
JOURNAL OF ECONOMIC, BUSINESS AND ADMINISTRATION (JEBA)

Vol. 5 No. 4 (2024) | E ISSN: 2746 1688 | ISSN: 2985 6744

THE EFFECT OF WORK ENVIRONMENT AND JOB SATISFACTION ON PERFORMANCE OF EMPLOYEE MANAGERS IN GORONTALO DISTRICT

Wati Rudin¹, Sri Yulianty Mozin², Rizal³

¹University of Bina Taruna Gorontalo

²University of Gorontalo

³Lembaga Layanan Pendidikan Tinggi Wilayah XVI

¹email: wati.rudin78@gmail.com

²email: sri@noemail.com

³email: rizalakhtar23@gmail.com

Abstract

The purpose of this study was to determine and analyze (1) how the influence of the work environment on the performance of personnel managers in Gorontalo Regency, (2) how the influence of job satisfaction on the performance of personnel managers in Gorontalo Regency; (3) how the influence of the work environment and job satisfaction together on the performance of personnel managers in Gorontalo Regency. This study uses a quantitative approach to the type of survey research. The technique used to obtain data is a questionnaire technique (questionnaire) or a list of questions. Data analysis techniques were carried out through descriptive analysis, validity test, reliability test, analysis requirements test, multiple regression analysis, partial test (t test), F test, and R² test (coefficient of determination). The technique of collecting data is through a survey of 64 personnel managers in Gorontalo Regency. Data analysis was performed by multiple linear regression. The results of this study indicate that: (1) the work environment has a positive and significant effect on the performance of personnel managers in Gorontalo Regency. This means that the better the work environment, the higher the performance of personnel managers in Gorontalo Regency; (2) job satisfaction has a positive and significant effect on the performance of personnel managers in Gorontalo Regency. This means that the higher the job satisfaction felt by the personnel managers, the higher the performance of the personnel managers in Gorontalo Regency; (3) work environment and job satisfaction together have a positive and significant effect on the performance of personnel managers in Gorontalo Regency. The higher the work environment and job satisfaction, the higher the performance of personnel managers in Gorontalo Regency.

Keywords: *Work Environment, Job Satisfaction, Employee Performance, Personnel Manager, Gorontalo Regency.*

Submit: 06/03/2022

Accepted: 25/11/2024

Publish: 15/12/2024

1. Introduction

Optimal performance is something that every public organization wants to achieve. The organization will progress if it is supported by the quality of employee performance and is reliable. This will have an impact on accelerating the achievement of organizational goals because along with the development of science and technology, there is a very tight competition in the world of work. Job satisfaction and performance is a very close relationship in an organization.

Job satisfaction and performance is a very close relationship in an organization. Job satisfaction is important for actualization, employees who do not get job satisfaction will never reach psychological maturity, and in turn will become frustrated. Employees will often daydream, have low morale, get tired and bored quickly, emotionally unstable, often absent and doing activities that have nothing to do with the work to be done.

The researcher found that in an initial interview with the Head of the Gorontalo Regency Regional Personnel, Education and Training Agency (BKD-Diklat) in February 2021, information was obtained that there were problems with the performance of personnel managers within the Gorontalo Regency Government. These

performance problems can be seen in terms of both quantity and quality. In terms of quantity, the performance data of personnel managers in Gorontalo Regency in the last three years is shown in Table 1. below this.

Table 1. Average Performance Achievement of Personnel Managers in Gorontalo.

Year	Performance Achievement	Target
2018	87, 81 persen	100 persen
2019	88, 01 persen	100 persen
2020	91, 32 persen	100 persen

Source: *Performance Accountability Report (2021)*

Data in Table 1. The above generally shows the trend in the performance of personnel managers in the Gorontalo Regency Government. The problem with this low performance is from the quantity, if from the data for the last 3 years where in 2018 the performance of personnel managers only reached 87.81%, for 2019 it was 88.01% and for 2020 it was 91.32%.

Data on the percentage of performance achievements each year is in Table 1. above is calculated based on the average performance of personnel managers in the Gorontalo Regency Government as an accumulation of attendance and the rest is actual performance. This is in accordance with the regulation of PNS performance and Payment of Performance Allowances based on Gorontalo Regent Regulation Number 22 of 2020 concerning Additional Income for Civil Servants within the Gorontalo Regency Government. 3 (three) months at Gorontalo Regency Government with 30% attendance component calculation and 70% Performance [1]. The attendance component is the result of the attendance recapitulation through finger print and the performance component is the result of monthly performance realization on the e-performance application. For example, the performance achievement in 2020 comes from an average of 30% attendance and 60.32% actual performance, so that the total achievement is 91.32%. This means, if a personnel manager, especially civil servants, only achieves 91.32% performance, then there is a TPP cut because it does not reach 100%. For example, the deduction becomes $91.32\% \times \text{Rp. } 2.500.000,-$ (for nominal TPP echelon IV) = Rp. 2,283,000,-

If you look at the data in Table 1. There is indeed an upward trend, but it is seen that it has not reached the expected target of 100%. As the vision of the elected Regional Head, namely Gemilang Regency towards civil society, is glorious, which means beyond achievement, it can be seen that the performance of the personnel manager in Gorontalo Regency has not achieved what is expected. Furthermore, in terms of quality based on initial observations, there are several personnel managers who have not mastered their main tasks or do not understand their duties and even tend to carry out other people's duties and functions, then they are disrespectful, indifferent, in providing services to stakeholders, only playing cellphones, also frequently not being in place when you want to be met or ignoring working hours, thus slowing down the management process such as for the management of promotions, periodic salaries, etc. Then there are some personnel managers who depend on orders or instructions from the leadership.

Based on the problem of the low performance of staffing managers in Gorontalo Regency, the researchers believe that work environment factors and job satisfaction are factors that affect the performance of staffing managers in Gorontalo Regency is low or not good. The problem is seen from the work environment factors based on the initial data obtained that the work environment is not optimal where some personnel managers who hold important positions are not involved in decision making, facilities and infrastructure are lacking in the form of stationery, tables and chairs that look worn out, not clean, there is a buildup of files file, so that it does not provide comfort for personnel managers to feel at home in doing work, and the most important thing is the information system that has not been integrated between service units, thus slowing down the work that has been targeted. Then the problem of the job satisfaction factor is that the personnel manager is not satisfied with the award program given by the leadership both materially and non-materially, there is no certificate or the like given to the personnel manager to provide morale, so that the personnel manager can excel and perform well.

