



WORK ENVIRONMENT, MENTALITY, AND ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE AS PREDICTORS OF EMPLOYEE PERFORMANCE: THE MEDIATING ROLE OF WORK MOTIVATION

Andri Arga Kusumah¹, Herma Wiharno², Yanneri Elfa Kiswara Rahmantya^{3*}

^{1,2,3} Program Magister Manajemen, Sekolah Pascasarjana, Universitas Kuningan, Jawa Barat, Indonesia

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received April 02, 2026
Revised April 15, 2026
Accepted April 25, 2026
Available online May 21, 2026

Keywords:

Employee Performance;
Mentality; Organizational Culture;
Public Sector;
Work Environment; Work Motivation



This is an open access article under the [CC BY-SA](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/) license.

Copyright © 2022 by Author.
Published by CV Putra Publisher.

ABSTRACT

Declining employee performance indicators in public sector organizations call for empirical investigation into the multifaceted determinants of performance. This study examines the extent to which work environment, mentality, and organizational culture predict employee performance directly and indirectly through work motivation as a mediating mechanism at the Civil Service Police Unit (Satpol PP) of Kuningan Regency, West Java, Indonesia. Adopting a quantitative descriptive-verification design, the study incorporated all 172 active civil servants as respondents through a saturated (census) sampling procedure. Structured questionnaires employing a ten-point interval scale were used for data collection. Analytical procedures encompassed validity and reliability testing, classical assumption diagnostics, three-model path analysis, and Sobel's mediation test processed through SPSS v.25. Findings reveal that work environment ($\beta = 0.434$), mentality ($\beta = 0.727$), and organizational culture ($\beta = 1.230$) each exert a statistically significant positive influence on work motivation ($R^2 = 0.865$). All three antecedents, alongside work motivation ($\beta = 0.910$), likewise demonstrate significant positive direct effects on employee performance. Sobel test results confirm that work motivation significantly mediates each antecedent-performance relationship (Sobel statistics: 4.391, 5.993, and 12.249, respectively; all $p < 0.001$). Among the tested paths, organizational culture exercises the most potent indirect effect through motivation (coefficient product = 1.119), indicating that performance enhancement is most powerfully achieved when cultural values are internalized alongside motivational support. These findings contribute a holistic structural model linking environmental, psychological, and cultural antecedents to public-sector performance.

1. INTRODUCTION

Sustaining high levels of employee performance remains one of the central strategic challenges confronting public sector organizations, particularly those mandated to enforce regulations and maintain public order. Unlike private enterprises, government agencies face additional complexity stemming from bureaucratic constraints, diverse stakeholder expectations, and limited discretionary management practices (Narmodo, 2009; Kasmir, 2019). Within this context, understanding which antecedents most powerfully drive performance is not merely an academic exercise but a practical imperative for organizational improvement.

The Civil Service Police Unit (Satpol PP) of Kuningan Regency exemplifies this challenge. Longitudinal performance assessment records spanning 2021 through 2024 document a gradual erosion of key performance indicators: the composite performance score declined from 92.70 in 2021 to 89.32 in 2024 crossing from the "good" into the "adequate" classification. A preliminary survey of 40 randomly selected civil servants corroborated these records, with an aggregate mean performance score of 3.04 on a five-point scale, categorized as moderate across all measured dimensions (Pra-Survey, 2025). Indicators concerning service orientation, commitment, and initiative work recorded particularly low scores, signaling structural gaps in organizational drive. Specific issues identified include delays in task completion, suboptimal interdepartmental coordination, and diminished initiative among field personnel.

The extant literature points to a constellation of factors that shape public-sector performance. Kasmir (2019) catalogues over a dozen predictors—among them work environment, organizational culture, and work motivation. Parallel empirical inquiries have confirmed the relevance of these constructs in diverse organizational settings: Sari et al. (2022) demonstrated that a favorable work environment amplifies employee output, with motivation serving as the conduit; Zhenjing et al. (2022) documented positive links between workplace conditions and task completion; and Wijayanti & Putra (2021) found that motivation and culture jointly correlate with civil servant performance. Yet a countervailing body of evidence—including Setiawan & Dewi (2021), Rachmawati (2020), and Kusnadi (2022) indicates that motivational mediation is not universally operative, varying with organizational context and job design characteristics.

