

The Effect of Work Environment on Employee Performance with Work Motivation as a Mediation Variable at the Indonesian Immigration and Community Polytechnic

Dwi Nuryani

Faculty of Economic, Universitas Islam Sultan Agung (UNISSULA) Semarang, Indonesia, E-mail: dwinuryani576@gmail.com

Abstract. *This study examines the effect of Work Environment on Employee Performance with Work Motivation as a mediating variable among educational support personnel at the Indonesian Immigration and Corrections Polytechnic. The study employed a quantitative explanatory research approach. The population consisted of 63 educational support personnel and all members of the population were included as respondents using saturated sampling. Primary data were collected through a five-point Likert questionnaire and analyzed using Structural Equation Modeling–Partial Least Squares with SmartPLS. The final research model consists of three constructs: Work Environment as the exogenous variable, Work Motivation as the mediating variable, and Employee Performance as the endogenous variable. Measurement-model evaluation indicates that all final indicators have outer loadings above 0.70, Average Variance Extracted values above 0.50, Heterotrait–Monotrait ratios below 0.90, and Cronbach's Alpha and Composite Reliability values above 0.70. The structural results show that Work Environment has a positive and significant effect on Work Motivation ($\beta=0.555$; $T=7.510$; $P<0.001$), Work Environment has a positive and significant effect on Employee Performance ($\beta=0.434$; $T=3.683$; $P<0.001$), and Work Motivation has a positive and significant effect on Employee Performance ($\beta=0.359$; $T=3.217$; $P<0.001$). The indirect effect of Work Environment on Employee Performance through Work Motivation is 0.199 with $T=2.901$ and $P=0.002$. Because the direct effect remains significant, Work Motivation functions as a partial mediator. The findings support the Job Demands–Resources Theory, particularly the motivational process, in which supportive work resources stimulate motivation and contribute to performance. Managerially, the organization should strengthen communication and coordination, supervisory support, teamwork, opportunities for competence development, and recognition of employees' contributions.*

Keywords: *Employee Performance; Job Demands–Resources Theory; SEM-PLS; Work Environment; Work Motivation.*

1. Introduction

Public sector organizations in the era of bureaucratic transformation face increasingly complex demands to improve the quality of public services, the effectiveness of organizational governance, accountability, and adaptability to changes in the strategic environment. These changes occur in tandem with developments in information technology, regulatory changes, increasing public expectations for service quality, and organizational dynamics that require every government agency to operate effectively, efficiently, and responsively. Under these conditions, the success of public sector organizations is determined not only by the quality of policies and the availability of supporting facilities, but also by the organization's ability to manage human resources professionally, adaptively, and performance-oriented (Dessler, 2020).

Human resources are one of an organization's strategic assets because they possess the ability to think, innovate, adapt, make decisions, and directly contribute to achieving organizational goals. From a Human Resource Management perspective, employees are viewed not merely as administrative workers, but as human capital possessing the competence, experience, creativity, commitment, and motivation to create value for the organization. Therefore, organizations need to create policies and working conditions that enable employees to develop their potential and deliver their best performance. Effective human resource management is ultimately expected to align employee interests with the achievement of organizational goals (Dessler, 2020; Armstrong, 2020).

One important indicator of successful human resource management is employee performance. Employee performance reflects an individual's level of success in carrying out their duties and responsibilities according to the standards set by the organization. Performance is not only related to the achievement of work results, but also includes the quality of work, timeliness, responsibility, ability to work together, and employee contributions to achieving organizational goals. In public sector organizations, employee performance has a broader meaning because it is related to the quality of program implementation, service effectiveness, organizational accountability, and the achievement of strategic government goals. Conversely, suboptimal performance can hinder the achievement of organizational goals, reduce the effectiveness of program implementation, and ultimately affect the quality of public services (Mathis & Jackson, 2019).