Administration Concept

Etymologically, the term administration comes from English administration whose infinitive form is to administer, which means to manage or to direct (to move) [2].

The definition of administration is distinguished in a broad and narrow sense. In a broad sense: a) leading, controlling, implementing the law, b) serving/regulating interests based on the rule of law, as the government's power to regulate public or state interests. Whereas in a narrow sense it is an activity of recording, storing, sending, and reproducing letters, data, information, documents in a particular office/work unit [3].

Human Resource Management

Human Resource Management (HRM) is one of the fields of general management which includes aspects of planning, organizing, implementing and controlling. The factor of concern in HR management is the human itself [4].

The main reason for improving the quality and performance of HR in public organizations is mainly because of the strategic role of HR as the executor of the functions of public organizations, namely planning, organizing, staff management, leadership, control and supervision. The success or failure of the implementation of these functions is very dependent on the extent to which the quality and performance of human resources are [4]. HR management is also a strategic series, processes and activities designed to support the goals of public organizations by integrating the needs of public organizations and their individual human resources [4].

Performance

The basic concept of performance in the English equivalent is called "performance" namely job performance or actual performance (performance or real achievement) related to all activities in a work organization. Performance as a result of work in quality and quantity achieved by an employee in carrying out his duties in accordance with the responsibilities given to him [5]. In essence, the concept of performance focuses on the work results achieved by members of the organization according to the responsibilities assigned to them. Performance is a set of behaviors that are relevant to the goals of the organization or organizational unit where people work [6].

There are dimensions and indicators to measure the performance of the apparatus. Performance indicators can be seen from: 1) Quality of work, 2) Timeliness (pompntnees), 3) Initiative, 4) Capability, 5) Communication [6]. It is different with the performance indicators of the apparatus as detailed in Law Number 43 of 1999 concerning the assessment of the implementation of the work of the State Civil Apparatus. These indicators are: (1) loyalty, (2) work performance, (3) responsibility, (4) obedience (5) honesty, (6) cooperation, (7) initiative, (8) leadership [7].

Work Environment

The work environment is everything that is around the workers that can affect themselves in carrying out the tasks assigned [8]. The work environment of the apparatus can be categorized into (1) physical environment, and (2) non-physical environment. The physical work environment is all physical conditions that exist around the workplace that can affect them either directly or indirectly [6]. In contrast to the non-physical work environment, all conditions that occur are related to work relations, both relationships with leaders and relationships with fellow co-workers, or relationships with the apparatus [6].

Job Satisfaction

The concept and understanding of job satisfaction as put forward by experts focuses on feelings of satisfaction or dissatisfaction felt by the apparatus in carrying out their work. Job satisfaction is a pleasant or unpleasant emotional state in which employees view their work [9]. Job satisfaction is basically a psychological aspect that reflects a person's feelings towards his job [10].

2. Method and Analysis

This study uses a quantitative approach that is used to examine a sample of staffing managers in Gorontalo Regency, researchers collect data using research instruments, analyze data in statistical form with the aim of testing the established hypothesis. The population of this study is all staff managers in Gorontalo Regency, both State Civil Apparatus and contract workers totaling 64 people.

Thus, the sample studied is the staff manager in Gorontalo Regency, both State Civil Apparatus and contract workers totaling 64 people. This type of research is a survey research which involves the systematic collection of information from the Personnel Manager in Gorontalo Regency with standard procedures.

The starting point of this research data collection is the development of an instrument that contains the variables to be studied consisting of two independent variables (X), namely the work environment (X_1) and job satisfaction (X_2) and one dependent variable (dependent variable).) namely the performance of the personnel manager (Y). Collecting data in this study using a questionnaire technique (questionnaire) or a list of questions. Quantitative data analysis techniques in this study were used in the analysis process consisting of 1) descriptive analysis, 2) validity test, 3) reliability test, 4) analysis requirements test, 5) multiple regression analysis, 6) partial test (t test), 7) F test, and 8) R^2 test (*coefficient of determination*).

To test the proposed hypothesis, the analytical method used in the analysis process is descriptive analysis, which is to provide a complete picture of the general tendency of respondents regarding the influence of the work environment and job satisfaction on the performance of personnel managers in Gorontalo Regency. Validity test, which is to find out how far the research instrument is able to reflect the content in accordance with the things and properties being measured. Test the validity of this study using the formula from the Pearson Product Moment (PPM) correlation, namely:

$$r_{XY} = \frac{n\sum X_i Y_i - (\sum X_i)(\sum Y_i)}{\sqrt{\{n\sum X_i^2 - (\sum X_i)^2\} \{n\sum Y_i^2 - (\sum Y_i)^2\}}}$$

Where :

r_{XY} : The magnitude of relationship between the independent variable (X) and the dependent variable (Y)

n : Number of subjects that become respondents

The results of the empirical validity test on the three research variables consisting of (a) Personnel Manager Performance (Y), (b) Work Environment (X_1), and (c) Job Satisfaction (X_2), through field trials with the help of the program Validity test will be carried out with assistance program Statistical Product and Service Solutions (SPSS) version 22.0 for windows.

3. Result and Discussion

Description of Personnel Manager Performance Variable Data (Y)

Personnel Manager Performance Data (Y) was collected through a questionnaire spread over 21 statement items, obtained from 64 personnel managers as the research sample. The performance of the Personnel Manager (Y) is measured by five indicators, namely: (1) quality of work, (2) timing, (3) initiative, (4) ability, and (5) communication.

