

---

## EFFECT OF WORK ENVIRONMENT ON EMPLOYEE PERFORMANCE WITH WORK SPIRIT AS INTERVENING VARIABLE

Oleh  
Limega Candrasa  
High School of Economics Bina Karya  
Email: [limega@stie-binakarya.ac.id](mailto:limega@stie-binakarya.ac.id)

---

### Article History:

Received: 15-12-2021

Revised: 16-01-2022

Accepted: 22-02-2022

### Keywords:

Work Environment, Work Spirit, And Performance

**Abstract:** *This research shows. (1) It can be seen that the magnitude of the adjusted R square value is 0.130 or 13.0%. This shows that the work environment (X) can explain work morale (Z) by 13.0%, the remaining 87.0% (100% - 13.0%) is explained by other variables outside the research model. (2) The results of the t-test (partial) can be seen that the obtained tcount (7.652) > ttable (2.042), as well as the significance value of 0.00 < 0.05, it can be concluded that the first hypothesis is accepted, meaning that the work environment variable (X) positive and significant effect on morale (Z). (3) The results of the t-test (partial) can be seen that the value of tcount (3.955) > ttable (2.042), and the significance value of 0.00 < 0.05, it can be concluded that the second hypothesis is accepted, meaning that the work environment (X) has a significant effect on employee performance (Y). (4) The results of the path analysis test show that the direct effect of variable X on variable Y2 is 0.586. Meanwhile, the indirect effect through the X variable is  $0.397 \times 0.184 = 0.730$ . From the calculation results obtained, the indirect effect through the Z variable is greater than the direct effect on the Y variable.*

---

## INTRODUCTION

Humans are the most important resource in achieving organizational success. Human resources will be realized if the enthusiasm in working to carry out organizational goals is carried out with a full sense of responsibility. Human resources affect performance in organizations where the role of quality human resources in the context of employee performance is a very important factor. There are several factors that cause high and low employee performance, especially strongly influenced by the work environment and group cooperation provided by employees. As for the things that result in reduced morale from employees, namely low work productivity caused because employees tend to be lazy and like to procrastinate work so that existing tasks are neglected. A comfortable work environment for employees who work to provide morale as an increase in performance in a company or an institution, whether private or government.

Where is one's comfort work will make a better performance in the future. A good and comfortable work environment will encourage the emergence of high work enthusiasm

for employees who work in one area, and in the end this will lead to the achievement of maximum employee performance and will have a positive impact on the agency. In addition, good cooperation seems to be very consistent in carrying out work duties and responsibilities when providing services and when doing this, this will certainly be a trigger factor in work harmonization and increase the morale of employees in the sub-district office. However, all of the above factors will be accompanied by also with how the level of wages received in work that makes a person more enthusiastic in doing his job. employees experience a decrease in enthusiasm in completing their work which is influenced by other factors in the agency ranging from late arrivals to work, piled up work but the absence of good cooperation in the work environment makes this phenomenon protracted without any better action from all over the world. employees and superiors.

Research purposes

The objectives of this research are:

1. To find out how the influence of the work environment on the morale of the Dolok Merawan sub-district office employees.
2. To find out how the influence of the work environment on the performance of the Dolok Merawan sub-district office employees. c. To find out how the influence of work morale on the performance of the Dolok Merawan sub-district office employees. d. To find out how the influence of the work environment on the performance of the Dolok Merawan sub-district employee with work spirit as an intervening variable.

## LITERATURE REVIEW

### A. Human Resource

Management Human resource management is a series of organizational activities directed at attracting, developing and retaining an effective workforce. Managers have a big role in directing people in the organization to achieve the expected goals, including thinking about how to have human resource management (HRM) that is able to work effectively and efficiently.

### B. Work Environment

According to Siagian (2014: 56) suggests that the work environment is an environment where employees do their daily work. Every organization, in general, whether large, medium, or small, will all interact with the environment in which the organization or company is located. The environment itself undergoes changes so that an organization or company that can survive is an organization that can adapt to environmental changes. On the other hand, the organization will experience a period of destruction if the organization does not pay attention to developments and changes in the surrounding environment.

### C. Work Spirit

Morale is "reflecting the condition of employees in their work environment, if the work spirit is good then the company gains benefits, such as low absenteeism, less turnover of employees and increasing labor productivity". Sri Widodo (2015: 104). Conversely, if the workforce is not enthusiastic or lazy in working, it is said that the workforce concerned has a low moral level. Low work morale can lead to strikes, frequent absenteeism, pretense, and various other actions. The spirit of work will stimulate a person to be able to work and be

creative in his work. Employees who have high morale must be able to complete their work effectively and efficiently. The definition of work spirit according to Hasibuan (2009: 94) is "the desire and sincerity of a person to do his job well and be disciplined to achieve maximum work performance".