Employee performance is fundamentally determined not only by individual abilities and competencies. Organizational factors also play a significant role in shaping employee behavior and work outcomes. One relevant organizational factor is the work environment. From a human resource management perspective, the work environment relates not only to the physical conditions of the workplace but also encompasses psychological and social aspects, such as interpersonal relationships, communication, leadership support, cooperation, coordination, work culture, and opportunities for employee development. A conducive work environment can provide a sense of security and comfort, improve the quality of work relationships, facilitate coordination, and provide the support employees need to carry out their duties. Therefore, the work environment can be a factor that encourages better employee performance (Dessler, 2020).

The relationship between the work environment and employee performance can be explained through the Job Demands–Resources (JD-R) Theory developed by Bakker and Demerouti. This theory explains that job characteristics can generally be grouped into two main components: job demands and job resources. Job demands are various job demands that require continuous physical and psychological effort, while job resources are resources available in the job that help employees complete tasks, mitigate the impact of job demands, and support individual development and the achievement of work goals (Demerouti et al., 2001; Bakker & Demerouti, 2007).

2. Research Methods

This study employed a quantitative approach with an explanatory research approach. This approach was used because the study aimed to examine the relationships between variables through numerical data obtained using structured research instruments. Meanwhile, explanatory research aims to explain causal relationships or inter-variable relationships based on previously formulated hypotheses (Creswell & Creswell, 2018; Sugiyono, 2022).

This study examines the relationship between Work Environment as an independent variable, Work Motivation as a mediating variable, and Employee Performance as a dependent variable. The relationships tested include the influence of Work Environment on Work Motivation, the influence of Work Environment on Employee Performance, the influence of Work Motivation on Employee Performance, and the indirect influence of Work Environment on Employee Performance through Work Motivation.

Data analysis in this study used Structural Equation Modeling–Partial Least Squares (SEM-PLS) with the assistance of SmartPLS software. The selection of SEM-PLS was based on the characteristics of the research model involving latent constructs, reflective indicators, and mediating relationships. PLS-SEM analysis was conducted through evaluation of the measurement model (outer model), evaluation of the structural model (inner model), and hypothesis testing through a bootstrapping procedure (Hair et al., 2019).

The use of a quantitative approach and SEM-PLS allows the study to obtain empirical evidence regarding the strength and direction of the relationship between variables based on data obtained from all research respondents.

3. Results and Discussion

3.1. Description of Research Object

The objects of this study are the work environment and employee performance, with work motivation as a mediating variable at the Indonesian Immigration and Correctional Polytechnic. The study was conducted at the Indonesian Immigration and Correctional Polytechnic, focusing on educational staff as a group of employees who are an important part in supporting the implementation of educational activities, administration, and organizational services.

The Indonesian Immigration and Correctional Polytechnic is a civil service educational institution characterized by a structured work system and high professional demands. In carrying out its educational and management functions, human resources are a crucial factor in achieving organizational goals. Educational staff play a role in supporting various academic and non-academic activities, administration, service delivery, and other operational activities.

In this study, the work environment is an independent variable positioned as a factor suspected of influencing employee performance, both directly and through work motivation. The selection of the work environment as the research object is based on the consideration that work environment conditions can influence employees' experiences in carrying out their tasks and interacting within the organization.

The work environment in this study focuses more on the non-physical work environment, because this aspect is considered relevant to the characteristics of educational staff work. The non-physical work environment relates to the social and psychological relationships formed within the organization, including the relationship between employees and superiors, relationships with coworkers, communication, cooperation, and a work atmosphere that supports task implementation (Sedarmayanti, 2017). This concept is also in line with Job Demands–Resources Theory which explains that job resources, such as social support, information, feedback, and support from leaders, can help employees achieve work goals and encourage motivational processes (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007).

A conducive work environment is expected to create conditions that enable educational staff to carry out their duties more effectively. Good working relationships, clear communication, leadership support, and cooperation between employees can help employees understand tasks and complete them. From the perspective of Job Demands–Resources Theory, these

conditions can function as job resources that support motivational processes and ultimately contribute to employee performance (Bakker & Demerouti, 2017).

The second variable studied is Work Motivation. Work motivation is positioned as a mediating variable that explains the mechanism by which the Work Environment can influence Employee Performance. In this study, work motivation is understood as a drive originating from within and outside the employee that influences their enthusiasm, willingness, responsibility, and willingness to perform their work optimally.

The concept of Work Motivation in this study refers to the Two-Factor Theory developed by Herzberg, Mausner, and Snyderman. This theory explains that motivating factors, such as achievement, recognition, responsibility, and opportunities for development, can drive individual motivation in carrying out work (Herzberg et al., 1959). Thus, work motivation is not only related to the drive to complete tasks, but also to the desire to achieve, develop abilities, and make a better contribution to the organization.

The third variable is Employee Performance, which serves as the dependent variable. Employee performance in this study is understood as the level of employee success in carrying out their duties and responsibilities in accordance with organizational goals. Performance is not only measured by job completion, but also by quality, accuracy, timeliness, quantity of work completed, and behaviors that support organizational effectiveness.

The placement of Work Motivation as a mediating variable is based on the premise that a positive work environment does not necessarily directly result in performance, but can initially increase employee motivation. Employees who receive support, good communication, positive working relationships, and opportunities for development will have conditions that are more conducive to building motivation at work. This motivation can then encourage employees to carry out their work more diligently and produce better performance (Bakker & Demerouti, 2017).

Thus, the object of this research describes the relationship between three main constructs, namely:

Work Environment → Work Motivation → Employee Performance

In addition to these indirect relationships, the study also tested direct relationships:

Work Environment → Employee Performance

This model is used to determine whether the work environment directly influences the performance of educational staff and whether work motivation can be a mechanism that explains this influence.

3.2. Description of Research Subjects

The subjects in this study were educational staff at the Indonesian Immigration and Correctional Polytechnic. Based on the study population data, the number of educational staff who were the subjects of the study was 63 people. Because the population size was relatively limited and all members of the population could be reached by the researcher, this study used a saturated sampling technique, namely, all members of the population were used as the research sample.

The selection of educational staff as research subjects was based on the consideration that educational staff play a crucial role in supporting the organization's academic, administrative, service, and operational activities. In carrying out these duties, educational staff interact with superiors, colleagues, other work units, and various parties involved in the organization's operations.

Furthermore, educational staff are a group of employees who directly encounter various work environment dynamics. Relationships with superiors, coworkers, communication, coordination, cooperation, and opportunities for skill development can all be part of the daily work experience. Therefore, educational staff are considered relevant for use as subjects in examining the relationship between work environment, work motivation, and employee performance.

The research data was obtained by distributing questionnaires to 63 education personnel. All questionnaires used in the analysis were collected from respondents who met the research requirements. The data were then analyzed using Structural Equation Modeling–Partial Least Squares (SEM-PLS) with the assistance of SmartPLS software.

The use of SEM-PLS in this study aligns with the research objective, which is to not only examine the direct influence between variables but also the indirect influence through mediating variables. The SEM-PLS approach can be used to analyze the relationships between latent constructs measured by several indicators and simultaneously test structural models (Hair et al., 2022).

The characteristics of the research subjects are further described based on several demographic characteristics, namely gender, age, education level, length of service, and job group. The presentation of these characteristics is intended to provide an overview of the profile of the educational staff who served as research respondents.

Table Characteristics of Research Subjects

Characteristics	Category	Frequency	Percentage
-----------------	----------	-----------	------------

Gender	Man	37	58.73%
	Woman	26	41.27%
Age	20–30 years	57	90.48%
	31–40 years	6	9.52%
Education	Diploma (D3/D4)	45	71.43%
	Bachelor degree)	6	9.52%
	Masters (S2)	12	19.05%
Years of service	2–5 years	43	68.25%
	6–10 years	20	31.75%
Total		63	100%

Source: Data processed by researchers

Based on Table, there were 63 research subjects. Based on gender, 37 respondents were male, or 58.73%, while 26 respondents were female, or 41.27%. Thus, the research subjects were predominantly male education personnel.

