

THE EFFECT OF WORK MOTIVATION AND WORK DISCIPLINE ON EMPLOYEE PERFORMANCE THROUGH JOB SATISFACTION MEDIATION (EMPIRICAL STUDY ON PUBLIC COMPANIES IN DRINKING WATER AREA (PERUMDAM) TJM SUKABUMI REGENCY)

Budiarkah^{a*)}, Widodo Sunaryo^{a)}, Nancy Yusnita^{a)}

^{a)}Universitas Pakuan, Bogor, Indonesia

^{*)}Corresponding Author: budiarkah17@gmail.com

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.33751/jssah.v3i1.7412>

Abstract.

Article history

received 02 January 2023
revised 23 January 2023
accepted 16 February 2023

The Influence of Work Motivation and Work Discipline on Employee Performance Through Mediation of Job Satisfaction (Empirical Study of Regional Water Supply Companies (Perumdram) Tjm, Sukabumi Regency). The purpose of this study was to determine the effect of work motivation and work discipline on employee performance through the mediation of job satisfaction. The study population was 161 employees of the executive division at the Regional Public Water Company (Perumdram) TJM Sukabumi Regency and a sample of 115 employees. Data collection for each variable studied using a questionnaire with a rating scale. Data analysis techniques using descriptive statistical analysis techniques and path analysis techniques (path analysis). The results showed: (a) There is a direct influence between work motivation on job satisfaction with a regression coefficient value of $\beta_{y.1} = 0.986$, work motivation contributes 97.21% to job satisfaction, (b) There is a direct effect between work discipline on job satisfaction with a regression coefficient value of $\beta_{y.1} = 0.335$. Work discipline contributes 11.22% to job satisfaction, (c). There is a direct influence between work motivation on employee performance with a regression coefficient value of $\beta_{z.1} = 0.329$. Work motivation contributes 10.82% to employee performance, (d). There is a direct effect between work discipline on employee performance with a regression coefficient value of $\beta_{z.2} = 0.804$. Work discipline contributes 64.64% to employee performance, (e). There is a direct effect of job satisfaction on employee performance with a regression coefficient of $\beta_{z.y} = 0.303$. Job satisfaction contributes 9.18% to employee performance, (f). There is an indirect effect between work motivation on employee performance through job satisfaction with a zcount value greater than z_{table} or $38.42 > 1.96$. So it can be concluded that job satisfaction mediates the influence of work motivation on employee performance, and (g). There is an indirect effect between work discipline on employee performance through job satisfaction with a zcount value greater than z_{table} or $15.02 > 1.96$. So it can be concluded that job satisfaction mediates the effect of work discipline on employee performance.

Keywords: work motivation; work discipline; job satisfaction; employee performance

I. INTRODUCTION

Human resources are the movers and determinants of the course of an organization or agencies. Because of the importance of the human element in carrying out a job, it is necessary to get the attention of the leadership [1]. Employees are an important factor in every organization both in achieving office or agency goals effectively and efficiently. An organization not only expects capable, competent and skilled employees, but most importantly they want to work hard and want to achieve maximum work results [2]. Employee abilities and skills mean nothing to agencies/organizations if they don't want to work hard. In order to want to work hard and enthusiastically achieve optimal results, in this case motivation is very important because the leader distributes work to his subordinates to do well and be integrated to the desired goals [3]. An

organization is required to be able to improve the quality of existing human resources. The quality of human resources is largely determined by the extent to which the existing system in the organization or company is able to support and satisfy the desires of both employees and from the organization or company [4]. Therefore, organizations and companies are required to have mutually supportive performance to achieve organizational goals and personal goals. Employees play a major role in running the wheel of company life [5]. If employees have high productivity and work motivation, the wheels will run fast and will ultimately result in good performance and achievement for the company. But on the contrary, if employees work unproductively and do not have high morale, are not tenacious at work and have low morale, it can reduce company performance [6]. Employees are a person or group of people who occupy a very important leading position in the operational processes of the

organization. In this regard, employees will spearhead the success of an organization, the problem is that there are many things that organizations need to pay attention to employees related to loyalty, dedication, totality, dedication and performance itself [7].