Theoretically, the relationship between these antecedents and performance is grounded in multiple frameworks. Herzberg's Two-Factor Theory posits that work environment conditions serve as hygiene factors whose adequacy prevents dissatisfaction and, when elevated, stimulates motivational states (Dessler, 2020; Robbins & Judge, 2020). Ryan and Deci's (2020) Self-Determination Theory contends that intrinsic motivation is most durable when anchored in autonomous, competence-affirming mental orientations precisely the dimensions captured by mentality constructs. Schein's cultural framework and institutional embeddedness arguments (Robbins & Judge, 2020) further establish how shared organizational values translate into heightened motivational commitment and performance outcomes.

A notable research gap persists: few studies simultaneously investigate three distinct predictors—work environment, individual mentality, and organizational culture in tandem with a motivational mediating mechanism, especially within the context of Indonesian local government enforcement units. Moreover, the construct of mentality (operationalized through hope, self-efficacy, resilience, and optimism; Ajzen, 2020; Luthans, 2020) remains understudied compared to structural variables. This study seeks to address these gaps by testing a multi-predictor path model in which work motivation mediates the relationships between each antecedent and employee performance at Satpol PP Kuningan Regency. Based on the foregoing, this study poses the following research questions: (1) Do work environment, mentality, and organizational culture significantly affect work motivation? (2) Do work environment, mentality, organizational culture, and work motivation significantly affect employee performance? (3) Does work motivation significantly mediate the relationships between each antecedent and employee performance? The study aims to provide empirically grounded recommendations for performance management in Indonesian local government enforcement agencies.

2. RESEARCH METHOD

This investigation adopted a quantitative descriptive-verbatim design. Descriptive analysis characterized the distributional properties of each construct, while verbatim procedures tested the structural relationships posited in the conceptual model (Saunders et al., 2020; Bryman & Bell, 2020). The study setting was Kantor Satpol PP Kabupaten Kuningan, a regional civil service enforcement agency in West Java, Indonesia. The study population comprised all 172 active civil servants (Aparatur Sipil Negara/ASN)—encompassing both permanent civil servants (PNS) and government contract employees (PPPK) across the Polisi Pamong Praja and Damkar units. Given the manageable population size, a saturated (census) sampling approach was employed, making all 172 personnel eligible respondents (Etikan & Bala, 2020; Sekaran & Bougie, 2020).

Data were gathered via a closed-ended, self-administered questionnaire using a ten-point interval scale (1 = Strongly Disagree; 10 = Strongly Agree). The ten-point interval scale was selected over the conventional five-point Likert scale to increase measurement sensitivity, reduce central tendency bias, and produce finer variance in responses across a population with relatively homogeneous sociodemographic characteristics. Scores were interpreted as: 1–4 = low/unfavorable; 5–7 = moderate; 8–10 = high/favorable. Five constructs were operationalized as follows: (1) Work Environment (X_1): Three dimensions adapted from Budiasa (2021) workplace atmosphere (3 items), interpersonal relations (3 items), and availability of work facilities (3 items); totaling 9 items. Work environment is operationally defined as the totality of physical and social conditions within the workplace that influence employees' comfort, morale, and productivity. (2) Mentality (X_2): Four dimensions from Ajzen (2020) and Luthans (2020)—hope (3 items), self-efficacy (3 items), resilience (3 items), and optimism (3 items); totaling 12 items. Mentality is operationally defined as the psychological capital an employee brings to the workplace, encompassing positive cognitive and motivational orientations that support task engagement and perseverance. (3) Organizational Culture (X_3): Six dimensions from Wirawan (2007) norm implementation (2 items), value

