

The Influence of Work Environment on Job Satisfaction toward Professional Performance and Non-professional Performance

Pribadi Widyatmojo and Winarno
Universitas Pembangunan Nasional Veteran Yogyakarta

Keyword: Work Environment, Job Satisfaction, Individual Professional Performance

Abstract: This research aims to figure out the influence of the work environment variable on the influence of job satisfaction variable toward individual professional performance variables in comparison with non-professional performance. Theoretically, the work environment is one of the job satisfaction variable antecedents, but it is possible that the work environment serves as a moderator variable of job satisfaction and the individual performance variable relationship. This research use doctors and nurses as research respondents. The analysis result discussed

1 INTRODUCTION

Innovation is bringing business advancement. Advancement is a viable method to react to the disturbance business atmosphere since the development is fit for proposing a better approach to experience a new risk of the choppiness business atmosphere (Widyatmojo P, 2009). In this way, the organization needs to construct its management to be a management that equipped for upholding advancement improvement. Sadly, this innovation improvement is not simple management practice, because innovation is intellectual and brain science perspectives came about of organization member fulfillment as an individual, who works in the organization (Burgenon, 1998; Tiwana, 1999).

In the previous industrialization time, the board perspective spotlights on looking for profitability extension technique. The logical management hypothesis proposed by Frederic Taylor has upgraded significant commitment toward efficiency improvement through optimization organization member's exhibition in the working place. This organization member's exhibition optimization in management science is come about because of work specialization. This specialization thought originates from a moderate movement study. The moderate movement study upgraded the board partitions a vocation into a few words, that expansion the profitability. They divided work called work specialization; consequently, every organization

member is capable of his or her very own work by any stretch of the imagination.

Typically, scientific management hypothesis stresses performance through work specialization to expand organization goal or benefit, since there are numerous researches to upgrade organization performance. Organization member's performance optimization practice by the work specialization is delivering organization member's weariness, boredom, and weights in the working place, because the tedium work specialization stresses each organization member's work amount and fills in as though a machine or as an instrument of production.

The practice of organization member's exhibition optimization through the work specialization is delivering organization member's weariness, boredom, and weights in the workplace because the repetitiveness work specialization accentuates each organization member's work amount and fills in as though a machine or as an instrument of product generation.

This organization member's boredom in the workplace debilitates profitability, lessens the organization member's soul to complete his or her work, innovativeness debilitating, and confines the organization member's pride to finish his or her work well. Accordingly, this organization member's performance optimization practice through specialization is not adequate for innovativeness improvement, advancement, and high innovation businesses, let alone organization faces choppiness business atmosphere.

Since Chester Barnard school of perspective, the management hypothesis is considering psychological viewpoints into management discretion, in light of new worldview that satisfied organization member performs superior to unsatisfied one. Consequently, management thoughts take into account workplace environment. This new management worldview is a fortuitous event with the Hawthorne effect found by Elton Mayo's research. Although the environment of the workplace has not evident direct impact on the individual performance, this environment of the workplace contributes roundabout impact toward individual performance achievement.

In reality, job satisfaction antecedents are including variables that produce job satisfaction, for example, wage and incentive payment, teamwork cooperation and cohesiveness, great shot of advancement, opportunity reasonableness, significant authority, excellent performance appraisal on the workplace (Luthans, 1995). The environment in the workplace puts asides from the management thought since it does not have a direct impact on job satisfaction and individual performance. There is an uncertainty of the work environment that influence the association between job satisfaction toward performance. This misty impact it ought to be affirmed or demonstrated. Consequently, this research is genuinely expected to answer the uncertainty above.