Based on age, the majority of respondents were in the 20–30 age group, amounting to 57 people (90.48%). Meanwhile, 6 respondents were in the 31–40 age group, or 9.52%. This composition indicates that the study subjects were predominantly education personnel in the 20–30 age group.

In terms of educational attainment, 45 respondents, or 71.43%, had a diploma (D3/D4), 6 respondents, or 9.52%, had a bachelor's degree (S1), and 12 respondents, or 19.05%, had a master's degree (S2). Therefore, the majority of the study subjects had a diploma.

Based on length of service, 43 respondents, or 68.25%, had a service period of 2–5 years, while 20 respondents, or 31.75%, had a service period of 6–10 years. This indicates that the majority of study subjects had a service period of 2–5 years.

Overall, these characteristics illustrate that the research subjects were predominantly male educational staff, aged 20–30, with a diploma, and 2–5 years of service. These characteristics then serve as context for understanding the research findings on Work Environment, Work Motivation, and Employee Performance.

3.3. Subject Description Based on Position Family

In addition to demographic characteristics, research subjects can also be grouped by job group. This grouping is necessary because educational personnel have diverse job functions and characteristics.

Table Characteristics of Research Subjects Based on Job Groups

No.	Job Group	Frequency	Percentage
1	Office Administration	39	61.90%
2	Caregiver	18	28.57%
3	Honorary	6	9.52%
Total		63	100%

Source: Personnel Data, processed by researchers (2026)

Based on Table, the majority of research subjects came from the Office Administration group, with 39 people (61.90%). Furthermore, the Caregiver group had 18 people (28.57%), and the Honorary group had 6 people (9.52%).

The dominance of the Office Administration group indicates that most research subjects perform work related to administrative activities and organizational services. Meanwhile, the Caregiver group has work characteristics more related to mentoring and coaching. Honorary workers are the group with the smallest number of research subjects.

These differences in job characteristics illustrate that educational staff perform diverse functions in supporting organizational operations. Nevertheless, all these groups operate

within the same organizational environment, making them relevant to research on work environment, work motivation, and employee performance.

a. Descriptive Analysis of Research Variables

Descriptive analysis in this study was used to provide an overview of respondents' perceptions of the variables studied. Descriptive analysis was conducted by examining the average (mean) value of each indicator for each research variable. The variables analyzed consisted of Work Environment as the independent variable, Work Motivation as the mediating variable, and Employee Performance as the dependent variable.

Descriptive analysis is necessary to determine the tendencies of respondents' assessments of each indicator used in the study. The average values obtained are then used to describe the condition of each variable based on the perceptions of educational staff at the Indonesian Immigration and Correctional Polytechnic.

According to Sugiyono (2022), descriptive analysis is used to provide an overview of collected data without the intention of drawing general conclusions. In this study, descriptive analysis was used as a supporting analysis before testing the measurement model and structural model using Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modeling (PLS-SEM).

Respondents' assessments of each statement in the questionnaire were scored using a Likert scale ranging from 1 to 5. The higher the average score, the more positive the respondents' perceptions of the measured indicators. To interpret these average scores, the following class intervals were used.

Table Interpretation Criteria for the Average Value of Respondents' Answers

Value Interval	Category
1.00–2.33	Low
2.34–3.66	Currently
3.67–5.00	Tall

Source: Processed by researchers (2026)

Based on these criteria, the average value in the interval 1.00–2.33 is categorized as low, the value 2.34–3.66 is categorized as medium, while the value 3.67–5.00 is categorized as high.

The results of the descriptive analysis of the three research variables can be seen in the following table.

Table Descriptive Analysis of Research Variables

No.	Variables	Average value	Category
1	<i>Work Environment</i>	3,984	Tall
2	<i>Work Motivation</i>	3,984	Tall
3	<i>Employee Performance</i>	3,917	Tall

Source: Primary data, processed by researchers (2026).

