

The Influence of Reward, Punishment, Organizational Commitment and Work Motivation towards Employee Performance

Agustin Hari Prastyowati^{1*}, Nasution Bin Ismail², Musaiyadi³

^{1,3} Institut Teknologi dan Sains Mandala, Jember, Indonesia

² Universiti Kuala Lumpur Business School, Malaysia

Correspondence: agustin@itsm.ac.id

Abstract

This study aims to analyze the influence of rewards, punishments, organizational commitment, and work motivation on employee performance at the Department of Agriculture and Food Security of Bondowoso Regency. The research method used a quantitative approach with OLS-based multiple linear regression analysis. A sample of 105 respondents was selected through purposive sampling, with criteria of a minimum of three years of service and civil servant status. The results showed that rewards, organizational commitment, and work motivation significantly influenced employee performance, while punishment had no significant effect. Simultaneous tests showed that all four variables together contributed significantly to improving employee performance, with work motivation being the dominant factor. The research discussion confirms that appropriate rewards, commitment to the organization, and strong motivational drive can increase employee productivity and loyalty. Conversely, punishment proved less effective because it did not always encourage positive changes in work behavior. A unique finding of this study was the insignificance of the punishment variable on performance, indicating that the sanction approach is irrelevant in the context of Bondowoso's public bureaucracy, and work motivation emerged as the primary determinant of performance improvement..

Keyword: Reward, Punishment, Organizational Commitment, Work Motivation, Employee Performance

INTRODUCTION

Human resources, in general, are employees whose thinking skills must be used to provide input on the work and all existing provisions. This activity must also be supported by strong motivation so that employees are more active in their work and more enthusiastic in carrying out their work because an employee must be given frequent motivational input to achieve alignment within an employee. Therefore, to achieve performance goals, employees require motivation to work harder. Considering the importance of employees in their work, these employees need more serious attention to the tasks they carry out so that goals are achieved.

This study aims to analyze several variables/instruments related to employee performance at the Department of Agriculture and Food Security of Bondowoso Regency. This research is interesting because observations indicate a lack of effective employee performance in carrying out their duties and functions. This is because not all employees at the Department of Agriculture and Food Security of Bondowoso Regency receive reward. In the form of TPP (Employee Income Supplement). Only civil servants (PNS) receive TPP, while employees with work agreements (P3K) and regional daily field

workers (THLD) do not. This creates a gap between employees, as both civil servants and P3K have the same workload. Furthermore, regarding sanctions/punishment This applies to all employees, especially those receiving TPP, as employee discipline is strictly enforced. Employees who arrive late or leave early will be immediately punished by deducting their TPP.

These two factors will also encourage or motivate employees to improve their performance and commit to remaining at the Department of Agriculture and Food Security of Bondowoso Regency. The primary factor motivating employees is ensuring their basic needs are met. These needs are generally met by meeting the appropriate salary and benefits. If employees' needs can be met by working at the Department of Agriculture and Food Security of Bondowoso Regency, they will certainly have no desire to move to another department. Therefore, to improve employee performance at the Department of Agriculture and Food Security of Bondowoso Regency, a suitable job is needed. reward, as well as punishment to provide motivation and commitment to motivation.

Based on the description that has been put forward in the background, this research can be formulated as follows: (1). Does the variable partially...reward has an influence on employee performance at the Department of Agriculture and Food Security of Bondowoso Regency; (2) Does the variable partially punishment has an influence on employee performance at the Department of Agriculture and Food Security of Bondowoso Regency; (3) Does the organizational commitment variable partially have an influence on employee performance at the Department of Agriculture and Food Security of Bondowoso Regency? (4) Does the work motivation variable partially have an influence on employee performance at the Department of Agriculture and Food Security of Bondowoso Regency? (5) Does the work motivation variable simultaneously have an influence on employee performance at the Department of Agriculture and Food Security of Bondowoso Regency? reward, sanctions, organizational commitment and work motivation have an influence on employee performance at the Department of Agriculture and Food Security of Bondowoso Regency.

Hypothesis

Regarding this research, a conceptual framework can be described which is how the theory connects independent variables to dependent variables in order to determine the influence of the relationship between variables as follows:

The influence of rewards on employee performance

In accordance with the opinion put forward by Oemar (2007) in (Mangkunegara, 2009) who is of the opinion that reward is a reward given by the company to employees for the performance they have provided. This means reward given by the company to employees as a form of company appreciation to employees for their dedication or performance. In general, the provision of reward for employees aims to improve employee performance so that company goals can be achieved, in addition to that, with the existence of reward Employees feel that their

contributions are appreciated, which encourages increased employee performance. It can be said that employee performance is influenced by the presence of reward whether from salary, allowances, bonuses, interpersonal awards in the form of praise, promotions, achievements (Achievement) in the form of a sense of satisfaction and pride, as well as from autonomy. Mansyur (2014) stated that Reward has a significant impact on employee performance. This is supported by the results of previous research which stated that reward influence on performance. (Koencoro, (2012) Sisworo, Sampeadi and Apriono (2014), Suryadilaga (2016). Based on the theoretical explanation and previous research, the hypothesis in this study is:

H1. Partially variable reward has a significant influence on the performance of employees at the Department of Agriculture and Food Security of Bondowoso Regency.

The effect of punishment on employee performance

Mangkunegara (2000) is of the opinion punishment This is a threat of punishment aimed at improving violating employees, maintaining applicable regulations, and providing a lesson to violators. This lesson can ultimately change the employee's negative attitude to a positive one, resulting in more profitable and professional performance. In general, the provision of sanctions punishment for employees aims to improve employee performance so that company goals can be achieved, in addition to that, with the existence of punishment Employees will feel more responsible for the work assigned to them, thus spurring their performance to improve.

H2: Partially variable punishment has a significant influence on employee performance at the Department of Agriculture and Food Security of Bondowoso Regency

The Influence of Organizational Commitment on Employee Performance

According to Kharis (2015) organizational commitment is a condition where an employee sides with a particular organization and its goals and desires to maintain membership in the organization. So high job involvement means siding with a particular job of an individual. According to Moorhead and Griffin (2015) organizational commitment is an attitude that reflects the extent to which an individual recognizes and is bound to his organization. An individual who has a high commitment is likely to see himself as a true member of the organization. According to Kreitner and Kinicki (2014) organizational commitment is an agreement to do something for oneself, another individual, a group or an organization. Luthans (2011) The definition of organizational commitment according to Mowday, Porter and Steers consists of three factors, namely: a strong desire to remain a member of the organization, a strong willingness to strive for the organization and a strong belief and acceptance of the values and goals of the organization.

