

The Effect of Work Environment on Employee Performance Mediated by Job Satisfaction and Work Motivation at the Badan Pembinaan Ideologi Pancasila (BPIP)

Bayu Trifiansyah¹, I Ketut R Sudiarditha², Christian Wiradendi Wolor³

^{1,2,3} Faculty of Economics, Jakarta State University, Indonesia.

Corresponding author : bayu942013@gmail.com

Abstract

This study aims to analyze the effect of the work environment on employee performance by considering the mediating roles of job satisfaction and work motivation at the Badan Pembinaan Ideologi Pancasila (BPIP). The research is motivated by internal and external challenges faced by BPIP as a strategic non-ministerial institution, including budget efficiency policies, fluctuations in key performance indicators, and organizational restructuring. A quantitative method was employed using Structural Equation Modeling–Partial Least Squares (SEM-PLS). The sample consisted of BPIP employees selected through purposive sampling. The findings reveal that the work environment significantly affects both job satisfaction and work motivation. Job satisfaction has a significant effect on employee performance, while work motivation does not show a significant impact. The work environment also directly affects employee performance. Furthermore, job satisfaction partially mediates the relationship between the work environment and performance, while work motivation does not serve as a significant mediator. The practical implications highlight the importance of optimizing both physical and non-physical work environment factors to improve employee performance, with job satisfaction identified as a strategic pathway for HR policy development in the public sector.

Keywords: Work Environment, Job Satisfaction, Work Motivation, Employee Performance.



INTRODUCTION

Human Resources (HR) are a vital element within any organization, institution, or agency—whether governmental or private. The sustainability of an organization depends on the quality of its human resources, which play a key role in driving institutional advancement. Therefore, enhancing the capacity of human resources is essential for progress. Concrete and targeted HR development is crucial to ensure that individuals grow effectively within an organization.

In the era of globalization and rapid technological disruption, employee performance has become a central focus for both private and public sectors. Various international reports, such as those from the McKinsey Global Institute (2021) and the World Economic Forum, emphasize the importance of improving human productivity in response to the dynamics of the digital economy and global uncertainty. Employee performance not only reflects organizational effectiveness but also serves as a foundation for national competitiveness. In Indonesia, bureaucratic reform has been identified as a strategic development priority. However, classic challenges—such as inconsistent employee performance, low motivation, and suboptimal work environments—continue to hinder performance in several government agencies. In this context, investigating the factors that influence employee performance becomes increasingly relevant.

This study focuses on the Agency for the Implementation of Pancasila Ideology (Badan Pembinaan Ideologi Pancasila – BPIP). This agency was selected as the research locus because it is a relatively new institution, established in 2018 under Presidential Regulation No. 7 of 2018. As a newly-formed non-ministerial government body, BPIP faces unique challenges in ensuring optimal employee performance amid budget constraints, organizational restructuring, and high public expectations for the promotion of Pancasila values.

BPIP is tasked with grounding the values of Pancasila across Indonesia. The realization of the vision and mission of the President and Vice President must be supported by highly competent, professional, innovative, and integrity-driven human resources (apparatus) at BPIP in delivering services related to Pancasila Ideology Development. These employees are expected to perform at their best to meet the demands of their work, which directly impacts the quality of services provided to the President and Vice President. Thus, BPIP personnel hold a crucial role in driving the institution's mission to embed Pancasila values and promote it as the national ideology throughout Indonesia.



The influence of the work environment on employee performance is not always direct. In modern occupational psychology, job satisfaction and work motivation often act as key mediating variables in this relationship. Motivation plays a vital role in encouraging employees to perform optimally. Both intrinsic motivation such as a sense of responsibility and personal satisfaction and extrinsic motivation such as rewards and compensation encourage employees to contribute more toward organizational goals. Highly motivated employees tend to be more disciplined, committed, and proactive in completing tasks. In contrast, lack of motivation may lead to aimlessness, low morale, and decreased organizational productivity.

Robbins and Judge (2017) define motivation as the process that explains an individual's intensity, direction, and persistence in achieving goals. Hasibuan (2014) describes work motivation as a drive that makes a person willing and ready to exert effort, skills, and time to carry out tasks to achieve organizational goals. Meanwhile, Mangkunegara (2005) states that work motivation is a condition that drives a person to consciously engage in activities to reach specific objectives. Employees with high motivation tend to be more effective, responsible, and able to meet performance targets.

Previous studies have extensively identified factors affecting the relationship between the work environment and employee performance, with job satisfaction and motivation as mediators. Ayunasrah et al. (2022) found that while the work environment affects employee performance, job satisfaction actually weakens this effect. Similarly, Pawirosumarto (2017) reported that the work environment influences job satisfaction but not employee performance, and that job satisfaction does not significantly mediate performance outcomes.

Conversely, Chandra (2016) showed that the work environment directly influences employee performance. R. Setyo (2017), in a study on Indonesia Stock Exchange employees, found that the physical dimension of the work environment had the greatest influence, while non-physical aspects had a smaller correlation. Meanwhile, Haerofiatna et al. (2021), in a study on teachers in the Greater Jakarta area, concluded that the work environment had no effect on job satisfaction, but still influenced performance. In this case, job satisfaction did not affect performance.

In terms of motivation, several studies also emphasize its correlation with employee performance. Handoko (2018) found that work motivation significantly affects performance, especially through self-actualization and recognition needs. Similarly, Priansa (2016) stated that both internal and external motivation jointly enhance employee productivity and accountability. Additionally, Suryani (2019) affirmed that motivation plays

1277



a key role in shaping job satisfaction, which subsequently impacts performance improvement.

From these findings, it can be concluded that both the work environment and motivation are crucial factors influencing performance, either directly or indirectly through job satisfaction. Therefore, this study investigates three main variables: work environment, motivation, and job satisfaction in relation to employee performance. These variables were chosen based on their frequent appearance in prior research, such as office conditions, lighting, temperature, cleanliness, and access to technology (work environment), as well as recognition, promotion, feedback, and compensation (motivation and job satisfaction).

LITERATURE REVIEW

Employee Performance

Employee performance is one of the most crucial aspects of human resource management, as it determines the extent to which employees contribute to the achievement of organizational goals. According to Bernardin and Russell (1993), performance is defined as the record of outcomes produced from a specific job function over a certain period, with a primary focus on measurable work results. This view is in line with Mangkunegara (2005), who stated that performance refers to the quality and quantity of work achieved by an employee in carrying out their duties in accordance with the responsibilities assigned. This indicates that performance is not only about results but also about how the work processes are executed by the employee. Furthermore, Robbins (2006) emphasized that performance is a function of motivation and ability, implying that an employee's success is largely determined by their willingness to work and their competence in performing the job. Similarly, Sedarmayanti (2001) defines employee performance as the output achieved by an individual in executing assigned tasks, influenced by skills, experience, and work commitment. He also highlights the importance of the work environment and organizational systems as contributing factors to performance levels. Additionally, Mathis and Jackson (2010) noted that performance encompasses what employees do—or fail to do—that contributes to organizational objectives, underlining the critical role of employees in supporting overall organizational effectiveness. Operationally, employee performance is defined as the outcome of performance appraisal by supervisors, based on the tasks carried out by individuals according to their assigned responsibilities, measured in terms of both quantity and



quality. It is assessed using five dimensions according to Mangkunegara (2005) is Work Quality, Work Quantity, Timeliness, Attendance, and Cooperation Ability

Work Environment

The work environment refers to the physical, social, and psychological conditions in the workplace that influence employee performance and well-being. A healthy and supportive work environment can enhance productivity and job satisfaction, whereas a poor environment may lead to stress, reduced performance, and dissatisfaction (Chandrasekar, 2011). A well-designed work environment can have a long-term impact on operational efficiency. Conversely, an inadequate work environment often demands more energy and time from employees and hinders the development of an efficient work system (Vischer, 2007). According to Robert L. Kahn and Cary L. Byosiore (1992), the work environment is the interaction between individuals and workplace situations, composed of two main elements: physical and psychological aspects. Both elements play an important role in influencing individual behavior and performance in the workplace. Physical elements include temperature, lighting, cleanliness, and comfort, while psychological aspects encompass employees' feelings toward their work, interpersonal relationships, and stress levels. Wahyudin and Logahan (2020) stated that a conducive work environment includes physical conditions, psychological climate, social relationships, and adequate facilities that support comfort and work productivity. Similarly, Nitisemito (1996) noted that the work environment consists of everything surrounding an employee that may influence their ability to carry out assigned tasks effectively. Operationally, the work environment is defined as the total physical, social, and psychological conditions in the workplace that affect employee comfort and productivity. In this study, it is measured using two main dimensions based on Sedarmayanti (2001) is Physical Work Environment and Non-Physical Work Environment.

Job Satisfaction

Job satisfaction remains a crucial issue for discussion, as it helps organizations retain experienced, well-trained, and competent employees. It also directly impacts the quality of work and employee productivity (Ismail & Razak, 2016). Moreover, job satisfaction enhances employee loyalty and organizational commitment, thereby reducing absenteeism, turnover intention, and actual turnover (Nath Gangai & Agrawal, 2015). Job satisfaction can be defined as a series of pleasant or unpleasant emotional feelings experienced by employees regarding their work (Srivasta, 2013). In line with this, Lambert

1279



(2004) stated that job satisfaction reflects the extent to which an individual enjoys their job. In addition, job satisfaction refers to an individual's perception that arises from the relationship between how well the work environment fulfills their needs and values, and the individual's response to that environment (Nath Gangai & Agrawal, 2015). Locke (1969) defined job satisfaction as a positive emotional state resulting from one's evaluation of their job experience by comparing what they expect from their job with what they actually receive. One of the most influential theories on job satisfaction is Herzberg's Two-Factor Theory, developed in 1959. Herzberg categorized the factors affecting job satisfaction into two groups: motivator factors (intrinsic), which refer to the need for growth and self-actualization (Herzberg, 2003), and hygiene factors (extrinsic), which are associated with the need to avoid unpleasant conditions (Herzberg, 2003). Motivator factors are responsible for increasing and enhancing job satisfaction, while hygiene factors are aimed at reducing job dissatisfaction (Alshmemri, Shahwan-Akl, & Maude, 2017). Operationally, job satisfaction is defined as employees' positive self-perception of their job, stemming from the fulfillment of expectations, needs, and personal values. It is measured through two dimensions based on Herzberg's Two-Factor Theory (2003) is Intrinsic (Motivator) Factors: advancement, the work itself, opportunities for growth, responsibility, recognition, and achievement and Extrinsic (Hygiene) Factors: relationships with coworkers, salary, organizational policies, supervision, and working conditions

Work Motivation

According to Robbins and Judge (2017), motivation is a process that explains an individual's intensity, direction, and persistence in achieving a goal. This theory emphasizes that motivation is not only about how hard someone works but also the direction of that effort and how long they sustain it. Herzberg's Two-Factor Theory (2003) further divides motivation into two key elements: motivator factors (intrinsic)—such as achievement, recognition, and the work itself—and hygiene factors (extrinsic)—such as salary, interpersonal relationships, and working conditions. Both sets of factors play a critical role in determining an employee's level of satisfaction and motivation. Additionally, McClelland (1961) proposed that work motivation is driven by three fundamental needs: the need for achievement, the need for power, and the need for affiliation. Each of these needs contributes differently to shaping an individual's motivation at work. Vroom's Expectancy Theory (1964) is also highly relevant in explaining work motivation. Vroom posited that motivation is a result of an individual's expectation that effort will lead to good

1280



performance (expectancy), performance will lead to desirable outcomes (instrumentality), and that these outcomes are valued by the individual (valence). Empirical research by Paais and Pattiruhu (2013) further supports the critical role of motivation in enhancing employee performance, both directly and indirectly through job satisfaction as a mediating variable. Operationally, work motivation is defined as the psychological process that directs, intensifies, and sustains individual behavior in achieving job goals. It is measured using three dimensions according to Robbins & Judge (2017) is Intensity, Direction and Persistence.

RESEARCH METHOD

This study employs a quantitative explanatory approach, which aims to test and explain causal relationships between predetermined variables based on existing theories and previous research. This approach was chosen because it allows for the measurement of the influence of the independent variable (work environment) on the dependent variable (employee performance), with job satisfaction and work motivation as mediating variables. The type of research is applied research, as the results are expected to provide practical recommendations for the Agency for the Implementation of Pancasila Ideology (BPIP) in its efforts to improve employee performance. Furthermore, this study is classified as cross-sectional research, as data collection was carried out at a single point in time (snapshot) through an online questionnaire distributed to selected respondents. The population in this study consists of all civil servants (PNS) working at BPIP, totaling 321 employees. The sampling technique used is purposive sampling, in which respondents are selected based on specific criteria relevant to the research objectives, such as a minimum of one year of service and involvement in public service activities. The data collection instrument used is a structured (closed-ended) questionnaire, developed based on well-established theoretical indicators, including Herzberg's theory for job satisfaction, Paais & Pattiruhu's theory for motivation, Sedarmayanti's theory for the work environment, and Mangkunegara's theory for employee performance. The collected data will be analyzed using the Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) method with SmartPLS software. SEM is chosen because it enables testing of both direct and indirect relationships among variables, including testing the mediating effects of job satisfaction in the relationship between work environment and motivation on employee performance.



RESULT**Respondent Classification****Table 1: Respondent Classification**

No	Category	Sub-Category	Frequency	Percentage
1	Gender	Male	74	47.7%
		Female	81	52.3%
2	Age	20–25 years	19	12.3%
		26–30 years	61	39.4%
		31–35 years	39	25.2%
		36–40 years	18	11.6%
		41–45 years	9	5.8%
		46–50 years	6	3.9%
		51 years or older	3	1.9%
3	Educational Background	Senior High School (SMA/SMK)	0	0%
		Diploma I/II/III	43	27.7%
		Diploma IV/Bachelor's Degree	88	56.8%
		Master's Degree	24	15.5%
		Doctoral Degree	0	0%
4	Work Unit	Main Secretariat	72	46.5%
		Deputy for Inter-Institutional Relations, Socialization, Communication, and Networks	13	8.4%
		Deputy for Legal Affairs, Advocacy, and Regulatory Oversight	16	10.3%
		Deputy for Research and Materials	21	13.5%



5		Deputy for Education and Training	21	13.5%
		Deputy for Control and Evaluation	12	7.7%
	Years of Service	Less than 2 years	50	32.3%
		2 to less than 5 years	73	47.1%
		5 to less than 7 years	23	14.8%
		7 years or more	9	5.8%

Based on Table 1, the majority of respondents came from the Main Secretariat Unit, totaling 72 respondents (46.5%). In terms of gender, 52.3% of the respondents were female, while 47.7% were male. Regarding age distribution, most respondents were in the 31 to 35 years age group. In terms of educational background, the majority held a Diploma IV or Bachelor's Degree. Lastly, based on years of service, most employees at BPIP had 2 to less than 5 years of work experience.

Measurement Model

Table 2: Loading Factors

Variable	Item Code	Loading Factor	Description
Employee Performance	KP 1	0.841	Valid
	KP 2	0.713	Valid
	KP 3	0.809	Valid
	KP 4	0.789	Valid
	KP 5	0.776	Valid
	KP 6	0.819	Valid
	KP 7	0.871	Valid
	KP 8	0.792	Valid
	KP 9	0.786	Valid
	KP 10	0.716	Valid
	KP 11	0.768	Valid
	KP 12	0.807	Valid
	KP 13	0.836	Valid
	KP 14	0.874	Valid
	KP 15	0.785	Valid



Work Environment	LK 1	0.769	Valid
	LK 2	0.779	Valid
	LK 3	0.832	Valid
	LK 4	0.824	Valid
	LK 5	0.799	Valid
	LK 6	0.768	Valid
	LK 7	0.720	Valid
	LK 8	0.807	Valid
	LK 9	0.834	Valid
Job Satisfaction	KK1	0.707	Valid
	KK2	0.794	Valid
	KK3	0.761	Valid
	KK4	0.801	Valid
	KK5	0.797	Valid
	KK6	0.774	Valid
	KK7	0.799	Valid
	KK8	0.781	Valid
	KK9	0.760	Valid
	KK10	0.773	Valid
	KK11	0.820	Valid
	KK12	0.813	Valid
	KK13	0.826	Valid
	KK14	0.787	Valid
	KK15	0.781	Valid
Work Motivation	MK 1	0.855	Valid
	MK 2	0.827	Valid
	MK 3	0.701	Valid
	MK 4	0.785	Valid
	MK 5	0.871	Valid
	MK 6	0.866	Valid
	MK 7	0.780	Valid
	MK 8	0.797	Valid
	MK 9	0.845	Valid



	MK 10	0.839	Valid
--	-------	-------	-------

Based on the table above, all indicators for the variables of employee performance, work environment, job satisfaction, and work motivation have loading factor values greater than 0.70, which meet the standard threshold for indicator validity in reflective measurement models. This indicates that all items are valid and strongly reflect their respective constructs. Therefore, all indicators can be used for further analysis using Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) with SmartPLS.

Table 3: Reliability Test Result

Construct	Cronbach's Alpha	Composite Reliability	Conclusion
Employee Performance	0,960	0,964	Reliable
Work Environment	0,926	0,938	Reliable
Job Satisfaction	0,956	0,960	Reliable
Work Motivation	0,946	0,953	Reliable

The table above shows that all constructs—Employee Performance, Work Environment, Job Satisfaction, and Work Motivation—have Cronbach's Alpha and Composite Reliability values above 0.7, which meets the recommended threshold for internal consistency reliability (Hair et al., 2019). Specifically, Cronbach's Alpha values range from 0.926 to 0.960, and Composite Reliability values range from 0.938 to 0.964, indicating that all constructs are highly reliable and consistently measured by their respective indicators.

Structural Model**Table 4: R-Square**

Construct	R Square
Employee Performance	0,754
Job Satisfaction	0,448
Work Motivation	0,302

Based on the figure above, the R-Square (R^2) value for the Employee Performance variable is 0.754, which means that the proportion of variance in employee performance



can be explained by Work Environment, Job Satisfaction, and Work Motivation by 75.4%, indicating a strong level of explanatory power. Meanwhile, the R^2 value for Job Satisfaction is 0.448, indicating that the Work Environment explains 44.8% of the variance in job satisfaction, which is classified as moderate. As for Work Motivation, the R^2 value is 0.302, meaning that 30.2% of its variance is explained by the Work Environment, which also falls within the moderate category.

Table 5: Q-Square

Construct	SSO	SSE	$Q^2 (=1-SSE/SSO)$
Employee Performance	1395,000	1395,000	
Job Satisfaction	2325,000	1704,277	0,267
Work Motivation	1550,000	1269,178	0,181

Based on the table above, the Q^2 value for the Employee Performance variable is 0.472 or 47.2%, for Job Satisfaction it is 0.267 or 26.7%, and for Work Motivation, the Q^2 value is 0.181 or 18.1%. Since all Q^2 values are greater than 0, it indicates that the structural model has predictive relevance for all endogenous variables. In other words, the model is capable of predicting data points that were not used in model estimation, thereby supporting the quality and robustness of the predictive capability of the proposed model.

Table 6: F-Square

Construct	Job Satisfaction	Work Motivation	Employee Performance
Employee Performance	0,812	0,432	0,282
Job Satisfaction			0,612
Work Motivation			0,000

Based on the table above, the f-square (f^2) values indicate that the Work Environment (X) construct has a large substantive effect on Job Satisfaction, with an f^2 value of 0.812, a moderate effect on Work Motivation ($f^2 = 0.432$), and a small to moderate effect on Employee Performance ($f^2 = 0.282$). Furthermore, the Job Satisfaction (Z1) construct has a large substantive effect on Employee Performance, with an f^2 value of 0.612, indicating that it is a key factor influencing employee performance. On the other hand, the Work Motivation (Z2) construct has an f^2 value of 0.000 on Employee



Performance, which suggests that it has no significant contribution to the performance variable. These findings demonstrate that Job Satisfaction serves as the most influential factor in explaining Employee Performance (Y), followed by the Work Environment, which also plays a meaningful role. In contrast, Work Motivation has a minimal effect, indicating that its direct impact on employee performance is negligible within this model.

Hypothesis Test

Table 7: Hypothesis Test

Hypothesis	Original Sample	T Statistic	P Values	Conclusion
Direct Effect				
H1	0,669	15,802	0,000	Accepted
H2	0,549	10,718	0,000	Accepted
H3	0,586	9,621	0,000	Accepted
H4	-0,002	0,035	0,972	Rejected
H5	0,752	20,982	0,000	Accepted
Indirect Effect				
H6	0,392	8,085	0,000	Accepted
H7	-0,001	0,034	0,973	Rejected

Based on the results of hypothesis testing, several findings were obtained as follows:

1. The original sample value of 0.669 indicates that Work Environment has a positive direct effect on Job Satisfaction. The t-statistic value of $15.802 > 1.96$ and the p-value of $0.000 < 0.05$ indicate that this effect is statistically significant. Thus, H1 is accepted.
2. The original sample value of 0.549 suggests that Work Environment has a positive direct effect on Work Motivation. With a t-statistic of $10.718 > 1.96$ and a p-value of $0.000 < 0.05$, the effect is deemed statistically significant. Therefore, H2 is accepted.
3. The original sample value of 0.586 shows that Job Satisfaction has a positive direct effect on Employee Performance. The t-statistic of $9.621 > 1.96$ and the p-value of $0.000 < 0.05$ confirm that the effect is significant. Hence, H3 is accepted.
4. The original sample value of -0.002 indicates that Work Motivation has a negative direct effect on Employee Performance. However, with a t-statistic of $0.035 < 1.96$ and a p-value of $0.972 > 0.05$, the effect is not statistically significant. Therefore, H4 is rejected.



5. The original sample value of 0.752 suggests that Work Environment has a positive direct effect on Employee Performance. With a t-statistic of $20.982 > 1.96$ and a p-value of $0.000 < 0.05$, this effect is statistically significant. Thus, H5 is accepted.
6. The original sample value of 0.392 shows that Work Environment has a positive indirect effect on Employee Performance through Job Satisfaction. The t-statistic of $8.085 > 1.96$ and the p-value of $0.000 < 0.05$ indicate a significant mediating effect. Therefore, H6 is accepted.
7. The original sample value of -0.001 indicates that Work Environment has a negative indirect effect on Employee Performance through Work Motivation. However, the t-statistic of $0.034 < 1.96$ and the p-value of $0.973 > 0.05$ show that this effect is not statistically significant. Therefore, H7 is rejected.

DISCUSSION

The findings of this study confirm that the work environment plays a critical role in influencing employee performance, both directly and indirectly. The direct positive and significant impact of the work environment on job satisfaction aligns with previous research (e.g., Sedarmayanti, 2001), which emphasized that physical and non-physical workplace conditions substantially affect employees' comfort and overall psychological well-being. A conducive work environment—characterized by proper lighting, temperature, cleanliness, and interpersonal relationships—creates a positive atmosphere that fosters satisfaction and engagement.

Additionally, the work environment also demonstrated a significant positive effect on work motivation, supporting theories by Robbins & Judge (2017) that emphasize the role of external conditions in shaping intrinsic and extrinsic motivation. However, the study revealed a contrasting finding regarding motivation: although the work environment positively influences motivation, motivation itself does not significantly impact employee performance. This suggests that motivation, while present, may not be strong enough or appropriately aligned with performance goals, possibly due to mismatches between rewards, recognition, or organizational expectations. In contrast, job satisfaction shows a strong positive and significant effect on employee performance, confirming Herzberg's Two-Factor Theory (2003), which explains that satisfied employees tend to demonstrate higher commitment, productivity, and responsibility. This implies that efforts to enhance employee satisfaction such as through meaningful work, advancement opportunities, and fair supervision are more likely to yield improvements in performance.



Moreover, the work environment has both direct and indirect effects on employee performance. The indirect effect through job satisfaction was found to be significant, highlighting the mediating role of satisfaction in translating a supportive environment into higher performance. This reinforces the idea that satisfaction acts as a psychological bridge that converts favorable work conditions into productive behavior. However, the indirect effect of the work environment on performance through work motivation was negative and not significant. This outcome suggests that although the work environment may enhance motivation, it does not necessarily translate into better performance unless motivation is internalized and aligned with organizational objectives. The absence of a significant mediating role for motivation may also reflect issues such as lack of reward clarity, weak goal setting, or insufficient managerial support in turning motivation into action.

Overall, the results underscore the pivotal role of job satisfaction in mediating the relationship between work environment and performance, while also indicating the need for deeper strategies to translate motivation into measurable outcomes. Organizations like BPIP should therefore prioritize improvements in workplace quality and ensure that motivational programs are well-integrated with performance management systems.

CONCLUSION

Based on the research questions and the results of hypothesis testing, it can be concluded that the work environment has a direct positive and significant effect on both job satisfaction and work motivation, indicating that a supportive and comfortable workplace contributes to higher levels of employee satisfaction and motivation. Job satisfaction also has a direct positive and significant effect on employee performance, meaning that employees who are more satisfied with their jobs tend to perform better. However, work motivation shows a direct negative and insignificant effect on employee performance, suggesting that high motivation alone does not necessarily lead to improved performance. Furthermore, the work environment has a direct positive and significant effect on employee performance, reinforcing its critical role in driving productivity. Indirectly, the work environment positively and significantly affects employee performance through job satisfaction, implying that a conducive work environment can enhance performance by increasing employee satisfaction. In contrast, the indirect effect of the work environment on performance through motivation is negative and insignificant, indicating that although the environment may appear adequate, it does not effectively enhance employee motivation in a way that translates to better performance outcomes.

1289



REFERENCES

- Alshmemri, M., Shahwan-Akl, L., & Maude, P. (2017). Herzberg's Two-Factor Theory. *Life Science Journal*, 14(5), 12–16.
- Ayunasrah, T., Ratnawati, R., Diana, R., & Ansari, A. (2022). *Pengaruh Lingkungan Kerja terhadap Kinerja Pegawai dengan Kepuasan Kerja sebagai Variabel Mediasi pada Dinas Lingkungan Hidup Kabupaten Bener Meriah*. *Jurnal Ilmiah Ilmu Manajemen*, 4(1), 1–10.
- Bernardin, H. J., & Russell, J. E. A. (1993). *Human Resource Management: An Experiential Approach*. McGraw-Hill.
- Chandra, T. (2016). The Influence of Leadership Styles, Work Environment and Job Satisfaction of Employee Performance--Studies in the School of SMPN 10 Surabaya. *International Education Studies*, 9(1), 131-140.
- Chandrasekar, K. (2011). Workplace environment and its impact on organizational performance in public sector organizations. *International Journal of Enterprise Computing and Business Systems*, 1(1), 1–19.
- Haerofiatna, Erlangga, H., Mulyana, Y., Sunarsi, D., Solahudin, M., Dwiwarman, D. A., Waskita, N. I. D., ... & Purwanto, A. (2021). The effect of organizational commitment and work environment on job satisfaction and teachers performance. *Turkish Journal of Computer and Mathematics Education*, 12(7), 109-117.
- Hasibuan, M. S. P. (2014). *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia*. Bumi Aksara.
- Herzberg, F. (2003). One More Time: How Do You Motivate Employees? *Harvard Business Review*, 81(1), 86–96.
- Kahn, R. L., & Byosiore, C. L. (1960). Organizational stress: Studies in role conflict and ambiguity. In J. W. Newstrom (Ed.), *Wiley Series in Organizational Psychology*.
- Lambert, E. G. (2004). The impact of job characteristics on correctional staff members. *The Prison Journal*, 84(2), 208–227.
- Mangkunegara, A. A. P. (2005). *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia Perusahaan*. Remaja Rosdakarya.
- Mathis, R. L., & Jackson, J. H. (2010). *Human Resource Management* (13th ed.). South-Western Cengage Learning.
- McClelland, D. C. (1961). *The Achieving Society*. Van Nostrand.
- Nath Gangai, K., & Agrawal, R. (2015). Job satisfaction and organizational commitment: Is it important for employee performance. *International Journal of Management and Business Research*, 5(4), 269–278.



- Paais, M., & Pattiruhu, J. R. (2020). Effect of motivation, leadership, and organizational culture on satisfaction and employee performance. *Journal of Asian Finance, Economics and Business*, 7(8), 577–588.
- Pawirosumarto, S., Sarjana, P. K., & Gunawan, R. (2017). The effect of work environment, leadership style, and organizational culture towards job satisfaction and its implication towards employee performance in Parador Hotels and Resorts, Indonesia. *International journal of law and management*, 59(6), 1337-1358.
- Priansa, D. J. (2016). *Perilaku Organisasi dalam Manajemen*. Alfabeta.
- Riyanto, S., Sutrisno, A., & Ali, H. (2017). The impact of working motivation and working environment on employees performance in Indonesia stock exchange. *International Review of Management and Marketing*, 7(3), 342-348.
- Robbins, S. P., & Judge, T. A. (2017). *Organizational behavior* (17th ed.). Pearson Education.
- Sedarmayanti. (2001). *Tata kerja dan produktivitas kerja*. Mandar Maju.
- Srivastava, S. (2013). Job satisfaction and organizational commitment relationship: Effect of personality variables. *Vision: The Journal of Business Perspective*, 17(2), 159–167. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0972262912483529>
- Suryani, N. (2019). Pengaruh motivasi terhadap kepuasan kerja dan dampaknya terhadap kinerja karyawan. *Jurnal Manajemen dan Bisnis*, 7(1), 12–21.
- 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.
- Vroom, V. H. (1964). *Work and Motivation*. Wiley.
- Wahyudin, D., & Logahan, J. F. (2020). Lingkungan kerja dan motivasi pegawai: Kajian psikososial dalam organisasi pemerintahan. *Jurnal Psikologi Industri dan Organisasi*, 5(1), 45–58.