Table 2. Descriptive Results of Personnel Manager Performance Variable (Y)

Statement	Statement Score								Criteria
	F5	F4	F3	F2	F1	Actual	Ideal	%	Statement
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
Items 1	12	25	20	2	5	229	320	71,56	Good
Items 2	16	24	21	3	0	245	320	76,56	Good
Items 3	5	12	19	11	17	169	320	52,81	Not Good
Items 4	7	30	18	9	0	227	320	70,94	Pretty Good
Items 5	11	29	14	4	6	227	320	70,94	Pretty Good
Items 6	22	29	8	5	0	260	320	81,25	Good
Items 7	17	30	17	0	0	256	320	80	Good
Items 8	11	35	13	1	4	240	320	75	Good
Items 9	16	31	15	2	0	253	320	79,06	Good
Item 10	6	34	16	4	4	226	320	70,63	Pretty Good
Items 11	4	11	36	10	3	195	320	60,94	Pretty Good
Items 12	5	31	22	6	0	227	320	70,94	Pretty Good
Items 13	19	32	9	4	0	258	320	80,63	Good
Items 14	19	33	10	2	0	261	320	81,56	Good
Items 15	26	33	1	2	2	271	320	84,69	Good
Item 16	18	27	16	2	1	251	320	78,44	Good
Items 17	8	31	21	4	0	235	320	73,44	Good
Items 18	21	32	7	2	2	260	320	81,25	Good
Items 19	11	30	16	5	2	235	320	73,44	Good
Items 20	18	35	7	2	2	257	320	80,31	Good
Items 21	20	31	11	2	0	261	320	81,56	Good
Total	292	605	317	82	48	5043	6720	75,04	Good

Source: SPSS version 22.0 for windows (2021)

Based on the descriptive analysis of the Personnel Manager Performance variable (Y) in Table 2. above, it describes the three indicators or statement items that get the highest percentage in the good category, namely the indicator item 15 (employment managers are satisfied if they give the best results on their work), item indicators 14 (generally personnel manager jobs are completed with information technology capabilities), and item 21 indicators (employment managers do not experience difficulties in interacting with other staff).

Description of Work Environment Variable Data (X_1)

Work Environment Data (X_1) was collected through a questionnaire spread over 17 statement items, obtained from 64 personnel managers as the research sample. Work Environment (X_1) is measured by four indicators, namely: (1) relationship interaction, (2) personal growth, (3) system change and improvement, and (4) physical environment.

Table 3. Descriptive Results of Work Environment Variables (X₁)

Statement	Statement Score								Criteria
	F5	F4	F3	F2	F1	Actual	Ideal	%	Statement
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
Item 1	11	31	17	1	4	236	320	73,75	Very Good
Item 2	14	34	13	1	2	249	320	77,81	Very Good
Item 3	13	31	19	0	1	247	320	77,19	Very Good
Item 4	17	32	12	1	2	253	320	79,06	Very Good
Item 5	16	35	9	2	2	253	320	79,06	Very Good
Item 6	13	30	20	1	0	247	320	77,19	Very Good
Item 7	18	28	14	4	0	252	320	78,75	Very Good
Item 8	12	35	15	1	1	248	320	77,5	Very Good
Item 9	10	28	22	4	0	236	320	73,75	Very Good
Item 10	13	30	20	1	0	247	320	77,19	Very Good
Item 11	17	22	22	3	3	245	320	76,56	Very Good
Item 12	11	23	28	1	1	234	320	73,13	Very Good
Item 13	15	32	16	1	0	253	320	79,06	Very Good
Item 14	13	27	23	1	0	244	320	76,25	Very Good
Item 15	21	31	12	0	0	265	320	82,81	Very Good
Item 16	21	32	9	0	2	262	320	81,88	Very Good
Item 17	15	30	13	3	3	243	320	75,94	Very Good
Total	250	511	284	25	21	4214	5440	77,46	Very Good

Source: SPSS version 22.0 for windows (2021)

Based on the descriptive analysis of the Work Environment variable (X₁) in Table 3. above, it describes the three indicators or statement items that get the highest percentage in the very good category, namely item 15 indicator (organizational activities are supported by internet connections in all existing units), item 16 indicator (organizations apply Information Technology Systems to improve service quality), and item 4 indicators (to achieve organizational goals, members are able to work in teams). Meanwhile, the three indicators or statement items that received the lowest percentage were item 12 (every staff was given the opportunity to participate in decision making), item 1 indicator (organizational members have an understanding mindset in acting in the face of the era of digitalization of technology), and item 9 indicator (members of the organization). organization has the ability to organize organizational systems).

Description of Job Satisfaction Variable Data (X₂)

Job Satisfaction Data (X₂) was collected through a questionnaire spread over 18 statement items, obtained from 64 personnel managers as the research sample. Job Satisfaction (X₂) is measured from five indicators, namely: (1) self-satisfaction, (2) satisfaction with leaders, co-workers and subordinates, (3) satisfaction with institutions and management, (4) satisfaction with welfare benefits, and (5) satisfaction with the physical environment.

Table 4. Descriptive Results of Job Satisfaction Variables (X₂)

Statement	Statement Score								Criteria
	F5	F4	F3	F2	F1	Aktual	Ideal	%	Statement
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
Item 1	28	30	5	0	1	276	320	86,25	Very Good
Item 2	22	31	10	1	0	266	320	83,13	Very Good
Item 3	22	29	11	2	0	263	320	82,19	Very Good
Item 4	12	33	17	2	0	247	320	77,19	Very Good
Item 5	7	26	30	0	1	230	320	71,88	Good
Item 6	16	29	14	2	3	245	320	76,56	Very Good
Item 7	17	31	13	2	1	253	320	79,06	Very Good
Item 8	17	37	7	3	0	260	320	81,25	Very Good
Item 9	10	36	17	1	0	247	320	77,19	Very Good
Item 10	13	35	16	0	0	253	320	79,06	Very Good
Item 11	13	37	12	0	2	251	320	78,44	Very Good
Item 12	21	25	14	4	0	255	320	79,69	Very Good
Item 13	16	33	9	2	4	247	320	77,19	Very Good
Item 14	9	18	20	8	9	202	320	63,13	Good
Item 15	8	36	9	4	7	220	320	68,75	Good
Item 16	22	27	8	7	0	256	320	80	Very Good
Item 17	21	29	10	4	0	259	320	80,94	Very Good
Item 18	22	29	11	2	0	263	320	82,19	Very Good
Total	296	551	233	44	28	4499	5760	78,11	Very Good

Source: SPSS version 22.0 for windows (2021)

Based on the descriptive analysis of the Job Satisfaction variable (X_2) in Table 4. above, it describes the three indicators or statement items that get the highest percentage in the very good category, namely item 1 indicator (the available information technology working method can be used to complete work), item indicator 2 (digital data available to the organization can get the job done), and indicator item 3 (available digital data can be used in decision making). Meanwhile, the three indicators or statement items that received the lowest percentage were in the good category, namely item 14 indicator (organization develops bonuses and other incentives in accordance with work performance), item 15 indicator (organization provides opportunities for promotion of outstanding staff), and item 5 indicator (personnel managers have the ability to analyze quickly).

Results of Testing the Validity and Reliability of the Questionnaire

Testing the validity and reliability of the questionnaire was carried out before analyzing the data. Items are said to be valid or invalid, determined by the comparison between the value of r calculated and r table. If r count $>$ r table then the item is valid and vice versa if r count $<$ r table then the item is invalid. With the significance level and $N = 64$ and with the 95% confidence interval criteria, the obtained price for $df = N-2 = 64-2 = 62$ is.

The determination of instrument reliability decisions is based on the classification of the magnitude of the reliability coefficient based on the following Guiford benchmark.

$r < 0,20$: very low level of reliability

$0,20 \leq r < 0,40$: low level of reliability

$0,40 \leq r < 0,70$: moderate level of reliability

$0,70 \leq r < 0,90$: high level of reliability

$0,90 \leq r \leq 1,00$: very high level of reliability

a. Employee Manager Performance Variable (Y)

The results of testing the validity and reliability of the questions used to measure the Personnel Manager Performance variable (Y) are shown as follows :

Table 5. Validity and Reliability Test Results of Personnel Manager Performance Variables (Y)

N=64	Statement Item										
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
r item	0,882	0,985	0,981	0,963	0,995	0,951	0,971	0,961	0,952	0,894	0,843
r table	0,246	0,246	0,246	0,246	0,246	0,246	0,246	0,246	0,246	0,246	0,246
Status	Valid	Valid	Valid	Valid	Valid	Valid	Valid	Valid	Valid	Valid	Valid

N=64	Statement Item										
	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	
r item	0,963	0,995	0,951	0,971	0,961	0,963	0,995	0,951	0,971	0,961	
r table	0,246	0,246	0,246	0,246	0,246	0,246	0,246	0,246	0,246	0,246	
Status	Valid	Valid	Valid	Valid	Valid	Valid	Valid	Valid	Valid	Valid	

Alpha Cronbach = 0,992

Source: SPSS version 22.0 for windows (2021)

The test data for the validity of the Personnel Manager Performance variable (Y) in Table 5. above shows twenty-one statement items for the Personnel Manager Performance variable (Y), it can be seen that each statement item has an r count $>$ 0.246. Thus, each statement item is valid and takes the measurement together with the total score, so that it has a contribution to the measurement.

The reliability test data in Table 5. above shows the Cronbach Alpha value of the Personnel Manager Performance variable (Y) is 0.942. Based on the classification of the magnitude of the reliability coefficient based on the Guiford benchmark, the Cronbach Staffing Alpha value (Y) is in the very high category, so the Manager Performance variable proves that the statement items in the variable can be internal. It is said to have consistency reliability.

b. Work Environment Variable (X_1)

The results of testing the validity and reliability of the questions used to measure the Work Environment (X_1) variable are shown as follows:

Table 6. Work Environment Variable Validity Test Results (X_1)

N=64	Statement Item								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
r item	0,969	0,902	0,946	0,952	0,917	0,899	0,893	0,938	0,969
r table	0,246	0,246	0,246	0,246	0,246	0,246	0,246	0,246	0,246
Status	Valid	Valid	Valid	Valid	Valid	Valid	Valid	Valid	Valid

N=64	Statement Item								
	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	
r item	0,969	0,902	0,946	0,952	0,917	0,899	0,893	0,938	0,969
r table	0,246	0,246	0,246	0,246	0,246	0,246	0,246	0,246	0,246
Status	Valid	Valid	Valid	Valid	Valid	Valid	Valid	Valid	Valid

r item	0,902	0,946	0,952	0,938	0,969	0,902	0,946	0,952
r table	0,246	0,246	0,246	0,246	0,246	0,246	0,246	0,246
Status	Valid	Valid	Valid	Valid	Valid	Valid	Valid	Valid
Alpha Cronbach = 0,967								

Source: SPSS version 22.0 for windows (2021)

The test data for the validity of the Work Environment variable (X_1) in Table 6. above shows seventeen items of Work Environment variable statements (X_1), it can be seen that each statement item has an r count > 0.246 . Thus, each statement item is valid and takes the measurement together with the total score, so that it has a contribution to the measurement. The reliability test data in Table 6. above shows the Cronbach Alpha value of the Work Environment variable (X_1) is 0.952. Based on the classification of the magnitude of the reliability coefficient based on the Guiford benchmark, the Cronbach Alpha value of the Work Environment variable (X_1) is in the very high category, thus proving that the statement items in the variable can be said to have internal consistency reliability.

c. Job Satisfaction Variable (X_2)

The results of testing the validity and reliability of the questions used to measure the Job Satisfaction variable (X_2) are shown as follows :

Table 7. Job Satisfaction Variable Validity Test Results (X_2)

N=64	Statement Item								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
r item	0,807	0,838	0,626	0,745	0,861	0,745	0,821	0,753	0,848
r table	0,246	0,246	0,246	0,246	0,246	0,246	0,246	0,246	0,246
Status	Valid	Valid	Valid	Valid	Valid	Valid	Valid	Valid	Valid
N=64	Statement Item								
	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
r item	0,8	0,813	0,813	0,87	0,838	0,626	0,745	0,861	0,8
r table	0,246	0,246	0,246	0,246	0,246	0,246	0,246	0,246	0,246
Status	Valid	Valid	Valid	Valid	Valid	Valid	Valid	Valid	Valid
Alpha Cronbach = 0,983									

Source: SPSS version 22.0 for windows (2021)

The test data for the validity of the job Satisfaction variable (X_2) in Table 7. above shows eighteen items of Job Satisfaction variable statements (X_2), it can be seen that each statement item has an r count > 0.246 . Thus, each statement item is valid and takes the measurement together with the total score, so that it has a contribution to the measurement. The reliability test data in Table 7. above shows the Cronbach Alpha value of the Job Satisfaction variable (X_2) is 0.939. Based on the classification of the magnitude of the reliability coefficient based on the Guiford benchmark, the Cronbach Alpha value of the Job Satisfaction variable (X_2) is in the very high category, thus proving that the statement items in the variable can be said to have internal consistency reliability.

Results of Regression Analysis

a. Testing Data Analysis Requirements

1) Normality Test

a) Normality Test Kolmogorov-Smirnov

Kolmogorov-Smirnov test to test the normality of the data and by using SPSS software version 22.0 for windows the following test results were obtained :

Table 8. Normality Test Kolmogorov-Smirnov

One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test		
		Unstandardized Residual
N		64
Normal Parameters ^{a,b}	Mean	.0000000
	Std. Deviation	6.77432912
Most Extreme Differences	Absolute	.080
	Positive	.058
	Negative	-.080
Test Statistic		.080
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)		.200c,d
a. Test distribution is Normal.		
b. Calculated from data.		
c. Lilliefors Significance Correction.		
d. This is a lower bound of the true significance.		

Source: SPSS versi 22.0 for windows (2021)

Based on the SPSS output in Table 8. above, it is known that the significance value of Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed) of 0.200 is greater than 0.05 ($p > 0.05$). The basis for decision making in the Kolmogorov-Smirnov normality test, the data requirements are called normal if the probability or $p > 0.05$ in the Kolmogorov-Smirnov normality test. Due to the p value > 0.05 , it is known that the data on the variables of Personnel Manager Performance Policy (Y), Work Environment (X1) and Job Satisfaction (X2), which come from 64 respondents are normal or meet the requirements of the normality test.

b) Residual Normality Normality Test

Not different from the results of the data normality test using the residual normality assumption test as shown in Table 9. as follows :

Table 9. Residual Normality Test

Tests of Normality	Kolmogorov-Smirnova			Shapiro-Wilk		
	Statistic	df	Sig.	Statistic	df	Sig.
	Unstandardized Residual	.080	64	.200*	.984	64

*. This is a lower bound of the true significance.
a. Lilliefors Significance Correction

Source: SPSS versi 22.0 for windows (2021)

Based on the output of the Test of Normality in Table 9. above, the sig value is obtained. Shapiro Wilk of 0.563. The basis for making decisions on the standardized residual normality test are:

- (1) If the residual value of Shapiro Wilk is greater than value of 0.05, it means that the standard residual value is normally distributed.
- (2) On the other hand, if Shapiro Wilk's residual value is less than < 0.05 , it means that the standard residual value is not normally distributed.

Because the value of 0.563 is greater than value of 0.005, it can be concluded that the standard residual value is normally distributed.

2) Multicollinearity Test

Multicollinearity means that there is a strong relationship between some or all of the independent variables in the regression model. In this study, the Tolerance and Variance Inflation Factors (VIF) values were used as indicators of the presence or absence of multicollinearity among the independent variables. In Table 10., it can be seen the value of Tolerance and VIF for each independent variable.

Table 10. Multicollinearity Test

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	Collinearity Statistics	
	B	Std. Error	Beta	Tolerance	VIF
	1 (Constant)	27.195	5.634		
WORK_ENVIRONMENT	.006	.125	.007	.367	2.724
JOB_SATISFACTION	.744	.126	.790	.367	2.724

a. Dependent Variable: PERFORMANCE_MANAGEMENT_PEPEGAIAN

Source: SPSS versi 22.0 for windows (2021)

A regression is said to not detect multicollinearity if the Tolerance value is greater than 0.10 (> 0.10) and the VIF value is less than 10.00 (< 10.00). The results of the multicollinearity test in Table 9. show that the tolerance value for each independent variable (X1 and X2) is 0.367 (> 0.10) and the VIF value is 2.724 (< 10.00). This shows that there is no strong enough correlation between the independent variables. Thus, it can be concluded that there is no symptom of multicollinearity among the independent variables in the regression model.

3) Heteroscedasticity Test

Heteroscedasticity is an indication that the variance between residuals is not homogeneous which results in the estimated value obtained is no longer efficient. To test whether the variance of the residuals is homogeneous, the Rank-Spearman test is used, namely by correlating each independent variable to the absolute value of the residual (error). If there is a correlation coefficient of each independent variable which is significant at an error rate of 5%, it indicates the existence of heteroscedasticity. In Table 11. the following shows the correlation coefficient and p -value for each independent variable as follows :

Table 11. Heteroscedasticity Test

Correlations			LINGKUNGAN KERJA	KEPUASAN KERJA	Unstandardized Residual
Spearman's rho	WORK_ENVIRONMENT	Correlation Coefficient	1.000	.826**	-.090
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.000	.480
		N	64	64	64
	JOB_SATISFACTION	Correlation Coefficient	.826**	1.000	-.132
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.	.297
		N	64	64	64
Unstandardized Residual		Correlation Coefficient	-.090	-.132	1.000
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.480	.297	.
		N	64	64	64

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Source: SPSS versi 22.0 for windows (2021)

From the results of Table 11. obtained a significance value or sig. (two tailed) Work Environment variable (X1) is 0.480 and Job Satisfaction (X2) is 0.297. Because the value of the two independent variables (X) is greater than the value of 0.05, it can be said that there are no problems or symptoms of heteroscedasticity.

b. Research Hypothesis Testing

To test whether the variables of Work Environment (X1) and Job Satisfaction (X2) have a significant effect on the Performance of Personnel Managers (Y) in Gorontalo Regency, it is done through a regression model as shown below.

Tabel 12. Variable Entered/Removed

Variables Entered/Removed ^a			
Model	Variables Entered	Variables Removed	Method
1	WORK_ENVIRONMENT, JOB_SATISFACTION b	.	Enter
a. Dependent Variable: PERFORMANACE-MANAGEMENT_PERFORMNACE			
b. All requested variables entered.			

Source: SPSS versi 22.0 for windows (2021)

Based on Table 12., it can be seen that in model 1: all research variables are included in the regression model, so it is known that the variables of Work Environment (X1) and Job Satisfaction (X2) together (simultaneously) affect the Performance of Personnel Manager (Y) in Gorontalo Regency. While the results of the Research Model Summary are shown in Table 4.23 below.

Table 13. Model Summary

Model Summary				
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.855a	.731	.722	6.884

a. Predictors: (Constant), WORK_SATISFACTION, WORK_ENVIRONMENT

Source: SPSS versi 22.0 for windows (2021)

The data in Table 13. Model Summary above shows that model 1 has an Adjusted R Square value = 0.722, indicating that 0.722 or 72.2 percent of the variation in personnel manager performance is influenced by work environment variables and job satisfaction, and the rest by other causes. The influence of other factors that were not observed by the researcher was $(100\% - 72.2\%) = 27.8\%$. This influence is the influence of other factors outside the work environment and job satisfaction variables such as work motivation programs, leadership behavior, organizational culture, work discipline and so on. From the regression model, the overall regression coefficient test is obtained as shown in Table 4.24 below.