#### D. Performance

There are many definitions proposed about performance, although these terms basically have many similarities with each other. The term performance is matched from the term "performance" in English which means deeds, actions, appearances and others. Employee performance (work achievement) is the result of work in quality and quantity achieved by an employee in carrying out his duties in accordance with the responsibilities given to him (Mangkunegara, 2009:18). The success rate of a performance includes both quantitative and qualitative aspects. Meanwhile, according to Siswanto (in Muhammad Sandy, 2015:11) performance is the achievement achieved by a person in carrying out the tasks and work assigned to him. The definition of performance according to Moehariono (2012: 95) is "Performance or performance is a description of the level of achievement of the implementation of a program of activities or policies in realizing the goals, objectives, vision and mission of the organization as outlined through the strategic planning of an organization."

## RESEARCH METHODS

### Location and Time of Research

This research was conducted at the Dolok Merawan sub-district office, Serdang Bedagai Regency. The time of this research started in January 2020 until finished.

### Population and Sample

The population is a generalization area consisting of objects or subjects that have certain qualities and characteristics set by researchers to be studied and drawn conclusions (Sugiyono, 2017). In this research the population is 32 employees of the Dolok Merawan sub-district office. Because the target population is less than 100, the sampling technique used is the census method, where the entire population of 32 employees of the Dolok Merawan sub-district office will be used as the research sample.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### A. Descriptive Analysis of Research Variables

#### 1. Work Environment (X)

It is known the number and percentage of respondents' answers regarding the work environment (X) the average respondent's answers are on the agree and strongly agree scale with the average answer value of 3.89. This shows that from the 4 work environment measurement indicators (X) it can be concluded that the average work environment (X) is in the High category.

#### 2. Employee Performance (Y)

It is known that the number and percentage of respondents' answers regarding employee performance (Y), the average respondent's answers are on the agree and strongly agree scale with the average answer value of 3.91. This shows that from the 4 indicators of employee performance measurement (Y) it can be concluded that the average employee performance score (Y) is in the High category.

## 3. Morale (Z)

Based on Appendix 2, it is known that the number and percentage of respondents' answers regarding work spirit (Z), the average respondent's answers are on the agree scale and strongly agree with the average answer value of 4.02. This shows that from the 4 indicators of measuring the morale variable (Z) it can be concluded that the average score of morale (Z) is in the High category.

## B. Instrument Test

## 1. Validity Test

Testing the validity using SPSS version 25.00 with criteria based on the calculated  $r$  value as follows:

a) If  $r \text{ count} > r \text{ table}$  or  $-r \text{ count} < -r \text{ table}$  then the statement is declared valid.

b) If  $r \text{ count} < r \text{ table}$  or  $-r \text{ count} > -r \text{ table}$  then the statement is declared invalid.

This test was carried out on 32 respondents, then  $df = 32 - k = 30$ , with  $\alpha = 5\%$ , the  $r$  table value was 0.349 (Ghozali, 2016), then the calculated  $r$  value will be compared with the  $r$  table value for all points of the statement both variables work environment (X), employee performance (Y2) and morale (Y1) have a value of  $r$  arithmetic which is greater than the value of  $r$  table, so it can be concluded if all statements of each variable are declared valid.

## 1. Reliability Test

Reliability is an index that shows the extent to which a measuring instrument can be trusted or reliable. According to Sugiyono (2013) a factor is declared reliable if the Cronbach Alpha is greater than 0.6. Based on the results of data processing using SPSS 25.00, the following results were obtained:

Table 1 Reliability Test Results

| Variabel             | Cronbach Alpha | Konstanta | Reliabilitas |
|----------------------|----------------|-----------|--------------|
| Lingkungan Kerja (X) | 0,726          | 0,6       | Reliabel     |
| Kinerja Pegawai (Y2) | 0,751          | 0,6       | Reliabel     |
| Semangat Kerja (Y1)  | 0,724          | 0,6       | Reliabel     |

Based on the reliability test using Cronbach Alpha, all research variables are reliable because Cronbach Alpha is greater than 0.6, so the results of this study indicate that the measurement tool in this study has met the reliability test (reliable and can be used as a measuring instrument).

## C. Classical Assumption Test Equation 1

The tests of classical assumptions with the SPSS 25.00 program carried out in this study include:

## 1. Normality Test

Normality test aims to test whether in the regression model, the confounding or residual variables have a normal distribution (Ghozali, 2016). Testing the normality of the data can be done using two methods, graphs and statistics. The normality test of the graph method uses a normal probability plot, while the statistical method normality test uses the

one sample Kolmogorov Smirnov Test. Data that is normally distributed will form a straight diagonal line and plotting residual data will be compared with a diagonal line, if the distribution of residual data is normal, the line that describes the actual data will follow the diagonal line (Ghozali, 2016). The test results using SPSS 25.00 are as follows:

**Tabel 2 Uji One Sample Kolmogorov Smirnov Test**

| One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test                          |                            |                |                                |
|-------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------|----------------|--------------------------------|
|                                                             |                            |                | Unstan<br>dardized<br>Residual |
| N                                                           |                            |                | 32                             |
| Normal<br>Parameters <sup>a,b</sup>                         | Mean                       |                | .00000                         |
|                                                             | Std. Deviation             |                | 1.1871                         |
| Most Extreme<br>Differences                                 | Absolute                   |                | .118                           |
|                                                             | Positive                   |                | .112                           |
|                                                             | Negative                   |                | -.118                          |
| Test Statistic                                              |                            |                | .118                           |
| Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)                                      |                            |                | .200 <sup>c,d</sup>            |
| (2-tailed)                                                  | Monte Carlo Sig.           | Sig.           | .688 <sup>e</sup>              |
|                                                             | 99%<br>Confidence Interval | Lower<br>Bound | .476                           |
|                                                             |                            | Upper<br>Bound | .899                           |
| a. Test distribution is Normal.                             |                            |                |                                |
| b. Calculated from data.                                    |                            |                |                                |
| c. Lilliefors Significance Correction.                      |                            |                |                                |
| d. This is a lower bound of the true significance.          |                            |                |                                |
| e. Based on 32 sampled tables with starting seed 299883525. |                            |                |                                |

From the output in table 2, it can be seen that the significance value (Monte Carlo Sig.) of all variables is 899. If the significance is more than 0.05, then the residual value is normal, so it can be concluded that all variables are normally distributed.

## 2. Heteroscedasticity Test

The heteroscedasticity test aims to test whether from the regression model there is an inequality of variance from the residuals of one observation to another observation. A good regression model is one with homoscedasticity or no heteroscedasticity. One way to detect the presence or absence of heteroscedasticity is the Glejser test, in the Glejser test, if the independent variable is statistically significant in influencing the dependent variable, then there is an indication of heteroscedasticity. On the other hand, if the independent variable is not statistically significant in influencing the dependent variable, then there is no indication of heteroscedasticity. This is observed from the significance probability above the 5% confidence level (Ghozali, 2016; 138). The results of data processing using SPSS 17.00 show the results in the following table:

Table 3 Glejser Test Results

| Coefficients <sup>a</sup>      |                    |                             |            |                           |      |      |
|--------------------------------|--------------------|-----------------------------|------------|---------------------------|------|------|
| Model                          |                    | Unstandardized Coefficients |            | Standardized Coefficients | t    | Sig. |
|                                |                    | B                           | Std. Error | Beta                      |      |      |
|                                | (Constant)         | .888                        | 1.613      |                           | .551 | .586 |
|                                | Lingkungan_Kerja_X | .081                        | .090       | .179                      | .900 | .376 |
|                                | Semangat_Kerja_Z   | -.087                       | .126       | -.137                     | .687 | .497 |
| a. Dependent Variable: Abs_RES |                    |                             |            |                           |      |      |

#### D. Simple Linear Regression

Test Simple linear regression test explains the magnitude of the role of work discipline (X) on incentives (Z). Data analysis in this study used multiple linear regression analysis using SPSS 25.0 for windows. The analysis of each variable is described in the following description:

Table 4 Simple Linear Regression Results

| Table 1. Simple Linear Regression Results |                    |                                    |          |                                  |      |      |                             |      |
|-------------------------------------------|--------------------|------------------------------------|----------|----------------------------------|------|------|-----------------------------|------|
| Coefficients <sup>a</sup>                 |                    |                                    |          |                                  |      |      |                             |      |
| Model                                     |                    | Unstandar<br>dized<br>Coefficients |          | Stand<br>ardized<br>Coefficients |      |      | Collineari<br>ty Statistics |      |
|                                           |                    | B                                  | d. Error | Beta                             |      |      | Tol<br>erance               | IF   |
|                                           | (Constant)         | 7.652                              | 1.873    |                                  | .085 | .000 |                             |      |
|                                           | Lingkungan_Kerja_X | .283                               | .120     | .397                             | .371 | .024 | 1.000                       | .000 |
| a. Dependent Variable: Semangat_Kerja_Z   |                    |                                    |          |                                  |      |      |                             |      |

Based on these results, the multiple linear regression equation has the formulation:  $Z = a + b_1X + b_2X^2 + \dots$ , so that the equation is obtained:  $Z = 7,652 + 0,283 X + \dots$  The description of the multiple linear regression equation above is as follows:

- The constant value (a) of 7.652 indicates the amount of work enthusiasm (Z) if the work environment (X) is equal to zero.
- The value of the regression coefficient of the work environment (X) (b<sub>1</sub>) of 0.283 indicates the magnitude of the role of the work environment (X) on morale (Z). This means that if the work environment factor (X) increases by 1 unit value, it is predicted that work morale (Z) will increase by 0.283 units.

