



The Influence of the Physical Work Environment and Work Discipline on Employee Performance with Motivation as a Mediating Variable

*Yulia Puspita Dewi

Universitas Widyatama,
Indonesia

Nurul Hermina

Universitas Widyatama,
Indonesia

***Corresponding author:**

Yulia Puspita Dewi, Universitas Widyatama,
Indonesia. ✉yulia.puspita@widyatama.ac.id

Article Info:

Article history:

Received: June 17, 2026

Revised: July 20, 2026

Accepted: August 13, 2026

Available Online: August 22, 2026

Keywords:

Physical Work Environment; Work
Discipline; Work Motivation;
Employee Performance.



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

Copyright © 2026 by Author. Published by
Politeknik Siber Cerdika International

Abstract

Background: Sustained employee performance is especially important in security services, where work is dispersed across locations and depends on reliable discipline and operational readiness. Earlier findings on whether the physical work environment and work discipline directly improve performance remain mixed, suggesting that work motivation may be the process through which these conditions are converted into stronger work outcomes.

Objective: This study evaluates the direct effects of the physical work environment and work discipline on employee performance at PT Bandung Perkasa Madani and examines whether work motivation carries those effects.

Methods: A quantitative descriptive-verify design was applied to all 100 permanent employees using a saturated sample. Questionnaire data were processed with Structural Equation Modeling based on Partial Least Squares (PLS-SEM) in SmartPLS 4.

Results: Neither the physical work environment nor work discipline showed a significant direct relationship with employee performance. Both, however, were significant positive predictors of work motivation, and motivation significantly predicted performance. The indirect paths were also significant, indicating that work motivation fully mediates the effects of the physical work environment and work discipline on employee performance.

Conclusion: The findings position work motivation as the principal mechanism linking workplace conditions and disciplined behavior to performance. Managerial efforts should therefore combine improvements in the physical work setting and consistent discipline with incentives, recognition, and other practices that strengthen employees' motivation.

To cite this article: Dewi, Y. P., & Hermina, N. (2026). The Influence of the Physical Work Environment and Work Discipline on Employee Performance with Motivation as a Mediating Variable. *Journal of Business, Social and Technology*, 7(3), 1296-1305. <https://doi.org/10.59261/jbt.v7i3.730>

INTRODUCTION

<https://doi.org/10.59261/jbt.v7i3.730> Organizations depend on employees to convert financial resources, technology, and operating systems into actual results. For that reason, workforce performance is a central management concern rather than a secondary outcome. In this study, employee performance refers to the extent to which individuals complete assigned responsibilities and produce work that meets organizational expectations (Akob et al., 2021; Ramadhani et al., 2026). The issue is particularly relevant to service organizations, where the quality and continuity of operations are closely tied to employees' readiness, consistency, and behavior at work.

PT Bandung Perkasa Madani operates in security services under the BFC Security brand, making employee reliability directly relevant to service continuity and client commitments.

Internal human-resource records for 2025 indicated that performance targets were not achieved consistently. Monthly undocumented absences ranged from three employees in April and August to nine employees in December, while target realization fluctuated between 91% and 97% and never remained at the planned 100% level. These company-specific indicators provide the empirical basis for examining factors associated with the observed performance gap.

The internal pre-survey further suggested that the performance shortfall may be connected to workplace conditions and employee discipline. Employees reported differences in the adequacy of work facilities and comfort across assignment locations, while coordination between supervisors and personnel was not always uniform. At the same time, some employees showed inconsistent adherence to working hours, standard operating procedures (SOPs), and company rules. These conditions coincided with signs of weaker initiative, morale, and drive to achieve targets, indicating that motivation may connect the organizational context with employee performance.

Operational records reinforce this concern. SOP compliance reached 93%, and the quality of task implementation was recorded at 94%, both still below the company's expected level. Communication and coordination between supervisors and field personnel also require improvement because unclear work directions can reduce consistency in task execution. In a security company whose personnel are deployed across multiple locations and must maintain physical readiness and procedural discipline, it is therefore necessary to test whether the physical work environment and work discipline influence performance directly or primarily through work motivation.