2 LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Performance

The earliest management consideration focuses on the performance of an organization because this scientific management is developed from economics attention, primarily based on microeconomic theory, which focuses on production efficiency aggregate or comprehensive nationally. The microeconomics theory attention focuses on production efficiency, which is indicated by an equation that the marginal cost of production should have to be the same with marginal revenue. Consequently, the scientific management theory pays attention to production efficiency, either, that indicated by its performance. An organization has to pay attention to production efficiency. At the same time, the organization has to pay attention to performance development either, to attain the organization's production efficiency in turbulence economics. This production efficiency is indicated by the ratio of input needed in the

production divided by the output of production. This input-output ratio shows resources use capability to produce an amount of output. The higher the ratio, the more production efficiency. The ratio of production efficiency is indicating the organization's production efficiency at all, but it is not capable of indicating how the organization's production efficiency should be attained. Thereby, there is a difference in attention between scientific management and macroeconomics.

The difference between microeconomics and scientific management is located on their attention. The management science pays attention not only to the production efficiency of an organization but also on the way to accomplish the production efficiency at all. Thereby, the management science attention not only focuses on production efficiency but also on the way to attain the production efficiency. An organization consists of human resources or members of the organization, financial resources, capital, natural resources, and technology. The organizations have various techniques to produce the same output, thereby the organization focus on how to accomplish the production efficiency.

Organization production efficiency consists of all its member efficiency. Every organization member contributes the organization's production efficiency according to his or her specialization, and thereby every organization member supports the entire organization's performance. Logically, the performance improvement endeavor ought to need to take into account every member organization's performance improvement, to improve the whole organization performance. In this way, the higher member organization performance contribution to the organization the higher organization performance thoroughly. In other words, the organization's performance determines the entire organization's performance.

2.2 Professional Individual Performance

Every organization has professional members and non-professional members to conduct organization activities. The classification of professional and non-professional members is concurring with the supply chain concept of the production process in the organization. Doctors, for examples, are professional members in the hospital.

A professional member of an organization is a member of an organization who accomplishes his or her works professionally in the organization. This professional has professional responsible for his or

her work. Most professional has an amount of dominant contribution toward the organization performance accomplishment, because of his or her professional capabilities. On the other hand, a non-professional member of an organization is a member responsible for his or her work received from the organization. Every organization has a professional member and non-professional members.

The supply chain concept clarifies that production supply chains in the organization comprise of primary activities and supporting activities to create the organization's services or products. The primary activities consist of the leading job to create organization services or products. These primary or main jobs are an essential process of production in the organization; if these primary or main jobs are disturbed, the services or product creation stopped. These primary or mains activities have to be operated and controlled by professionals. For example, pilots responsible for their flights. The pilots are creating flight services offered by the air flight company. It means the professional organization member plays a vital role in creating the organization's services or products.

On the other hand, the supporting activities consist of supporting a job that eases the organization's production process. These supporting activities do not create any service or product, but these supporting activities ease the primary activities of creating services or products. Even though these organization supporting activities do not create any organization services or products, these activities enhance the primary activities grows continually — for example, accountants who work in the flight company.

The professional member has to be a specific professional performance appraisal because of his or her contribution to professional capabilities. Professional member performance has to be evaluated based on his or her professional responsibilities in the workplace. The performance appraisal implementation has to be done fairly. Thereby, non-professional performance assessment has to be based on his or her responsibilities, either. Following the performance evaluation base, this professional performance needs to be assessed based on professional performance responsibilities (AzisImrana, et al, 2015). Consequently, this professional performance is indicated by the organization member's professional responsibilities, such as; received workload, work authority, work accomplishment, and work targeted.

2.3 Job Satisfaction

Management practice appreciates business climate changes resulted from the economics turbulence because the economics turbulence makes organization failure. Management practice to improve the organization's competitiveness in the changing business climate is improving organization efficiency through performance improvement practice. Performance improvement management practice in the organization that emphasizes on quantity at all produce organization member stress, because of monotony or repetitiveness work.

This monotony work is a harmful abundance of specialization techniques to improve organization productivity. This specialization way of productivity improvement is capable of easing the manager to count every organization member' monotony work (Azis et al., 2015). Thereby, this specialization technique emphasizes each organization member's productivity improvement. However, it results in organization member boredom.

