

J. Management & Education Human Development

ISSN: ISSN: 2775 - 7765 web link: http://www.ijmehd.com



# The Effect of Human Resource Development, Work Discipline and Work Climate on Employee Performance in Motui District, North Konawe Regency

Neliwati, Bakhtiar Abbas, Mahmuddin A. Sabilalo

Master of Management Study Program, Sekolah Tinggi Ilmu Ekonomi Enam Enam Kendari, Indonesia

Representative e-Mail: asripputera@gmail.com

# 

This study aims to find out and analyze (1) The influence of human resource development on employee performance in Motui District, North Konawe Regency; (2) The effect of work discipline on employee performance in Motui District, North Konawe Regency; and (3) The effect of work climate on employee performance in Motui District, North Konawe Regency. The determination of the number of samples in this study is by using the census method, namely the number of samples taken from the entire population of 49 employees. The data analysis technique in this study uses Partial Least Square (PLS). Based on the results of the study, it can be concluded that (1) Human resource development has a positive and significant effect on employee performance in Motui District, North Konawe Regency; (2) Work discipline has a positive and significant effect on employee performance in Motui District, North Konawe Regency; and (3) Work climate has a positive and significant effect on employee performance in Motui District, North Konawe Regency.

Keywords: Employee Performance, Human Resource Development, Work Discipline, Work Climate,

# I. INTRODUCTION

Civil servants as elements of the state apparatus are tasked with providing services to the community in a professional, honest, fair, and equitable manner in the implementation of state duties, government, and development. Civil Servants are the most important pillars in the implementation of government and development tasks, in addition to the institutional (organizational) and administrative (mechanism/procedure) pillars. In other words, Civil Servants or bureaucrats are actually a buffer for the running of a government. If Civil Servants are able to provide good service, then the government will run well

According to Mangkunegara (2002) in Pasolong (2010), performance is the result of work in terms of quality and quantity achieved by a person in carrying out his function in accordance with the responsibilities given to him. Employee performance assessment is explained in the Regulation of the Head of the State Civil Service Agency Number 1 of 2013 concerning Provisions for the Implementation of Government Regulation Number 46 of 2011 concerning the Assessment of Work Performance of Civil Servants. Furthermore, Government Regulation of the Republic of Indonesia Number 30 of 2019 concerning Civil Servant Performance Assessment. The indicators in this study are quality, quantity, time, cost, service orientation, commitment, work initiative, cooperation and leadership.

Employee performance is influenced by human resource development, work discipline and work climate. According to Kaswan (2012:97) stated "Development is building, expanding, transforming and adapting, with existing knowledge, understanding and skills". According to Chris Rowley and Keith Jackson (2012:88) human resource development is a process carried out to develop workers' knowledge, skills, and abilities, as well as competencies developed through training and development, organizational learning, leadership management, and knowledge management for the benefit of performance improvement. According to Siregar, (2009) human resource development can be measured through indicators, namely education and training, non-training activities, learning and promotion tasks.

Agustini (2019:81) "work discipline is also the willingness and obedience to behave in accordance with the regulations in the agency concerned". Rivai in Rizki and Suprajang (2017) "work discipline has several components such as attendance, obedience to work regulations, obedience to work standards, high level of vigilance, and ethical work". According to Rivai in Alfiah (2019) there are five indicators of work discipline, namely attendance, obedience to work regulations, obedience to work standards, level of vigilance and work ethics.

Co-responding Author: Neliwati

According to Sugiono in the book Agutini (2010) states that "The Work Climate is the environment of an organization or company that can create a good and bad working atmosphere for employees". Wirawan (2007) The

, the researcher is interested in conducting a study titled: "The Influence of Human dimensions of the work climate, namely the state of the physical environment of the workplace, the state of the social environment, the implementation of the management system, the physical and psychological conditions of the members of the workforce and the work culture.

Human resource development, work discipline and work climate have an important role in improving employee performance. One of them is in government institutions in North Konawe Regency, especially at the Bende Village Office, Motui Sub-district Office and Motui Health Center of North Konawe Regency.

Based on initial observations in Motui District, North Konawe Regency, it is known that employee performance has not been optimal. This is because there are still some employees who are still ineffective, where the boss places employees in certain jobs that are not in accordance with their educational background and are not supported by adequate skill abilities causing them to be less able to complete their work properly.

Another phenomenon that occurs is that employees need to improve education and training, employee participation in non-training activities, and provide equal opportunities for employees to get promotions so that both of these things interfere with the quality of employee work. This has an impact on employee performance. In addition, there are still employees who are negligent with the duties and responsibilities given, lack of supervision, unclear rules and expectations, lack of incentives or sanctions, lack of communication, lack of awareness of the impact, and lack of intrinsic motivation. This also happens related to a poor work climate, such as an unsupportive work culture, an unsupportive physical environment, interpersonal conflicts, a lack of appreciation and recognition, and a lack of supportive leadership can create a work climate that causes employee performance to be less than optimal. As a reference to support the theory and prepositions in this study, an empirical study of the author is needed, so several research results were adopted, namely: the results of research conducted by Niluh Made Yuni Pradnyawati, et al. (2021) show that human resource development has a positive and significant effect on employee performance.

#### II. LITERATURE REVIEW

Previous research that is relevant to the research to be carried out are: Niluh Made Yuni Pradnyawati, et al. (2021) "The Influence of Human Resource Development, Work Discipline and Work Climate on Employee Performance at the Housing, Settlement and Land Office of Denpasar City". This study aims to test and obtain empirical evidence regarding the influence of human resource development, work discipline and work climate on employee performance at the Denpasar City Housing, Settlement and Land Office. The population of this study is 92 people. Sampling in this study uses a saturated sampling technique (total sampling) where the entire population is used as a sample. This research was conducted at the Denpasar City Housing, Settlement and Land Office. Data collection was carried out through questionnaires. The analysis techniques used are instrument test, classical assumption test and multiple linear regression. The results of the study show that human resource development, work discipline and work climate have a positive and significant effect on employee performance at the Denpasar City Housing, Settlement and Land Office. Partially, human resource development has a positive and significant effect on employee performance, work discipline has a positive and significant effect on employee performance and work climate has a positive and significant effect on employee performance.

Yahya and David Ahmad Yani (2023) "The Effect of Human Resource Development and Work Motivation on Employee Performance at the Blambangan Umpu Village Office, Bimbangan Umpu District, Way Kanan Regency". This study aims to determine the influence of human resource development and work motivation on employee performance at the Blambangan Umpu Village Office, Blambangan Umpu District, Way Kanan Regency. The type of research used in this study is the Explanatory research model. The research method used is quantitative. This study used 19 research respondents. Based on the results of data processing, the hypothetical answers were found as follows; there is an influence of Human Resource Development (X1) on employee performance (Y). There is an effect of Work Motivation (X2) on employee performance (Y). There is an influence of human resource development (X1) and work motivation (X2) together on employee performance (Y).

Rafli Hinelo, et al. (2022) "The Effect of Human Resource Development on the Performance of Civil Servants at the Public Works and Spatial Planning Office of Gorontalo City". This study aims to determine the influence of human resource development on the performance of Civil Servants at the Public Works and Spatial Planning Office of Gorontalo City. The data collection technique in this study uses a questionnaire with a sample of 67 Civil Servants at the Public Works and Spatial Planning Office of Gorontalo City. The sampling technique uses saturated samples. The analytical tools used in testing this study are instrument tests, classical assumption tests, and simple linear regression tests. The results of the study show that human resource development has a positive effect on the performance of Civil Servants at the Public Works and Spatial Planning Office of Gorontalo City. This shows that if the better the development of human resources is implemented, the performance of Civil Servants will also increase.

# III. RESEARCH METHODS

This study intends to examine human resource development, work discipline and work climate that affect employee performance in Motui District, North Konawe Regency. The type of research used in this study is quantitative, namely collecting, compiling, processing and analyzing data in a way that in practice is given certain

LIMEHD 1259

treatment that is studied in it. According to Sugiyono (2016) quantitative research can be interpreted as a method based on the philosophy of positivism, used to research on a specific population or sample, sampling techniques are generally carried out randomly, data collection using research instruments, data analysis is quantitative/statistical with the aim of testing predetermined hypotheses.

According to Nasution, (2008) population is a generalization area consisting of objects or subjects that have certain qualities and characteristics. Based on the definition of population, the population of this study is all employees of Motui District, North Konawe Regency totaling 49 people, namely 13 employees of the Motui Subdistrict Office, 9 employees of the Bende Village Office and 27 employees of the Motui Health Center. The determination of the number of samples in this study is by using the census method, namely the number of samples taken from the entire population of 49 employees.

The types of data in this study are: Quantitative data which is data that can be imported into the statistical measurement scale. Facts and phenomena in this data are not expressed in descriptive language, but in numerical and qualitative data that can cover almost all non-numerical data. This data can be used in words to describe the observed facts and phenomena.

The data sources in this study are: Primary data is data obtained directly from the field, including laboratories. Primary data in this study is data collected directly from the research object obtained from respondents through the results of a questionnaire submitted by the researcher and secondary data as data or sources obtained from reading materials. This research is secondary data obtained from companies that can be seen in company documentation, reference books, and other information related to the research.

The data collection techniques used in this study are as follows: Ouestionnaire is a data collection technique that is carried out by giving a set of statements to respondents to be answered in order to obtain the information needed. Documentation, namely by collecting and studying supporting documents obtained directly from Motui District, North Konawe Regency. Such as a brief history of the company's establishment, organizational structure and other supporting documents.

In measuring a variable, the researcher uses a Likert scale as a tool to measure the variable that is used as the object of research. The likert scale is a question that shows the level of agreement or disagreement of respondents (Sujarweni, 2015). According to Sugiyono (2016) the Likert scale is used to measure the attitudes, opinions, and perceptions of a person or group of people about social phenomena. In research, this social phenomenon has been specifically determined by the researcher, which is further referred to as the research variable.

The author directly obtains the data needed based on the information and information provided by the respondents through a questionnaire (Questionnaire) that has been distributed by the score method, this scoring is given using a five-scale system, namely:

| NO | SCALE LIKES             | SCORE |
|----|-------------------------|-------|
| 1  | SS (Strongly Agree)     | 5     |
| 2  | S (Agree)               | 4     |
| 3  | N (Neutral)             | 3     |
| 4  | TS (Disagree)           | 2     |
| 5  | STS (Strongly disagree) | 1     |

The data analysis technique in this study uses Partial Least Square (PLS). PLS is a Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) equation model with a variance-based approach or component-based structural equation modeling. The purpose of PLS-SEM is to develop a theory or build a theory (prediction orientation). PLS is used to explain the existence or absence of relationships between latent variables (prediction). PLS is a powerful analysis method because it does not assume current data with a certain scale measurement, the number of samples is small (Ghozali, 2011).

This study has a complex model and a limited number of samples, so that the data analysis uses SmartPLS software. SmartPLS uses a random bootstrapping or duplication method. Therefore, the assumption of normality will not be a problem. In addition, with bootstrapping, SmartPLS does not require a minimum number of samples, so it can be applied to research with a small number of samples.

Descriptive statistics are statistics that function to describe or give an overview of the object being studied through sample data or population as it is, without conducting analysis and making conclusions that apply to the general public (Sugiyono, 2016)

The measurement model or outer model shows how each indicator block relates to its latent variable. The evaluation of the measurement model through confirmatory factor analysis is by using the MTMM (MultiTrait-MultiMethod) approach by testing the validity convergent and discriminant. Meanwhile, the reliability test is carried out in two ways, namely with Cronbach's Alpha and Composite Reliability.

The structural model or inner model shows the relationship or strength of estimation between latent variables or constructs based on substantive theory, namely R-Square, F-Square, and Estimate for Path Coefficients.

Hypothesis testing on PLS is used to measure the probability of a data using the path coefficient menu. The rule of thumbs supports a research hypothesis is: if the coefficient or direction of the variable relationship (indicated by the original sample value) is in line with the hypothesized one, and if the t-statistic value > 1.64 (two tailed) or >1.96 (one tailed) can be said to be significant and the probability value (p-value) < 0.01; < 0.05; < 0.10 can be said to be significant. In p-value, if a value of > 0.10 is obtained, it can be said to be insignificant (Jogiyanto and Abdillah, 2014).

Co-responding Author: Neliwati LIMEHD

#### IV. RESULT AND DISSCUSSION

#### 4.1 Results

The description of the research variables aims to interpret the frequency of respondents' answers from the data that has been collected. In this study, respondents' answers were categorized into five categories using the Likert scale. Each scale has a rating range from 1 to 5 which is outlined in the questionnaire answer choices. In providing the meaning of empirical assessment of variables, this study adopts the principle of weighting proposed by Sugiono (2005). The weighted average value or the value of the respondents' answer scores obtained is classified into the scale range of the value category presented in Table 4.1

Table. 4.1 Determination of the Average Category of Respondent's Statement Score and Descriptive Assessment

Meaning

|    | =                          |                                     |       |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|----|----------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| NO | Average Score Answer Score | Meaning of Category/ Interpretation | Score |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1  | 1,00-1,80                  | Very Not Good                       |       |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2  | 1,80 – 2,61                | Not Good                            |       |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3  | 2,62-3,40                  | Neutral                             |       |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4  | 2,62-3,40                  | Good                                |       |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5  | 4,22-5,00                  | Very Good                           |       |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Source: Sugiono, 2012

The determination of the interval is set by the formula:

$$I = \frac{bk \text{ Maks } - bk \text{ Min}}{k}$$

$$I = \frac{5 - 1}{5} = 0.80$$

info:

I = Interval

bk = Class Limits

k = Number of Classes

Table 4.1 above shows the categorical meaning in interpreting the results of this study based on the respondents' answer scores. The underlying reason for respondents was given the freedom to give an objective assessment based on what they saw, heard and felt while being an employee in Motui District, North Konawe Regency. An overview of the respondents' response data from the results of the study regarding the three latent variables studied using the average value of the respondent's statement score can be described as follows:

### 4.1.1 Human Resource Development Variables

Based on the results of the research obtained through the questionnaire, the objective conditions for the human resource development variables intended in this study are measured by 4 (four) indicator items, namely: (1) education and training, (2) non-training activities, (3) learning assignments, and (4) promotion. The results of the measurement of each item of the variable indicator of human resource development can be seen in the following table

Table 4.2 Distribution of Respondents' Answers to Human Resource Development Variables

| Table 4.2 Dis                     | stributioi         | 1 01 K    | espon                                | aents  |         |                |                  |            |                   | oment v | v ariabie | es      |  |
|-----------------------------------|--------------------|-----------|--------------------------------------|--------|---------|----------------|------------------|------------|-------------------|---------|-----------|---------|--|
| Variable                          |                    |           | Distribution of Respondents' Answers |        |         |                |                  |            |                   |         |           |         |  |
| Indicators                        | Item               | Frequency |                                      |        |         |                | Percentage (%)   |            |                   |         |           | Average |  |
| indicators                        |                    | SS        | S                                    | N      | TS      | STS            | SS               | S          | N                 | TS      | STS       |         |  |
| Education                         | $X_{1.1.1}$        | 11        | 24                                   | 8      | 4       | 2              | 22,45            | 48,98      | 16,33             | 8,16    | 4,08      | 3,78    |  |
| and Training                      | $X_{1.1.2}$        | 7         | 26                                   | 7      | 4       | 2              | 14,29            | 59,18      | 14,29             | 8,16    | 4,08      | 3,71    |  |
| and Training                      | $X_{1.1.3}$        | 5         | 31                                   | 7      | 4       | 2              | 10,20            | 63,27      | 14,29             | 8,16    | 4,08      | 3,67    |  |
| Indicator Average X <sub>L1</sub> |                    |           |                                      |        |         |                |                  |            |                   |         |           | 3,72    |  |
| NT                                | $X_{1.2.1}$        | 11        | 24                                   | 9      | 3       | 2              | 22,45            | 48,98      | 18,37             | 6,12    | 4,08      | 3,80    |  |
| Non-training                      | X <sub>1.2.2</sub> | 9         | 26                                   | 9      | 3       | 2              | 18,37            | 53,06      | 18,37             | 6,12    | 4,08      | 3,76    |  |
| activities                        | X <sub>1.2.3</sub> | 8         | 27                                   | 9      | 3       | 2              | 16,33            | 55,10      | 18,37             | 6,12    | 4,08      | 3,73    |  |
|                                   |                    |           |                                      | Inc    | dicator | Average        | X <sub>1,2</sub> |            |                   |         |           | 3,76    |  |
| T 191 4                           |                    |           |                                      |        | Distr   | ibution (      | Of Respen        | dents' Ans | wers              |         |           |         |  |
| Indikator<br>Variabel             | Item               | Frequency |                                      |        |         | Percentage (%) |                  |            |                   |         | Average   |         |  |
| variabei                          |                    | SS        | S                                    | N      | TS      | STS            | SS               | S          | N                 | TS      | STS       | Ü       |  |
| G. 1                              | $X_{1.3.1}$        | 15        | 24                                   | 5      | 3       | 2              | 30,61            | 48,98      | 10,20             | 6,12    | 4,08      | 3,96    |  |
| