The influence of work motivation, work environment, and job satisfaction on employee performance PT. XYZ

Adila Pramitha[1], Ridho Riadi[2], Dadan Abdul Aziz Mubarok[3], Siti Sarah[4]

[1,2,3,4]Management Study Program, Universitas Indonesia Membangun, Bandung, Jawa Barat, Indonesia

A R T I C L E I N F O	ABSTRACT
	This study examines the correlation between work motivation, work environment, and job satisfaction with employee performance at PT XYZ. The research employed a quantitative methodology, employing a descriptive and verificative approach. The sample used in this study consists of a comprehensive total of 35 respondents. To tackle the study issue, the SPSS software is utilized. The study's findings suggest that employee performance, work motivation, work atmosphere, and job satisfaction could be better. Motivation, work environment, and job happiness have a beneficial impact on employee performance to some extent. Concurrently, the motivation to work, the atmosphere in which work takes place, and the level of happiness with one's employment all benefit employees' performance.

Corresponding Author:

Adila Pramitha,
Management Study Program,
Universitas Indonesia Membangun Bandung
Jl. Soekarno Hatta No. 448, Batununggal, Kec.Bandung Kidul, Kota Bandung, Jawa Barat 40266
Email: adilapramitha@student.inaba.ac.id

1. Introduction

In the era of globalization, organizations must optimize the productivity of their personnel. Human resources are the paramount and primary asset in facilitating organizational success(Faiz et al., 2022)(Tahir et al., 2023)(Iswahyudi et al., 2023). Every organization requires highly capable and skilled human resources in various areas, including leadership and task management, to ensure the successful attainment of company objectives(Indrasari & Kartini, 2021)(Sabrina, 2021)(Karim, 2023). (Qader et al., 2021) An organization's ability to acquire human resources with the necessary competencies and skills for the commercial world and effectively retain and maximize its production is equally crucial.

Work motivation refers to an internal drive or stimulus within an individual to attain organizational objectives while considering their capacity to meet personal demands. (Hustia, 2020; Masitoh et al., 2020; Winarsih et al., 2019) The organization should enhance work motivation to optimize staff performance. Damayanti & Subagja, (2023) defines motivation as a stimulus that drives a sequence of human behavioral processes toward attaining objectives. Purnami et al., (2021) identifies several markers for assessing work motivation, including salary, supervision, policies and administration, work relationships, working environment, work performance, possibilities for career growth, recognition or awards, success, and responsibility.

According to Sedarmayanti, (2017), the working environment encompasses all available elements to individuals and organizations, including tools, resources, physical space, work practices, and arrangements. Individuals define optimum, healthy, safe, and comfortable working environments based on their capacity to carry out duties efficiently. The working environment comprises two main components: the tangible work environment and the intangible work environment.(Sadat et al., 2020; Sari, 2023). According to Muis et al.,

(2018), it includes all elements that can influence the efficiency of employees while performing their duties. Therefore, company management needs to give priority to its management.

Every employee has a unique level of satisfaction. Job satisfaction refers to the emotional state experienced by employees when they assess their employment as pleasant or unpleasant. (Caissar et al., 2022; Rosmaini & Tanjung, 2019) Job satisfaction is reflected in an employee's attitude, which can be positive if they are satisfied or negative if they are unsatisfied. (Bekti, 2018; Kristanti & Lestari, 2019) Employee discontent can manifest through various behaviors, such as vocalizing grievances, disregarding instructions, or evading specific job duties. Concurrently, employees aspire to attain job happiness as one of their primary objectives in the workplace. Given the significance of employee job satisfaction, it enhances employee work morale, dedication, and discipline(Pala'langan, 2021)(Ratnasari & Vivianty, 2021)(Siagian et al., 2023).