Conceptually, supportive working conditions can foster greater willingness to perform and may ultimately contribute to productivity (Muryani et al., 2022; Nitisemito, 2016). Work discipline reflects employees' readiness to comply with organizational rules and accepted norms (Mangkunegara, 2017; Trisnowati Josiah, 2026), whereas motivation represents the energy that initiates and sustains purposeful work behavior (Hasibuan, 2016; Rustiyana et al., 2025). Performance, in turn, concerns the work results achieved in relation to organizational expectations and standards (Armstrong, 2023).

The physical work environment in this research concerns tangible conditions surrounding employees while they perform their duties, including illumination, temperature, airflow, cleanliness, safety, workspace arrangement, and the availability of facilities (F. D. Rahmawati et al., 2024; Sedarmayanti, 2017). Appropriate physical conditions can reduce distractions and support concentration. Work discipline is reflected in punctuality, compliance with schedules and SOPs, consistency in task completion, and professional conduct. Work motivation arises from both personal and contextual drivers that direct and maintain work behavior and determine how much effort employees are willing to invest in their responsibilities (Hasibuan, 2020; Trisnowati Josiah, 2026).

Employee performance is assessed through the quality, quantity, and timeliness of work. Quality captures accuracy, orderliness, and the extent to which completed tasks conform to expected standards. Quantity reflects the amount of output produced within a specified period, while timeliness indicates how effectively employees use working time and meet deadlines. Together, these dimensions represent how successfully employees translate assigned responsibilities into results that contribute to organizational objectives.

The proposed model assumes that physical conditions and disciplined work behavior may not automatically produce higher performance. Instead, those conditions can first shape employees' willingness and energy to work, which then affect how well they perform. Work motivation is therefore treated as a mediating mechanism between the physical work environment and performance, and between work discipline and performance. This position is consistent with studies that have examined motivation as an intervening factor, although the magnitude and direction of the indirect relationships have not been uniform across settings (Nurhidayah, 2018; Rachmawati et al., 2025).

Prior evidence remains inconclusive. Untari and Nefianto (2024) and Rahmawati et al. (2023) reported a significant positive relationship between motivation and performance, whereas Sihombing et al. (2022), Tanjung et al. (2022), and Hidayat (2021) obtained different results (Basyid, 2024). Findings on the work environment are similarly mixed: Rachmawati et al.

(2025) identified a significant effect, while Putri (2024) and Etlanda and Dharma (2025) did not. Work discipline has also produced contradictory evidence, with Farhan and Indriyaningrum (2023) reporting significance and Sari et al. (2024) and Muna and Isnawati (2022) reporting non-significance. Differences also appear in mediation studies (Margaret, 2024; Novita, 2025; Nurhidayah, 2018). These inconsistencies form the empirical gap addressed in this research.

Accordingly, this study describes the physical work environment, work discipline, work motivation, and employee performance at PT Bandung Perkasa Madani; tests the direct effects of the physical work environment and work discipline on performance and motivation; evaluates the effect of motivation on performance; and determines whether motivation mediates the two relationships between working conditions and employee performance.

The study contributes to human resource management by clarifying how work motivation operates between organizational conditions and employee performance in a security-service setting characterized by distributed assignments, strict procedural requirements, and high readiness demands. The contribution is both explanatory and practical: the model identifies whether improving physical conditions or enforcing discipline is sufficient on its own, or whether those interventions need to strengthen motivation before they can influence performance. For management, the findings provide an empirical basis for prioritizing performance-improvement initiatives and allocating resources toward the pathways with the strongest demonstrated effects.

Seven hypotheses were derived from the proposed model. H1 predicts an effect of the physical work environment on employee performance, and H2 predicts an effect of work discipline on employee performance. H3 and H4 propose that the physical work environment and work discipline, respectively, influence work motivation. H5 predicts that work motivation affects employee performance. H6 proposes that motivation mediates the effect of the physical work environment on performance, whereas H7 proposes an analogous mediating role for the relationship between work discipline and performance.

The novelty of the study is the simultaneous examination of two workplace antecedents and a full motivational mediation mechanism within the security-services industry. Earlier studies have more often investigated employees in manufacturing, banking, government, or conventional office settings. By focusing on personnel who work across different locations under strict discipline and physical-readiness requirements, this research tests whether the apparent inconsistency of direct environment-performance and discipline-performance relationships can be explained by the motivational process that occurs between them.