Robbins and Judge (2011) define organizational commitment as a state in which employees identify with a particular company and its goals, and intend to maintain their membership in that company. In other words, organizational commitment relates to employees' strong desire to share and sacrifice for the company. Organizational commitment is valuable for the entire organization, not just for their jobs or work groups. Employee commitment itself is relative to the individual in identifying their involvement in the organization itself (Wibawa, 2015).

H3: Partially, the organizational commitment variable has a significant influence on employee performance at the Department of Agriculture and Food Security of Bondowoso Regency.

The Influence of Work Motivation on Employee Performance

Motivation is the provision of driving force that creates a passion for work for someone so that they are willing to work with all their efforts to achieve satisfaction, Hasibuan (2007: 95). Ishak and Hendri (2003: 12) stated that "motivation is a fundamental thing that drives every motive to work". Motivation is often interpreted as a driving factor for a person's behavior. Two things related to performance are the willingness or motivation of employees to work, which gives rise to employee effort and the employee's ability to carry it out. According to Gomez (2003: 177) that performance is a function of motivation and ability or can be written with the formula $P = f(M \times A)$ where P = performance, m = motivation, a = ability. Ability is inherent in a person and is innate since birth and is manifested in his actions at work, while motivation is a very important aspect to drive creativity and one's ability in doing a job, as well as always being enthusiastic in carrying out the job. Based on the explanation of the theory and previous research, the hypothesis in this study is:

H4: Partially, the work motivation variable has a significant influence on employee performance at the Department of Agriculture and Food Security, Bondowoso Regency.

Influence Reward, Punishment, Organizational Commitment and Work Motivation on Employee Performance

According to Mangkunegara, (2012) reward is a reward given by the company to employees for the performance they have provided. This means reward given by the company to employees as a form of company appreciation to employees for their dedication or performance. In general, the provision of reward for employees aims to improve employee performance so that company goals can be achieved, in addition to that, with the existence of reward Employees feel that their contributions are appreciated, thus spurring employee performance to increase.

Furthermore, Mangkunegara (2014) argues that punishment This is a threat of punishment aimed at improving employee violators, maintaining applicable regulations, and teaching them

a lesson. This lesson can ultimately change the employee's negative attitudes into positive ones, resulting in more profitable and professional performance. It can be said that employees who are undisciplined in carrying out their work will receive disciplinary action. punishment/punishment. In general, the provision of punishment for employees aims to improve employee performance so that company goals can be achieved, in addition to that, with the existence of punishment Employees will feel more responsible for the work assigned to them, thus spurring their performance to improve. Based on the theoretical explanation above, it can be concluded that reward and punishment Work discipline and employee performance are inextricably linked. Therefore, the following hypotheses can be formulated in this study:

H5: Simultaneously reward, punishment, organizational commitment and work motivation have a significant influence on employee performance at the Bondowoso Agriculture and Food Security Service

RESEARCH METHODS

This research uses a quantitative analysis method with *ordinary least square* (OLS) to understand the relationship between variables in a study. To facilitate research, it is necessary to create a conceptual research framework that describes the relationship between independent variables in this case, rewards, sanctions, organizational commitment, and work motivation and the dependent variable, namely employee performance.

This research was conducted for 3 months, namely from February to April 2023. The location of this research was at the Department of Agriculture and Food Security of Bondowoso Regency.

Population is a generalization area consisting of objects/subjects that have certain qualities and characteristics determined by the researcher to be studied and then conclusions drawn (Sugiyono, 2013). The population in this study was 209 employees of the Department of Agriculture and Food Security of Bondowoso Regency.

A sample is a portion of the population and its characteristics. If the population is large and researchers cannot study everything in the population, for example due to limited funds, time, and energy, then researchers can use samples taken from that population. What is learned by the sample, the conclusions will be applicable to the population (Sugiyono, 2013:91). The error rate, in social research the maximum error rate is 5% (0.05). According to Roscoe (1975) quoted by Sekaran (2006), provides a general reference for determining sample size. A sample size of more than 30 and less than 500 is appropriate for most studies. According to Arikunto

(2008:116), "Determining sample size if less than 100 is better to take all so that the research is a population study. If the number of subjects is large, it can be taken between 10-15% or 20-55% or more depending on the number of:

1. The researcher's ability is seen from time, energy and funds.
2. The narrow area of observation of each subject, because this concerns the amount of funds.
3. The size of the risk borne by the researcher for researchers with large risks, of course if the sample is large the results will be better.

Referring to the opinion above, the number of samples used in this study is 30% of the population, namely: $50\% \times 209 = 104.5$ rounded up to 105 employees as respondents. This study uses the sampling technique, namely: nonprobability sampling with technique purposive sampling. According to Sugiyono (2016) that: "purposive sampling is a technique for taking samples of data sources with certain considerations." Reasons for using this technique Purposive Sampling is because not all samples have the criteria that match the phenomenon being studied. Therefore, the author chose the technique Purposive Sampling which establishes certain considerations or criteria that must be met by the samples used in this research. The criteria for determining respondents are as follows:

1. Respondents who have worked at the Department of Agriculture and Food Security of Bondowoso Regency for at least 3 years This is because employees with this length of service fully understand the work culture, motivation, and discipline of employees.
2. Employees with civil servant status.

Validity Test

Validity testing is the degree to which data can be trusted to be true and consistent with reality. Sugiyono (2016) states that "Valid means the instrument can be used to measure what it is supposed to measure." Validity indicates the degree of accuracy between the data that actually occurs on the object and the data that the researcher can collect. Validity testing of the questionnaire is conducted to measure how accurately an instrument functions as a measuring tool. The decision-making requirements are as follows:

1. If $r_{\text{count}} \geq r_{\text{table}}$, then the statement items from the questionnaire are valid.
2. If $r_{\text{count}} < r_{\text{table}}$, then the statement items from the questionnaire are invalid.
3. r_{table} obtained from $df = n - 2$ with a significance level of 95% or α : 5%, where:
 df : degree of freedom
 n : number of samples

Validity testing in this study used the SPSS 22 program for windows 7. Correlation Product Moment according to Sanusi (2011:77) with the following formula:

Information:

r: Correlation Coefficient

n: Number of Samples

x: Score Item

y: Total Item Score

Reliability Test

Arikunto (2013:221) states that "Reliability refers to the understanding that an instrument is sufficiently trustworthy to be used as a data collection tool because the instrument is good." Reliability testing is a measuring tool for measuring a questionnaire which is an indicator of a variable. A questionnaire is said to be reliable. reliable or reliable if a person's answers to questions are consistent or stable over time. SPSS provides facilities for measuring reliability with statistical tests. Cronbach Alpha (α). A variable is said to be reliable if it gives a value of $\alpha > 0.60$, if the value of $\alpha < 0.60$ then it is not reliable. Sunyoto (2012:36) states that "mathematically the magnitude of reliability". It is formulated as follows:

Information:

α : Reliability coefficient

r: Correlation between items

k: Number of items

1. When the result of the coefficient $\alpha >$ significance level 60% or 0.60 then the questionnaire is reliable.
2. When the result of the coefficient $\alpha <$ significance level 60% or 0.60 then the questionnaire is not reliable.

Classical Assumption Test

Widardjono (2010:75) states that "There are five classical assumption tests: multicollinearity, heteroscedasticity, autocorrelation, linearity, and normality." In this study, the researcher did not use the two classical assumption tests, namely autocorrelation and linearity. The researcher only used three classical assumptions: normality, heteroscedasticity, and multicollinearity. The following are the results of the classical assumption tests and an explanation of the three classical assumptions used:

Normality Test

Ghozali (2018:161) states that "The normality test aims to determine whether each variable is normally distributed or not." The normality test is necessary because it is necessary to conduct tests on other variables by assuming that the residual values follow a normal distribution. Testing whether data is normally distributed or not can be determined using a normal plot graph. Looking at the histogram of the residuals, the normality test in this study uses the method Kolmogorov-Smirnov. If the significance value is less than 0.05, the data is not normally distributed. Basis for decision making (Ghozali, 2018:163):

1. If the data is spread around the diagonal line and follows the direction of the diagonal line or the histogram graph shows a normal distribution pattern, then the regression model meets the assumption of normality.
2. If the data is spread far from the diagonal and does not follow the direction of the diagonal line or the histogram graph does not show a normal distribution pattern, then the regression model does not meet the normality assumption.

Heteroscedasticity Test

Ghozali (2018) stated that "The heteroscedasticity test aims to test whether there is inequality of variance in one observation against another observation in the regression model." If the variance of the residuals of one observation remains constant, it is called homoscedasticity and if it is different, it is called heteroscedasticity. According to Ghozali (2018:105) a good regression model is a model that is homoscedastic or does not experience heteroscedasticity. If the p value > 0.05 is not significant, it means there is no heteroscedasticity, meaning the regression model passes the heteroscedasticity test. The heteroscedasticity test in this study uses a Plot Graph between the predicted value of the dependent variable, namely ZPRED, and its residual SRESID. The heteroscedasticity test is carried out with the help of software SPSS 22 for Windows 7. The basis for heteroscedasticity test analysis according to Ghozali (2018:138) is:

1. If there is a certain pattern, such as the existing points form a certain regular pattern (wavy, widening then narrowing) then it indicates that heteroscedasticity has occurred.
2. If there is no clear pattern, such as dots spread above and below the number 0 on the Y-axis, then heteroscedasticity does not occur.

Multicollinearity Test

Ghozali (2018) stated that "The multicollinearity test aims to test whether the regression model finds a correlation between independent variables (independent)". A good regression model should not have any correlation between independent variables. If independent variables are correlated with each other, then these variables are not orthogonal. Orthogonal variables are independent variables that have a correlation value between each independent variable equal to zero. Detecting the presence or absence of multicollinearity in a regression model is as follows:

1. The R value produced by an empirical regression model estimate is very high, but individually many of the independent variables do not significantly influence the dependent variable.
2. Analyze the correlation matrix of independent variables. If there is a high correlation between variables (usually above 0.90), this indicates multicollinearity. The absence of a high correlation between independent variables does not necessarily indicate the absence of multicollinearity. Multicollinearity can be caused by the combined effect of two or more independent variables.
3. Multicollinearity can also be seen from (1) the value tolerance and its opponent (2) variance inflation factor (VIF). These two measures indicate how much of each independent variable is explained by the other variables. In simple terms, each independent variable becomes a dependent variable and digress against other independent variables. Tolerance measure the variability of the selected independent variable that is explained by other independent variables. If the value tolerance low is equal to high VIF value (because $VIF = 1/Tolerance$). Mark cut off The value commonly used to indicate the presence of multicollinearity is the Tolerance ≤ 0.10 or equal to the VIF value ≥ 10 . Each researcher must determine the level of collinearity that can still be tolerated. For example, the value Tolerance = 0.10 is the same as the collinearity level of 0.95. Although multicollinearity can be detected with the value Tolerance and VIF, but we still do not know which independent variables are correlated with each other.

Multiple Linear Regression Analysis

This analysis is used to determine how much influence the independent variable, namely Awards (X_1), Sanctions/punishments (X_2), Organizational commitment (X_3), and work motivation (X_4) on the dependent variable, namely employee performance (Y) at the Department of Agriculture and Food Security of Bondowoso Regency. This research used the SPSS 22.0 computer program for regression analysis. for Windows 7. According to Sanusi

(2011:135) to determine the influence of independent variables on dependent variables, the multiple linear regression analysis formula is used as follows:

$$Y = a + b_1X_1 + b_2X_2 + b_3X_3 + b_4X_4 + \text{and}$$

Information:

AND : Employee performance

X_1 : Award

X_2 : Sanctions/punishment

X_3 : Organizational commitment

X_4 : Work motivation

a : Constant

$b_1 b_2 b_3 b_4$: Regression Coefficient

and : Error

Partial Test (t-Test)

The t-test is used to partially see how the independent variable (X) influences the dependent variable (Y), in order to test the established hypothesis of whether it has an influence or not (Sugiyono, 2016:184). In this study, the t-test used the SPSS 22 computer program for Windows 7:

Information:

t: t-test value

r: Correlation efficiency value

n: Number of Samples

a. The testing criteria are as follows:

1) $H_0: b_1=b_2=b_3=b_4=0$, meaning that partially the independent variables (Rewards, Sanctions/Punishments, Organizational Commitment, and Work Motivation) do not have a partial influence on the dependent variable (Employee Performance).

2) $H_a: b_1 \neq b_2 \neq b_3 \neq b_4 \neq 0$, meaning that partially the independent variables (Rewards, Sanctions/Punishments, Organizational Commitment, and Work Motivation) have a partial influence on the dependent variable (Employee Performance).

b. The basis for decision making according to Sanusi (2011:138) is to use significant probability figures, namely:

1) When $t_{\text{count}} \geq t_{\text{table}}$ or $-t_{\text{count}} \leq -t_{\text{table}}$ and the significant value $t < \text{significance level } 5\% (0.05)$, then H_0 rejected and H_a accepted. This means that there is a significant influence of each independent variable on the dependent variable partially.

2) When $t_{\text{count}} < t_{\text{table}}$ or $-t_{\text{count}} > -t_{\text{table}}$ and the significant value $t >$ significance level 5% (0.05), then H_0 accepted and H_a rejected. This means that there is no significant influence of each independent variable on the dependent variable partially.

c. Looking for t_{table} : $df = n - k (\alpha/2)$

Where: df: degree of freedom

n: number of samples

k: number of independent variables and dependent variables

α : 5% (0.05)

Simultaneous Test (F Test)

The F test is carried out to see simultaneously or together how variable X influences variable Y. In the F test in this study, the SPSS 22 computer program was used. for Windows

7. The F test formula quoted from (Sugiyono, 2016:192) is as follows:

Information:

Fh: F value_{count}

R^2 : Coefficient of Determination

n: Number of Samples

K: Number of Independent Variables and Dependent Variables

a. The testing criteria are as follows:

1) H_0 : $b_1 = b_2 = b_3 = b_4 = 0$, meaning that the independent variables (Rewards, Sanctions/Punishments, Organizational Commitment, and Work Motivation) do not have a simultaneous influence on the dependent variable (Employee Performance).

2) H_a : at least one coefficient of $b_1 \neq 0$, meaning that the independent variables (Rewards, Sanctions/Punishments, Organizational Commitment, and Work Motivation) have a joint (simultaneous) influence on the dependent variable (Employee Performance).

b. The basis for decision making according to Sanusi (2011:143) is to use probability figures as follows:

1) If $F_{\text{count}} \geq F_{\text{table}}$ and the Sig value < 0.05 , then H_0 rejected and H_a accepted, meaning that simultaneously the independent variables have a significant influence on the dependent variable.

2) If $F_{\text{count}} < F_{\text{table}}$ and the Sig value > 0.05 , then H_0 accepted and H_a rejected, meaning that simultaneously the independent variables do not have a significant influence on the dependent variable.

c. Looking for F_{table} : $df_1 = K - 1$

$$df_2 = n - K$$

Where: df: degree of freedom

n: number of samples

K: number of independent variables and dependent variables

Coefficient of Determination (R^2)

Coefficient of determination (R^2) is used to measure how well the regression line fits the actual data (goodness of fit) the coefficient of determination measures the percentage of total variation in the dependent variable Y explained by the independent variable in the regression line (Widarjono, 2010:19). According to Widarjono (2010:20) the equation for the coefficient of determination is as follows:

Information:

R^2 = Coefficient of determination

RSS = Residual Sum of Square

TSS = Total Sum of Square

Where when:

$R^2 = 0$, means the influence of variable X on variable Y is weak

$R^2 = 1$, means the influence of variable X on variable Y is strong

Table 1
Interpretation of Correlation Coefficient r Value

No.	Coefficient Interval	Relationship Level
1.	0,80 – 1,000	Very strong
2.	0,60 – 0,799	Strong
3.	0,40 – 0,599	Strong Enough
4.	0,20 – 0,399	Low
5.	0,00 – 0,199	Very Low

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Results

Based on the research data collected for both the dependent variable (Y) and the independent variable (X).⁴⁾ which was processed using the SPSS 25 program *for Windows 13*, then it can be seen in the following table:

Table 2

Summary of Multiple Linear Regression Analysis Results							
Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		Collinearity Statistics		
	B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.	Tolerance	VIF
1 (Constant)	10,419E-16	0,040		0,000	10,000		
<i>Reward</i>	0,243	0,063	0,243	3,868	0,000	0,411	2,433
<i>Punishment</i>	0,027	0,074	0,027	0,360	0,720	0,296	3,383
Commitment	0,253	0,083	0,253	3,045	0,003	0,235	4,253
Motivation	0,493	0,065	0,493	7,525	0,000	0,380	2,633

Source: Data Appendix 5

Based on the table above, the multiple linear regression equation can be obtained as follows:

$$Y = 10,419E-16 + 0.234X_1 + 0.027X_2 + 0.253X_3 + 0.493X_4$$

Based on the multiple linear regression equation, it shows the meaning and can be explained that:

- The constant value is **10,419E-16**. Thus, the constant value shows the value of the employee performance variable of the Department of Agriculture and Food Security of Bondowoso Regency. **10,419E-16** meaning if the variable *reward*, commitment, organizational commitment and work motivation are assumed to be equal to zero or constant, then employee performance is quite good because it has a positive value.
- The magnitude of the variable coefficient *reward* is as big as **0,234** which means ~~each increase in the variable reward~~ when the reward increases, it will improve the ASN's performance ~~increase~~ with the assumption that the variables punishment, organizational commitment and work motivation do not change.
- The magnitude of the variable coefficient *punishment* is as big as **0,027** which means when the punishment is increased ~~each increase in the variable punishment~~, then it will improve ASN performance assuming that the reward variables, organizational commitment and work motivation do not change.
- The coefficient of the Organizational Commitment variable is **0,253** which means that if the organizational commitment variable is increased, it will increase ASN performance, assuming that the reward, punishment, and work motivation variables do not change.

Simultaneous Statistical Test (F-test)

Simultaneous test or F test is a joint test to test the significant influence of variables. reward, punishment, Organizational commitment and employee work motivation on the performance of employees of the Department of Agriculture and Food Security of Bondowoso Regency. Then the results of F-test can be seen in the following table:

Table 3

F Test

	Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	87,069	4	21,767	128,561	0,000 ^b
	Residual	16,931	100	0,169		
	Total	104,000	104			

a. Dependent Variable: Kinerja

b. Predictors: (Constant), Motivation, Punishment, Reward, Commitment

Source: Data Appendix 5

Based on statistical testing using the F test method, where the significance level obtained is $0.000 < 0.05$. Because the value *p-value* smaller than α ($0.000 < 0.05$) then H_0 = no effect reward, punishment, Organizational commitment and work motivation simultaneously on the performance of employees of the Department of Agriculture and Food Security of Bondowoso Regency. rejected. This means that the variable reward, punishment, Organizational commitment and work motivation have a simultaneous influence on the performance of employees of the Department of Agriculture and Food Security of Bondowoso Regency.