Theoretically, this monotony work technique ables to improve the organization's productivity through organization member productivity improvement individually, which enhances organizational performance improvement in the short run, but this monotony work technique results in diminishing job satisfaction. Due to the diminishing job satisfaction, the manager should have to be cautious in leading the process of dividing the organization's work to prevent diminishing job satisfaction. Diminishing job satisfaction influences the working spirit negatively in the workplace.

As mentioned above, earlier scientific management does not take into account job satisfaction. Job satisfaction is a psychological aspect of a human being in the workplace. Consequently, job satisfaction demonstrates the extent to which the organization member feels happy to accomplish his or her job. The happiness of job accomplishment increases organization member's readiness to work.

Job satisfaction is an organization member's evaluation or reviews toward his or her actual workload following his or her job accomplishment to the organization. This evaluation results in positive or negative feels; thereby, this job satisfaction is an aspect of human attitude toward work (Azis et al., 2015).

Job satisfaction is an organization member's review toward his or her workload psychologically to complete his or her job in the workplace. This

organization member's review process is the organization member's psychological process of comparing his or her actual workload with his or her expectations of the workload. Job satisfaction seems to be related to organization member's happiness toward his or her job in his or her workplace (Theo JM, 2004; Rane D B, 2011; MbogoGerishon, 2015; Embuldeniya, 2017).

Sometimes, organization management needs to enrich the professional organization member's job to prevent the professional organization member from boredom in the workplace. This decision to enrich the organization member's job is called job enrichment. This job enrichment decision is a management practice of doing the job to be more motivational and satisfying to the organization member through enriching job variety, responsibility and decision-making contribution (Pelled, and Hill, 1997) because job enrichment is challenging and satisfying to the organization member.

Mentioned earlier that job satisfaction is the psychological aspect of an organization member that indicates the extent to which the organization feels happy to complete his or her job. This happy organization member tends to repeat finishing his or her job well again, to get happy again. Thereby, the satisfied human being has higher readiness to work well than the unsatisfied one. This organization member's job satisfaction is a psychological aspect of accomplishing the job in the workplace that produces desires, preparedness, or willingness to work hard (Pelled and Hill, 1997; Rane D B, 2011).

Due to the job satisfaction is preparedness to work hard, that indicates the organization member's pleasure to accomplish his or her job in the workplace, the assessment of this job satisfaction has to be based on the organization member's pleasure to accomplish his or her job in the workplace (Theo JM, 2004; MbogoGerishon, 2015). Thereby, this job satisfaction is indicated by an organization member's preparedness, desires, behavior to accomplish his or her job in the workplace.

2.4 Performance and Job Satisfaction Relationship

The first conclusion is that the organization member's psychological aspect of his or her job produces job satisfaction enlargement. Thereby, job satisfaction variable proxy is according to the extent to which organization member's satisfaction in the workplace.

The higher member's job satisfied in the workplace, the more member's outcome dedicated, the more efficient, the more committed to work hard, to get work happiness again (Azis, et al., 2015). The second conclusion is that the more satisfied a job, the happier toward a job, the higher the performance of his or her job. Thereby, the first hypothesis is formulated as follows.

Hypothesis 1: The higher job satisfaction, the higher the professional performance.

Even though a non-professional organization member does not create any organization services or product offered in the market, the non-professional organization member serves primary organization activities, in creating the organization services or products go well. Thereby, the non-professional organization member performance appraisal should be conducted fairly to support the organization's main activities (Theo JM, 2004). If the non-professional member gets comfortable in the workplace, so that his or her job satisfaction in the workplace increases, results in his or her working spirits grows up and influences his or her performance. Thereby, the second hypothesis is formulated as follows.

Hypothesis 2: The higher the job satisfaction, the higher the non-professional performance.

2.5 Work Environment

Work environment some times called by the job environment because work circumstances build up the job environment. The work environment is workplace circumstances that an organization member accomplish his or her job in the workplace. There is an insight that this work environment does not have any influence on the organization work accomplishment so that the organization manager puts this work environment aside. Let alone this insight is supported by empirical data; for an instant, many organizations conduct e-learning, e-training, and re-working program successfully for their organization members.