Related studies illustrate why the integrated model is needed. Ernawati et al. (2023) found that, among motivation, work environment, discipline, and compensation, only compensation significantly predicted performance in a rural bank. Using PLS-SEM, Nabilla et al. (2024) reported a significant role for discipline but not for the work environment in predicting work achievement through motivation. Farhan and Indriyaningrum (2023) found significant effects for discipline, motivation, and work environment, while Rachmawati et al. (2025) identified an indirect discipline-performance relationship through motivation. The present study extends this evidence by testing the physical work environment and work discipline together, with motivation as the mediator and employee performance as the outcome, in a security-service organization.

METHOD

This study employed a quantitative design combining descriptive analysis with hypothesis verification. Descriptive analysis was used to summarize the observed condition of each construct, while the verificative component tested the proposed structural relationships among variables (Kusumastuti et al., 2026; Sugiyono, 2021). PT Bandung Perkasa Madani served as the research setting. The model specified the physical work environment (X1) and work discipline (X2) as exogenous variables, employee performance (Y) as the outcome variable, and work motivation (Z) as the mediator.

The population comprised all 100 permanent employees of PT Bandung Perkasa Madani, and every member of that population was included through saturated sampling. Primary data were obtained with a closed questionnaire using a five-point Likert response format ranging from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5). Items were derived from the theoretical indicators used to operationalize each construct. Content validity was reviewed by two academics in human

resource management and one practitioner from the security-services sector, after which a pilot test involving 30 individuals outside the study population was conducted to examine item clarity and internal consistency. The physical work environment was represented by lighting, temperature, cleanliness, safety, and workspace neatness and comfort. Work discipline covered attendance, rule and SOP compliance, professionalism, and integrity; motivation covered needs, rewards, and achievement drive; and performance covered quality, quantity, and timeliness.

The data were analyzed with Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modeling (PLS-SEM) in SmartPLS 4. PLS-SEM was selected because the model emphasizes prediction and mediation, accommodates the study's sample size, and does not depend on strict multivariate-normality assumptions (Butler & Honey, 2023; Hair et al., 2019). Measurement-model assessment examined outer loadings, Average Variance Extracted (AVE), the Fornell-Larcker criterion, the Heterotrait-Monotrait Ratio (HTMT), composite reliability, and Cronbach's alpha. Structural-model assessment then considered R^2 , f^2 , Q^2 , model fit, and bootstrapped path estimates for direct and indirect effects (Ghozali & Latan, 2015; Hair et al., 2019; Wijayanti, 2025). A construct was treated as convergently valid when AVE was at least 0.50, and a hypothesized path was considered significant when t exceeded 1.96 and p was below 0.05.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Descriptive Description of Variables

Descriptive statistics placed all four constructs within the same "good" interval of 3.41-4.20. Mean scores were 4.06 for the physical work environment, 4.16 for work discipline, 4.04 for work motivation, and 4.08 for employee performance. Although these averages indicate generally favorable conditions, the adequacy-of-income item within the motivation construct recorded the lowest mean (3.92), pointing to compensation as a potential area for managerial review. The positive survey profile also contrasts with the fact that organizational performance targets were not consistently achieved during 2025.

For the physical work environment, 38.97% of respondents selected strongly agree and 44.89% selected agree. Cleanliness recorded a mean of 4.05 and workspace neatness and comfort 4.04, while protection from accident risk had the lowest mean within the construct at 4.00. Work discipline showed especially strong responses: routine punctual attendance averaged 4.27, and refraining from actions harmful to the company reached 4.25, suggesting high perceived integrity and loyalty. For motivation, 36.72% strongly agreed and 46.12% agreed overall, while recognition for work results averaged 4.05. The coexistence of favorable descriptive scores and incomplete target achievement indicates that the relationships among the constructs are more informative than their standalone mean levels.

Evaluation of Measurement Models (Outer Model)

The initial measurement model did not satisfy convergent-validity requirements for every construct. Work discipline (AVE = 0.547) and employee performance (AVE = 0.534) exceeded the 0.50 benchmark, whereas the physical work environment (0.445) and work motivation (0.447) did not. Indicators with weak outer loadings were therefore removed and the model was re-estimated. After refinement, the AVE values increased to 0.593 for work discipline, 0.540 for the physical work environment, 0.534 for employee performance, and 0.529 for work motivation (Table 1). Composite reliability and Cronbach's alpha also met the required levels, supporting continued analysis of the structural model.