Tabel 14. Anova

ANOVA ^a						
Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	7851.193	2	3925.596	82.825	.000b
	Residual	2891.167	61	47.396		
Total		10742.359	63			

a. Dependent Variable: PERFORMANACE_MANAGEMENT_PERFORMNACE

b. Predictors: (Constant), WORK_SATISFACTION, WORK_ENVIRONMENT

Source: SPSS versi 22.0 for windows (2021)

In Table 14. it can be seen that in this model the value of $F = 82.825$ with $p = 0.000$. Because $p < 0.05$, regression can be used to predict the performance of personnel managers in Gorontalo Regency, or together the independent variables of work environment and job satisfaction affect the performance of personnel managers in Gorontalo Regency at the 95% confidence level. From Table 14. it can be seen that the calculated F value = 82.825. This value becomes the test statistic to be compared with the F value from the table for = 0.05. From table F for = 0.05 and degrees of freedom (2 and 61) it is obtained that the value of F table = 3.15. Because F count > F table, with a degree of error of 5% ($\alpha = 0.05$), H_0 is rejected. It can be concluded that together the independent variables (X1, X2) affect the dependent variable (Y).

The probability value of F in Table 14. is 0.000 where this value is smaller than the alpha significance level for 5% ($p < 0.05$). This means that with a 95% confidence level, it can be concluded that together there is a significant influence of at least one of the work environment variables and job satisfaction affecting the performance of personnel managers in Gorontalo Regency. Based on the regression model, the regression coefficient and significance test for the research variables are obtained as shown in Table 15. below.

Table 15. Regression Coefficient and Significance Test

Coefficients ^a		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
Model		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	7.377	5.705		2.293	.001
	WORK_ENVIRONMENT	.254	.151	.245	2.357	.002
	JOB_SATISFACTION	.965	.148	.817	6.528	.000

a. Dependent Variable: PERFORMANCE_MANAGEMENT_PERFORMNACE

Source: SPSS versi 22.0 for windows (2021)

In Table 15. it can be seen with db (degrees of freedom) = $N - k$, N = Number of samples ($N = 64$) and K = Number of variables ($K = 3$) so $db = 64 - 3 = 61$. t table ($db = 3$ 95% confidence level ($\alpha / 2 = 0.05 / 2 = 0.025$)) = 1.99962. Table 15. shows that t count of work environment = 2,357. Because t count > t table, then H_0 is rejected, or the work environment individually (partial) is proven to have a significant effect on the performance of personnel managers in Gorontalo Regency. The value of the work environment $p = 0.000$ where $p < 0.05$; then H_0 is rejected or the work environment individually (partial) is proven to have a significant effect on the performance of personnel managers in Gorontalo Regency. The contribution of the direct influence of the work environment on the performance of personnel managers in Gorontalo Regency is $0.2452 = 0.060$ or 6 percent.

Furthermore, it can be seen in Table 15. that t count job satisfaction = 6.528. Because t count > t table, then H_0 is rejected, or job satisfaction individually (partial) is proven to have a significant effect on the performance of personnel managers in Gorontalo Regency. The value of job satisfaction $p = 0.002$ where $p < 0.05$; then H_0 is rejected or job satisfaction affects the performance of personnel managers in Gorontalo Regency. The contribution of the direct influence of job satisfaction on the performance of personnel managers in Gorontalo Regency is $0.8172 = 0.6674$ or 66.74 percent.

Paying attention to the comparison of the value of B Constant and the calculated t value for each independent variable (X1, X2) in table 15., it shows that job satisfaction has a more dominant influence on improving the performance of personnel managers in Gorontalo Regency. Based on the value of B Constant (regression coefficient parameter) in Table 4.24, it can be made a multiple linear regression equation as follows :

$$Y = 7.377 + 0.254 X1 + 0.965 X2$$

The regression equation above shows that there is a linear relationship between the independent variables of work environment and job satisfaction with the dependent variable of personnel manager performance. The positive value of each of these independent variables shows a unidirectional effect. The value of the coefficient of determination Adjusted R Square = 0.722, indicating that 0.722 or 72.2 percent of the variation in the performance of personnel managers is influenced by work environment variables and job satisfaction, and the rest by other causes. The influence of other factors that were not observed by the researcher was $(100\% - 72.2\%) = 27.8\%$. This influence is the influence of other factors outside the work environment and job satisfaction variables such as work motivation programs, leadership behavior, organizational culture, work discipline and so on.

On the basis of testing with an F value, it can be seen that the calculated F value = 82.825 while the F table = 3.15. The calculated F value > F table, it can be concluded that the research hypothesis can be proven. This means that the work environment and job satisfaction together have a significant effect on the performance of personnel managers in Gorontalo Regency.

Based on the test with the value of t shows that the value of t table = 1.99962. The value of t count work environment = 2,357 > t table, and with a value of $p = 0.002 < 0.05$; it can be concluded that the work environment individually (partial) has a significant effect on the performance of personnel managers in Gorontalo Regency. While the value of t count job satisfaction = 6.528 > t table, and with a value of $p = 0.000 < 0.05$; it can be concluded that individual (partial) job satisfaction has a significant effect on the performance of personnel managers in Gorontalo Regency.

Based on the analysis of the research results that have been carried out, it is proven that the work environment and job satisfaction individually have a positive influence on the performance of personnel managers in Gorontalo Regency and simultaneously (together), work environment and job satisfaction have a positive influence on the performance of personnel managers in the Regency. Gorontalo.

Discussion

The influence of the work environment on the performance of personnel managers

The results of the first hypothesis testing indicate that the work environment has a positive and significant effect on the performance of personnel managers in Gorontalo Regency. Based on the analysis, the direct influence of the work environment on performance is $0.245^2 = 0.060$, which implies that 6% of the variation in the performance of personnel managers in Gorontalo Regency can be explained by the work environment factor. This finding suggests that any improvement in work environment conditions, both physical and non-physical, will be followed by a linear increase in employee performance. Although the contribution is relatively small compared to other variables, the work environment remains a vital foundation for supporting managerial activities within local government agencies.

Theoretically, the physical conditions of the workplace, such as lighting, ventilation, and office layout, play a crucial role in determining productivity. Research by Qomariah et al. supports this finding, stating that a well-maintained work environment in local government institutions directly improves employee output [11]. Adequate facilities create physical comfort, allowing personnel managers to focus on administrative tasks that require high precision without technical distractions from their surroundings.

Other literature emphasizes that the work environment is not limited to physical aspects but also includes compensation and the overall atmosphere. Wahid et al. explain that the work environment is a determinant factor that, alongside compensation, shapes employees' perceptions of their institution [12]. In the context of public service, a conducive environment stimulates internal motivation to provide maximum service to stakeholders. This aligns with the descriptive results of this study, which show that the integration of technology within the work environment is a primary driver of performance.

Furthermore, the link between the work environment and performance is often strengthened by job satisfaction acting as a mediator. Girdwichai & Sriviboon assert that a healthy work environment and appropriate training programs are key to enhancing organizational performance in the public sector [13]. A supportive environment for competence development enables personnel managers in Gorontalo Regency to be more adaptive to bureaucratic digitalization, ultimately minimizing work barriers and increasing the achievement of annual targets.

The effect of job satisfaction on the performance of personnel managers

The results of the second hypothesis testing confirm that job satisfaction has a positive and significant influence on the performance of personnel managers in Gorontalo Regency. Statistical analysis reveals that the direct effect of job satisfaction on performance is $0.817^2 = 0.6674$, indicating that 66.74% of the variation in performance among personnel managers in Gorontalo Regency is explained by their level of job satisfaction. This high percentage signifies that satisfaction is a dominant predictor of productivity in this administrative context; when employees feel fulfilled by their roles, their performance output increases substantially. Conversely, a lack of satisfaction serves as a primary barrier to achieving organizational targets.

This finding is strongly supported by Herzberg's Two-Factor Theory, which posits that intrinsic motivators such as the nature of the work itself and opportunities for achievement are direct drivers of performance. Abdullah provides empirical evidence for this high predictive power, noting that job satisfaction can account for over 65% of performance outcomes, leaving only a minor portion to other variables [14]. In Gorontalo, this suggests that the personnel managers' ability to utilize information technology and digital data for decision-making (as seen in the high descriptive scores for Items 1 and 3) serves as a key "satisfier" that translates directly into high-quality work results.

Furthermore, the Social Exchange Theory explains this relationship through the lens of reciprocity. When an organization provides a supportive environment and fair treatment, employees reciprocate with higher dedication and satisfaction, which ultimately boosts performance. Mashri and Alsafadi & Altahat highlight that job satisfaction acts as a critical mediator between human resource management practices such as rewards and training and employee outcomes [15][16]. This theoretical framework clarifies why the personnel managers in

this study, who expressed satisfaction with their technical capabilities, were able to meet their performance targets despite the lack of formal award programs.

The comprehensive role of satisfaction is also evident in how it amplifies other organizational factors. Ratnasari et al. and Sabuhari et al. argue that leadership style and organizational culture only reach their full potential in improving performance when they first successfully foster employee satisfaction [17][18]. In the context of Gorontalo Regency, ensuring that staff feel satisfied with their professional contributions is the most effective mechanism for the government to achieve its "Gemilang" (Glorious) vision.

Finally, the findings align with the research of Rodjam et al., which demonstrates that HR practices specifically tailored to boost satisfaction such as providing clear career pathways and adequate compensation directly result in superior performance [19]. Since job satisfaction in this study accounts for nearly two-thirds of performance variation, it is evident that any managerial intervention aimed at improving personnel output in Gorontalo must prioritize the psychological and professional fulfillment of the employees to be truly effective.

The effect of the work environment and job satisfaction together on the performance of personnel managers

The results of the third hypothesis testing confirm that the work environment and job satisfaction, when acting simultaneously, have a positive and significant influence on the performance of personnel managers in Gorontalo Regency. The coefficient of determination, Adjusted R Square = 0.722, indicates that 72.2% of the variation in the performance of personnel managers is collectively influenced by the work environment and job satisfaction. The remaining 27.8% is attributed to other factors not observed in this study. This high R-Square value suggests a powerful synergy; a high-quality work environment paired with high job satisfaction creates an optimal ecosystem that drives performance far more effectively than either variable could in isolation.

In the field of Applied Psychology, this synergy is often viewed as a "satisfaction mirror," where internal workplace conditions reflect onto employee fulfillment and, ultimately, organizational outcomes. Research by Vermeeren et al. and Wright & Davis in public sector settings supports this, showing that when the work context (environment) and job characteristics (satisfaction) are aligned, they explain a vast majority of the variance in public service quality [20][21]. For the Gorontalo Regency Government, this 72.2% impact highlights that administrative excellence is not merely a matter of individual skill but is deeply rooted in the organizational climate.

International management literature also emphasizes that the simultaneous presence of these factors is essential for improving public service quality. Rusli et al. demonstrate that leadership styles and work environments indirectly elevate service quality by first stabilizing employee performance through satisfaction [22]. This is particularly evident in the "Gemilang" vision of Gorontalo; achieving "beyond achievement" results requires a holistic strategy that manages both the physical infrastructure (e.g., integrated IT systems) and the psychological well-being (e.g., rewards and incentives) of the staff.

Furthermore, the integration of IT within the work environment acts as a catalyst in this relationship. Studies by Tannady et al. find that in technical or administrative environments, the R-Square values for performance models often sit within the 0.65 to 0.75 range when environmental and satisfaction factors are combined [23]. In Gorontalo, the high descriptive scores for IT capabilities (Items 14 and 15) suggest that digital tools serve as the bridge between a functional work environment and the professional satisfaction of the managers, leading to higher performance achievements.

4. Conclusion

Based on the results of the analysis and discussion, the following primary conclusions can be drawn:

- a. Effect of Work Environment: The work environment partially proves to have a positive and significant effect on the performance of personnel managers, with a direct influence contribution of 6%. Improvements in both physical facilities and non-physical relationships will lead to a linear increase in employee performance.
- b. Effect of Job Satisfaction: Job satisfaction has a more dominant and significant influence on performance, contributing 66.74%. This indicates that feelings of fulfillment regarding technology-based work methods and digital data are crucial in supporting task success.
- c. Simultaneous Effect: The work environment and job satisfaction together (simultaneously) have a significant effect on the performance of personnel managers in Gorontalo Regency.
- d. Regression Model: The variation in the performance of personnel managers is determined by 72.2% by work environment and job satisfaction factors, while the remaining 27.8% is influenced by other variables such as motivation, work discipline, and organizational culture.