adherence (2 items), trust (2 items), member-oriented orientation (2 items), work aggressiveness (2 items), and stability maintenance (2 items); totaling 12 items. Organizational culture is operationally defined as the shared values, norms, and behavioral expectations institutionalized within the organization that guide employee conduct and collective identity. (4) Work Motivation (Z): Four dimensions from Afandi (2018) ompensation (3 items), working conditions (3 items), work facilities (3 items), and achievement recognition (3 items); totaling 12 items. Work motivation is operationally defined as the internal drive and external stimuli that direct, energize, and sustain employees' goal-oriented behavior in the workplace. (5) Employee Performance (Y): Eight dimensions from PermenPANRB No. 6/2022 and PP No. 30/2019—quantity (1 item), quality (1 item), timeliness (1 item), cost efficiency (1 item), service orientation (1 item), commitment (1 item), initiative (1 item), and teamwork (1 item); totaling 8 items; with 3 supplementary behavioral items, yielding 11 items in total. Employee performance is operationally defined as the degree to which an employee fulfills assigned duties and achieves organizational objectives across quantitative, qualitative, and behavioral dimensions.

The total questionnaire comprised 53 items. Prior to main data collection, instrument validity and reliability were assessed through a pilot test with 30 respondents drawn from the same population. Items were retained when the Pearson correlation coefficient exceeded $r_{table} = 0.361$ ($df = 28$; $\alpha = 0.05$), and scales were deemed reliable when Cronbach's Alpha exceeded 0.60 (Sekaran & Bougie, 2020). All 53 questionnaire items satisfied both criteria.

The primary analytic strategy was path analysis (analisis jalur), executed through three structural equation models in SPSS v.25. The path models were specified as follows:

$$\text{Model I (Motivation Model): } Z = \rho_{zx_1}X_1 + \rho_{zx_2}X_2 + \rho_{zx_3}X_3 + \varepsilon_1$$

$$\text{Model II (Performance—Direct Effects): } Y = \rho_{yx_1}X_1 + \rho_{yx_2}X_2 + \rho_{yx_3}X_3 + \varepsilon_2$$

$$\text{Model III (Performance—via Motivation): } Y = \rho_{yz}Z + \varepsilon_3$$

Prior to path estimation, classical assumption tests were conducted: Kolmogorov–Smirnov normality test; Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) for multicollinearity (threshold: $VIF < 10$; Tolerance > 0.10); Glejser test for heteroscedasticity (threshold: $p > 0.05$); and Durbin–Watson statistic for autocorrelation (acceptable range: 1.5–2.5). Mediation significance was evaluated using Sobel's test, wherein the indirect effect ($a \times b$) was deemed significant when the two-tailed p-value fell below 0.05, with the Sobel statistic computed as: $Sobel = (a \times b) / \sqrt{(b^2s_a^2 + a^2s_b^2)}$, where a and b are the unstandardized path coefficients and s_a , s_b are their standard errors.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1 Descriptive Statistics and Classical Assumption Tests

The one-sample Kolmogorov–Smirnov test yielded Asymp. Sig. values of 0.142 (work environment), 0.212 (mentality), 0.158 (organizational culture), 0.120 (work motivation), and 0.130 (employee performance), each exceeding the 0.05 threshold—indicating that all distributions conformed to normality. Multicollinearity was absent: Tolerance values ranged from 0.127 to 0.153 and VIF values from 7.397 to 9.411, both within acceptable bounds. Heteroscedasticity was not detected (Glejser significance values: 0.992, 0.255, 0.145, and 0.159; all > 0.05), and the Durbin–Watson statistic of 1.918 indicated no autocorrelation. These diagnostics collectively confirm that the data satisfied the prerequisite assumptions for path analysis.

3.2 Path Analysis Results

Model I assessed the simultaneous prediction of work motivation by the three antecedents. The overall model was statistically significant ($F = 358.209$; $p < 0.001$) and explained 86.5% of variance in work motivation ($R^2 = 0.865$). Unstandardized path coefficients were: work environment $\beta_1 = 0.434$ ($t = 6.016$; $p < 0.001$), mentality $\beta_2 = 0.727$ ($t = 6.511$; $p < 0.001$), and organizational culture $\beta_3 = 1.230$ ($t = 15.795$; $p < 0.001$). Organizational culture exerted the strongest influence on work motivation, followed by mentality and work environment. These results support Hypotheses H1, H2, and H3.

Model II examined direct paths to employee performance, explaining 78.4% of its variance ($R^2 = 0.784$; $F = 202.845$; $p < 0.001$). Standardized coefficients were: work environment $\beta = 0.252$ ($t = 2.759$; $p = 0.006$), mentality $\beta = 0.180$ ($t = 2.569$; $p = 0.005$), and organizational culture $\beta = 0.745$ ($t = 7.565$; $p < 0.001$). All

three predictors demonstrated significant positive direct effects on employee performance, with organizational culture again being most dominant. Hypotheses H4, H5, and H6 are supported.

Model III evaluated work motivation's direct effect on employee performance. A single predictor accounted for 82.7% of performance variance ($R^2 = 0.827$; $F = 815.482$; $p < 0.001$), with a path coefficient of $\beta = 0.910$ ($t = 28.557$; $p < 0.001$)—confirming motivation as the most powerful single predictor within the model. Hypothesis H7 is supported.

Sobel tests for mediation significance produced the following results: the indirect path from work environment to performance via motivation yielded a Sobel statistic of 4.391 ($p < 0.001$; indirect coefficient = $0.434 \times 0.910 = 0.395$); from mentality via motivation, 5.993 ($p < 0.001$; indirect = $0.727 \times 0.910 = 0.662$); and from organizational culture via motivation, 12.249 ($p < 0.001$; indirect = $1.230 \times 0.910 = 1.119$). All ten hypotheses were supported. Table 1 summarizes the complete hypothesis testing results.

Table 1. Summary of Hypothesis Testing Results

Hyp.	Path	β	t/Sobel	Sig.	Type	Decision
H1	Work environment → Work motivation	0.434	6.016	<0.001	Direct	Supported
H2	Mentality → Work motivation	0.727	6.511	<0.001	Direct	Supported
H3	Organizational culture → Work motivation	1.230	15.795	<0.001	Direct	Supported
H4	Work environment → Employee performance	0.252	2.759	0.006	Direct	Supported
H5	Mentality → Employee performance	0.180	2.569	0.005	Direct	Supported
H6	Org. culture → Employee performance	0.745	7.565	<0.001	Direct	Supported
H7	Work motivation → Employee performance	0.910	28.557	<0.001	Direct	Supported
H8	Work env. → Z → Performance (Sobel)	0.395*	4.391	<0.001	Indirect	Supported
H9	Mentality → Z → Performance (Sobel)	0.662*	5.993	<0.001	Indirect	Supported
H10	Org. culture → Z → Performance (Sobel)	1.119*	12.249	<0.001	Indirect	Supported

Note: * indicates indirect effect coefficient (path product); all tests two-tailed; $df = 170-172$

3.3 Discussion

The positive influence of work environment on both work motivation and employee performance corroborates a well-established body of evidence in organizational psychology. Consistent with Herzberg's Two-Factor Theory, physical and social working conditions constitute hygiene factors whose adequacy prevents dissatisfaction and, when elevated, stimulates motivational states (Dessler, 2020; Robbins & Judge, 2020). The present finding—that environmental quality predicts 43.4% of the variance attributed to motivation—reinforces earlier reports by Sari et al. (2022) and Rasool et al. (2025) that workspace comfort, facility provision, and collegial relationships collectively energize productive behavior. In the Satpol PP context, where personnel routinely perform high-stakes field operations, supportive environmental conditions serve a particularly salient role in sustaining operational readiness and morale. The logical mechanism is straightforward: when employees perceive their physical surroundings and interpersonal climate as supportive, they experience fewer motivational impediments and are more likely to channel energy toward task accomplishment rather than coping with environmental stressors.