Discriminant validity was also checked. In the initial specification, the Fornell-Larcker criterion indicated insufficient separation for several constructs, most notably the pair of work motivation and employee performance. After indicators with low loadings were excluded, the retained items generally loaded above 0.70 and the constructs became more distinct. The refined model consequently met the required convergent-validity, discriminant-validity, and reliability criteria (Ghozali & Latan, 2015; Wijayanti, 2025), providing an acceptable measurement basis for interpreting the structural paths.

Indicator refinement was necessary because poorly performing items can weaken construct representation and distort subsequent estimates. The higher AVE values obtained after the adjustment indicate that the retained indicators capture a larger share of variance in their

intended latent variables. The final hypothesis tests were therefore conducted using a measurement model with stronger validity and reliability evidence, consistent with established PLS-SEM evaluation practice (Hair et al., 2019).

Table 1

Convergent Validity (AVE) Before and After Indicator Refinement

Construct	Early AVE	AVE Customization
Work Discipline (X2)	0,547	0,593
Physical Work Environment (X1)	0,445	0,540
Employee Performance (Y)	0,534	0,534
Work Motivation (Z)	0,447	0,529

Source: Authors' processing of SmartPLS 4 output (2026).

Evaluation of Structural Models (Inner Model)

The structural model explained 73.9% of the variance in employee performance ($R^2 = 0.739$) and 68.1% of the variance in work motivation ($R^2 = 0.681$). Work motivation produced the largest effect on employee performance ($f^2 = 0.599$), whereas work discipline had the strongest effect on motivation ($f^2 = 0.401$). Model fit was acceptable, with SRMR = 0.092, which is below 0.10. Predictive relevance was also supported because Q^2_{predict} was above zero for both work motivation (0.659) and employee performance (0.549).

These statistics indicate substantial explanatory power for employee performance and meaningful explanatory power for work motivation. The remaining 26.1% of performance variance may be associated with factors not included in the model, such as competence, leadership, compensation, or other organizational influences. The effect-size pattern is especially important because it identifies motivation as the most influential immediate predictor of performance and shows that discipline contributes strongly to the formation of that motivational state.

Hypothesis Testing

Before estimating the hypothesized paths, collinearity was examined using variance inflation factors. All VIF values remained within acceptable limits, indicating that multicollinearity was not distorting the structural estimates. Bootstrapping was then used to obtain path coefficients, t statistics, and p values for the proposed direct and indirect relationships.

As reported in Table 2, the physical work environment did not significantly predict employee performance ($t = 0.136$; $p = 0.892$), leading to rejection of H1. Work discipline likewise had no significant direct effect on performance ($t = 1.232$; $p = 0.218$), so H2 was rejected. In contrast, the physical work environment significantly and positively predicted work motivation ($t = 3.980$; $p = 0.000$), supporting H3, and work discipline also significantly and positively predicted motivation ($t = 5.014$; $p = 0.000$), supporting H4. Work motivation significantly predicted employee performance ($t = 5.854$; $p = 0.000$), supporting H5.

Table 2

Structural Path Estimates for Direct Effects

Pathway	Coef.	t-stat	p-value	Result
Work Environment → Performance	0,029	0,136	0,892	Rejected
Work Discipline → Performance	0,181	1,232	0,218	Rejected
Work Environment → Motivation	0,359	3,980	0,000	Accepted
Work Discipline → Motivation	0,527	5,014	0,000	Accepted
Performance → Motivation	0,684	5,854	0,000	Accepted

Source: Authors' processing of SmartPLS 4 output (2026).

The bootstrapped indirect effects in Table 3 were significant for both mediation paths. Work motivation transmitted the effect of the physical work environment to employee performance ($\beta = 0.247$; $t = 2.973$; $p = 0.003$), supporting H6. It also transmitted the effect of work discipline to performance ($\beta = 0.371$; $t = 4.644$; $p = 0.000$), supporting H7. Because neither direct

X1-to-Y nor X2-to-Y path was significant while both indirect paths were significant, the evidence is consistent with full mediation by work motivation.