#### E. Coefficient of Determination (R<sup>2</sup>)

The coefficient of determination is used to see how much the independent variable contributes to the dependent variable. The greater the value of the coefficient of determination, the better the ability of the independent variable to explain the dependent variable. If the determination ( $R^2$ ) is getting bigger (closer to 1), it can be said that the influence of variable X is large on Z's work spirit. The value used to see the coefficient of determination in this study is in the adjusted R square column. This is because the adjusted R square value is not susceptible to the addition of independent variables. The value of the coefficient of determination can be seen in Table 5 below:

**Table 5 Coefficient of Determination**

| Model Summary <sup>b</sup>                    |                   |   |
|-----------------------------------------------|-------------------|---|
| R Square                                      | Adjusted R Square | R |
| .158                                          | .130              |   |
| a. Predictors: (Constant), Lingkungan_Kerja_X |                   |   |
| b. Dependent Variable: Semangat_Kerja_Z       |                   |   |

Based on table 5, it can be seen that the adjusted R square value is 0.130 or 13.0%. This shows that the work environment (X) can explain work morale (Z) by 13.0%, the remaining 87.0% (100% - 13.0%) is explained by other variables outside this research model such as leadership style, work motivation and job satisfaction.

#### F. Classical Assumption Test Equation 2

The tests of classical assumptions with the SPSS 25.00 program carried out in this study include:

##### 1. Normality Test

Normality test aims to test whether in the regression model, the confounding or residual variables have a normal distribution (Ghozali, 2016). Testing the normality of the data can be done using two methods, graphs and statistics. The normality test of the graph method uses a normal probability plot, while the statistical method normality test uses the one sample Kolmogorov Smirnov Test. Data that is normally distributed will form a straight diagonal line and plotting residual data will be compared with a diagonal line, if the distribution of residual data is normal, the line that describes the actual data will follow the diagonal line (Ghozali, 2016). The test results using SPSS 25.00 are as follows:

**Tabel 6 Uji One Sample Kolmogorov Smirnov Test**

| One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test  |                |                                |
|-------------------------------------|----------------|--------------------------------|
|                                     |                | Unstan<br>dardized<br>Residual |
| N                                   |                | 32                             |
| Normal<br>Parameters <sup>a,b</sup> | Mean           | .00000<br>00                   |
|                                     | Std. Deviation | 1.3874<br>8959                 |
| Most Extreme<br>Differences         | Absolute       | .090                           |
|                                     | Positive       | .054                           |

|                                                             |                         |             |                     |
|-------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------|-------------|---------------------|
|                                                             | Negative                |             | -.090               |
| Test Statistic                                              |                         |             | .090                |
| Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)                                      |                         |             | .200 <sup>c,d</sup> |
| Monte Carlo Sig. (2-tailed)                                 | Sig.                    |             | .969 <sup>e</sup>   |
| Monte Carlo Sig. (2-tailed)                                 | Sig.                    |             | .969 <sup>e</sup>   |
|                                                             | 99% Confidence Interval | Lower Bound | .890                |
|                                                             |                         | Upper Bound | 1.000               |
| a. Test distribution is Normal.                             |                         |             |                     |
| b. Calculated from data.                                    |                         |             |                     |
| c. Lilliefors Significance Correction.                      |                         |             |                     |
| d. This is a lower bound of the true significance.          |                         |             |                     |
| e. Based on 32 sampled tables with starting seed 926214481. |                         |             |                     |

From the output in table 6, it can be seen that the significance value (Monte Carlo Sig.) of all variables is 0.969. If the significance is more than 0.05, then the residual value is normal, so it can be concluded that all variables are normally distributed.

## 2. Multicollinearity Test

The multicollinearity test aims to determine whether there is a correlation between the independent variables in the regression model. The multicollinearity test in this study is seen from the tolerance value or variance inflation factor (VIF). The calculation of the tolerance value or VIF with the SPSS 25.00 for windows program can be seen in Table 4.12 below:

**Table 7 Multicollinearity Test Results**

| Coefficients <sup>a</sup>                |                    |                             |            |                           |       |      |                         |       |
|------------------------------------------|--------------------|-----------------------------|------------|---------------------------|-------|------|-------------------------|-------|
| Model                                    |                    | Unstandardized Coefficients |            | Standardized Coefficients | T     | Sig. | Collinearity Statistics |       |
|                                          |                    | B                           | Std. Error | Beta                      |       |      | Tolerance               | VIF   |
| 1                                        | (Constant)         | 2.869                       | 2.777      |                           | 1.033 | .310 |                         |       |
|                                          | Lingkungan_Kerja_X | .612                        | .155       | .586                      | 3.955 | .000 | .842                    | 1.187 |
|                                          | Semangat_Kerja_Z   | .270                        | .217       | .184                      | 1.244 | .224 | .842                    | 1.187 |
| a. Dependent Variable: Kinerja_Pegawai_Y |                    |                             |            |                           |       |      |                         |       |