2.   Research Method

Quantitative research is a distinct research method known for its methodical, deliberate, and well-organized approach, evident from the initial planning to the design phase. Quantitative research is a research approach grounded in the positivist philosophy. It aims to examine a particular population or sample, employing a generally random sampling process. Data collecting involves using research tools, while data analysis mainly focuses on quantitative and statistical methods to test pre-existing hypotheses. This study uses a descriptive methodology to depict the research subject or findings precisely. The verificative approach as research undertaken on a specific population or sample to evaluate existing hypotheses. The descriptive and investigative research aims to investigate the impact of work motivation, job satisfaction, and work environment on performance. This study employs a descriptive research approach, primarily through a literature review. The research methodology employed in this study entails the administration of a survey and the utilization of questionnaires. The study sample comprises 35 employees from PT. Kimia Farma. The research employed the census sampling technique as its sampling procedure. After collecting the data, the researcher proceeds to analyze it through a series of testing stages, including 1) Validity study, 2) Reliability assessment, 3) Evaluation of classical assumptions (including tests for normality, heteroscedasticity, and multicollinearity), 4) Conduct testing via multiple linear regression, and 5) Perform hypothesis testing with F-test and t-test.

3.   Results And Discussions

Research Results
a.   Validity Test

To assess an instrument's or questionnaire's validity, we conducted a validity test in this research using SPSS. The test results are valid if their two-tailed significance is less than 0.05. Here are the outcomes of the validity tests for each research variable.

Table 1. Validity test results

Variable	Fcount	F_{table}	Information
Y	0,283 – 0,587		Valid
X1	0,281 – 0,378	0,27	Valid
X2	0,273 – 0,339		Valid
X3	0,854		Valid

Source: Survey data analyzed using SPSS, 2024

The test findings determined that the Fcount of each variable exceeded the Ftable value, indicating that all questions are considered valid.

b.   Evaluation of Reliability

The reliability evaluation in this study utilized Cronbach's Alpha, a statistical metric employed to ascertain the dependability of a testing instrument. A Cronbach's Alpha score greater than 0.60 indicates a high level of reliability. The subsequent table presents the testing conducted using SPSS in the research.

Table 2. Reliability test results

Variable	Croncbach's Alpha	Critical Value	N of Item	Information
Employee Performance (Y)	0,936	0.60	10	Valid

Work Motivation (X_1)	0,901	0.60	12	Valid
Work environment (X_2)	0,654	0.60	12	Valid
Job satisfaction (X_3)	0.880	0.60	6	Valid

Source: Questionnaire data processed by SPSS, 2024

All variables, including Employee Performance (Y), Work Motivation (X1), Work Environment (X2), and Job Satisfaction (X3), have Cronbach's Alpha values that exceed 0.60. Therefore, we consider the research instruments used for each variable to be dependable.

c.   Classic Assumption Test
Test for Normality

Table 3. Displays the outcomes of the normality test

Kolmogrov-Smirnov		
Statistic	N	Sig.
0,68	35	0,05

Source: Questionnaire data processed by SPSS, 2024

The normality test findings in Table 4.18 indicate that the Kolmogorov-Smirnov probability value is 0.68, more significant than 0.05. Therefore, the study data follows a normal distribution.

Heteroscedasticity Test

Heteroscedasticity refers to a situation in which the variance of the residual values, which are the differences between observed and predicted values, is not equal across different observers or observations. The situation referred to as homoscedasticity is present. The findings of Gani and Amalia (2015: 126) show no evidence of heteroscedasticity.

Table 4. Results of the heteroscedasticity test

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		
		B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.
1	(Constant)	,397	6,195		,064	,949
	TOT_X1	,075	,076	,213	,993	,932
	TOT_X2	,152	,140	,232	1,089	,842
	TOT_X3	,217	,151	,250	1,439	,601

Source: Questionnaire data processed by SPSS, 2024

The heteroscedasticity test results for Work Motivation (X1) indicate a significance of 0.932. Similarly, the heteroscedasticity test results for the Work Environment (X2) indicate a significance level of 0.842. Lastly, the heteroscedasticity test results for Job Satisfaction (X3) reveal a significance of 0.601. The data indicates that the p-value for the three independent variables is more than 0.05. This result indicates that examining the three independent variables did not reveal heteroscedasticity.

Test Test for Multicollinearity

The Multicollinearity Test aims to ascertain the presence of correlation among the independent variables in the regression model. In order to evaluate multicollinearity, it is possible to analyze the Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) for each independent variable. A VIF value less than 10 indicates the lack of multicollinearity problems in the data.

Table 5. Multicollinearity test results

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Collinearity Statistics	
		B	Std.Error	Beta			Tolerance	VIF
1	(Constant)	28,195	10,233		2,775	,010		
	TOT_X1	,548	,125	,575	4,378	,000	,641	1,561
	TOT_X2	,412	,231	,233	1,785	,048	,649	1,541
	TOT_X3	,945	,249	,404	3,795	,001	,974	1,027

Source: Data processed by SPSS, 2024

The Tolerance (TOL) values are 0.641 for (X1) Work Motivation, 0.649 for (X2) Work Environment, and 0.974 for (X3) Job Satisfaction, all of which exceed the threshold of 0.1. The Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) values are 1.561 for (X1) Work Motivation, 1.541 for (X2) Work Environment, and

1.027 for (X3) Job Satisfaction, all of which are below 10. This result indicates the absence of multicollinearity.

d. Multiple Regression Analysis

Table 6. Multiple regression results

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Collinearity Statistics	
		B	Std.Error	Beta			Tolerance	VIF
1	(Constant)	28,195	10,233		-2,775	,010		
	TOT_X1	,548	,125	,575	4,378	,000	,641	1,561
	TOT_X2	,412	,231	,233	1,785	,048	,649	1,541
	TOT_X3	,945	,249	,404	3,795	,001	,974	1,027

Source: Data processed by SPSS, 2024

The following derivation yields the equation for multiple linear regression:
$$Y = 28.195 + 0{,}548X_1 + 0{,}412\,X_2 + 0{,}945\,X_3$$

The elucidation of the equation for multiple linear regression is delineated as follows: a) The number remained consistent at 28.195. When keeping the variables of Work Motivation (X1), Work Environment (X2), and Job Satisfaction (X3) constant, without any change or with a change of 0, the assessed Employee Performance (Y) is equal to 28.195. b) The independent variable (X1), representing Work Motivation, has a regression coefficient (b1) of 0.548. Thus, a one-unit change in Work Motivation, with Work Environment and Job Satisfaction held constant, will result in a 54.8% difference in Employee Performance. c) Variable X2, representing Work Environment, has a regression coefficient b2 = 0.412. If there is a one-unit alteration in the Work Environment, keeping Work Motivation and Job Satisfaction constant, there will be a proportional change of 0.412 or 41.2% in Employee Performance. d) The variable (X3), representing Job Satisfaction, has a regression coefficient (b3) of 0.945. Thus, holding Work Motivation and Work Environment constant, a one-unit change in Job Satisfaction will result in a 94.5% difference in Employee Performance.

The collective change in Employee Performance (Y) is 1.905 when Work Motivation (X1), Work Environment (X2), and Job Satisfaction (X3) each change by one unit. Adding the coefficients 0.548, 0.412, and 0.945 yields the calculated result.
e.   Conducting Hypothesis Testing
T-test

Table 7. The findings of the t-test

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Collinearity Statistics	
		B	Std.Error	Beta			Tolerance	VIF
1	(Constant)	28,195	10,233		-2,775	,010		
	TOT_X1	,548	,125	,575	4,378	,000	,641	1,561
	TOT_X2	,412	,231	,233	1,785	,084	,649	1,541
	TOT_X3	,945	,249	,404	3,795	,001	,974	1,027