Humans have unique characteristics and differ from one another, so their performance will also be different. Differences in performance among human resources in organizations or agencies are the center of attention for motivators and training program providers [8]. Performance is basically the result of work in quality and quantity achieved by an employee in carrying out his duties according to the responsibilities given to him. In this case, employees can learn how much their performance is through information tools such as good comments from work partners. However, performance appraisal refers to a formal and structured system that measures, assesses and influences job-related traits and outcomes including absenteeism rates [9]. The focus of performance appraisal is to find out how productive an employee is and whether the employee can work together or be more effective in the future. So important is the issue of employee performance, that it is not wrong if the core of human resource management is how to manage human resource performance [10]. Managing people in an organizational context means managing people in order to produce optimal performance for the organization. Therefore the performance of these employees needs to be managed properly to achieve organizational goals, so that it becomes a concept of performance management[11]. The following is target data and customer realization in recent years:

Table 1. Target and Realization of Customer Service for Regional Public Water Company (Perumdram) TJM Sukabumi Regency

Year	Service Targets	Realization	Achievement Percentage
2017	8.000	7.208	90%
2018	9.000	7.645	85%
2019	10.000	8.366	84%

Based on Table 1, it shows that the target and realization of customer service always decreases. In 2017 the target of 8,000 was realized 7,208 with a percentage of 90.00%. In 2018 the target of 9,000 was realized 7,645 with a percentage of 85%. In 2019 the target of 10,000 was realized 8,366 with a percentage of 84%. In connection with these demands, there is a phenomenon of employee performance that is less than optimal, where the results of the recapitulation of employee performance assessments for 50 employees in the internal environment of the TJM Sukabumi Regency Public Water Supply Company (Perumdram). Regional Drinking Water Company (Perumdram) TJM Sukabumi Regency is one of the Sukabumi Regency Regional Owned Enterprises which is engaged in providing clean drinking water services to the community. Based on the results of the author's preliminary study of 30 employees at the TJM Sukabumi Regency Public Water Supply Company (Perumdram), it shows that there are employee performance problems, namely that employee performance

has not reached the target. Problems that occur in employees of the TJM Sukabumi Regency Public Drinking Water Company (Perumdram) are thought to be caused by work motivation and work discipline. Employee performance is one of the determining factors in the success of an organization/company such as the Regional Water Supply Company (Perumdram) TJM Sukabumi Regency. If the way employees work is good, then good employee performance is achieved, so it can be said that employee performance has an important role in the organization. Besides that, in an organization, high performance from employees is something that is highly expected, with high performance the organization can plan various policies. Another factor that causes employee performance problems is job satisfaction [12]. Job satisfaction is very important for employees because everyone who works expects satisfaction from their workplace. Basically job satisfaction is an individual thing because each individual has a different level of satisfaction according to the values that apply to each individual. The more aspects of work that are in accordance with individual wishes, the higher the level of satisfaction felt and will create good work results so that the expected performance will be achieved [13]. Based on the background described above and employee performance issues, the authors are interested in raising research with the title "The Influence of Work Motivation and Work Discipline on Employee Performance Through Mediation of Job Satisfaction (Empirical Study of the Regional Public Water Company (Perumdram) TJM Sukabumi Regency.)

Performance (Job Performance) is the result of work in quality and quantity from the achievement of duties and responsibilities of employees within an organization [14]. Dimensions Indicators: a. Work quality; how good or how complete is the work, b. Working quantity; how many units are produced per unit time, c. Effectiveness; related to the implementation of activities in a timely manner, d. Efficiency; The level of use of resources to achieve work results, e. Productivity, speed in completing work on time and the results are satisfactory.

Job satisfaction is the emotional response (feelings) of employees about the achievement of expectations from their work [15]. With indicators of job satisfaction: (a). the work itself: the freedom to realize abilities, creations, achievements, etc., (b). Salary: the amount of wages received and the level at which this can be seen, (c). opportunity to advance: opportunity to advance in the organization, (d). supervision: Supervisor's ability to show interest and concern about employees, and (e). colleagues: good and responsible relationship.

Work motivation is an encouragement that is formed from the existence of an individual's need to be enthusiastic, passionate and act in doing work to achieve certain goals [16]. The dimensions of work motivation are: a. Intrinsic Dimension, with indicators 1. Responsibility, 2. Progress, 3. Achievement, b. Extrinsic Dimension, with indicators 1. Company Policy and Administration, 2. Working Conditions, 2. Salaries and Wages (Wages and Salaries), 4. Interpersonal Relations, 5. Supervision Quality (Quality Supervisor)

Work discipline is the efforts and provisions made and systematically designed to prevent problems (violations) for employees with the aim of guaranteeing order and protecting the work safety of employees [17]. Based on the factors above, it can be concluded that. Dimensions of work discipline, namely: a. Dimensions of organizational regulations, with indicators: 1. Employee behavior, 2. Punishment, b. Dimensions of implementing and supervising regulations, with indicators: 1. Employee consistency, 2. Employee obligations, c. Dimensions of obedience/compliance of members of the organization, with indicators: 1. Employee rules, 2. Employee prohibitions.

II. RESEARCH METHODS

This research method is a descriptive research with a quantitative approach. In this study, the authors used a correlational quantitative approach to process data obtained from research locations, where quantitative data according to Cooper [18] is data in the form of numbers or qualitative data that is numbered. This study illustrates the influence of the independent variables in this case work motivation (X1) and work discipline (X2) through the intervening variable namely job satisfaction (Y) on the dependent variable of employee performance (Z).

In this study the data collection technique that will be carried out is through questionnaires, literature studies [19]. In measuring the direct and indirect effects of each independent variable on the dependent variable and finding the total effect on path analysis, an analysis is carried out using path analysis. Simultaneous Hypothesis Test. The two-party significance test was carried out by referring to the probability value compared to 0.05, with the decision-making criteria if the probability < 0.05 then accept Ha and if the probability > 0.05 then accept H0 and reject Ha. Sobel test. The Sobel test was carried out to find out whether the effect through a mediating variable is significantly capable of being a mediator in that effect. Criteria for decision making if $t_{count} > t_{table}$ then accept Ha reject H0 which means that the intervening variable mediates the effect of the independent variable on the dependent variable positively and significantly, whereas if $z_{count} < z_{table}$ reject Ha accept H0 which means the intervening variable does not mediate the effect of the independent variable on the dependent variable positively and significantly. Dimensional analysis is used to determine the effect between the dimensions of the independent variables, namely motivation and work discipline with the intervening variable, namely job satisfaction and to determine the independent variable, namely motivation and work discipline and the intervening variable, job satisfaction with the dependent variable, namely employee performance.

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The Direct Effect of Work Motivation on Job Satisfaction

After testing the requirements analysis through the normality test, homogeneity test, and linearity test. The

direct effect of work motivation on job satisfaction is the following results:

Table 2. Direct Effect of Motivation on Job Satisfaction

Model	Coefficients ^a			t	Sig.
	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
(Constant)	.380	2.487		.153	.879
1 Work Motivation	1.024	.016	.986	62.577	.000

a. Dependent Variable: Job Satisfaction

In accordance with the research hypothesis, the direct effect of work motivation on job satisfaction using simple regression analysis obtained a regression value of $ry.1 = 0.986$. This means that there is a direct influence between work motivation on job satisfaction. To test whether or not the direct influence that occurs between work motivation on job satisfaction is significant, the t test is used. based on the table above, a tcount value of 62.577 is obtained with a ttable value at the sig level = 0.05 with $n - 2$ or $115 - 2 = 113$. It can be concluded that the $t_{count} > t_{table}$ or $62.577 > 1.658$ or a sig value of $0.000 < 0.05$ means the influence direct relationship between work motivation and job satisfaction is significant. To find out the contribution of work motivation to job satisfaction, it is calculated based on the value of the coefficient of determination, namely $r^2 = (ry.1)^2 = (0.986)^2 \times 100\% = 97.21\%$. Means that the variable of work motivation contributes 97.21% to job satisfaction.

Direct Effect of Work Discipline on Job Satisfaction

The direct effect of work discipline on job satisfaction results as follows:

Table 3. Direct Effect of Work Discipline on Job Satisfaction

Model	Coefficients ^a			t	Sig.
	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
(Constant)	81.968	18.413		4.452	.000
1 Work Discipline	.461	.122	.335	3.781	.000

a. Dependent Variable: Job Satisfaction

In accordance with the research hypothesis, the direct effect of work discipline on job satisfaction using simple regression analysis obtained a regression value of $ry.2 = 0.335$. This means that there is a direct influence between work discipline on job satisfaction. To test whether or not the direct effect that occurs between work discipline on job satisfaction is significant, the t test is used. based on the table above, the t-count value is 3.781 with the t-table value at the sig level = 0.05 with $n - 2$ or $115 - 2 = 113$. It can be concluded that the $t_{count} > t_{table}$ or $3.781 > 1.658$ or a sig value of $0.000 < 0.05$ means that the direct effect of work discipline on job satisfaction is significant. To find out the contribution of work discipline to job satisfaction, it is calculated based on the value of the coefficient of determination, namely $r^2 = (ry.2)^2 = (0.335)^2 \times 100\% = 11.22\%$. Means that the work discipline variable contributes 11.22% to job satisfaction.

The direct effect of work motivation on employee performance

The direct effect of work motivation on employee performance is the following results:

Table 4. The Direct Effect of Motivation on Employee Performance

Model	Coefficients ^a			t	Sig.
	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
(Constant)	117.391	8.258		14.215	.000
1 work motivation	.196	.053	.329	3.701	.000

a. Dependent Variable: employee performance

In accordance with the research hypothesis, the direct effect of work motivation on employee performance using simple linear regression analysis obtained a regression value of $r_{z.1} = 0.329$. This means that there is a direct influence between work motivation on employee performance. To test whether or not the direct influence that occurs between work motivation on employee performance is significant, the t test is used. based on the table above, a tcount value of 3.701 is obtained with a ttable value at the sig level = 0.05 with $n - 2$ or $115 - 2 = 113$. It can be concluded that the $t_{count} > t_{table}$ or $3.701 > 1.658$ or a sig value of $0.000 < 0.05$ means the direct effect of work motivation on employee performance is significant. To find out the contribution of work motivation to employee performance, it is calculated based on the value of the coefficient of determination, namely $r^2 = (r_{y.1})^2 = (0.329)^2 \times 100\% = 10.82\%$. This means that the work motivation variable contributes 10.82% to employee performance.

Direct Effect of Work Discipline on Employee Performance

The direct effect of work discipline on employee performance results as follows:

Table 5. Direct Effect of Work Discipline on Employee Performance

Model	Coefficients ^a			t	Sig.
	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
(Constant)	44.696	7.199		6.208	.000
1 Work Discipline	.684	.048	.804	14.353	.000

a. Dependent Variable: Employee Performance

In accordance with the research hypothesis, the direct effect of work discipline on employee performance using simple linear regression analysis obtained a regression value of $r_{z.2} = 0.804$. This means that there is a direct influence between work discipline on employee performance. To test whether or not the direct influence that occurs between work discipline on employee performance is significant, the t test is used. based on the table above, a tcount value of 14.353 is obtained with a ttable value at the sig level = 0.05 with $n - 2$ or $115 - 2 = 113$. It can be concluded that the $t_{count} > t_{table}$ or $14.353 > 1.658$ or a sig value of $0.000 < 0.05$ means the

influence The direct relationship between work discipline and employee performance is significant. To find out the contribution of work discipline to employee performance, it is calculated based on the value of the coefficient of determination, namely $r^2 = (r_{z.2})^2 = (0.804)^2 \times 100\% = 64.64\%$. This means that the work discipline variable contributes 64.64% to employee performance.

Direct Effect of Job Satisfaction on Employee Performance

The direct effect of job satisfaction on employee performance is the following results:

Table 6. Direct Relationship between Job Satisfaction and Employee Performance

Model	Coefficients ^a			t	Sig.
	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardize d Coefficients		
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
(Constant)	119.402	8.430		14.164	.000
1 Job Satisfaction	.188	.055	.303	3.386	.001

a. Dependent Variable: Employee Performance

In accordance with the research hypothesis, the direct effect of job satisfaction on employee performance using simple regression analysis obtained a regression value of $r_{z.y} = 0.303$. This means that there is a direct influence between job satisfaction on employee performance. To test whether or not the direct influence that occurs between work discipline on employee performance is significant, the t test is used. based on the table above, a tcount value of 3.386 is obtained with a ttable value at the sig level = 0.05 with $n - 2$ or $115 - 2 = 113$. It can be concluded that the $t_{count} > t_{table}$ or $3.386 > 1.658$ or a sig value of $0.001 < 0.05$ means the influence direct relationship between job satisfaction on employee performance is significant. To find out the contribution of job satisfaction to employee performance, it is calculated based on the coefficient of determination, namely $r^2 = (r_{z.y})^2 = (0.303)^2 \times 100\% = 9.18\%$. It means that the variable of job satisfaction contributes 9.18% to employee performance.