Reference

- [1] "Peraturan Bupati Gorontalo Nomor 22 Tahun 2020 tentang Tambahan Penghasilan bagi PNS di Lingkungan Pemerintah Kabupaten Gorontalo," Pemerintah Kabupaten Gorontalo, 2020.
- [2] M. Halimah and S. IP, "Konsep dan Ruang Lingkup Administrasi Perkantoran," 2018, [Online]. Available:

- <http://repository.ut.ac.id/3972/1/ADPU4331-M1.pdf>
- [3] R. Fajri, E. Setyowati, and Siswidiyanto, "Akuntabilitas Pemerintah Desa pada Pengelolaan Alokasi Dana Desa (ADD) (Studi pada Kantor Desa Ketindan, Kecamatan Lawang, Kabupaten Malang)," *J. Adm. Publik*, vol. 3, no. 7, pp. 1099–1104, 2017.
- [4] Rivai and E. Sagala, *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia Untuk Perusahaan*. Jakarta: Rajawali Pers, 2013.
- [5] S. R. O. Sandy, "Pengaruh Reward dan Punishment serta Rotasi Pekerjaan terhadap Motivasi Kerja untuk Meningkatkan Kinerja Karyawan Hotel di Jember," *J. Kepariwisata dan Hosp.*, vol. 1, no. 2, 2017.
- [6] Sedarmayanti, *Manajemen Perkantoran Modern*. Bandung: Mandar Maju, 2017.
- [7] "Undang-Undang Nomor 43 Tahun 1999 tentang penilaian pelaksanaan pekerjaan Aparatur Sipil Negara," 1999.
- [8] A. Nitisemito, *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia*. Bandung: Pustaka Setia, 2015.
- [9] T. H. Handoko, *Manajemen Personalita dan Sumber Daya Manusia*. Yogyakarta: BPFE, 2013.
- [10] S. Martoyo, *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia*. Yogyakarta: BPFE, 2013.
- [11] N. Qomariah, D. Friyanti, and E. Budisatoto, "The impact of leadership style, work environment and job satisfaction on employee performance," *Int. J. Eng. Res. Technol.*, vol. 13, no. 8, pp. 2030–2038, 2020, doi: 10.37624/ijert/13.8.2020.2030-2038.
- [12] A. Wahid, A. D. Sasono, F. Setianto, J. Suyono, and D. R. Elisabeth, "The determinant factors of job satisfaction and employee performance: direct compensation and work environment," in *Proceedings of the International Conference on Industrial Engineering and Operations Management*, Narotama University, Surabaya, Indonesia: IEOM Society, 2020, pp. 2943–2953. [Online]. Available: <https://www.scopus.com/inward/record.uri?eid=2-s2.0-85105561348&partnerID=40&md5=af66639c8671e894d724940bdb827a71>
- [13] L. Girdwichai and C. Sriviboon, "Employee motivation and performance: Do the work environment and the training matter?," *J. Secur. Sustain. Issues*, vol. 9, pp. 42–54, 2020, doi: 10.9770/JSSI.2020.9.J(4).
- [14] H. Abdullah, "Analysis the effect of job satisfaction toward employees performance as an effort to human resources foundry industry development," in *AIP Conference Proceedings*, N. null and M. D.R., Eds., Metal Industries Development Centre (MIDC), Ministry of Industry Indonesia, Bandung, 40135, Indonesia: American Institute of Physics Inc., 2020. doi: 10.1063/5.0001471.
- [15] M. S. Mashi, "The Mediating role of Job Satisfaction in the Relationship between Organizational Justice and Employee Outcomes," *Int. J. Public Adm.*, vol. 41, no. 16, pp. 1351–1360, 2018, doi: 10.1080/01900692.2017.1388819.
- [16] Y. Alsafadi and S. Altahat, "Human Resource Management Practices and Employee Performance: The Role of Job Satisfaction," *J. Asian Financ. Econ. Bus.*, vol. 8, no. 1, pp. 519–529, 2021, doi: 10.13106/jafeb.2021.vol8.no1.519.
- [17] S. L. Ratnasari and G. Sutjahjo, "The effect of job satisfaction, organizational culture and leadership on employee performance," *Ann. Trop. Med. Public Heal.*, vol. 23, no. 13 A, 2020, doi: 10.36295/ASRO.2020.231329.
- [18] R. Sabuhari, A. Sudiro, D. W. Irawanto, and M. Rahayu, "The effects of human resource flexibility, employee competency, organizational culture adaptation and job satisfaction on employee performance," *Manag. Sci. Lett.*, vol. 10, no. 8, pp. 1777–1786, 2020, doi: 10.5267/j.msl.2020.1.001.
- [19] C. Rodjam, A. Thanasrisuebwong, T. Suphuan, and P. Charoenboon, "Effect of human resource management practices on employee performance mediating by employee job satisfaction," *Syst. Rev. Pharm.*, vol. 11, no. 3, pp. 37–47, 2020, doi: 10.5530/srp.2020.3.05.
- [20] B. Vermeeren, B. Kuipers, and B. Steijn, "Two Faces of the Satisfaction Mirror: A Study of Work Environment, Job Satisfaction, and Customer Satisfaction in Dutch Municipalities," *Rev. Public Pers. Adm.*, vol. 31, no. 2, pp. 171–189, 2011, doi: 10.1177/0734371X11408569.
- [21] B. E. Wright and B. S. Davis, "Job Satisfaction in the Public Sector: The Role of the Work Environment," *Am. Rev. Public Adm.*, vol. 33, no. 1, pp. 70–90, 2003, doi: 10.1177/0275074002250254.
- [22] M. Rusli, M. Yahya, D. Hutagalung, Y. Yusradi, and T. Nurhaida, "Analysis of the influence of leadership style and work environment on apparatus performance in improving service quality," in *Proceedings of the International Conference on Industrial Engineering and Operations Management*, Sekolah Tinggi Ilmu Ekonomi AMKOP, Makassar, Indonesia: IEOM Society, 2021, pp. 3169–3177. [Online]. Available: <https://www.scopus.com/inward/record.uri?eid=2-s2.0-85121120410&partnerID=40&md5=a2d4c7c5b8d4a1a0b2bdf6df1fa112d7>
- [23] H. Tannady, J. F. Andry, and F. Nurprihatin, "Determinants factors toward the performance of the employee in the crude palm oil industry in West Sumatera, Indonesia," in *IOP Conference Series: Materials Science and Engineering*, H. null, Ed., Department of Management, Universitas Pembangunan Jaya, Indonesia: Institute of Physics Publishing, 2020. doi: 10.1088/1757-899X/771/1/012066.