Based on table 7, it can be seen that the tolerance value of the work environment (X) is 0.842, morale (Z) is 0.842, all of which are greater than 0.10 while the VIF value of the work environment (X) is 1.187, morale (Z) is 1.187. 1.187 where all of them are smaller than 10. Based on the results of the above calculations, it can be seen that the tolerance value of all independent variables is greater than 0.10 and the VIF value of all independent variables is also smaller than 5 so that there is no correlation symptom in the independent variables. So it can be concluded that there is no symptom of multicollinearity between independent variables in the regression model.

### 3. Heteroscedasticity Test

The heteroscedasticity test aims to test whether from the regression model there is an inequality of variance from the residuals of one observation to another observation. A good regression model is one with homoscedasticity or no heteroscedasticity. One way to detect the presence or absence of heteroscedasticity is the Glejser test, in the Glejser test, if the independent variable is statistically significant in influencing the dependent variable, then there is an indication of heteroscedasticity. On the other hand, if the independent variable is not statistically significant in influencing the dependent variable, then there is no indication of heteroscedasticity. This is observed from the significance probability above the 5% confidence level (Ghozali, 2016; 138). The results of data processing using SPSS 17.00 show the results in the following table:

**Table 8 Glejser Test Results**

| Coefficients <sup>a</sup>      |                    |                             |            |                           |      |      |
|--------------------------------|--------------------|-----------------------------|------------|---------------------------|------|------|
| Model                          |                    | Unstandardized Coefficients |            | Standardized Coefficients | t    | Sig. |
|                                |                    | B                           | Std. Error | Beta                      |      |      |
|                                | (Constant)         | .888                        | .613       |                           | .551 | .586 |
|                                | Lingkungan_Kerja_X | .081                        | .090       | .179                      | .900 | .376 |
|                                | Semangat_Kerja_Z   | -.087                       | .126       | -.137                     | .687 | .497 |
| a. Dependent Variable: Abs_RES |                    |                             |            |                           |      |      |

### G. Multiple Linear Regression

Test Multiple linear regression testing explains the magnitude of the role of the work environment (X) and work morale (Z) on employee performance (Y). Data analysis in this study used multiple linear regression analysis using SPSS 25.0 for windows. The analysis of each variable is described in the following description:

**Table 9 Multiple Linear Regression Results**

| Table 7. Multiple Linear Regression Results |                    |                                    |          |                                  |      |     |                             |      |
|---------------------------------------------|--------------------|------------------------------------|----------|----------------------------------|------|-----|-----------------------------|------|
| Coefficients <sup>a</sup>                   |                    |                                    |          |                                  |      |     |                             |      |
| Model                                       |                    | Unstandar<br>dized<br>Coefficients |          | Stand<br>ardized<br>Coefficients |      | ig. | Collineari<br>ty Statistics |      |
|                                             |                    | B                                  | d. Error | Beta                             |      |     | Tol<br>erance               | IF   |
|                                             | (Constant)         | 2.869                              | 2.777    |                                  | .033 | 310 |                             |      |
|                                             | Lingkungan_Kerja_X | .612                               | .155     | .586                             | .955 | 000 | .842                        | .187 |

|                                                  |                         |             |             |             |             |            |             |             |
|--------------------------------------------------|-------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|------------|-------------|-------------|
|                                                  | <b>Semangat_Kerja_Z</b> | <b>.270</b> | <b>.217</b> | <b>.184</b> | <b>.244</b> | <b>224</b> | <b>.842</b> | <b>.187</b> |
| <b>a. Dependent Variable: Kinerja_Pegawai_Y2</b> |                         |             |             |             |             |            |             |             |

Based on these results, the multiple linear regression equation has the formulation:  $Y = a + b_1X + b_2Y_1 +$ , so that the equation is obtained:  $Y = 2.869 + 0.612X + 0.270Y_1 +$  The description of the multiple linear regression equation above is as follows:

- The constant value (a) of 2.869 indicates the magnitude of employee performance (Y) if the work environment (X) and morale (Z) are equal to zero.
- The value of the work environment regression coefficient (X) (b1) of 0.612 indicates the magnitude of the role of the work environment (X) on employee performance (Y) with the assumption that the work morale variable (Z) is constant. This means that if the work environment factor (X) increases by 1 unit value, it is predicted that employee performance (Y) will increase by 0.612 unit value with the assumption that work morale (Z) is constant.
- The value of the regression coefficient of morale (Z) (b2) of 0.270 indicates the magnitude of the role of morale (Z) on employee performance (Y) with the assumption that the work environment variable (X) is constant. This means that if the morale factor (Z) increases by 1 unit value, it is predicted that employee performance (Y) will increase by 0.270 unit value with the assumption that the work environment (X) is constant.

