837</b>
Work Motivation	<b>0,737</b>	<b>0,858</b>
Employee Performance	<b>0,732</b>	<b>0,856</b>

AVE (Average Variance Extracted) quadratic root value of each consent must be greater than the correlation between consent. Another approach to the consent has met the discriminant validity (discriminant validity) is the value of  $AVE > 0.50$ , indicating the average construct explains more than half of its indicators variants (Hair et al., 2021).

#### Evaluation of Structural (Inner) Model

The purpose of the structural evaluation (inner) model is to maximize the variants of the variance from endogenous constructs in the model.

Table 6. Test for Path Coefficient

Variable	Work Environment	Work Attitude	Work Motivation	Employee Performance
Work Environment			0,356	<b>0,360</b>
Work Attitude			0,548	<b>0,258</b>
Work Motivation				0,303
Employee Performance				

The path coefficient test aims to test the effect of independent variables on the dependent variable. The path coefficient shows a statistically strong and significant relationship. The higher value obtained shows a strong effect between the independent variables on the dependent variable.

Evaluation of inner models can be done through 3 approaches, namely  $R^2$ ,  $Q^2$ , and GoF. The value obtained from the measurement results is  $R^2$  (R Square) can be seen in the table 7.

Table 7.  $R^2$  (R Square)

Variable	R Square	R Square Adjusted
Work Motivation	<b>0,692</b>	0,686
Employee Performance	<b>0,696</b>	0,687

The value of  $R^2$  (R Square) employee performance is 0.696 is moderate because it is greater than 0.25 and smaller than 0.75 (Hair et al., 2021).  $R^2$  (R Square) 0.696 explains the employee performance who are influenced by the work environment, work attitude, work motivation is 0.696 (69.6%) and 0.304 (30.4%) explained by other consent outside of the study.

The value of  $R^2$  (R Square) work motivation is 0.692 is moderate because it is greater than 0.25 and smaller than 0.75 (Hair et al., 2021).  $R^2$  (R Square) value 0.692 explains that work motivation is influenced by the work environment and work attitude is 0.692 (69.2%) and 0.308 (30.8%) explained by other consent consent outside of the study. To find out the value of  $Q^2$  (Q Square) to measure the predictive relevance value of the research model using calculations:

$Q^2$ (Q Square)	$: 1 - [(1 - R^2_1) \times (1 - R^2_2)]$ $: 1 - [(1 - 0.696) \times (1 - 0.692)]$ $: 1 - [(0.304) \times (0.308)]$ $: 1 - [0.094]$ $: 0.906$
------------------	--

$Q^2$  value: 0.906, which means  $Q^2 > 0$ , explains the observable values has been reconstructed well and the model has predictive relevance. (Hair et al., 2011) explains the value of  $Q^2$  is greater than 0, indicating the exogenous latent variable has a predictive relevance to the endogenous latent variable.

Furthermore, the calculation of Goodness of Fit Index (GoF) which aims to validate the combined performance of the outer model and structural model. The greater the GoF value obtained, the greater the picture of the research sample. GoF is the geometric average of two types of average  $R^2$  values: the average communality value (the proportion of the average variant described when the reflective indicator in the latent variable, based on table 5) and the average  $R^2$  value of the endogenous latent variable (based on table 7).

Goodness of Fit Index (GoF) is calculated manually with an average value of communality and  $R^2$  (R Square) using the following formula:

<i>Goodness of Fit Index (GoF)</i>	$: \sqrt{(\text{communality}) \times R^2}$ $: \sqrt{0.687 \times 0.694}$ $: \sqrt{0.476}$ $: 0.690$
------------------------------------	---

### Hypothesis Testing

Hypothesis testing is called a significance test, which aims to determine the effect of exogenous variables on endogenous variables and indicate the direction of the relationship and significance of each latent variable. The path coefficients are usually between -1 and +1, coefficients closer to -1 indicate a strong negative relationship and those closer to +1 indicate a strong positive relationship (Hair et al., 2021). Using SmartPLS 3.0 with bootstrapping results, hypotheses are evaluated using  $t$ -count values with a 10% significance level compared to  $t$ -tables.

Table 8. Path Coefficient and Hypothesis Testing

Variable Relation	Original Sample (O)	T Statistics ( O/STDEV )	t-table	P Values	Hypothesis Testing	Significant Result
Work Environment → Employee Performance	0.360	2.214	1.650	0.027	H1 accepted	Significant
Work Attitude → Employee Performance	0.258	1.954	1.650	0.051	H2 accepted	Significant
Work Motivation → Employee Performance	0.303	2.332	1.650	0.020	H3 accepted	Significant
Work Environment → Work Motivation	0.356	4.699	1.650	0.000	H4 accepted	Significant
Work Attitude → Work Motivation	0.548	7.063	1.650	0.000	H5 accepted	Significant
Work Environment → Work Motivation → Employee Performance	0.108	2.115	1.650	0.034	H6 accepted	Significant
Work Attitude → Work Motivation → Employee Performance	0.166	2.121	1.650	0.034	H7 accepted	Significant

Table 8 explains the following:

1. The results of testing the effect of the work environment on employee performance obtained on  $t$ -statistic:  $2.214 > 1.650$  and  $sig$  ( $p$  values):  $0.027 < 0.10$  has a positive effect direction. The value obtained is significant at a significance level of 10% and hypothesis 1 is accepted.

2. The results of testing the effect of work attitude on employee performance obtained  $t$ -statistic:  $1.954 > 1.650$  and  $sig$  ( $p$  values):  $0.051 < 0.10$  has a positive effect direction. The value obtained is significant at a significance level of 10% and hypothesis 2 is accepted.

3. The results of testing the effect of work motivation on employee performance obtained  $t$ -statistic:  $2.332 > 1.650$  and  $sig$  ( $p$  values):  $0.020 < 0.10$  has a positive effect direction. The value obtained is significant at a significance level of 10% and hypothesis 3 is accepted.

4. The results of testing the effect of the work environment on work motivation obtained  $t$ -statistic:  $4.699 > 1.650$  and  $sig$  ( $p$  values):  $0.000 < 0.10$  has a positive direction effect. The value obtained is significant at a significance level of 10% and hypothesis 4 is accepted.

5. The results of testing the effect of the work attitude on work motivation obtained  $t$ -statistic:  $7.063 > 1.650$  and  $sig$  ( $p$  values):  $0.000 < 0.10$  has a positive direction effect. The value obtained is significant at a significance level of 10% and hypothesis 5 is accepted.

6. The results of testing the effect of the work environment on employee performance through work motivation obtained  $t$ -statistic:  $2.115 > 1.650$  and  $sig$  ( $p$  values):  $0.034 < 0.10$  has a positive direction effect. The value obtained is significant at a significance level of 10% and hypothesis 6 is accepted.

7. The results of testing the effect of work attitude on employee performance through work motivation obtained *t-statistic*:  $2.121 > 1.650$  and *sig (p values)*:  $0.034 < 0.10$  has a positive direction effect. The value obtained is significant at a significance level of 10% and hypothesis 7 is accepted.

### Discussion

#### The effect of work environment on employee performance

Work environment has a significant positive effect on employee performance based on *t-statistic*:  $2.214 > 1.650$  and *sig (p values)*:  $0.027 < 0.10$ , which explains that the right work environment can fully support employee performance. A good work environment supports employees to improve their performance. This result supported by theory (Langford et al., 2020) that explaining a good work environment and the existence of comfort support can affect employee performance because studies show employees prefer a work environment that is not dangerous and comfortable to work. The results of this study are support the results of many study (Putri et al. (2019), Siddiqi (2018), Sofyan (2013), Gardjito et al. (2014), Utami & Hartanto (2010), Arifa & Muhsin (2018)), which explain the work environment has a positive effect on employee performance.

#### The effect of work attitude on employee performance

Work attitude has a significant positive effect on employee performance based on *t-statistic*:  $1.954 > 1.650$  and *sig (p values)*:  $0.051 < 0.10$ , which explains positive work attitude affect the increase in employee performance. The results of this study are in line with the theory put forward by Beardwell & Thompson (2017), which explains the positive attitude employees have towards the organization and its values, realizing that in a business context being able to work with colleagues can improve performance at work for the benefit of the organization. In line with the theory of Torrington et al. (2020), which suggests employee attitudes (attitudes) are described as a mediating variable in employee performance improvement, which is used to measure the extent to which employees are involved in discretionary behavior (contributing high and exceeding the minimum limit). The results of this study are similar to the results of previous studies (Tambak et al. (2021), Nwosu et al. (2018), Kettanurak et al. (2001), Shahab & Nisa (2014), Subakti (2013), Simanjuntak, (2020)).

#### The effect of work motivation on employee performance

Work motivation has a significant positive effect on employee performance based on *t-statistic*:  $2.332 > 1,650$  and *sig (p values)*:  $0.020 < 0.10$ , which explains work motivation is a factor in increasing employee performance. In line with the results of this study, Beardwell & Thompson (2017) explained the AMO theory (*ability, motivation, opportunity to perform*) which defines individual performance as a function of employee abilities, motivation, and opportunities, which affect high

performance. McShane & Glinow (2018) formulated that employees are influenced by two components, namely ability and motivation, which are the most frequently mentioned direct predictors of individual behavior and performance. To support the results of this study, several previous studies have explained which explains that work motivation has an effect on employee performance (Chmielewska et al. (2020), Kapantow et al. (2020), Rosmaini & Tanjung (2019), Widyawati (2021)).

#### The effect of work environment on work motivation

Work environment has a significant positive effect on work motivation based on *t-statistic*:  $4.699 > 1.650$  and *sig (p values)*:  $0.000 < 0.10$ , which explains the positive work environment that has an effect to support employee motivation. The results of this study are supported by the theory put forward by Robbins & Judge (2014) which explains that the work environment is related to employee motivation. A satisfying work environment can attract high-quality employees or keep high-performing employees in the organization. Motivation is in an organization with a satisfying work environment, having more value than money. The results of this study are supported by previous research (Hober et al. (2019), Tannady et al. (2019), Sudana & Supartha (2015), Umami (2017), Suprihatmi & Sulistyarningsih (2006), Suwondo & Sutanto (2015), Paita et al. (2015)), which explains the work environment has a direct influence on work motivation.

#### The effect of work attitude on work motivation

Work attitude has a significant positive effect on work motivation based *t-statistic*:  $7.063 > 1.650$  and *sig (p values)*:  $0.000 < 0.10$ , which explains positive work attitude affect employee motivation in carrying out tasks in work. The results of this study are supported by theory (Robbins & Judge, 2014) which explains when employees work with someone who has a positive attitude can inspire them to work by doing their best and vice versa when there are co-workers or work teams who are not enthusiastic at work it can drain (decrease) motivation of other employees. According to Luthans et al. (2021), motivation is a hypothetical construct that is used to help explain individual behavior. The basic process involves the needs that drive the fulfillment of the needs. Drives are classified into primary and secondary motives. Primary motives (hunger, thirst, pain) cannot be learned. Secondary motives (power, achievement, affiliation, security, status) are the main motivational forces that underlie behavior in organizations. The results of this study are in line with research conducted by Pawar (2019), Guido (2018), and Campos Monteiro et al. (2015).

#### The effect of work environment on employee performance through work motivation

Work environment has a significant positive effect on employee performance through work motivation based on *t-statistic*:  $2.115 > 1.650$  and *sig (p values)*:  $0.034 < 0.10$ , which explains work motivation to mediate the influence

of the work environment on the increase in employee performance. The results of this study are in line with the theory by Torrington et al. (2020) that promoting the work environment as a source of better health can improve health in the workplace. A healthy work environment can reduce absenteeism due to illness. Employees, who are healthy and more motivated to work, enable them to provide better performance. It also contradicts the theory put forward by Robbins & Judge (2014) explaining that the work environment influences employee performance through work motivation. One of the motivations of employees is to get a salary while working. When employees do not like the work environment, the response that may occur is to quit the workplace.

The results of this study are in line with research conducted by Narasuci et al. (2018) and Widyawati (2021) obtaining that work motivation mediates the influence of the work environment on employee performance. On the other hand, the result of this study contrary to the results of research by Dewi & Frianto (2013), Moulana et al. (2017), and Arifa & Muhsin (2018), which state that work motivation does not mediate the influence of the work environment on employee performance.

### **The effect of work attitude on employee performance through work motivation**

Work attitude has a significant positive effect on employee performance through work motivation based on *t-statistic*:  $2.121 > 1,960$  and *sig (p values)*:  $0.034 < 0.10$  which explains work motivation provides a role in mediation that supports the direct effect of work attitude on employee performance. The results of this study are consistent with the theory put forward by Wagner III & Hollenbeck (2010), which explains better work attitude and higher performance in teams led by superiors who exhibit employee-oriented behavior. Attitude is one of the causes of high and low employee performance. There is a positive correlation between motivated employees and work attitude that affect employee performance.

Schermerhorn et al. (2010) describe the behavior and expectations that shape the culture that prevails in the organization and the results are mapped in three cultures. One of them is a constructive culture, where employees are encouraged to work together in ways that meet human needs, which is most associated with high-performance organizations. The results of this study are confirmed by the research of Subandowo (2016) and Syahrudin et al. (2019).

## **4 References**

- Arifa, S. N., & Muhsin. (2018). Pengaruh Disiplin Kerja, Kepemimpinan dan Lingkungan Kerja Terhadap Kinerja Melalui Motivasi Kerja.pdf. *Economic Education Analysis Journal*, 7(1), 16.
- Armstrong, M. (2021). Strategic Human Resource Management – Improve Business Performance Through Strategic People Management. In *Kogan Page* (Seventh ed.). Kogan Page Limited. <https://lcn.loc.gov/2020039567>
- Badrianto, Y., & Ekhsan, M. (2019). *The Effect of Work Environment and Motivation on Employee Performance of PT. Hasta Multi Sejahtera Cikarang*, 1(1), 64–70. <http://e-journal.stie-kusumanegara.ac.id>
- Beardwell, J., & Thompson, A. (2017). *Human Resource Management: A Contemporary Approach* (Eighth ed.). Pearson Education Limited.
- Bukhari, & Pasaribu, S. E. (2019). Pengaruh Motivasi, Kompetensi, dan Lingkungan Kerja terhadap Kinerja Pegawai. *Jurnal Ilmiah Magister Manajemen*, 2(1), 89–103. <https://doi.org/10.52103/tatakelola.v7i1.65>

## **CONCLUSIONS**

The results of this study show the following:

- 1) Work environment has a significant positive effect on employee performance. The comfort of a positive work environment supports employee performance;
- 2) Work attitude has a significant positive effect on employee performance. Work attitude affects the increase in employee performance;
- 3) Work motivation has a significant positive effect on employee performance. Work motivation is a factor in increasing employee performance;
- 4) Work environment has a significant positive effect on work motivation. Positive work environment has a positive influence on work motivation;
- 5) Work attitude has a significant positive effect on work motivation. A positive work attitude supports employee motivation in carrying out their duties;
- 6) Work environment has a significant positive effect on employee performance through work motivation. Work motivation mediates the direct influence of the work environment on increasing employee performance;
- 7) Work attitude has a significant positive effect on employee performance through work motivation. Work motivation provides a mediating role that supports the direct influence of work attitude on employee performance.

This study recommends that the Directorate General of Hindu Community Guidance and the Directorate General of Buddhist Community Guidance within the Ministry of Religious Affairs of the Republic of Indonesia government pay more attention to its employees, namely:

- a) to make the workspace arrangement so that it customized to the needs of the employees;
- b) superiors should communicate more with their subordinates to solve work problems;
- c) it is advisable to combine the methods of punishments and incentives to increase employees' discipline.

Considering that work motivation affects employee performance, organizations should keep paying attention to employee motivation to sustain employee performance. The role of work motivation is to mediate the work environment or attitude's direct effect on increasing employee performance.

- Campos Monteiro, D. L., Peñaloza, V., Pinto, F. R., Denegri Coria, M. del C., & Orellana Calderón, L. M. (2015). Attitudes towards money and motivational orientation to work in Brazilian young workers. *Contaduría y Administración*, 60(1), 11–30. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0186-1042\(15\)72145-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0186-1042(15)72145-5)
- Chin-Wen Liao. (2012). Work values, work attitude and job performance of green energy industry employees in Taiwan. *African Journal of Business Management*, 6(15), 5299–5318. <https://doi.org/10.5897/ajbm11.1449>
- Chmielewska, M., Stokwiszewski, J., Filip, J., & Hermanowski, T. (2020). Motivation factors affecting the job attitude of medical doctors and the organizational performance of public hospitals in Warsaw, Poland. *BMC Health Services Research*, 20(1), 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12913-020-05573-z>
- Colquitt, J. A., Lepine, J. A., & Wesson, M. J. (2019). *Organizational Behavior* (Sixth ed.). McGraw-Hill Education.
- Dessler, G. (2020). Fundamentals of Human Resource Management. In *Human Resource Management* (Fifth ed., Issue November). Pearson Education Limited.
- Dewi, S. K., & Frianto, A. (2013). *Pengaruh Lingkungan Kerja Terhadap Kinerja Karyawan Melalui Motivasi Sari. 1.*
- DuBrin, A. J. (2019). Fundamentals of Organizational Behavior. In *Fundamentals of Organizational Behavior* (Sixth ed.). Academic Media Solutions. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781446261781>
- Gardjito, A. H., Musadieg, M. A., & Nurtjahjono, G. E. (2014). Pengaruh Motivasi Kerja dan Lingkungan Kerja terhadap Kinerja Karyawan (Studi pada Karyawan Bagian Produksi PT. Karmand Mitra Andalan Surabaya). *Jurnal Administrasi Bisnis S1 Universitas Brawijaya*, 13(1), 83778.
- Griffin, R. W., Phillips, J. M., & Gully, S. M. (2020). *Organizational Behavior – Managing People and Organizations* (Thirteenth ed.). Cengage Learning, Inc. <http://www.cengage.com/>
- Guido, R. M. D. (2018). *Attitude and Motivation towards Learning Physics*. 2(11), 2087–2094. <http://arxiv.org/abs/1805.02293>
- Hair, Hult, G. T. M., Ringle, C. M., Sarstedt, M., Danks, N. P., & Ray, S. (2021). *Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modeling (PLS-SEM) Using R*. Springer Nature Switzerland. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-80519-7>
- Hair, J. F., Ringle, C. M., & Sarstedt, M. (2011). PLS-SEM: Indeed a silver bullet. *Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice*, 19(2), 139–152. <https://doi.org/10.2753/MTP1069-6679190202>
- Hellriegel, D., & Slocum, J. W. (2008). *Organizational Behavior Thirteenth Edition*. In M. Acuña (Ed.), *Organizational Behavior* (Thirteenth ed.). South-Western Cengage Learning. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315669304>
- Hober, B., Schaarschmidt, M., & Korflesch, H. von. (2019). Internal idea contests: Work environment perceptions and the moderating role of power distance. *Journal of Innovation and Knowledge*, 3(1), 44–55. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jik.2017.06.002>
- Jones, G. R., & George, J. M. (2022). *The Contemporary Management Twelfth Edition* (12<sup>th</sup> ed). McGraw-Hill Education.
- Kapantow, N. H., Luddin, M. R., & Kambey, D. C. (2020). The Effect of Job Motivation, Job Satisfaction, and Attitude towards Profession on Nurse Performance in Outpatient Clinic of Prof. Dr. R.D. Kandou Hospital. *KnE Social Sciences*, 2020, 565–575. <https://doi.org/10.18502/kss.v4i14.7915>
- Kettanurak, V. N., Ramamurthy, K., & Haseman, W. D. (2001). User attitude as a mediator of learning performance improvement in an interactive multimedia environment: An empirical investigation of the degree of interactivity and learning styles. *International Journal of Human Computer Studies*, 54(4), 541–583. <https://doi.org/10.1006/ijhc.2001.0457>
- Langford, D., Fellows, R. F., Hancock, M. R., & Gale, A. W. (2020). Organizational Behavior. *Human Resources Management in Construction*, 70–100. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315844695-9>
- Luthans, F., & Doh, J. P. (2018). *International Management: Culture, Strategy, Behavior*.
- Luthans, F., Luthans, B. C., & Luthans, K. W. (2021). *Organizational Behavior : an evidenced based approach*.
- Marjaya, I., & Pasaribu, F. (2019). Pengaruh Kepemimpinan, Motivasi, Dan Pelatihan Terhadap Kinerja Pegawai. *Maneggio: Jurnal Ilmiah Magister Manajemen*, 2(1), 129–147. <https://doi.org/10.30596/maneggio.v2i1.3650>
- Mathis, R. L., Jackson, J. H., Valentine, S. R., & Meglich, P. A. (2016). *Human Resource Management*. Cengage Learning.
- McShane, S. L., & Glinow, M. A. Y. Von. (2018). *Organizational Behavior: Emerging Knowledge*. Global Reality (8th Edition). In *McGraw-Hill* (Eight Edit). McGraw-Hill Education.
- Moulana, F., Sunuharyo, B. S., & Utami, H. N. (2017). Pengaruh Lingkungan Kerja terhadap Kinerja Karyawan melalui Variabel Mediator Motivasi Kerja (Studi pada Karyawan PT. Telkom Indonesia, Tbk Witel Jatim Selatan, Jalan A. Yani, Malang). *Jurnal Administrasi Bisnis S1 Universitas Brawijaya*, 44(1), 178–185.
- Murti, H., & Srimulyani, V. A. (2013). Pengaruh Motivasi Terhadap Kinerja Pegawai dengan Variabel Pemeditasi Kepuasan Kerja pada PDAM Kota Madiun. *Cendekia*, 9(2), 135–148.
- Narasuci, W., Setiawan, M., & Noermijati, N. (2018). Effect of Work Environment on Lecturer Performance Mediated by Work Motivation and Job Satisfaction. *Jurnal Aplikasi Manajemen*, 16(4), 645–653. <https://doi.org/10.21776/ub.jam.2018.016.04.11>
- Nwosu, I. A., Nsude, I., Nwafor, K. A., Ronald, C. N., & Ugwuanyi, C. U. (2018). Evaluation of Work Attitude and Job Performance among Non-Teaching Staff of a Nigerian University. *IOSR Journal Of Humanities And Social Science (IOSR-JHSS)*, 23(8), 71–80. <https://doi.org/10.9790/0837-2308037180>
- Paíta, S., Tewal, B., & Sendow, G. M. (2015). Pengaruh Kompensasi Dan Lingkungan Kerja Terhadap Kinerja Pegawai Melalui Motivasi Kerja Pada Balai Pendidikan Dan Pelatihan Keagamaan Manado. *Jurnal Emba*, 3(3), 683–694.
- Pawar, P. R. (2019). Impact of Teachers' Attitude on Motivation of the Students. *Adalya Journal*, 8(1), 1–2.