Partial Statistical Test (t-test)

This test is to see to what extent the partial (individual) influence of variable X (reward, punishment, organizational commitment and work motivation) on variable Y (performance). Based on the results of processing using SPSS version 25 for Windows 13 then the results of the t-test are obtained, the results of which are summarized in the following table:

Table 4
Recapitulation of t-Test Results

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients Beta	t	Sig.	Collinearity Statistics	
	B	Std. Error				Tolerance	VIF
1 (Constant)	10,419E-16	0,040		0,000	10,000		
Reward	0,243	0,063	0,243	3,868	0,000	0,411	2,433
Punishment	0,027	0,074	0,027	0,360	0,720	0,296	3,383
Commitment	0,253	0,083	0,253	3,045	0,003	0,235	4,253
Motivation	0,493	0,065	0,493	7,525	0,000	0,380	2,633

Source: Data Appendix 5

a. Reward

Values for variablesrewardof 3.868, with a significance value of $0.000 < 0.05$. Because the valuep-value smaller than α ($0.000 < 0.05$), meaning the variablerewardhas a partial effect on the performance of employees of the Department of Agriculture and Food Security of Bondowoso Regency.

b. Punishment

Values for variablespunishmentthis is as big as 0,360, with a significant value of $0.720 > 0.05$. Because the valuep-value greater than α ($0.720 > 0.05$). This means that the variablepunishmentdoes not have a partial effect on the performance of employees of the Department of Agriculture and Food Security of Bondowoso Regency.

c. Organizational commitment

t value_{count}for variablespunishmentThis is 3.045, with a significance value of $0.003 < 0.05$. Because the valuep-value smaller than α ($0.003 < 0.05$) meaning that the organizational commitment variable has a significant partial effect on employees of the Department of Agriculture and Food Security of Bondowoso Regency.

d. Work motivation

Values for variablespunishmentThis is 7.525 with a significance value of $0.000 < 0.05$. Because the valuep-value smaller than α ($0.000 < 0.05$) meaning that the work motivation variable has a partial influence on employees of the Department of Agriculture and Food Security of Bondowoso Regency

Coefficient of Determination (R^2)

The coefficient of determination is used to determine the ability of an independent variable to explain a dependent variable. The magnitude of determination can be seen in the R Square and is expressed as a percentage. The following is a measure of the variable's contribution: reward (), punishment(), Organizational commitment (), and work motivation (), on employee performance (Y) which are presented in the following table:

Table 5
Results of the Determination Coefficient Test ()

Model Summary ^b					
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Durbin-Watson
1	0,915 ^a	0,837	0,831	0,41147754	10,646

a. Predictors: (Constant), Motivation, Punishment, Leadership, Commitment

b. Dependent Variable: Employee performance

Source: Data Processed

Results of the influence analysis reward (), punishment(), organizational commitment (), and work motivation (), on employee performance (Y) as in the table above, shows the value of the coefficient of determination or Adjusted R square shows a value of 0.831, from these results it means that all independent variables (reward, punishment, Work commitment and motivation) has a contribution of 83.1% to the dependent variable (performance) with a very strong level of determination, and the remaining 16.9% is influenced by other factors outside of this research.

Discussion

The Influence of Rewards on Employee Performance

Based on the second hypothesis reward has an effect on employee performance. After hypothesis testing, the results obtained stated that reward has a significant influence on the performance of employees of the Department of Agriculture and Food Security of Bondowoso Regency. Its truth is proven or H_2 accepted. This could be due to aspects related to reward has been able to improve employee performance. These aspects include salary, benefits, bonuses/incentives, interpersonal recognition, and promotional awards.

Based on the descriptive results of the overall answer results for the variable indicators reward Most of them stated that they agreed with the questions/statements regarding reward at the Department of Agriculture and Food Security of Bondowoso Regency. The most dominant indicator is the variable reward is interpersonal appreciation ($X_{1.4}$) that is,

respondents felt they had received interpersonal appreciation from their superiors. This indicates that the superiors/leaders of the employees of the Department of Agriculture and Food Security in Bondowoso Regency who were respondents in this study often provided verbal appreciation for work completed. This form of appreciation, in the form of thanks, recognition, or praise for subordinates, will certainly have a positive impact that can influence employee performance.

In general, giving reward for employees aims to improve employee performance so that company goals can be achieved, in addition to that, with the existence of reward Employees feel that their contributions are appreciated, which in turn encourages increased employee performance. It can be said that employee performance is influenced by the presence of reward whether from salary, allowances, bonuses, interpersonal awards in the form of praise, promotions, achievements (Achievement) in the form of a sense of satisfaction and pride, as well as from autonomy. Mansyur (2014) stated that Reward has a significant impact on employee performance.

In addition to the expert opinions that have been discussed, the results of this study are supported by empirical evidence conducted by (Koencoro, (2012) Sisworo, Sampeadi and Apriono (2014), Suryadilaga (2016) which states that Reward has an influence on employee performance.

Influence Punishment On Employee Performance

Based on the second hypothesis punishment has an impact on employee performance. After testing and data analysis, the results obtained stated that punishment has no significant effect on the performance of employees of the Department of Agriculture and Food Security of Bondowoso Regency., is it true or H_2 rejected. This could be due to aspects related to punishment has been able to improve the performance of employees at the Bondowoso Regency Agriculture and Food Security Service. These aspects include minimizing errors, imposing harsher penalties, providing explanations, and promptly administering penalties.

Based on the descriptive results, it shows that the overall answer to the variable punishment Most of the employees of the Department of Agriculture and Food Security of Bondowoso Regency stated that they agreed with the four variable indicators. punishment at the Department of Agriculture and Food Security of Bondowoso Regency. The most dominant indicator agreed upon by respondents was that respondents felt that for every violation that occurred, the sanctions given were always expedited ($X_{2.4}$) This statement implies that every mistake that is directly sanctioned or warned also demonstrates the leadership function of

monitoring and evaluation. This ensures that employees feel that their work results and incorrect actions are immediately addressed and that they can be followed up with improvements in their work attitudes and behaviors. This action will undoubtedly serve as a lesson and experience for employees, preventing them from repeating the same mistakes.

In accordance with H Mangkunegara's (2000) opinion punishmentThis is a threat of punishment aimed at improving violating employees, maintaining applicable regulations, and providing a lesson to violators. This lesson can ultimately change the employee's negative attitude to a positive one, resulting in more profitable and professional performance. In general, the provision of sanctionspunishmentfor employees aims to improve employee performance so that company goals can be achieved, in addition to that, with the existence ofpunishmentEmployees will feel more responsible for the work assigned to them, thus spurring better performance. The results of this study agree with those of Rizal, M. F., & Widyasunu, P. (2019)punishment(X2) partially does not have a significant influence on employee performance.

Apart from the expert opinions that have been discussed, the results of this study contradict the empirical evidence conducted by (Mas'ud et al., 2017),Azwar, M. R., Meutia, M., & Budiastara, K. (2022).which states thatpunishmenthas an influence on employee performance.

The Influence of Organizational Commitment on Employee Performance

Based on the third hypothesis, organizational commitment influences employee performance. After testing and data analysis, the results showed that organizational commitment significantly influences employee performance at the Department of Agriculture and Food Security of Bondowoso Regency. The proposed hypothesis was not proven or H0 Acceptable. This could be due to aspects of organizational commitment related to the performance of employees at the Bondowoso Regency Agriculture and Food Security Service. These aspects include employee willingness, loyalty, and pride.

Based on the descriptive results of the study, the overall responses to the organizational commitment variable of employees of the Department of Agriculture and Food Security of Bondowoso Regency, the majority stated that they agreed with all organizational commitment indicators. The most dominant indicator chosen by respondents was that respondents felt they would continue their careers at the Department of Agriculture and Food Security of Bondowoso Regency (X_{3.2}) refers to an employee's desire and awareness to remain part of the organization due to certain factors. Generally, the most important factor influencing this desire is the type of employment that does not allow for transfer within the organization. The type of

employment at the Department of Agriculture and Food Security of Bondowoso Regency is functional, which is difficult and has a small chance of becoming a structural employee.

According to Robbins and Judge (2011), Organizational Commitment is defined as a state in which employees side with a particular company and its goals, and intend to maintain their membership in that company. In other words, organizational commitment is related to employees' high desire to share and sacrifice for the company. Organizational commitment is valuable for the entire organization, and not just for work or work groups. Employee commitment itself is relative to the individual in identifying his or her involvement in the organization itself (Wibawa, 2015). The results of this study are supported by empirical evidence conducted by Sasanti et al., (2020), Sasanti, M. N., Indrawati, M., & Muninghar, M. (2020). (Luh et al., 2018), Rosalina, D., & Tanjung, M. S. B. (2020). which states that organizational commitment has an influence on employee performance.

The Influence of Work Motivation on Employee Performance

Based on the fourth hypothesis, work motivation influences employee performance. After testing and data analysis, the results showed that work motivation significantly influences employee performance at the Department of Agriculture and Food Security of Bondowoso Regency. This was proven true or H_0 .2accepted. This could be due to the existence of aspects of work motivation related to the performance of employees of the Department of Agriculture and Food Security of Bondowoso Regency. These aspects are as follows: physiological needs, safety needs, social needs, self-esteem needs, and self-actualization needs.

Based on the overall results of the responses to the work motivation variable at the Bondowoso Regency Agriculture and Food Security Service, the majority agreed with all work motivation indicators. The most dominant indicator chosen by respondents was that they felt they had received awards and recognition and were not treated arbitrarily ($X_{4.4}$) This statement is clearly rarely encountered in the field, considering that arbitrary actions are no longer the culture of any organization. A work culture that can motivate employees is the provision of awards and recognition for the work achieved by employees of the Bondowoso Regency Agriculture and Food Security Service.

Ishak and Hendri (2003:12) state that "motivation is a fundamental factor that drives every motive to work." Motivation is often interpreted as a driving factor in a person's behavior. Two things related to performance are the willingness or motivation of employees to work, which generates employee effort and the employee's ability to carry it out. In addition to the expert opinions discussed, the results of this study are supported by empirical

evidence conducted by Sasanti et al., (2020), (Lesmana, 2016), (Luh et al., 2018), Rosalina, D., & Tanjung, M. S. B. (2020), which states that work motivation has an influence on employee performance.

CONCLUSION

Based on the research findings presented in research, the following conclusions can be drawn: partially, reward, organizational commitment, and work motivation each have a positive and significant impact on employee performance, while punishment does not show a significant effect. Simultaneously, the variables of reward, punishment, organizational commitment, and work motivation collectively exert a positive and significant influence on employee performance. These results highlight the importance of a comprehensive approach to performance enhancement, emphasizing motivational and organizational factors.

In light of these findings, it is recommended that the leadership of the Agriculture and Food Security Service of Bondowoso Regency prioritize efforts to improve employee motivation, such as ensuring that salaries and benefits are aligned with workload and basic needs. Given that punishment has the least and insignificant impact, it is advisable to evaluate the sanctioning process, including clear communication of disciplinary actions and preventive measures for recurring violations. Future research should consider additional factors influencing employee performance, such as work discipline, competence, and job satisfaction, and expand the scope to include different organizational settings or broader populations.

REFERENCES

- Afandi, Pandi. 2016. *Concept & Indicator Human Resources Management For Management Research*. Yogyakarta. Deepublish.
- Azhar, N, M., Rasto. 2018. Lingkungan Kerja Dan Implikasinya Terhadap Kepuasan Kerja Karyawan. *Jurnal Pendidikan Manajemen Perkantoran*. 123-126.
- Aziri, B., 2011. Job satisfaction: a literature review, *Management Research And Practice*, 3(4), 77-86.
- Badrianto, Y. Ekhsan M. 2019. The Effect Of Work Environment And Motivation On Employee Performance Of Pt. Hasta Multi Sejahtera Cikarang. *Journal Of Reseach In Business, Economics, And Education*. 64-70.
- Bagis, F. Et.al. 2020. The Influence of Leadership Style and Organizational Culture by Mediating Job Satisfaction on Organizational Commitment Case Study in Employees Of Islamic Education Institution. *Jurnal Ilmiah Ekonomi Islam*, 616-620.