Theoretically, this work environment is not an antecedent of the organization's production process. Consequently, this work environment does not determine the organization's production process. This insight of the work environment is not obviously against the wright theory. Although this work environment does not influence the performance directly, this work environment enhances the organization member to accomplish his or her work, comfortable (Albaqami, 2015; Azis et al., 2015; MbogoGerishon, 2015). Thereby, the work

environment does not create any organization services or products, but this work environment is capable of enhancing the primary organization activities grows well.

The conclusion is that the work environment refers to the workplace circumstance; thereby, this work environment proxy has to be related to the workplace environment where the organization member completes his or her job.

2.6 Work Environment, Performance and Job Satisfaction Relationship

Mentioned above, that work environment is workplace circumstances; thereby this work environment is not an antecedent of performance. This work environment does not have a direct impact on the organization production process, but this work environment enhances the productivity improvement process (Jain and Kaur, 2014).

This work environment consists of workplace circumstances that do not influence organizational performance directly, but this work environment is capable of enhancing the continuity of the organization's production process (Albaqami, 2015; Duru and Shimawua, 2017). In case an organization does not pay any attention to its work environment, resulting in a bad work environment, this bad work environment probably enhances organization production process continuity grows down (Donald Ian, et al. (2005).

The effect of work specialization is that an organization member job consists of an amount of job-related works. Consequently, the work environment called the job environment. The work environment is unique, and it does not have a direct effect on job performance, because every job has its antecedent of job success in accordance to the specialization work (Theo JM, 2004; Duru and Shimawua, 2017). Thereby, this work environment serves as a moderator variable of the organization's production process, which means this work environment was sometimes supporting or reducing the organization's production process (Albaqami, 2015; MbogoGerishon, 2015).

The conclusion is that the higher the work environment, the higher the causal relationship between job satisfaction and professional performance. On the other hand, the lower the work environment, the lower the causal relationship between job satisfaction and professional performance. Therefore, the third hypothesis formulated as follows.

Hypothesis 3: The work environment moderates the causal relationship between job satisfaction and professional performance.

An organization needs non-professional members to facilitate the primary organization activities of creating the organization's services or products. Hence the organization's performance improved thoroughly (Jain and Kaur, 2014). Non-professional organization member does not create any organization services or product offered in the market but serves primary organization activities of creating the organization services or products. Non-professional member comfort in the workplace increases his or her job satisfaction and his or her working spirit and improves his or her support toward the organization's primary activities. Hence organization performance grows up. Thereby, a non-professional organization member's work environment serves as an organization's primary activities support (Donald Ian et al., 2005; Owusu, 2014). This discussion implies, the work environment improvement of non-professional organization member influences the primary organization activities, enhance organization performance improvement positively (Albaqami, 2015; MbogoGerishon, 2015; Duru and Shimawua, 2017). Thereby, the higher the work environment, the higher the non-professional comfortability in the workplace, the higher the organization's performance.

The conclusion is that the higher the work environment, the higher the causal relationship between job satisfaction and professional performance. On the other hand the lower the work environment, the lower the causal relationship between job satisfaction and professional performance. Thereby, the fourth hypothesis is formulated as follows.

Hypothesis 4: The work environment moderates, the causal relationship between job satisfaction and professional performance.

3 RESEARCH METHODS

This research collects data through distributed questionnaires to doctors and nurses working in the hospitals surround Yogyakarta. Doctors and nurses are so very busy that this research has only 36 doctors and 62 nurses respondents. Mentioned above, this research aim is to figure out the effect of the work environment on the causal relationship between job satisfaction and individual professional performance in comparison with non-professional

individual performance. Following the research aim, the analysis technique of this research is the regression analysis technique. The regression technique is conducted by ordinary least square with the stepwise method. The ordinary least square is a technique of identifying the causal relationship among variables through the minimum square variance of the variables (Gujarati, 2003). This research examines the professional data, then examines the non-professional data group.