Table 3

Bootstrapped Indirect Effects

Mediation Pathway	β	t-stat	p-value	Result
Discipline → Motivation → Performance	0,371	4,644	0,000	Accepted
Environment → Motivation → Performance	0,247	2,973	0,003	Accepted

Source: Authors' processing of SmartPLS 4 output (2026).

Table 4

Decisions on the Proposed Hypotheses

Hip.	Statement	Result
H1	Physical work environment predicts employee performance	Rejected
H2	Work discipline predicts employee performance	Rejected
H3	Physical work environment predicts work motivation	Accepted
H4	Work discipline predicts work motivation	Accepted
H5	Work motivation predicts employee performance	Accepted
H6	Work motivation transmits the effect of the physical work environment to performance	Accepted
H7	Work motivation transmits the effect of work discipline to performance	Accepted

Source: Authors' processing of SmartPLS 4 output (2026).

Discussion

The structural results reveal a consistent pattern: the physical work environment and work discipline are not significant direct predictors of employee performance, yet each becomes consequential when work motivation is included as the intervening mechanism. The discussion therefore focuses on why the direct paths are weak, how both antecedents shape motivation, and why motivation becomes the decisive pathway to performance, before considering theoretical and managerial implications.

Direct Influence on Employee Performance

The non-significant discipline-performance path ($p = 0.218$) suggests that formal compliance by itself is not enough to raise work results at PT Bandung Perkasa Madani. Discipline may function primarily as an administrative requirement unless employees internalize it as a reason to invest greater effort, a pattern consistent with Sari et al. (2024) and Muna and Isnawati (2022). The physical work environment, although rated positively with a mean of 4.06, also showed no direct effect on performance ($p = 0.892$), consistent with Putri (2024) and Etlanda and Dharma (2025). Together, these results indicate that rules and facilities are unlikely to improve performance unless they alter employees' psychological readiness to perform.

Influence on Work Motivation

The pattern changes when work motivation is used as the outcome. The physical work environment had a significant positive relationship with motivation ($p = 0.000$), supporting the view that comfortable and adequately equipped working conditions can strengthen employees' willingness to exert effort (Nurhidayah, 2018; F. D. Rahmawati et al., 2024; Sedarmayanti, 2017; Sudarmanto et al., 2022). Work discipline also significantly predicted motivation ($p = 0.000$). Consistent and meaningful work rules may provide clarity, accountability, and a sense of responsibility that encourages stronger engagement with assigned tasks (Hasibuan, 2020; Trisnowati Josiah, 2026). Its effect size of 0.401 makes discipline the strongest predictor of motivation in the model.

The Role of Work Motivation Mediation

Work motivation was the strongest direct predictor of performance ($f^2 = 0.599$; $p = 0.000$), which is consistent with Untari and Nefianto (2024) and Rahmawati et al. (2023). More

importantly, the significant indirect effects indicate full mediation: the physical work environment and work discipline influence performance to the extent that they first strengthen motivation. This mechanism helps reconcile earlier inconsistent findings because the same workplace condition may produce little performance change when it fails to motivate employees, yet become influential when it generates stronger effort and persistence (Margaret, 2024; Nurhidayah, 2018). Self-Determination Theory offers a useful interpretation of this pattern (Ryan & Deci, 2000, 2022). Adequate physical resources can support employees' sense of competence, while discipline that is understood and internalized can provide structure without necessarily undermining autonomy. When such conditions satisfy basic psychological needs, motivation becomes the more immediate driver of performance behavior.

Managerial Implications and Limitations

The full-mediation result refines the way workplace antecedents are interpreted in this context. The physical work environment (F. D. Rahmawati et al., 2024; Sedarmayanti, 2017) and work discipline (Mangkunegara, 2017; Trisnowati Josiah, 2026) appear to operate mainly as conditions that shape employees' motivational state, whereas motivation (Hasibuan, 2016; Rustiyana et al., 2025) is the mechanism more directly associated with realized performance (Armstrong, 2023). This distinction is particularly relevant to security services, where personnel work under hierarchical procedures, distributed assignments, and substantial readiness demands. The findings suggest that formal discipline is most valuable when employees understand and internalize it, rather than when compliance is pursued as an end.