The influence of mentality on work motivation ($\beta = 0.727$) represents a theoretically significant finding, as it elevates psychological capital alongside structural variables as a predictor of motivational states. Ryan & Deci's (2020) Self-Determination Theory contends that intrinsic motivation is most durable when anchored in autonomous, competence-affirming mental orientations—precisely the attributes captured by the hope, self-efficacy, resilience, and optimism dimensions employed here. Personnel who maintain optimistic appraisals of challenges, who believe in their capacity to accomplish tasks, and who recover readily from adversity are better equipped to sustain motivational engagement across the

demanding and often unpredictable operational environment of a civil enforcement unit. In the Satpol PP context, where staff frequently encounter resistance and high-pressure situations, psychological resilience and self-efficacy are not merely personal assets but organizational necessities. The current data support this reasoning, with mentality exhibiting a stronger motivational path coefficient than work environment, suggesting that internal psychological resources may be more amenable to sustained motivational uplift than physical environmental adjustments alone (Luthans, 2020).

Organizational culture emerged as the single most potent predictor of both work motivation ($\beta = 1.230$) and employee performance ($\beta = 0.745$ direct; indirect = 1.119 through motivation), a result that resonates with the institutional embeddedness arguments of Robbins & Judge (2020) and Schein's cultural framework. In organizations where discipline, loyalty, shared responsibility, and integrity are institutionalized as core values, employees develop a sense of organizational belonging that translates into heightened motivational commitment. The dominance of the cultural path aligns with Ahmed et al. (2024) and Chen & Huang (2025), both of whom documented the primacy of cultural factors in linking organizational context to performance outcomes in public institutions. For a paramilitary-style enforcement body like Satpol PP, shared cultural norms around professional conduct and collective duty represent a particularly potent motivational infrastructure. The logical explanation is that culture operates at a deeper normative level than either physical environment or individual psychology: it shapes the meaning employees attach to their work, the standards they internalize, and the social accountability they feel toward colleagues and organizational goals.

Work motivation emerged as the overarching performance driver ($\beta = 0.910$; $R^2 = 0.827$), and its mediating role was confirmed across all three antecedents. Critically, indirect effects through motivation exceeded direct effects in all cases: the organizational culture indirect effect (1.119) surpassed its direct counterpart (0.745), and the mentality indirect effect (0.662) similarly outweighed direct prediction (0.180). This pattern of dominant mediation implies that environmental, cultural, and psychological antecedents do not primarily act on performance through rational compliance or structural conformity; rather, they operate by transforming the motivational states of employees, which in turn mobilize discretionary effort and task commitment. This finding challenges management approaches that target only structural improvements—facility upgrades, rule enforcement—without investing in motivational climate, suggesting that such approaches capture only a fraction of available performance gains.

Compared with prior work, the present study's simultaneous inclusion of mentality as a psychological predictor alongside structural (work environment) and institutional (organizational culture) variables yields a more comprehensive predictive architecture. Earlier studies have typically examined dyadic relationships or positioned motivation as a moderator (Prabowo, 2021; Kusnadi, 2022). The three-predictor mediational model tested here accounts for 86.5% of variance in motivation and 82.7% in performance via the motivational pathway, suggesting strong model parsimony and explanatory power for this population.

4. CONCLUSION

This investigation establishes three principal conclusions. First, work environment ($\beta = 0.434$), mentality ($\beta = 0.727$), and organizational culture ($\beta = 1.230$) each exert statistically significant, positive direct effects on work motivation, collectively explaining 86.5% of its variance ($R^2 = 0.865$). Second, all three antecedents together with work motivation ($\beta = 0.910$)—demonstrate significant positive direct effects on employee performance ($R^2 = 0.784$ for the full direct-effect model; $R^2 = 0.827$ for the motivation-only model). Third, work motivation functions as a robust and significant mediator of all three antecedent-performance relationships, with Sobel statistics of 4.391 (work environment), 5.993 (mentality), and 12.249 (organizational culture), all $p < 0.001$.