#### H. Coefficient of Determination (R<sup>2</sup>)

The coefficient of determination is used to see how much the independent variable contributes to the dependent variable. The greater the value of the coefficient of determination, the better the ability of the independent variable to explain the dependent variable. If the determination (R<sup>2</sup>) is getting bigger (closer to 1), it can be said that the influence of the variable X is large on morale (Z). The value used to see the coefficient of determination in this study is in the adjusted R square column. This is because the adjusted R square value is not susceptible to the addition of independent variables. The value of the coefficient of determination can be seen in Table 10 below:

**Table 10 Coefficient of Determination**

| <b>Model Summary<sup>b</sup></b>                                        |                   |                 |                          |                                   |                      |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------|-----------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------|
| <b>Model</b>                                                            | <b>R</b>          | <b>R Square</b> | <b>Adjusted R Square</b> | <b>Std. Error of the Estimate</b> | <b>Durbin-Watson</b> |
| 1                                                                       | .681 <sup>a</sup> | .463            | .426                     | 1.435                             | 2.396                |
| <b>a. Predictors: (Constant), Semangat_Kerja_Y1, Lingkungan_Kerja_X</b> |                   |                 |                          |                                   |                      |
| <b>b. Dependent Variable: Kinerja_Pegawai_Y</b>                         |                   |                 |                          |                                   |                      |

Based on table 10, it can be seen that the adjusted R square value is 0.426 or 42.6%. This shows that work enthusiasm (Z) and work environment (X) can explain employee performance (Y) by 42.6%, the remaining 57.4% (100% - 42.6%) is explained by other

variables outside the model. this research. such as leadership style, work motivation and job satisfaction. I. Hypothesis Test 1. t test (Partial) The t statistic test is also known as the individual significance test. This test shows how far the influence of the independent variable partially on the dependent variable. In this study, partial hypothesis testing was carried out on each independent variable as shown in Table 11 below:

**Table 11 Partial Test (t) Equation 1**

| Coefficients <sup>a</sup> |                    |                                    |            |                                  |      |      |                             |      |
|---------------------------|--------------------|------------------------------------|------------|----------------------------------|------|------|-----------------------------|------|
| Model                     |                    | Unstandar<br>dized<br>Coefficients |            | Stand<br>ardized<br>Coefficients |      | Sig. | Collineari<br>ty Statistics |      |
|                           |                    | B                                  | Std. Error | Beta                             |      |      | Tolerance                   | IF   |
|                           | (Constant)         | 7.652                              | 1.873      |                                  | .085 | .000 |                             |      |
|                           | Lingkungan_Kerja_X | .283                               | .120       | .397                             | .371 | .024 | 1.000                       | .000 |

a. Hypothesis

Testing the effect of work environment variables (X) on the work morale variable (Z). The form of hypothesis testing based on statistics can be described as follows: Decision Making Criteria:

- a) Accept H0 If tcount < ttable or -tcount > - ttable or Sig value. > 0.05
- b) Reject H0 If tcount ttable or -tcount - ttable or Sig. < 0.05

From table 11, the tcount value is 7.652. With = 5%, ttable (5%; nk = 30) the ttable value is 2.042. From the description it can be seen that tcount (2.371) > ttable (2.042), as well as the significance value of 0.024 < 0.05, it can be concluded that the first hypothesis is accepted, meaning that the work environment variable (X) has a positive and significant effect on work morale (Z). This study is in accordance with the research of Syahrin, Aidil (2017) The effect of the work environment on employee performance through work discipline as an intervening variable: Case study at PT. Ayu Indah Tour and Travel Lamongan. Undergraduate thesis, Maulana Malik Ibrahim State Islamic University.

**Tabel 12 Uji Parsial (t) Persamaan 2**

| Coefficients <sup>a</sup> |                    |                                 |            |                                  |      |      |                             |      |
|---------------------------|--------------------|---------------------------------|------------|----------------------------------|------|------|-----------------------------|------|
| Model                     |                    | Unstandar<br>dized Coefficients |            | Stand<br>ardized<br>Coefficients |      | Sig. | Collinearit<br>y Statistics |      |
|                           |                    | B                               | Std. Error | Beta                             |      |      | To<br>lerance               | IF   |
|                           | (Constant)         | 2.869                           | 2.777      |                                  | .033 | .310 |                             |      |
|                           | Lingkungan_Kerja_X | .612                            | .155       | .586                             | .955 | .000 | .842                        | .187 |
|                           | Semangat_Kerja_Z   | .270                            | .217       | .184                             | .244 | .224 | .842                        | .187 |

|                                          |
|------------------------------------------|
| a. Dependent Variable: Kinerja_Pegawai_Y |
|------------------------------------------|