- Braunscheidel, M.J., Suresh, N.C. and Boishier, A.D. 2010, "Investigating the impact of organizational culture on supply chain integration", *Human Resource Management*. 883-911.
- Byars, Liloyd. Leslie W, R. 2008. *Human Resource Management*. New York: McGraw-Hill Irwin.
- Dafruddin, Heryanto. 2019. The Effect of Work Motivation and Work Environment on Performance With Satisfaction as *Intervening Variables* Education Personnel Rektorat Andalas University. *Archives of Business Research*, 103-120.
- Djokosantoso Moeljono. 2005. *Cultured. Budaya Organisasi Dalam Tantangan*. Jakarta: PT Pustaka Binaman Pressindo.
- Dziuba, S. T., Ingaldi, M., & Zhuravskaya, M. (2020). Employees' Job Satisfaction and their Work Performance as Elements Influencing Work Safety. *System Safety: Human-Technical Facility-Environment*, 2(1), 18-25.
- Ghozali, Imam. 2012. *Aplikasi Analisis Multivariate Dengan Program IBM SPSS 20*. Penerbit Universitas Diponegoro. Semarang.
- Hair, et al. (2010). *Multivariate Data Analysis Seventh Edition*. Pearson Prentice Hall.
- Hakim, L., Tobing, D. S. K., & Fadah, I. 2019. The Effect of Transformational Leadership Style and Work Discipline Toward Job Satisfaction and the Performance of Cooperation Extension Officer of East Java's State Minister for Cooperatives Small and Medium Enterprises (SME). *International Journal Of Research Science & Management*
- Hartinah, S. Et al. 2020. Teacher's performance management: The role of principal's leadership, work environment and motivation in Tegal City, Indonesia. *Management Science Letters*. 235–246.
- Hasanah, F., & Lo, S. J. 2020. The Mediating Role Of Employee Satisfaction On The Influences Of Employee Discipline And Employee Motivation On Employee Performance At The Ministry Of Transportation, Republic Of Indonesia, Research And Development Department. *Dinasti International Journal Of Management Science*, 2(1), 1-11.
- Hasibuan. 2007. *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia*. Cetakan kesembilan. Jakarta: PT. Bumi Aksara.
- Insan, N. 2019. *Kepemimpinan Transformasional*. Bandung; ALFABETA.
- Islamy, J.F. Et.al. 2020. The role of organizational culture, knowledge sharing and job satisfaction in higher education. *Management Science Letters*. 3957–3966.

- Kreitner, Robert. 2003. *Perilaku Organisasi (Organisasi Behavior)*, Edisi Ke Lima, Jakarta; Salemba Empat.
- Kurniawaty, Ramly, M. Ramlawati. 2019. The effect of work environment, stress, and job satisfaction on employee turnover intention. *Management Science Letters*. 877–886.
- Lesmana, R. (2016). Pengaruh Motivasi Kerja Terhadap Kinerja Penyuluh Pertanian Lapangan (Ppl) Dinas Pertanian Kabupaten Bulungan Kalimantan Timur. *JBTI: Jurnal Bisnis : Teori Dan Implementasi*, 7(2), 251–277. <https://doi.org/10.18196/JBTI.V7I2.2555>
- Lolowang, N, L. Et Al. 2019. The Effect Of Leadership And Organizational Culture On Employee Performance That Is Educated By Motivation (Study On The Implementation Empowerment Programs In Jayapura City). *Business Perspectives*. 268-277.
- Luh, N., Asmara, F., & Yasa, D. (2018). Pengaruh Motivasi Dan Komitmen Terhadap Kinerja Pegawai Negeri Sipil Di Dinas Kebudayaan Provinsi Bali. *Public Inspiration: Jurnal Administrasi Publik*, 3(1), 46–52. <https://doi.org/10.22225/PI.3.1.2018.46-52>
- Mangkunegara, Anwar Prabu. 2006. *Evaluasi Kinerja Sumber Daya Manusia*. Bandung: PT. Refika Aditama.
- Mangkunegara, Anwar Prabu. 2013. *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia perusahaan*. Bandung: PT. Remaja Rosdakarya.
- Mardiana. 2005. *Manajemen Produksi*. Jakarta: Penerbit Badab Penerbit IPWI.
- Mas'ud, R., Jonathan, L. R., & Lau, E. A. (2017). Pengaruh reward dan punishment terhadap kinerja pegawai di dinas pendidikan dan kebudayaan kabupaten kutai timur. *Ekonomia*, 6(1), 147–153. <http://ejurnal.untag-smd.ac.id/index.php/EKM/article/view/2603>
- Mesfin, D., Woldie, M., Adamu, A., & Bekele, F. (2020). Perceived organizational culture and its relationship with job satisfaction in primary hospitals of Jimma zone and Jimma town administration, correlational study. *BMC Health Services Research*, 20, 1-9
- Mohammad, Nasir. 2013. *Metode Penelitian*, Jakarta Ghalia Indonesia.
- Mondy, R Wayne. 2008. *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia* (Jilid I, Edisi 10). Terjemahan oleh Bayu Airlangga. Jakarta: Penerbit Erlangga.
- Nabawi, R. 2019. Pengaruh Lingkungan Kerja, Kepuasan Kerja dan Beban Kerja Terhadap Kinerja Pegawai. *Jurnal Ilmiah Magister Manajemen*. 170-183.
- Nawawi, Ismail. 2009. *Prilaku Administrasi Kajian Teori dan Praktis*. Surabaya: ITSPers.
- Noor, Juliansyah. 2014. *Metodologi Penelitian*. Jakarta: Kencana Prenada Media Group.
- Notoatmodjo, Soekidjo. 2003. *Pengembangan sumber daya manusia*. Jakarta: Rineka Cipta.
- Notoatmodjo, Soekidjo. 2010. *Metodologi Penelitian Kesehatan*. Jakarta: Rineka Cipta.
- Nuraini, T. 2013. *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia*. Pekanbaru: Yayasan Aini Syam.