Source: Data processed by SPSS, 2024

The hypothesis posits that work motivation (X1) impacts employee performance (Y). The test results demonstrate a significant t-value of 4.378 for the Work Motivation variable (X1) with a p-value of 0.00. Thus, rejecting the null hypothesis (H0) and accepting the alternative hypothesis (H1) unequivocally illustrates the robust impact of Work Motivation (X1) on Employee Performance (Y). This is additionally supported by the greater magnitude of 4.378 compared to 2.037 and the observation that 0.00 is smaller than 0.05. The hypothesis proposes a cause-and-effect relationship between the work environment (X2) and employee performance (Y). Nevertheless, the test findings indicated a t-value of 1.785 for the Work Environment variable (X2), which did not reach statistical significance at the 0.84 significance level. Therefore, considering that 1.785 is less than 2.037, and 0.84 is more statistically significant than 0.05, Based on the evidence, we can conclude that we accept the null hypothesis (H0) and reject the alternative hypothesis (H1). The results indicate that the Work Environment (X2) positively influences Employee Performance (Y). The hypothesis posits a correlation between Job Satisfaction (X2) and Employee Performance (Y). The test results indicate a t-value of 3.795 for the Job Satisfaction variable (X2) at a significance level of 0.01.

f.   F Test Results

Sugiyono (2019:257) defines simultaneous testing as assessing the combined impact of many independent variables on a dependent variable.

Table 8. Test results f

Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1. Regression	610,252	3	203,417	19.,799	,000[b]
Residual	318,490	31	10,274		
Total	928.743	34			

Source: Data analyzed with SPSS in 2024.

The calculated Fcount value of 19.799 is greater than the critical Ftable value of 2.67 (19.799 > 2.67) and the significance value is 0.000, which is less than 0.05. These findings demonstrate that the combined impact of Work Motivation (X1), Work Environment (X2), and Job Satisfaction (X3) on Employee Performance (Y) is positively significant. Therefore, we can deduce that the null hypothesis (H0) is invalidated, and simultaneously, the alternative hypothesis (H1) is validated

Discussion

The influence of work motivation on employee performance at PT Kimia Farma Apotek Cihampelas Unit, Bandung City, the multiple regression analysis reveals a regression coefficient 0.548 for the variable Work Motivation (X1). Therefore, keeping the Work Environment and Job Satisfaction unchanged, a slight change of one unit in Work Motivation leads to a significant 54.8% variation in Employee Performance. The concurrent assessment test produces an R-square coefficient of 0.443, signifying that 44.3% of the variation in Employee Performance (Y) can be accounted for by Work Motivation (X1). Additional variables outside the parameters of this investigation are responsible for the remaining 55.7%. The results of the hypothesis testing show that the Work Motivation variable (X1) has a t-value of 4.378, which indicates statistical significance at a significance level of 0.00.

Consequently, the conclusion that the value of 4.378 is more than 2.037 and that 0.00 is smaller than 0.05 results in the rejection of the null hypothesis (H0) and the acceptance of the alternative hypothesis (H1). The data indicates a direct relationship between Work Motivation (X1) and Employee Performance (Y). Furthermore, an independent study conducted by Sutristo et al. (2022) corroborates these findings, illustrating that the variable of Work Motivation substantially and positively impacts employee performance within the Department of Labor and Industry in the City of Padang. Therefore, our investigation confirms the accuracy of the second hypothesis (H2). Work motivation is crucial since it has a beneficial impact on both the performance of employees and the business. Inadequate incentives might lead to a decline in staff performance inside the organization.

The Influence of the Work Environment on the Performance of Employees at PT Kimia Farma Apotek Cihampelas Unit, Bandung City, according to the multiple regression analysis, when keeping the variables of Work Motivation and Job Satisfaction constant, a one-unit rise in the Work Environment (X2) leads to a 0.412 or 41.2% rise in Employee Performance (Y). The concurrent assessment test reveals that the Work Environment (X2) exerts a 33.6% impact on Employee Performance (Y), as indicated by the R-square value of 0.336. External factors not considered in this study influence the remaining 66.4%. The hypothesis testing results indicate that the Work Environment variable (X2) has a t-value of 1.785, which is statistically significant at a significance level of 0.84. Hence, the magnitude of 1.785 is significantly smaller than that of 2.037, and 0.84 is considerably greater than 0.05.