Managerially, the company should treat motivation as the central target of performance improvement. Recognition, incentives, feedback, and transparent reward practices can be used to reinforce employees' sense that disciplined behavior and good work are valued. Discipline systems should be applied consistently and fairly, while the physical workplace should continue to meet basic standards for lighting, temperature, cleanliness, airflow, safety, and equipment availability. These interventions are expected to be more effective when they are designed to strengthen motivation rather than implemented as isolated administrative actions. The study is limited to one organization, 100 respondents, and two antecedent variables; future research should test the model in additional organizations and consider factors such as leadership, compensation, competence, or organizational culture.

The effect sizes also provide a practical order for intervention. Because motivation has the largest effect on performance (0.599), initiatives that directly strengthen motivation warrant priority. Work discipline, which has the strongest effect on motivation (0.401), can then be reinforced through consistent supervision and clear expectations, followed by improvements in the physical work environment ($f^2 = 0.178$). This sequence allows PT Bandung Perkasa Madani to align resource allocation with the strongest empirical pathways while keeping workplace improvement, motivation, and performance targets connected.

CONCLUSION

The study shows that the physical work environment, work discipline, work motivation, and employee performance at PT Bandung Perkasa Madani were all rated in the good category, yet their structural relationships differed markedly. The physical work environment and work discipline were not significant direct predictors of performance. Both were, however, significant positive predictors of work motivation, and motivation significantly predicted employee performance. The two indirect effects were significant, indicating full mediation by work motivation.

The main scientific contribution is therefore not simply the identification of several significant paths, but the clarification of the mechanism connecting working conditions with performance. In this security-service setting, motivation functions as the psychological channel through which improvements in physical conditions and disciplined behavior become meaningful for employee outcomes. This finding helps explain why prior studies have reported inconsistent direct effects and shows that performance initiatives should be evaluated according to whether they create stronger motivation, rather than only whether they improve facilities or tighten rules.

For PT Bandung Perkasa Madani, the practical implication is to strengthen motivation

through fair recognition, incentives, feedback, and opportunities for employees to experience achievement, while maintaining consistent discipline and adequate physical working conditions. Future studies should extend the model to other security-service organizations, use broader samples, and examine additional predictors such as leadership, compensation, competence, and organizational culture so that the generalizability and explanatory scope of the model can be tested more rigorously.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The authors thank PT Bandung Perkasa Madani for facilitating the study and acknowledge the employees who voluntarily provided the survey data used in the analysis. Appreciation is also extended to colleagues and institutional parties whose academic input and administrative assistance supported the completion of the research.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTION STATEMENT

Yulia Puspita Dewi led the study conceptualization and design, coordinated data collection, performed the principal data analysis and interpretation, and prepared the initial manuscript. Nurul Hermina provided methodological oversight, reviewed the research procedures, validated the analytical approach, and critically revised the manuscript. Both authors reviewed the completed article, approved the version submitted for publication, and share responsibility for the accuracy and integrity of the work.