Based on Table, the three research variables have average values in the high category. The Work Environment variable has an average value of 3.984, Work Motivation 3.984, and Employee Performance 3.917.

These results indicate that, in general, educational staff at the Indonesian Immigration and Correctional Polytechnic have positive perceptions of the work environment, work motivation, and performance. However, these average values do not directly indicate a causal relationship between the variables. The relationships between the variables were then tested using a structural model using SmartPLS.

b. Work Environment Variable Description

Work Environment This study describes educational staff's perceptions of the work environment, including relationships and communication between colleagues, superior support, clarity of information and coordination, and work atmosphere and teamwork. These four indicators were the final indicators used in the study.

Table Descriptive Analysis of Work Environment Variables

No.	Code	Indicator	Mean Value	Category
1	WE1	Relationships and communication with coworkers support work execution	4,032	Tall
2	WE2	The superior provides the necessary support or guidance in carrying out the work.	3,984	Tall
3	WE3	The information and coordination received is clear enough to complete the work.	3,905	Tall
4	WE4	The working atmosphere and teamwork support the implementation of tasks	4,016	Tall
Average Work Environment			3,984	Tall

Source: Primary data, processed by researchers (2026)

Based on Table, the Work Environment variable obtained an average score of 3.984, falling into the high category. These results indicate that educational staff generally have a positive perception of their work environment.

The WE1 indicator, regarding relationships and communication with colleagues, achieved an average score of 4.032. This score indicates that respondents perceived relationships and communication between colleagues as very good. This indicates the existence of social support that can assist educational staff in carrying out their work.

The WE2 indicator, regarding superior support or guidance, obtained an average score of 3.984. This result indicates that superior support was perceived favorably by respondents. Leadership support is a job resource that can help employees cope with work demands.

The WE3 indicator obtained an average score of 3.905, making it the indicator with the lowest score in the Work Environment variable. However, this score is still in the high category. This indicates that information clarity and coordination are aspects of the work environment that

can still be strengthened. This finding was also identified in the final analysis of the study, which found that WE3 was the indicator with the lowest average score in the Work Environment construct.

The WE4 indicator, concerning work atmosphere and teamwork, obtained an average score of 4.016. These results indicate that the work atmosphere and teamwork are perceived favorably by respondents and are one of the aspects that support task implementation.

Overall, these results indicate that the working environment for educational staff is in good condition. However, information clarity and coordination require further attention, as they had the lowest average scores compared to other indicators.

c. Description of Work Motivation Variables

Work Motivation is a mediating variable in this study. This variable describes the motivation of educational staff in carrying out their work, which includes enthusiasm for work, opportunities to learn and develop, appreciation for work results, and opportunities to develop careers and competencies. These four indicators constitute the final indicators of the study.

Table Descriptive Analysis of Work Motivation Variables

No.	Code	Indicator	Mean Value	Category
1	WM1	Enthusiasm in carrying out tasks that are your responsibility	4,016	Tall
2	WM2	Opportunity to learn and develop skills	3,968	Tall
3	WM3	Appreciation or recognition of work results	4,000	Tall
4	WM4	Opportunity to develop career and competency	3,952	Tall
Average Work Motivation			3,984	Tall

Source: Primary data, processed by researchers (2026)

Based on Table, Work Motivation obtained an average score of 3.984, which is in the high category. These results indicate that educational staff generally have a positive work motivation.

The WM1 indicator, regarding enthusiasm for completing tasks, obtained an average score of 4.016. This indicates that respondents have good enthusiasm in carrying out their work and responsibilities.

The WM2 indicator, which deals with opportunities to learn and develop skills, achieved an average score of 3.968. This score indicates that respondents generally perceive opportunities to improve their skills, although there is still room to strengthen aspects of learning development.

The WM3 indicator regarding appreciation or recognition of work results obtained an average score of 4.000. This result indicates that appreciation for work results has been perceived positively by educational staff.

Meanwhile, the WM4 indicator, concerning career development opportunities and competency, achieved an average score of 3.952. This indicator has the lowest relative value in Work Motivation, although it is still considered high. These results are consistent with previous research analysis that identified WM4 as the lowest relative indicator in the Work Motivation construct.

Thus, overall work motivation among education personnel is high. However, organizations can prioritize career and competency development opportunities, for example through training, competency development, continuous learning, and communication regarding career development opportunities.

d. Description of Employee Performance Variables

Employee Performance is the dependent variable in this study. Employee performance is measured by the ability to produce work with good quality, accuracy, and neatness; the ability to complete the required amount of work; the ability to complete work within the specified time; and the willingness to help coworkers.

Table Descriptive Analysis of Employee Performance Variables

No.	Code	Indicator	Mean Value	Category
1	EP1	Quality, accuracy and neatness of work	3,778	Tall
2	EP2	Ability to complete the amount of work according to task demands	4,000	Tall

3	EP3	Ability to complete work within the specified time	3,921	Tall
4	EP4	Willingness to help coworkers complete work	3,968	Tall
Average Employee Performance			3,917	Tall

Source: Primary data, processed by researchers (2026)

Based on Table, Employee Performance obtained an average score of 3.917, which is included in the high category. These results indicate that educational staff generally have a positive perception of their performance.

The EP1 indicator, concerning work quality, accuracy, and neatness, achieved an average score of 3.778. This score is the lowest compared to other indicators, although it is still in the high category. These findings indicate that work quality, accuracy, and neatness are areas with room for improvement. This result was also identified in the final research data as the indicator with the lowest average score in Employee Performance.

The EP2 indicator obtained an average value of 4,000, which indicates that educational staff generally feel capable of completing the amount of work according to task demands.

The EP3 indicator regarding punctuality obtained an average score of 3.921. This result indicates that the ability to complete work within the specified time is in the high category.

Furthermore, the EP4 indicator, which concerns willingness to help colleagues, achieved an average score of 3.968. This indicates that mutual assistance among colleagues has become a positive aspect of the work of educational staff.

3.4. Outer Model Evaluation

An outer model evaluation, or measurement model, is conducted to determine the extent to which the indicators used in the study are capable of measuring the latent constructs being studied. In this study, the outer model evaluation was conducted on three constructs: Work Environment, Work Motivation, and Employee Performance.

The evaluation of the measurement model in this study included testing convergent validity through outer loading and Average Variance Extracted (AVE), discriminant validity through Heterotrait–Monotrait Ratio (HTMT), and construct reliability through Cronbach's Alpha and Composite Reliability. This approach aligns with the measurement model evaluation

procedure in Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modeling (PLS-SEM) analysis (Hair et al., 2019; Hair et al., 2022).

Evaluation of the outer model is a crucial step before evaluating the inner model. This is because the analysis of relationships between variables in a structural model must be based on constructs that meet validity and reliability requirements. Based on data processing using SmartPLS on 63 respondents, all final indicators met the established criteria and could therefore be used for testing the structural model.

4. Conclusion

Based on the results of research on the influence of Work Environment on Employee Performance with Work Motivation as a mediating variable on educational staff at the Indonesian Immigration and Correctional Polytechnic, with a total of 63 educational staff as respondents, and based on the results of data processing using Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modeling (PLS-SEM), several things can be concluded as follows:

- a. The work environment has a positive and significant effect on work motivation. The test results show a path coefficient of 0.555, a t-statistic of 7.510, and a p-value <0.001. These results indicate that the better the work environment perceived by educational staff, the higher their work motivation. Thus, the first hypothesis is accepted.
- b. The work environment has a positive and significant effect on employee performance. The test results show a path coefficient of 0.434, a t-statistic of 3.683, and a p-value <0.001. These results indicate that the work environment is one of the factors related to educational staff performance. The more conducive the work environment, the better the resulting performance. Thus, the second hypothesis is accepted.
- c. Work motivation has a positive and significant effect on employee performance. The test results show a path coefficient of 0.359, a t-statistic of 3.217, and a p-value <0.001. These results indicate that increased work motivation is followed by increased performance of educational staff. Thus, the third hypothesis is accepted.
- d. Work motivation has been shown to mediate the influence of work environment on employee performance. The indirect effect test results showed a value of 0.199, a t-statistic of 2.901, and a p-value of 0.002. Because the direct influence of work environment on employee performance remains significant, the form of mediation that occurs is partial mediation. Thus, the fourth hypothesis is accepted.