Thus, the findings corroborate the null hypothesis (H0), dismissing the alternative hypothesis (H1) and suggesting that the Work Environment (X2) does not exert a substantial influence on Employee Performance (Y). This finding aligns with the study conducted by Siahaan and Bahri (2019). The research findings indicate that the calculated t-value for the motivation variable is 0.037, lower than the crucial t-value of 1.659, and the significance level is 0.971. These data indicate that the null hypothesis (H0) is confirmed for the work environment factor, suggesting that the work environment factor does not substantially influence employee performance at PT PLN (Persero) North Sumatra Power Generation Main Unit.

The Effect of Job Satisfaction on Employee Performance at PT Kimia Farma Apotek Cihampelas Unit, Bandung City, the findings of the multiple regression test show that a one-unit change in Job Satisfaction (X3) while keeping Work Motivation and Work Environment unchanged will result in a 0.945 or

94.5% change in Employee Performance (Y). The R-square result of the simultaneous determination test is 0.911, indicating that Job Satisfaction (X3) significantly influences 91.1% of Employee Performance (Y). In comparison, the remaining 8.9% is influenced by factors not considered in this study. The hypothesis testing results reveal that the Job Satisfaction variable (X2) has a t-value of 3.795, statistically significant at a significance level of 0.01. Therefore, it can be concluded that 3.795 surpasses 2.037, and 0.01 is below 0.05, leading to the rejection of the null hypothesis (H0) and the acceptance of the alternative hypothesis (H1). This indicates that Job Satisfaction (X2) positively influences Employee Performance (Y). This is further supported by the study conducted by Rosmaini and Tanjung (2019). Hypothesis testing findings demonstrate that job satisfaction significantly impacts employee performance. This is underscored by the computed t-value of 3.465 for the job satisfaction variable (X3), exceeding the critical t-value of 1.668. Additionally, the significance value of 0.004 is less than the 0.05 threshold. These results suggest that the job satisfaction variable has a moderately positive and statistically significant effect on the employee performance variable.

The Influence of Work Motivation, Work Environment and Job Satisfaction on Employee Performance of PT Kimia Farma Apotek Unit Cihampelas Bandung City, the multiple regression analysis demonstrates that a one-unit increase in Work Motivation (X1), Work Environment (X2), and Job Satisfaction (X3) collectively leads to a 1.905-unit increase in Employee Performance (Y), with corresponding coefficients of 0.548, 0.412, and 0.945. The concurrent assessment test yields an R-square coefficient of 0.657, signifying that the collective influence of Work Motivation (X1), Work Environment (X2), and Job Satisfaction (X3) on Employee Performance (Y) amounts to 65.7%. The unanalyzed variables in this study explain the remaining 34.3% of the impact.

The results of the hypothesis testing show that the F-value is 19.799, above the critical F-table value of 2.67 (19.799 > 2.67). In addition, the p-value is 0.000, which is below the threshold of 0.05. The results indicate a statistically significant and positive correlation between Work Motivation (X1), Work Environment (X2), Job Satisfaction (X3), and Employee Performance (Y). Thus, we reject the null hypothesis (H0) and accept the alternative hypothesis (H1).

Corroborating this claim, a study conducted by A. Sutisna (2021) substantiates the correlation between the workplace and employee performance. The study indicates that enhancing the work environment can significantly enhance employee performance. Moreover, it highlights a clear correlation between job satisfaction and performance, indicating that higher job satisfaction leads to enhanced employee performance.

4. Conclusion

The study above's findings demonstrate that the performance of employees is crucial in enhancing a company's profitability. Work motivation, work atmosphere, and job happiness can impact employee performance. The primary role of human resources in a firm is to efficiently harness the innate potential of individuals to achieve success in meeting personal and corporate goals. Hence, it is imperative for business actors and professionals to actively tackle the repercussions of globalization, taking into account both external and internal issues. The researcher's firsthand experience with the study process has shown several constraints that should be carefully explored by future researchers in order to improve their work. There are still issues with this research that should be fixed in subsequent investigations. Among the research's limitations are: Only 35 respondents is a small enough sample size to represent the real scenario fairly, information provided by respondents via the questionnaire throughout the data-gathering procedure occasionally must reflect their opinions accurately. This happens due to respondents' varying ways of thinking, presumptions, comprehension, and other elements like their candor when sharing their thoughts on the questionnaire.

The recommendations that might be put forth are that the corporation should bolster job motivation to increase employee productivity. In addition, the organization should prioritize the establishment of a comfortable, hygienic, and secure atmosphere, fostering a sense of relaxation and enhancing employees' concentration on their tasks. Moreover, fostering a congenial and cooperative atmosphere might enhance employees' work drive. Job satisfaction is vital in determining total life satisfaction, as much human time is dedicated to work. The level of job satisfaction in doing duties is crucial in facilitating the company's attainment of its established objectives.

References

Bekti, R. R. (2018). PENGARUH KUALITAS KEHIDUPAN KERJA TERHADAP KEPUASAN KERJA KARYAWAN RUMAH SAKIT IBU DAN ANAK X SURABAYA. *Jurnal Administrasi Kesehatan Indonesia*, *6*(2), 156. https://doi.org/10.20473/jaki.v6i2.2018.156-163

Caissar, C., Hardiyana, A., Nurhadian, A. F., & Kadir, K. (2022). Pengaruh Motivasi Kerja Dan Disiplin Kerja Terhadap Kinerja Karyawan. *Acman: Accounting and Management Journal*, *2*(1), 11–19. https://doi.org/10.55208/aj.v2i1.27

Damayanti, A., & Subagja, I. K. (2023). PENGARUH LINGKUNGAN KERJA DAN STRES KERJA TERHADAP KINERJA KARYAWAN PD. DHARMA JAYA. *Jurnal Manajemen Bisnis Krisnadwipayana*, *11*(1). https://doi.org/10.35137/jmbk.v11i1.918

Faiz, M. T., Suryawan, R. F., & Latuconsina, A. S. (2022). PERAN DAN MANFAAT PENGGUNAAN SISTEM INFORMASI SUMBER DAYA MANUSIA TERHADAP PERUSAHAAN DI PT LINTAS DEWATA CARGO. *Jurnal Transportasi, Logistik, Dan Aviasi*, *2*(1), 56–63.

Hustia, A. (2020). Pengaruh Motivasi Kerja, Lingkungan Kerja Dan Disiplin Kerja Terhadap Kinerja Karyawan Pada Perusahaan WFO Masa Pandemi. *Jurnal Ilmu Manajemen*, *10*(1), 81. https://doi.org/10.32502/jimn.v10i1.2929

Indrasari, M., & Kartini, I. A. N. (2021). *Karakteristik Sumber Daya Manusia Era Digital (Perspektif Kepemimpinan, Motivasi Dan Etos Kerja)*. Zifatama Jawara.

Iswahyudi, M. S., Tahir, R., Samsuddin, H., Hadiyat, Y., Herman, H., Hamdani, D., & Ramadoan, S. (2023). *STRATEGI PERENCANAAN SUMBER DAYA MANUSIA: Mengelola dan menetapkan SDM yang Berkualitas*. PT. Sonpedia Publishing Indonesia.

Karim, A. (2023). *Manajemen sumber daya manusia*. CV. Intelektual Manifes Media.