## b Hypothesis

Testing the influence of the work environment (X) on employee performance (Y) The form of hypothesis testing based on statistics can be described as follows: Decision Making Criteria:

a) Accept  $H_0$  If  $t_{count} < t_{table}$  or  $-t_{count} > -t_{table}$  or Sig value.  $> 0.05$

b) Reject  $H_0$  If  $t_{count} > t_{table}$  or  $-t_{count} < -t_{table}$  or Sig.  $< 0.05$

From table 12, the  $t_{count}$  value is 3.955. With  $\alpha = 5\%$ ,  $t_{table}$  (5%;  $nk = 30$ ) the  $t_{table}$  value is 2.042. From this description it can be seen that  $t_{count}$  (3.955)  $> t_{table}$  (2.042), and the significance value is  $0.024 < 0.05$ , it can be concluded that the second hypothesis is accepted, meaning that the work environment (X) has a significant effect on employee performance (Y). This study is in accordance with the research of Syahrin, Aidil (2017) The effect of the work environment on employee performance through work discipline as an intervening variable: Case study at PT. Ayu Indah Tour and Travel Lamongan. Undergraduate thesis, Maulana Malik Ibrahim State Islamic University

c. Hypothesis test of the effect of morale (Z) on employee performance (Y) The form of hypothesis testing based on statistics can be described as follows: Decision Making Criteria:

a) Accept  $H_0$  If  $t_{count} < t_{table}$  or  $-t_{count} > -t_{table}$  or Sig value.  $> 0.05$

b) Reject  $H_0$  If  $t_{count} > t_{table}$  or  $-t_{count} < -t_{table}$  or Sig.  $< 0.05$

From table 12, the  $t_{count}$  value is 1.244. With  $\alpha = 5\%$ ,  $t_{table}$  (5%;  $nk = 30$ ) the  $t_{table}$  value is 2.042. From this description it can be seen that  $t_{count}$  (1.244)  $< t_{table}$  (2.042), and the significance value is  $0.00 > 0.05$ , it can be concluded that the third hypothesis is not accepted, meaning that work morale (Y1) has no significant effect on employee performance (Y2). This study is in accordance with the research of Syahrin, Aidil (2017) The effect of the work environment on employee performance through work discipline as an intervening variable: Case study at PT. Ayu Indah Tour and Travel Lamongan. Undergraduate thesis, Maulana Malik Ibrahim State Islamic University

## 2. Path Analysis

In order to prove that whether a variable is capable of being a variable that mediates the relationship between the independent variable and the dependent variable, the direct and indirect effects of the independent variable on the dependent variable will be calculated. If the indirect effect of the independent variable on the dependent variable through the intervening variable is greater than the direct influence of the independent variable on the dependent variable, then that variable can be a variable that mediates between the independent variables and the dependent variable (Ghozali, 2016). To perform direct and indirect calculations, it is carried out from the following standardized coefficients of regression equations I and II:

**Tabel 13 Nilai *Standardized Coefficients* Persamaan I**

| Coefficients <sup>a</sup> |                                         |                             |            |                           |
|---------------------------|-----------------------------------------|-----------------------------|------------|---------------------------|
| Model                     |                                         | Unstandardized Coefficients |            | Standardized Coefficients |
|                           |                                         | B                           | Std. Error | Beta                      |
|                           | (Constant)                              | 7.652                       | 1.873      |                           |
|                           | Lingkungan_Kerja_X                      | .283                        | .120       | .397                      |
|                           | a. Dependent Variable: Semangat_Kerja_Z |                             |            |                           |

**Tabel 14 Nilai *Standardized Coefficients* Persamaan II**

| Coefficients <sup>a</sup> |                                          |                             |            |                           |
|---------------------------|------------------------------------------|-----------------------------|------------|---------------------------|
| Model                     |                                          | Unstandardized Coefficients |            | Standardized Coefficients |
|                           |                                          | B                           | Std. Error | Beta                      |
|                           | (Constant)                               | 2.869                       | 2.777      |                           |
|                           | Lingkungan_Kerja_X                       | .612                        | .155       | .586                      |
|                           | Semangat_Kerja_Z                         | .270                        | .217       | .184                      |
|                           | a. Dependent Variable: Kinerja_Pegawai_Y |                             |            |                           |

The path analysis shows that the direct effect of variable X on variable Y is 0.586. Meanwhile, the indirect effect through the Z variable is  $0.397 \times 0.184 = 0.730$ . From the calculation results obtained, the indirect effect through the Z variable is greater than the direct effect on the Y variable. These results can be seen in the following table 4.20:

**Table 15 Direct and Indirect Relationships**

| No | Variabel             | Direct | Indirect | Total | Kriteria         | Kesimpulan                   |
|----|----------------------|--------|----------|-------|------------------|------------------------------|
|    | Work environment (X) | .586   | .397     |       | Signifikan       | Sebagai Variabel Independen  |
|    | Morale (Z)           | .184   |          | .730  | Tidak Signifikan | Sebagai Variabel Intervening |

## CONCLUSION

Based on the results of research and discussion in the previous chapter, it can be concluded as follows:

1. The thing proposed states that: From table 4.16, the tcount value is 2,371. With = 5%, ttable (5%; nk = 30) the ttable value is 2,042. From the description it can be

seen that  $t_{count} (2,371) > t_{table} (2,042)$ , and the significance value is  $0.024 < 0.05$ , it can be concluded that the first hypothesis is accepted, meaning that the work environment (X) has a significant effect on Z's work spirit.

2. From table 4.17 obtained  $t_{count}$  value of 3.955 With  $\alpha = 5\%$ ,  $t_{table} (5\%; nk = 30)$  obtained  $t_{table}$  value of 2.042 From the description it can be seen that  $t_{count} (3.955) > t_{table} (2.042)$ , and the significance value is  $0.024 < 0.05$ , it can be concluded that the second hypothesis is accepted, meaning that the work environment (X) has a significant effect on employee performance (Y).
3. From the above calculation, the  $t_{count}$  value is 1,244 ( $5\%; nk = 30$ ) and the  $t_{table}$  value is 1,697. (Z) is not an intervening variable that mediates the effect of the work environment (X) on employee performance (Y).

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- [1] Abdullah, M. 2014. Management and Employee Performance Evaluation. : Publisher Aswaja Pressindo. Yogyakarta.
- [2] Antoniate, Ihsan. 2011. The Effect of the Use of Flash Learning Media on Student Learning Outcomes in the Sub-Material of Electrolyte and Non-Electrolyte Solutions, Thesis, FMIPA, Unimed, Medan
- [3] Anwar Prabu, Mangkunegara. 2011. Human Resource Management. PT. Youth Rosda Karya, Bandung.
- [4] Bangun, Wilson. 2012. Human Resource Management. Erlangga. Jakarta
- [5] Desseller, Gary. 2015. Human Resource Management (Fourteenth Edition). Salemba Empat Jakarta.
- [6] Hasibuan, Malay S.P. 2016. Human Resource Management. Revised Edition. Publisher PT Bumi Aksara Jakarta
- [7] Buchari Alma. 2011. "Marketing Management and Marketing Services". Alfabeta Publisher: Bandung
- [8] Chien, P.M.; Cornwell, T.B.,; and Pappu, R. (2011). "Sponsorship Portfolio as a Brand-Image Creation Strategy". Journal of Business Research. Vol. 64, pp. 142-149.
- [9] Edy Sutrisno, 2011. Human Resource Management, Third Edition, Kencana Prenada Media Group, Jakarta
- [10] Ghazali, Imam. 2011. "Application of Multivariate Analysis With SPSS Program" Diponegoro University Publishing Agency. Semarang
- [11] Hasibuan, Malayu S.P. 2017. Human Resource Management. Revised Edition. Jakarta: Earth Literacy.
- [12] Kotler, and Keller. 2012. "Marketing Management". Edition 12. Jakarta : Erlangga
- [13] Keller, Kevin L. 2013. "Strategic Brand Management; Building, Measuring, and Managing Brand Equity". Fourth Edition Harlow, English : Pearson Education Inc.
- [14] Kotler, Philip and Armstrong, Gary, (2014), "Principles of Marketing", 12th Edition, Volume 1 Translated by Bob Sabran. Erlangga. Jakarta Mangkunegara, A. A, Anwar Prabu, 2011. Human Resource Management Company, Bandung: Youth
- [15] Rosdakarya. Nazir, Moh. 2013. "Research Methods". Indonesian Ghalia. Bogor
- [16] Sugiyono. 2012. "Business Research Methodology", Print 16.
- [17] Alfabeta. Bandung 2013. "Quantitative, Qualitative and R&D Research Methods". Alfabeta.CV. Bandung:

- [18] Suryana. 2013. "Entrepreneurship Tips and Process Towards Success. Jakarta: SALEMBA FOUR."
- [19] Siagian, Son. 2010. Human Resource Management. Jakarta: Earth Literacy
- [20] Rivai, Veithzal. 2011, Human Resource Management for Companies: from Theory to Practice, Jakarta Old,
- [21] Marihot EH. 2009. Human Resource Management. Grasindo Publisher. Jakarta

[HALAMAN INI SENGAJA DI KOSONGKAN]