- Nuryadin deni, Tohirin, Ilhamdi. 2019. *Perilaku Organisasi Modern*. Jakarta: Mitra wacana media.
- Ozanna, N., Adam, M., & Majid, M. S. A. 2019. Does job satisfaction mediate the effect of organizational change and organizational culture on employee performance of the public works and spatial planning agency. *IOSR Journal of Business and Management*, 21(1), 45-51.
- Paaais, M. Pattiruhu, J, R. 2020. Effect of Motivation, Leadership, and Organizational Culture on Satisfaction and Employee Performance. *Journal of Asian Finance, Economics and Business*. 577–588.
- Priansa, Doni J. 2018. *Perencanaan dan pengembangan sumber daya manusia*. Bandung: ALFABETA.
- Radita, F. R., Amri, W. A. A., Supiana, N., Sasono, I., Pramono, T., Novitasari, D., ... & Asnaini, S. W. (2021). Work-Family Conflict among Employees: What is the Role of Religiosity on Job Satisfaction and Performance. *International Journal of Science and Management Studies (IJSMS)*, 4(1), 45-59.
- Robin, Stephen P. 2003. *Perilaku Organisasi, Ahli Bhasa Tim Indeks*. Edisi Indonesia. Jakarta: PT. Indeks.
- Sabuhari, R. et.al. 2020. *The effects of human resource flexibility, employee competency, organizational culture adaptation and job satisfaction on employee performance*. *Management Science Letters*. 1777–1786.
- Sabuhari, R., Sudiro, A., Irawanto, D., & Rahayu, M. (2020). The effects of human resource flexibility, employee competency, organizational culture adaptation and job satisfaction on employee performance. *Management Science Letters*, 10(8), 1775-1786.
- Saputra, P., Sudiro, A., & Irawanto, D. W. 2018. Job satisfaction in compensation, environment, discipline, and performance: evidence from Indonesia higher education. *MEC-J (Management and Economics Journal)*, 2(3), 217-236.
- Sasanti, M. N., Indrawati, M., & Muninghar, M. (2020). PENGARUH BUDAYA ORGANISASI, MOTIVASI KERJA DAN KOMITMEN TERHADAP KINERJA PEGAWAI STUDI KASUS PADA PEGAWAI PPL PNS DINAS PERTANIAN BOJONEGORO. *Jurnal Mitra Manajemen*, 4(5), 819–830. <https://doi.org/10.52160/EJMM.V4I5.400>
- Sastroasmoro, S dan Ismael, S. 2011. *Dasar-dasar Metodologi Penelitian Klinis*. Binarupa Aksara: Jakarta.
- Sedarmayanti 2014. *Sumber Daya Manusia dan Produktivitas Kerja*. Jakarta: Mandar Maju.

- Sedarmayanti 2014. *Sumber Daya Manusia dan Produktivitas Kerja*. Jakarta: Mandar Maju.
- Sekaran, U. 2006. *Research Methods For Business. Metode Penelitian Untuk Bisnis* (Edisi 4) Jakarta: Selemba Empat.
- Simanjuntak, Payaman J. 2005. *Manajemen dan Evaluasi Kinerja*. Jakarta: Lembaga Penerbit Fakultas Ekonomi UI.
- Sinambela, Poltak L. Sinambela Sartan. 2019. *Manajemen Kinerja Pengelolaan, Pengukuran Dan Implikasi Kinerja*. Depok: PT. Raja Grafindo Persada.
- Siregar, Syofian. 2013. *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif*. Jakarta: PT Fajar Interpratama Mandiri.
- Soejono. 2015. *Sistem dan Prosedur Kerja, cetakan kedua*, Jakarta: Bumi Aksara.
- Sudarsih, S., & Supriyadi, S. 2019 The Role of Workload and Work Discipline in Improving Job Satisfaction and Performance of Outsourcing Employees. *International Journal of Scientific Research and Management (IJSRM)*.
- Sudaryo, Y. Ariwibowo, A. Sofiati, Ayu N. 2018. *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia Kompensasi Tidak Langsung dan Lingkungan Kerja Fisik*. Yogyakarta: Andi.
- Sudiarditha, I. K. R., Susita, D., & Kartini, T. M. 2019. Compensation And Work Discipline On Employee Performance With Job Satisfaction As *Intervening*. *TRIKONOMIKA*, 18(2), 80-87.
- Sugiono, E., & Efendi, S. 2020. Leadership Style, Work Discipline, and Compensation to Employee Performance through Job Satisfaction. *ENDLESS: International Journal of Future Studies*, 3(2), 47-63.
- Sugiyono. 2013. *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif, Kualitatif dan R&D*. Bandung: Alfabeta CV.
- Sugiyono. 2015. *Metode Penelitian Kombinasi (Mix Methods)*. Bandung: Alfabeta.
- Sugiyono. 2016. *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif, Kualitatif dan R&D*. Bandung: PT Alfabet.
- Sujarweni, V. Wiratna. 2015. *Statistik untuk Bisnis dan Ekonomi*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Baru Press.
- Sujarweni, Wiratna. 2012. *Statistika Untuk Penelitian*. Yogyakarta: Graha ilmu.
- Sulistiyono, A., Tri, U., Aldino, A A., Joko, S., & Damarsari R E. (2020) The Mediating Role of Job Satisfaction in Relationship Between Work Discipline on Employee Performance. *Proceedings of the 2nd African International Conference on Industrial Engineering and Operations Management Harare, Zimbabwe (IEOM Society International)*.
- Sunarsi, D. 2019. The Analysis of The Work Environmental and Organizational Cultural Impact on The Performance and Implication of The Work Satisfaction. *Jurnal Ilmiah Ilmu Administrasi Publik: Jurnal Pemikiran dan Penelitian Administrasi*. 237-246.
- Sunyoto, D. 2012. *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia*. Jakarta: PT Buku Seru.

- Suprpti, S., Astuti, J. P., Sa'adah, N., Rahmawati, S. D., Astuti, R. Y., & Sudargini, Y. (2020). The effect of work motivation, work environment, work discipline on employee satisfaction and public health center performance. *Journal of Industrial Engineering & Management Research*, 1(2), 153-172.
- Suriansyah, A. (2020). The Effect of Organizational Climate, Work Discipline and Job Satisfaction Towards Teacher Performance at State Senior High School. *Journal of K6 Education and Management*, 3(1), 17-25.
- Yasundar, W. 2019. Effect Of Work Environment And Job Satisfaction On The Performance Of Employees At The Office Of Bank Indonesiamedan North Sumatera. *International Conference On Global Education Vii*.
- Yusnita, N, Ely Rusdiawati, E. Sunaryo, W. 2019. Studying The Relationship between Organizational Culture and Transformational Leadership with Employees' Performance. *International Journal of Latest Engineering and Management Research (IJLEMR)*. 1-7.