Kristanti, D., & Lestari, R. (2019). PENGARUH DISIPLIN KERJA KARYAWAN DAN MOTIVASI TERHADAP KINERJA KARYAWAN BAGIAN PRODUKSI (Studi di UD. Pratama Karya Kota Kediri). *JURNAL NUSANTARA APLIKASI MANAJEMEN BISNIS*, *4*(2), 107–116. https://doi.org/10.29407/nusamba.v4i2.13808

Masitoh, I., Firdaus, M. A., & Rinda, R. T. (2020). PENGARUH MOTIVASI DAN LINGKUNGAN KERJA TERHADAP KINERJA KARYAWAN. *Manager : Jurnal Ilmu Manajemen*, *2*(3), 301. https://doi.org/10.32832/manager.v2i3.3704

Muis, M. R., Jufrizen, J., & Fahmi, M. (2018). Pengaruh Budaya Organisasi Dan Komitmen Organisasi Terhadap Kinerja Karyawan. *Jesya (Jurnal Ekonomi & Ekonomi Syariah)*, *1*(1), 9–25. https://doi.org/10.36778/jesya.v1i1.7

Pala'langan, A. Y. (2021). Pengaruh servant leadership, disiplin kerja, dan kepuasan kerja terhadap kinerja guru. *Jurnal Akuntabilitas Manajemen Pendidikan*, *9*(2), 223–231.

Purnami, D. R., Lamidi, L., & Sunarso, S. (2021). PENGARUH LINGKUNGAN KERJA, MOTIVASI KERJA, DAN KEPEMIMPINAN TERHADAP KINERJA DI CV EJS GROUP. *JURNAL EKONOMI DAN KEWIRAUSAHAAN*, *20*(4). https://doi.org/10.33061/jeku.v20i4.5000

Qader, K. S., Ismeal, B. A., Aziz, H. M., Hamza, P. A., Sorguli, S., Sabir, B. Y., Anwar, G., & Gardi, B. (2021). The Effect of Human Resources Management Skills on Accounting Information Quality in Kurdistan Public Sector. *Journal of Humanities and Education Development*, *3*(3), 131–143. https://doi.org/10.22161/jhed.3.3.14

Ratnasari, D., & Vivianty, Y. (2021). *KEPUASAN KERJA KARYAWAN PADA PT WARISAN EURINDO BANYUWANGI*.

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

Sabrina, R. (2021). *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia* (Vol. 1). umsu press.

Sadat, P. A., Handayani, S., & Kurniawan, M. (2020). Disiplin Kerja dan Motivasi Terhadap Kinerja Karyawan. *Inovator*, *9*(1), 23. https://doi.org/10.32832/inovator.v9i1.3014

Sari, P. N. (2023). PENGARUH LINGKUNGAN KERJA DAN DISIPLIN KERJA TERHADAP KINERJA KARYAWAN. *Jurnal Bisnis, Logistik Dan Supply Chain (BLOGCHAIN)*, *3*(1), 11–17. https://doi.org/10.55122/blogchain.v3i1.552

Sedarmayanti. (2017). *Perencanaan dan pengembangan sdm untuk meningkatkan kompetensi kinerja dan produksi kerja*. Refika Aditama.

Siagian, A. O., Asman, Z., Suaidy, H. M., Widyastuti, T., & Karsono, B. (2023). Dampak Disiplin kerja, Kompensasi, Servant Leadership dan Kepuasan Kerja terhadap Kinerja Dosen di Perguruan Tinggi. *Jurnal Manajemen Kreatif Dan Inovasi*, *1*(2), 126–137.

Tahir, R., Aulia, D. I., Sunarto, S., Syahputra, H., Dewi, R., Muharam, D. D., Joeliaty, J., Ramadhi, R., Rohim, M., & Afiyah, S. (2023). *MANAJEMEN SUMBER DAYA MANUSIA: Sebuah Konsep dan Implementasi terhadap kesuksesan Organisasi*. PT. Sonpedia Publishing Indonesia.

Winarsih, S., Bachri, A. A., & Yulianto, A. (2019). PENGARUH MOTIVASI DAN KEPUASAN KERJA TERHADAP KINERJA KARYAWAN (Studi Pada Bank Kalsel Syariah Kandangan). *JWM (Jurnal Wawasan Manajemen)*, *6*(2), 197. https://doi.org/10.20527/jwm.v6i2.153