REFERENCES

- Akob, M., Arianty, R., & Putra, A. H. P. K. (2021). The mediating role of distribution kinerja: An evidence of human resources. *The Journal of Asian Finance, Economics and Business*, 7(2), 233–242.
- Armstrong, M. (2023). *Armstrong's handbook of human resource management practice* (16th ed.). Kogan Page. <https://books.google.com/books?id=3oChEAAAQBAJ>
- Basyid, A. (2024). Pengaruh motivasi kerja terhadap kinerja karyawan. *Manajerial Dan Bisnis Tanjungpinang*, 7(1), 39–43.
- Butler, P. C., & Honey, R. C. (2023). *Decision Making Within and Outside Standard Operating Procedures: Paradoxical Use of Operational Discretion in Firefighters*.
- Ernawati, F. Y., Budiyo, R., & Siswanto, A. (2023). Pengaruh motivasi, lingkungan kerja, disiplin kerja dan kompensasi terhadap kinerja karyawan PT BPR Sinar Mitra Sejahtera Semarang. *Jurnal STIE Semarang*, 15(3), 156–173. <https://doi.org/10.33747/stiesmg.v15i3.676>
- Etlanda, F. A., & Dharma, R. (2025). Pengaruh lingkungan kerja terhadap kinerja karyawan. *Jurnal Manajemen Dan Bisnis*, 12(1), 78–91.
- Farhan, R. M., & Indriyaningrum, K. (2023). Pengaruh disiplin kerja, motivasi kerja dan lingkungan kerja terhadap kinerja karyawan. *VISIONIDA Jurnal Manajemen Dan Bisnis*, 9(1). <https://ojs.unida.ac.id/jvs/article/view/7486>
- Ghozali, I., & Latan, H. (2015). *Partial least squares: Konsep, teknik dan aplikasi menggunakan program SmartPLS 3.0* (2nd ed.). Badan Penerbit Universitas Diponegoro. <https://openlibrary.telkomuniversity.ac.id/pustaka/117046/partial-least-squares-konsep-teknik-dan-aplikasi-menggunakan-program-smartpls-3-0-2-e-.html>
- Hair, J. F., Risher, J. J., Sarstedt, M., & Ringle, C. M. (2019). When to use and how to report the results of PLS-SEM. *European Business Review*, 31(1), 2–24. <https://doi.org/10.1108/EBR-11-2018-0203>
- Hasibuan, M. S. P. (2016). *Manajemen dasar, pengertian, dan masalah* (Edisi revisi). Bumi Aksara.
- Hasibuan, M. S. P. (2020). *Manajemen sumber daya manusia* (Edisi revisi, cetakan ke-24). Bumi Aksara.
- Hidayat, R. (2021). *Pengaruh motivasi kerja terhadap kinerja karyawan*.
- Kusumastuti, S. Y., Judijanto, L., Alirejo, H. M. S., Mutoharoh, M., Umalihayati, U., Chandra, K., & Ifadah, E. (2026). *Metode Penelitian Kualitatif dan Kuantitatif: Teori dan Aplikasinya*. PT. Sonpedia Publishing Indonesia.
- Mangkunegara, A. A. A. P. (2017). *Manajemen sumber daya manusia perusahaan*. PT Remaja Rosdakarya.