- Putri, E. M., Ekowati, V. M., Supriyanto, A. S., & Mukaffi, Z. (2019). The Effect of Work Environment on Employee Performance Through Work Discipline. *International Journal of Research-GRANTHAALAYAH*, 7(4), 132–140. <https://doi.org/10.29121/granthaalayah.v7.i4.2019.882>
- Robbins, S. P., Coulter, M. A., & Cenzo, D. A. De. (2020). *Fundamental of Management* (Eleventh E, Vol. 1999, Issue December). Pearson Education Limited.
- Robbins, S. P., & Judge, T. A. (2014). *Essentials of Organizational Behavior Twelfth Edition* (S. Wall (ed.); Twelfth ed). Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data.
- Robbins, S. P., & Judge, T. A. (2015). *Organizational Behavior: Organizational Contexts* (S. Wall (ed.); 16th ed.). Pearson Education Limited.
- Robbins, S. P., & Judge, T. A. (2022). *Organizational Behavior Seventeenth Edition* (Eighteenthv ed.). Pearson Education Limited.
- Rosmaini, R., & Tanjung, H. (2019). Pengaruh Kompetensi, Motivasi Dan Kepuasan Kerja Terhadap Kinerja Pegawai. *Maneggio: Jurnal Ilmiah Magister Manajemen*, 2(1), 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.30596/maneggio.v2i1.3366>
- Ross, S. C. (2021). Organizational Behavior Today. In *Organizational Behavior Today* (1st ed.). Routledge Taylor & Francis Group. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003142119>
- Schermerhorn, J. R., Hunt, J. G., Osborn, R. N., & Uhl-Bien, M. (2010). Organizational Behavior Eleventh ed. In L. Johnson (Ed.), *John Wiley & Sons, Inc* (Eleventh ed.). John Wiley & Sons, Inc. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315669304>
- Sekaran, U., & Bougie, R. (2016). *Research Methods for Business* (Seventh ed). John Wiley & Sons Ltd.
- Shahab, M. A., & Nisa, I. (2014). The Influence of Leadership and Work attitude toward Job Satisfaction and Performance of Employee. *International Journal of Managerial Studies and Research (IJMSR)*, 2(5), 69-77.
- Siddiqi, T. (2018). Impact of Work Environment, Compensation and Motivation on the Performance of Employees in the Insurance Companies of Bangladesh. *South East Asia Journal of Contemporary Business, Economic and Law*, 15(5), 153–162.
- Simanjuntak, P. A. (2020). Pengaruh Etos Kerja, Kepuasan Kerja, Sikap Kerja Dan Motivasi Kerja Terhadap Kinerja Pegawai Pada Kantor Pelayanan Pajak Pratama Medan Polonia. *JMB (Jurnal Manajemen Dan Bisnis)*, 2(1), 44–85. <https://doi.org/10.30743/jmb.v2i1.2358>
- Sofyan, D. K. (2013). Pengaruh Lingkungan Kerja Terhadap Kinerja Kerja Pegawai BAPPEDA. *Malikussaleh Industrial Engineering*, 2(1), 18–23.
- Subakti, A. G. (2013). Pengaruh Motivasi, Kepuasan, dan Sikap Kerja terhadap Kinerja Karyawan di Café X Bogor. *Binus Business Review*, 4(1), 596–606.
- Subandowo, M. (2016). The Effect of Training on Work Motivation, Attitude, Fatigue, and Productivity. *International Journal of Management and Administrative Sciences (IJMAS)*, 3(07), 41–52.
- Sudana, I. W., & Supartha, W. G. (2015). Pengaruh Kompensasi dan Lingkungan Kerja Fisik terhadap Motivasi dan Kepuasan Kerja Karyawan di Grand Puncak Sari Restaurant Kintamani. *E-Jurnal Manajemen Universitas Udayana*, 4(7), 1865–1882.
- Suprihatmi, & Sulistyanyingsih, S. (2006). Pengaruh Gaya Kepemimpinan Dan Lingkungan Kerja terhadap Motivasi Kerja Guru.pdf. *Jurnal Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia*, 1(1), 113–127.
- Suwondo, D. I., & Sutanto, E. M. (2015). Hubungan Lingkungan Kerja, Disiplin Kerja, dan Kinerja Karyawan. *Jurnal Manajemen Dan Kewirausahaan*, 17(2), 41–59. <https://doi.org/10.9744/jmk.17.2.135>
- Syahrudin, Saleh, M. S., & Saleh, M. S. (2019). The influence of kinesthetics, attitude and motivation on the learning results of sports education. *Jurnal Sportif Jurnal Penelitian Pembelajaran*, 5(2), 17.
- Tambak, N. A., Zebua, Y., & Lam, S. (2021). The Effect of Work Discipline , Work Engagement , Work Attitude and Commitment on Employee Performance in the Pamong Praja Police Unit , Labuhan Batu Regency. *Budapest International Research and Critics University Journal*.
- Tannady, H., Erlyana, Y., & Nurprihatin, F. (2019). Effects of work environment and self-efficacy toward motivation of workers in creative sector in province of Jakarta, Indonesia. *Quality – Access to Success*, 20(172), 165–168.
- Torrington, D., Hall, L., Taylor, S., & Atkinson, C. (2020). *Human Resource Management* (Eleventh ed.). Pearson Education Limited. <http://medcontent.metapress.com/index/A65RM03P4874243N.pdf>
- Umni, K. (2017). Pengaruh Lingkungan Kerja dan Budaya Organisasi terhadap Efektivitas Kerja melalui Motivasi Kerja sebagai Variabel Intervening pada PT. Trasti Global Konverta. *Journal of Business Studies Quarterly*, 2(2), 12.
- Utami, S. S., & Hartanto, A. (2010). Pengaruh kepemimpinan, motivasi, komunikasi dan lingkungan kerja terhadap kinerja pegawai kecamatan jumantono kabupaten karanganyar. *Manajemen Sumberdaya Manusia*, 4(1), 58–67. <http://ejournal.unisri.ac.id/index.php/Manajemen/article/view/89/62>
- Wagner III, J. A., & Hollenbeck, J. R. (2010). *Organizational Behavior Securing Competitive Advantage*. Taylor & Francis Group.
- Wahyudi, A., & Suryono, J. (2021). Pengaruh Gaya Kepemimpinan, Lingkungan Kerja, dan Motivasi Kerja Terhadap Kinerja Pegawai. *Jurnal Administrasi Bisnis (Jab)*, 11(1), 7–13. <https://doi.org/10.35797/jab.11.1.2021.33535.7-13>
- Widyawati, E. (2021). Pengaruh Disiplin Kerja dan Lingkungan Kerja terhadap Kinerja Pegawai melalui Motivasi Kerja di Dinas Kelautan dan Perikanan Provinsi Jawa Timur. *Soetomo Business Review*, 2(2), 106–112. <https://ejournal.unitomo.ac.id/index.php/sbr/article/view/3512>