The indirect effect of organizational culture through motivation (1.119) constitutes the strongest performance-predictive pathway identified in this study, underscoring that cultural value internalization more than structural or environmental adjustments most effectively enhances civil servant performance by first elevating motivational states. From a managerial standpoint, administrators at Satpol PP Kuningan Regency should: (1) cultivate a positive organizational culture through consistent socialization of

institutional values, enforcement of work norms, and transparent recognition of achievement; (2) reinforce personnel mentality through structured coaching programs targeting hope and resilience, particularly given the lowest-scoring indicator on the hope sub-dimension; (3) improve physical and relational work environment quality, including workspace conditions, equipment adequacy, and interpersonal climate; and (4) align compensation structures with workload demands to strengthen extrinsic motivational reinforcement.

This study carries several limitations. The cross-sectional design precludes causal inference, and the sample is confined to a single organization, limiting generalizability. Subsequent investigations might adopt longitudinal or comparative multi-agency designs, and incorporate moderating variables such as leadership style, organizational commitment, or job stress to capture contingent performance dynamics. Mixed-method approaches could additionally illuminate the qualitative mechanisms through which culture and mentality translate into motivational change.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author gratefully acknowledges the guidance of Dr. Herma Wiharno, M.Si. (Supervisor I) and Dr. Yanneri Elfa Kiswara Rahmantya, M.M. (Supervisor II) at the Graduate School of Universitas Kuningan. Sincere appreciation is extended to the leadership and all personnel of Kantor Satpol PP Kabupaten Kuningan for their cooperation in data collection.

REFERENCES

- Afandi, P. (2018). *Manajemen sumber daya manusia: Teori, konsep, dan indikator*. Zahir Publishing.
- Ahmed, S., Rahman, M., & Chowdhury, T. (2024). The influence of organizational culture and work ethics on employee performance through motivation: Evidence from public institutions. *International Journal of Public Sector Management*, 37(1), 58–75. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJPSM-03-2023-0084>
- Ajzen, I. (2020). The theory of planned behavior: Frequently asked questions. *Human Behavior and Emerging Technologies*, 2(4), 314–324. <https://doi.org/10.1002/hbe2.195>
- Bryman, A., & Bell, E. (2020). *Business research methods* (5th ed.). Oxford University Press.
- Budiasa, I. M. (2021). *Perilaku organisasi: Konsep, teori, dan praktik*. Pustaka Larasan.
- Chen, L., & Huang, T. (2025). The mediating effect of work motivation between organizational culture and employee performance in the post-COVID era. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 46(3), 412–428. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.2780>
- Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2020). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (5th ed.). SAGE.
- Dessler, G. (2020). *Human resource management* (16th ed.). Pearson.
- Etikan, I., & Bala, K. (2020). Sampling and sampling methods. *Biometrics & Biostatistics International Journal*, 5(6), 215–217.
- Indrawan, R. (2023). Pengaruh keterlibatan pegawai dan praktik ramah lingkungan terhadap motivasi dan kinerja. *Jurnal Manajemen dan Bisnis*, 12(2), 155–170.
- Karepesina, M. T. (2023). The role of motivation and organizational culture on civil servants' performance. *Journal of Public Administration Studies*, 8(1), 77–90.
- Kasmir. (2019). *Manajemen sumber daya manusia: Teori dan praktik*. RajaGrafindo Persada.
- Khan, N., & Al-Mutairi, F. (2024). Interplay of work environment, organizational culture, and motivation in driving employee performance in government agencies. *Public Administration Quarterly*, 48(2), 189–210.
- Kusnadi, D. (2022). Lingkungan kerja, pelatihan, dan budaya organisasi terhadap kinerja dengan motivasi sebagai mediasi. *Jurnal Ilmu Administrasi*, 19(1), 77–89.