- <https://scholar.google.com/scholar?q=%22Manajemen+sumber+daya+manusia+perusahaan%22+Mangkunegara+2017>
- Margaret, Y. (2024). *Pengaruh disiplin kerja terhadap kinerja karyawan melalui motivasi sebagai variabel mediasi*.
- Muna, N., & Isnawati, S. (2022). Pengaruh disiplin kerja, motivasi kerja, dan pengembangan karir terhadap kinerja karyawan (Studi pada PT LKM Demak Sejahtera). *Jesya (Jurnal Ekonomi & Ekonomi Syariah)*, 5(2), 1119–1130.
- Muryani, E., Sulistiarini, E. B., Prihatiningsih, T. S., Ramadhana, M. R., Heriteluna, M., Maghfur, I., Hastuti, P., Ahdiyat, M., Desembrianita, E., & Purnomo, A. (2022). *Manajemen sumber daya manusia*. Unisma Press.
- Nabilla, H. Y., Prawitasari, D., Oktavia, V., & Haziroh, A. L. (2024). Pengaruh disiplin kerja dan lingkungan kerja melalui motivasi kerja sebagai variabel mediasi terhadap prestasi kerja pegawai pada PT APL Semarang. *Bisnis-Net Jurnal Ekonomi Dan Bisnis*, 7(1), 48–60. <https://jurnal.dharmawangsa.ac.id/index.php/bisnet/article/view/4381>
- Nitisemito, A. S. (2016). *Manajemen personalia: Manajemen sumber daya manusia*. Ghalia Indonesia. <https://scholar.google.com/scholar?q=%22Manajemen+personalia%22+Nitisemito+2016>
- Novita, D. (2025). *Pengaruh disiplin kerja terhadap kinerja karyawan dengan motivasi sebagai variabel intervening*.
- Nurhidayah, S. (2018). *Pengaruh lingkungan kerja terhadap kinerja karyawan dengan motivasi kerja sebagai variabel mediasi* [Institut Agama Islam Negeri Surakarta]. <https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/296475326.pdf>
- Putri, D. A. (2024). *Pengaruh lingkungan kerja, disiplin kerja dan kepuasan kerja terhadap kinerja karyawan pada PT Pelindo (Persero) Sub Regional Head Jawa* [STIESIA Surabaya]. <https://repository.stiesia.ac.id/id/eprint/7008/>
- Rachmawati, T. N., Wahyuningsih, S. H., & Setyawan, A. (2025). Pengaruh efikasi diri, disiplin kerja dan lingkungan kerja terhadap kinerja karyawan dengan motivasi kerja sebagai mediasi pada BLPT Yogyakarta. *RELASI: Jurnal Ekonomi*. <https://jurnal.itsm.ac.id/index.php/relasi/article/view/1058>
- Rahmawati, F. D., Al-Habsyi, A. Z. A., & Mardiyah, M. (2024). Pengembangan sumber daya manusia dalam meningkatkan produktivitas kinerja pegawai. *An-Nadzir: Jurnal Manajemen Pendidikan Islam*, 2(02), 107–123.
- Rahmawati, N., Suddin, A., & Istiqomah, N. (2023). *Pengaruh motivasi kerja terhadap kinerja karyawan*.
- Ramadhani, D. S., Syahriza, R., & Hasibuan, F. U. (2026). Human Resource Competency Development and Work Productivity: The Mediating Role of Knowledge Management at The Palm Oil Research Center, Medan. *ADILLA: Jurnal Ilmiah Ekonomi Syari'ah*, 9(2), 340–360.
- Rustiyan, R., Judijanto, L., Erliningsih, E., Zubaedah, R., Susanti, R. K., Arief, M. Y., Minullah, M., Meta, W., & Ediyanto, E. (2025). *Konsep Dasar Manajemen*. PT. Sonpedia Publishing Indonesia.
- Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000). Self-Determination Theory and the Facilitation of Intrinsic Motivation, Social Development, and Well-Being. *American Psychologist*, 55(1), 68–78. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.55.1.68>
- Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2022). Self-determination theory. In *Encyclopedia of quality of life and well-being research* (pp. 1–7). Springer.
- Sari, N. A. P., Kurniawati, D., & Handayani, R. (2024). *Pengaruh disiplin kerja terhadap kinerja karyawan*.
- Sedarmayanti. (2017). *Perencanaan dan pengembangan sumber daya manusia untuk meningkatkan kompetensi, kinerja, dan produktivitas kerja* (1st ed.). PT Refika Aditama. <https://opac.ut.ac.id/detail-opac?id=39062>
- Sihombing, J., Siahaan, E., & Gultom, M. (2022). *Pengaruh motivasi kerja terhadap kinerja karyawan*. <https://scholar.google.com/scholar?q=%22Pengaruh+motivasi+kerja+terhadap+kinerja+karyawan%22+Sihombing+Siahaan+Gultom>
- Sudarmanto, Y., Prasetya, A., & Kusuma, A. R. (2022). *Pengaruh lingkungan kerja dan disiplin kerja*

- terhadap motivasi serta dampaknya pada kinerja karyawan.*
- Sugiyono. (2021). *Metode penelitian kuantitatif, kualitatif, dan R&D* (Cetakan ketiga). Alfabeta.
<https://opac.perpusnas.go.id/DetailOpac.aspx?id=1543971>
- Tanjung, R., Hendrawati, T., & Fitriani, N. (2022). *Pengaruh motivasi kerja terhadap kinerja karyawan.*
<https://scholar.google.com/scholar?q=%22Pengaruh+motivasi+kerja+terhadap+kinerja+karyawan%22+Tanjung+Hendrawati+Fitriani+2022>
- Trisnowati Josiah, S. S. (2026). *MANAJEMEN SUMBER DAYA MANUSIA:(Teori, Konsep, dan Implementasi Kontemporer di Era Digital)*. Dunia Penerbitan buku.
- Untari, N. S., & Nefianto, T. (2024). Pengaruh motivasi kerja, disiplin kerja, dan gaya kepemimpinan terhadap kinerja karyawan. *Journal of Mandalika Literature*, 5(1), 20–32.
<https://doi.org/10.36312/jml.v5i1.2188>
- Wijayanti, C. A. (2025). *PLS-SEM SmartPLS 3 dan 4: Panduan Praktis bagi Pemula*. Penerbit NEM.