Indirect Effect of Work Motivation on Employee Performance Through Mediation of Job Satisfaction

Table 7. Regression Coefficient of Independent Variable (Work Motivation) Against Mediating Variable (Job Satisfaction)

Model	Coefficients ^a			t	Sig.
	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
(Constant)	.380	2.487		.153	.879
1 Work Motivation	1.024	.016	.986	62.577	.000

a. Dependent Variable: Job Satisfaction

Table 8. Mediating Variable Regression Coefficient Output (Job Satisfaction) Against Dependent Variable (Employee Performance)

Model	Coefficients ^a			t	Sig.
	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
(Constant)	40.983	7.292		5.621	.000
1 Work Motivation	.797	.194	.882	4.100	.000
Work Discipline	.686	.047	.806	14.507	.000
Job Satisfaction	.798	.186	.340	4.290	.000

a. Dependent Variable: Employee Performance

The table above shows that the regression coefficient value of work motivation on job satisfaction is 1.024 and the standard error value is 0.016 and the sig. 0.000. Furthermore, for job satisfaction it shows a regression coefficient value of 0.798 with a standard error of 0.186 and a sig. 0.000. So that work motivation has a significant influence on employee performance through the mediation of job satisfaction. The calculation results show that the zcount value is 38.42 > 1.96, based on the comparison value zcount > ztable, it can be concluded that job satisfaction mediates the influence of work motivation on employee performance.

The Effect of Work Discipline on Employee Performance through Mediation of Job Satisfaction

Table 9. Output Regression of Independent Variable (Work Discipline) Against Mediation Variable (Job Satisfaction)

Model	Coefficients ^a			t	Sig.
	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
(Constant)	86.491	19.236		4.496	.000
1 Work Discipline	.458	.127	.320	3.596	.000

a. Dependent Variable: Job Satisfaction

Table 10. Mediating Variable Regression Coefficient Output (Job Satisfaction) Against Dependent Variable (Employee Performance)

Model	Coefficients ^a			t	Sig.
	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
(Constant)	40.983	7.292		5.621	.000
1 Work Motivation	.797	.194	.882	4.100	.000
Work Discipline	.686	.047	.806	14.507	.000
Job Satisfaction	.798	.186	.340	4.290	.000

a. Dependent Variable: Employee Performance

The table above shows that the regression coefficient value of work discipline on job satisfaction is 0.458 and the standard error value is 0.127 and the sig. 0.000. Furthermore, for job satisfaction it shows a regression coefficient value of 0.798 with a standard error of 0.186 and a sig. 0.000. So that the work discipline variable has a significant influence on

employee performance through the mediation of job satisfaction. Find the Z value from the results of the calculation it is known that the zcount value is 15.02 > 1.96, based on the comparison value zcount > ztable, it can be concluded that job satisfaction mediates the influence of work discipline on employee performance.

IV. CONCLUSION

This research has succeeded in finding ways and strategies to improve employee performance through identification of the strength of influence between research variables. Furthermore, this research has produced findings about research variable indicators that need to be repaired and maintained. In detail, the conclusions of this study are as follows: There is a direct influence between work motivation on job satisfaction. Thus strengthening work motivation can increase job satisfaction. There is a direct influence between work discipline on job satisfaction. Thus strengthening work discipline can increase job satisfaction. There is a direct influence between work motivation on employee performance. Thus strengthening work motivation can improve employee performance. There is a direct influence between work discipline on employee performance. Thus strengthening work discipline can improve employee performance. There is a direct influence between job satisfaction on employee performance. Thus strengthening job satisfaction can improve employee performance. There is an indirect effect between work motivation on employee performance through job satisfaction. Thus strengthening work motivation can improve employee performance through job satisfaction. Comparison of the value of the direct effect and the indirect effect obtained by calculating the indirect effect is greater than the direct effect, so it can be concluded that the job satisfaction variable functions effectively on employee performance as an intervening variable on the effect of work motivation on employee performance. This means that improving employee performance can be done together between work motivation and job satisfaction or can also be done separately. There is an indirect effect between work discipline on employee performance through job satisfaction. Thus strengthening work discipline can improve employee performance through job satisfaction. Comparison of the value of the direct effect and the indirect effect obtained by calculating the indirect effect is greater than the direct effect, so it can be concluded that the job satisfaction variable functions effectively on employee performance as an intervening variable on the effect of work discipline on employee performance. This means an increase in employee performance can be done together between work discipline and job satisfaction or can also be done separately.

REFERENSI

[1] Ahmad Yani, Billy Tunas, dan M. Entang. "Transformational Leadership, Organizational Climate and Work Motivation in Boosting Teachers' Performance". *International Journal of Managerial*

- Studies and Research (IJMSR)*, Volume 5 (6), pp 43-50. 2017.
- [2] Dessler, Gary. “*Human Resource Management*”. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall. 2008.
- [3] Daft, Richard L. “*New Era of Management*”. 9th Edition: Cengage Higher Education. 2010.
- [4] Colquitt Jason A, Jeffery A. Lepine, and Michael J. Wesson. “*Organizational Behavior Improving Performance and Commitment in the Workplace*”, New York: McGraw-Hill Irwin. 2009.
- [5] Gibson J. L, J. M. Ivancevich, J. H. Donnelly, Jr., and R. Konopaske. “*Organizations: Behavior Structure and Processes. Organization: Behavior, Structure and Processes*”. Fourteenth Edition, New York: McGraw-Hill. 2006.
- [6] Fred, Luthans. “*Organizational Behavior, An Evidence-Based Approach*”. New York: McGraw-Hill. 2011
- [7] Greenberg Jerald and Robert A. Baron. “*Behavior in Organizations*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall. 2008.
- [8] Gibson J. L, J. M. Ivancevich, J. H. Donnelly, Jr., and R. Konopaske. “*Organizations: Behavior Structure and Processes*”. New York: McGraw-Hill/Irwin. 2012.
- [9] Robbins Stephen P. “*Organizational Behavior*”. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall, p. 53. 2003.
- [10] Robbins Stephen P. and Mary Coulter. “*Management 11th edition*”. New Jersey: Pearson, p. 492. 2012.
- [11] Suparyadi. “*Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia*. Yogyakarta: CV Andi Offset. 2015.
- [12] Ivancevich J.M. “*Human Resource Management*”. New York: McGraw-Hill. 2010.
- [13] Jerald Greenberg, Robert A. Baron. “*Behavior in Organization*. Ninth Edition. Pearson International Edition. New York: McGraw-Hill. 2008
- [14] Mangkunegara Anwar Prabu. “*Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia Perusahaan*”. Bandung: PT Refika Aditama. 2011.
- [15] Nelson Debra L dan James Campbell Quick. “*Organization Behavior, Pfoundations, Realities, & Challenges*” 5 Th Edition, America: Thomson South Western. 2006.
- [1] Y. Suchyadi and Nurjanah, “Relationship between Principal Supervision in Increasing the Job Satisfaction of Private Junior High School Teachers in East Bogor District,” *JHSS (Journal Humanit. Soc. Stud.*, vol. 02, no. 01, pp. 26–29, 2018, doi: <https://doi.org/10.33751/jhss.v2i1.818>.
- [17] Ilham Thaief, Aris Baharuddin, Priyono dan Mohamad Syafi’i Idrus. “Effect of Training, Compensation and Work Discipline against Employee Job Performance”. *International Journal of Managerial Studies and Research (IJMSR)*, Volume 5 (6), pp. 43-50. 2015.
- [18] Cooper, D. R., & Schidler, P. S. “*Metode Penelitian Bisnis*”, Edisi 12 Buku 1. Jakarta: Salemba Empat. 2019
- [19] Creswell, J. W., & Clark, V. L. P. “*Mendesain dan Melaksanakan Mixed Methods Research*”. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar. 2018.
- [20] Sugiyono. “*Metode Penelitian Bisnis*. Edisi tiga. Bandung: Alfabeta. 2017.