4 RESULTS ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

The summaries of the analysis result shown in the following tables. The first step regression is analyzing the influence of job satisfaction toward professional performance, and the second step regression is analyzing the job satisfaction and work environment toward professional performance variables. Following the research aim, the first analysis is analyzing professional performance data, that consists of doctors' performance.

Table 1: Model Summary

Model	R		R sq	Adj R sq	Std Error of Estim	Change			F Sig Change
	Doct-Nurse Selected	Doct-Nurse unselected				R sq change	Df1	Df2	
1	0,712 a		,508	0,493	0,1921	0,507	1	34	0,00
2	0,807 b	0,291	,652	0,631	0,1679	0,114	1	35	0,01

The summary of the first analysis above shows that job satisfaction and work environment variables are significant predictors toward professional performance variables. The table above shows that the professional performance prediction model has the goodness of fit. The goodness of fit of the model is indicated by the increases of correlation coefficient from 0,712 to 0,807 along with the stepwise analysis method, with a significance F test. Even though the F test decreases, the F significance remain s below 0.05. It is indicating that the prediction model is good.

The table 2 below is reporting the significance of the work environment as a moderating variable toward the influence of job satisfaction toward professional performance. This analysis process is conducting by the stepwise regression technique. The stepwise regression is analyzing the influence significance of job satisfaction and work environment variables toward professional performance variables. The analysis of variance summary shows the model's significance as follows.

Table 2: Anova

Model		Sum of Square	Df	Mean Square	F test	Sign
1	Regression	1,292	1	1,292	35,026	0,000*
	Residual	1,255	34	0,037		
	Total	2,547	35			
2	Regresion	1,660	2	0,830	30,895	0,000*
	Residual	0,887	33	0,027		
	Total	2,547	35			

The result of the analysis above shows that first step of the analysis which predicts professional performance variable by job satisfaction variable only, and the second step of the analysis which predicts professional performance variable by job satisfaction variable and work environment variable. The second step of analysis shows the predictors' variables are predicting the professional

performance better than the first step of the analysis. The significant F test supports the second step of the analysis. This means that job satisfaction variables and work environment variables are predictors of the professional performance variable.

The analysis also analyzes the extent to which the professional performance model breaks the traditional assumption, such as autocorrelation, etc.

Table 3 below shows that the Durbin Watson is 1,629, located between 1,6 and 2,4. This means the equation of the professional performance model does not break the autocorrelation assumption. The result table printed as follows.

Table 3: Durbin Watson

Model	Durbin watson Statistics	
	Doctor-Nurse = 0 (selected)	Doctor-Nurse = 2 (unselected)
1	-	-
2	1,629	0,654

The fourth analysis is analyzing the significant influence of each predictor of professional performance. This analysis is examining the influence significance of job satisfaction and work environment toward professional performance. The analysis of variance summary shows the model significance in table 4.

Table 4 below shows that the professional performance model is significant. The significance is indicated by job satisfaction and work environment variables t-test are less than 0,05, that, implies the two predictors of professional performance variables are significant, as following table 4.

Table 4: Analysis of Variance

Model		Unstandardized		Standardized		Sign	Lower	Upper
		B	Std err	Beta	T			
1	Constant	1,778	,396		4,512	,000	,983	2,594
	rt satisf	,576	,097	,712	5,918	,000	,378	,774
2	Constant	,866	,420		2,060	,047	,011	1,721
	rt satisf	,465	,088	,575	5,266	,000	,285	,644
	rt envir	,327	,088	,404	3,700	,001	,147	,507

This analysis result also implies that the work environment variable is a predictor of professional performance, neither a moderator nor a mediator

variable onto the influence of job satisfaction variable toward professional performance.

Table 5: Analysis of Coefficients significance continued

Model		Correlations			Colinear Statistic	
		Zero order	Partial	Part	Tolerance	VIF
1	Constant	-	-	-	-	-
	rt satisf	,712	,712	,712	1	1
2	Constant	-	-	-	-	-
	rt satisf	,712	,676	,541	,885	1,131
	rt envir	,599	,541	,380	,885	1,131

The fourth analysis result that consists of table 4 and table 5 show that the professional performance model does not against the classic assumption. To summaries, the analysis indicates that empirical data support hypothesis 1, but empirical data do not support hypothesis 2. The conclusion is that job satisfaction and work environment variables are significant predictors of professional performance variables, but the work environment variable is neither a moderating nor mediating variable toward professional performance variables.

Non-professional performance data analysis

The following analysis examines the influence of job satisfaction and works environment toward non-professional performance variables. As mentioned above, the first step regression is analyzing the influence of job satisfaction toward non-professional performance only. The second step regression is analyzing the job satisfaction and work environment toward non-professional performance variables. The table of analysis results printed as the following tables.

Table 6: Model Summary of the non-professional model 1

R		R sq	Adj R sq	Std Error of Estim	Change			F Sig Change
Doct-Nurse Selected	Doct-Nurse unselected				R sq change	Df1	Df2	
0,223	0,712	0,053	0,042	0,2194	0,053	1	86	4,91

The analysis of variance summary shows the non-professional performance model is significant as follows.

Table 7: Anova

Model		Sum of Square	Df	Mean Square	F test	Sign
1	Regression	0,231	1	0,231	4,91	0,03 a
	Residual	4,139	86	0,048		
	Total	4,370	87			

The analysis result table above shows that job satisfaction defines non-performance professional significantly. The goodness of the model is indicated by the F significance of 0,03. This analysis does not explain the work environment variable in the model, thus the work environment does not determine the non-professional performance.

The following analysis examines the extent to which the non-professional performance model breaks the classic assumption, especially toward

autocorrelation. The result table shows that the equation of statistic prediction of non-professional performance is autocorrelation because Durbin Watson ratio is 0,674 far below 2 as the following table.

Table 8: Durbin Watson

Model	Durbin watson Statistics	
	Doctor-Nurse = 2 (selected)	Doctor-Nurse = 0 (unselected)
1	0,674	0,627

The autocorrelation above probably is caused by the little number of research data. Thereby, if this research has enough number of data, the autocorrelation can be solved.

The analysis of variance summary shows each predictors significance in the model. Following the t-test, job satisfaction is significant predictor toward non-professional variable, but the work environment is not significant. The predictor significance is printed in the following table.

Table 9: Analysis of Coefficients significance

Model		Unstandardized		Standardized		Sign	Lower	Uper
		B	Std err	Beta	t			
1	Constant	3,150	,440		7,157	0,00	2,271	4,025
	rt satisf	0,223	,102	0,230	2,103	0,031	0,021	0,025

Table 10: Analysis of Coefficients significance continued

Model		Correlations			Colinear Statistic	
		Zero order	Partial	Part	Tolerance	VIF
1	Constant	-	-	-	-	-
	rt satisf	0,230	0,230	0,230	1	1

Table 9 and Table 10 above show that the model of non-professional performance does not contain multicollinearity, it means the model does not against the classic assumption. The second analysis indicates that the hypothesis is 3 supported by empirical data, but hypothesis 4 is not supported by empirical data. The conclusion is that job satisfaction is significant predictors of non-professional performance variable, but the work environment is not a predictor of non-professional performance. This research shows the work

environment variable is not a moderating nor mediating variable.

5 DISCUSSION

To sum up, the supported hypothesizes of this research are hypothesis 1 and hypothesis 2. Job satisfaction variable is significant, but the work environment variable is not significant. This research gives clue that works environment is not

moderating nor mediating variable of the professional performance model. This research gives clue that variable job satisfaction predictors of non-professional performance, but this research does not explain the work environment toward the non-professional model.

6 CONCLUSION

Though this research fails to explain the role of the work environment as a moderating variable, the analysis result of this research indicates that the work environment is a significant predictor of professional performance in the organization. It means that variable job satisfaction and work environment predictors of professional performance. Job satisfaction and work environment improvement capable of improving the organization professional performance comprehensively.

This research aim does not accomplish fully, since only hypothesis 1 that variable job satisfaction is a predictor of professional performance, is supported. It concludes that variable job satisfaction and work environment are significant predictors of professional performance. Though this research indicates that job satisfaction is a predictor of non-professional performance, the work environment is not a predictor of non-professional performance.