Overall, the research results indicate that the work environment plays a significant role in improving employee performance, both through direct influence and through increased work motivation. Therefore, improving the performance of educational staff requires not only a

supportive work environment but also attention to the motivational mechanisms that drive employees in carrying out their work.

5. References

Journals:

- Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2007). The Job Demands–Resources model: State of the art. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 22(3), 309–328. <https://doi.org/10.1108/02683940710733115>
- Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2017). Job demands–resources theory: Taking stock and looking forward. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 22(3), 273–285. <https://doi.org/10.1037/ocp0000056>
- Danielsson, C. B., & Bodin, L. (2008). Office type in relation to health, well-being, and job satisfaction among employees. *Environment and Behavior*, 40(5), 636–668. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013916507307459>
- Demerouti, E. (2025). Job demands-resources and conservation of resources theories: How do they help to explain employee well-being and future job design? *Journal of Business Research*, 192, 115296. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2025.115296>
- Demerouti, E., & Bakker, A. B. (2013). The job demands-resources model. *Revista de Psicología del Trabajo y de las Organizaciones*, 29(3), 1–10.
- Demerouti, E., Bakker, A. B., Nachreiner, F., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2001). The job demands–resources model of burnout. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(3), 499–512. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.86.3.499>
- Elsbach, K. D., & Pratt, M. G. (2007). The physical environment in organizations. *Academy of Management Annals*, 1(1), 181–224. <https://doi.org/10.1080/078559803>
- Gagné, M., & Deci, E. L. (2005). Self-determination theory and work motivation. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 26(4), 331–362. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.322>
- Haynes, B. P. (2008). The impact of office comfort on productivity. *Journal of Facilities Management*, 6(1), 37–51. <https://doi.org/10.1108/14725960810847459>
- Hong, Y., & Kim, J. (2022). Environmental demands and resources: A framework for understanding the physical environment for work. *Facilities*, 39(9/10), 652–666. <https://doi.org/10.1108/F-07-2020-0090>
- Kanfer, R., Frese, M., & Johnson, R. E. (2017). Motivation related to work: A century of progress. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 102(3), 338–355. <https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000133>

Parker, S. K., & Jorritsma, K. (2020). Good, better, best: The development of proactive performance in organizations. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 41(1), 1–16.

Pinder, C. C. (2014). *Work motivation in organizational behavior* (2nd ed.). Psychology Press.

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>

Van den Broeck, A., Ferris, D. L., Chang, C. H., & Rosen, C. C. (2016). A review of self-determination theory's basic psychological needs at work. *Journal of Management*, 42(5), 1195–1229. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206316632058>

Vischer, J. C. (2007). The effects of the physical environment on job performance: Towards a theoretical model of workspace stress. *Stress and Health*, 23(3), 175–184. <https://doi.org/10.1002/smi.1134>

Books:

Armstrong, M., & Taylor, S. (2023). *Armstrong's handbook of human resource management practice* (16th ed.). Kogan Page.

Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (5th ed.). SAGE Publications.

Dessler, G. (2020). *Human resource management* (16th ed.). Pearson.

Herzberg, F., Mausner, B., & Snyderman, B. B. (1959). *The motivation to work*. John Wiley & Sons.

Robbins, S. P., & Judge, T. A. (2019). *Organizational behavior* (18th ed.). Pearson.

Sedarmayanti. (2017). *Manajemen sumber daya manusia: Reformasi birokrasi dan manajemen Pegawai Negeri Sipil*. Refika Aditama.

Sugiyono. (2022). *Metode penelitian kuantitatif, kualitatif, dan R&D*. Alfabeta.