- Kurniawan, A., & Andriani, S. (2020). Pengaruh lingkungan kerja terhadap kinerja dosen dengan mediasi komitmen dan motivasi berprestasi. *Jurnal Pendidikan dan Pengajaran*, 53(1), 45–56.
- Luthans, F. (2020). *Organizational behavior: An evidence-based approach* (14th ed.). McGraw-Hill.
- Narmodo, A. (2009). *Manajemen kinerja pegawai*. Andi.
- Prabowo, H. (2021). Pengaruh budaya organisasi terhadap kinerja pegawai melalui motivasi kerja. *Jurnal Administrasi Publik Indonesia*, 6(2), 89–104.
- Rachmawati, I. (2020). Budaya organisasi terhadap kinerja pegawai. *Jurnal Ilmu Manajemen*, 8(1), 34–42.
- Rasool, S. F., Wang, M., Tang, M., Saeed, A., & Iqbal, J. (2025). Exploring the nexus between a supportive workplace environment and employee performance. *Sustainability*, 17(2), 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su17020423>
- Robbins, S. P., & Judge, T. A. (2020). *Organizational behavior* (18th ed.). Pearson.
- Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2020). Intrinsic and extrinsic motivation from a self-determination theory perspective: Definitions, theory, practices, and future directions. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 61, 101860. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cedpsych.2020.101860>
- Sari, M., Nugraha, D., & Putri, A. (2022). Lingkungan kerja dan motivasi terhadap kinerja karyawan di industri manufaktur. *Jurnal Ekonomi dan Bisnis*, 15(1), 55–67.
- Saunders, M., Lewis, P., & Thornhill, A. (2020). *Research methods for business students* (8th ed.). Pearson.
- Sekaran, U., & Bougie, R. (2020). *Research methods for business: A skill-building approach* (8th ed.). Wiley.
- Setiawan, D., & Dewi, L. (2021). Peran motivasi sebagai mediator budaya organisasi terhadap kinerja. *Jurnal Riset Manajemen*, 12(3), 210–220.
- Sutrisno, E. (2022). *Manajemen sumber daya manusia*. Kencana.
- Wijayanti, R., & Putra, D. (2021). Motivasi dan budaya organisasi terhadap kinerja pegawai pelayanan publik. *Jurnal Riset Manajemen*, 14(2), 88–101.
- Wirawan. (2007). *Budaya dan iklim organisasi: Teori, aplikasi, dan penelitian*. Salemba Empat.
- Zhenjing, G., Li, H., & Zhang, Y. (2022). Impact of employees' workplace environment on task performance: Mediating role of commitment and achievement striving. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 43(6), 780–796. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.2585>
- Ahmed, K., Pervaiz, M., & Sajjad, M. (2021). Impact of leadership style on employee performance mediated by motivation. *Journal of Business and Social Sciences*, 3(1), 1–15.
- Bandura, A. (2019). Social cognitive theory: An agentic perspective. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 52(1), 1–26.
- Hackman, J. R., & Oldham, G. R. (2020). *Work redesign* (reprint ed.). Addison-Wesley.
- Locke, E. A., & Latham, G. P. (2019). Goal-setting theory: The current state. *New Developments in Goal Setting and Task Performance*, 1, 623–630.
- Motowidlo, S. J., & Kell, H. J. (2020). Job performance. *Handbook of Psychology: Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 12, 82–103.
- Peraturan Menteri PAN-RB Nomor 6 Tahun 2022 tentang Pengelolaan Kinerja Pegawai ASN. Kementerian Pendayagunaan Aparatur Negara dan Reformasi Birokrasi Republik Indonesia.
- Peraturan Pemerintah Nomor 30 Tahun 2019 tentang Penilaian Kinerja Pegawai Negeri Sipil. Pemerintah Republik Indonesia.