Since this research is talking about organization member's perception of his or her job in the workplace, thereby in the future readers need research that explores individual work environment in the workplace.

REFERENCES

- Albaqami Talal (2015) "Working Environment and Productivity", *International Journal of Scientific & Engineering Research*, Vol. 6, Issues 12, December.
- Azis Imrana, et al (2015), "Working environment and Job Satisfaction among Health Professional Working at A Tertiary Care Hospital of Pakistan", *J Ayubmed*, 27 (1), Abbottabad
- Bergenson Bryan (1999), *Essential Knowledge Management*, John Wiley and Sons,
- Bockerman Patri and Ilmakunnas Pekka (2012) "The Job Satisfaction Productivity Nexus: A Study Using Matched Survey and Register Data", *Industrial and Labour Relation Review*, vol 65, no: 2.
- Donald Ian, et al (2005), "Working environment, Stress, and Productivity: An Examination Using Asset", *International Journal of Stress Management*, vol 12, No. 4, pp 409-422.
- Duru Chika Ebenezer and Shimawua Dominic (2017), "The Effect of Work Environment on Employee Productivity: A Case Study of Edo City Transport Services Benin City, Edo State Nigeria", *European Journal of Business and Innovation Research*, Vol. 5, No. 5, pp 23-39, October.
- Embuldeniya Apekhsa (2017), "The Impact of Employee Job Satisfaction on Employee Productivity in Apparel Industry of Sri Langka", *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR)*, vol. 31, issues 12, December.
- Fahzani A, (2019) "Job Satisfaction", unpublished report.
- Hair J. (1995) *Multivariate Data Analysis with Readings*, Prentice Hall, Engelwood Cliffs, NJ.
- Gujarati Damodar N (2003) *Basic Econometrics*, United State Military Academy, 4th edition, Mc Graw Hill, New York.
- Jain Ruchi and Kaur Surinder (2014), "Impaact of work environment on Job satisfaction", *International Journal of Scientific and Research Publication*, Vol. 4, Issue 1, January.
- Luthans F (1995), *Organizational Behavior*, 7 (1) McGraw Hill.
- Mbogo Gerishon (2015) "The Influence of Work Environment on Job Satisfaction among Teachers in Public Primary Schools Programmes in Membuke Division, Embu West District Kenya", Master of Art and Planning Management Thesis, University of Nairobi.
- Owusu Benjamin (2014), "An Assesment of Job Satisfaction and Its Effect on Employees Performance : A Case of Mining Company in the Bibliani Ahnwiaso Bekwai District", Managerial science Dissertation of Kwame Nkrumah, University of Science and Technology.
- Pelled. Lisa Hope., and Hill. Kenneth. D., (1997) "Participative Management in Northern Mexico; a study of maquiladoras", *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, Vol. 8, No.3, April.
- Widyatmojo P (2009) " Dampak Perilaku Atasan, Komitmen Organisasional, Melalui Perubahan Strategi terhadap Kinerja Instansidal am Tim Manajemen, Studi Empirik Pengelolaan Dokter Rumah Sakit di Daerah Istimewa dan Jawa Tengah", Dissertation, Universitas Diponegoro, Semarang.
- Rane D B (2011), "Employee Job Satisfaction: An essence of Organization", *HRM Review*, vol 11, no. 7.
- Robbins Steven Paul (1993) *Organizational Behavior*, 6 th edition, Prentice Hall International.
- Theo JM vand der Voort (2004), "Productivity and Employee Satisfaction in Flexible Workplaces", *Journal of Corporate Real Estate*, Vol 6, No. 2, pp 133-148, Herry Stuart Publication, April,
- Tiwana Amrit (1999), *The Knowledge Management Toolkit*, 1st edition, Prentice Hall PTR, December.
- Zikmund. William C., (1994) *Business Research Methods*, International Edition, Forth edition, Harcourt Brace College Publishers, The Dryden Press, Philadelphia.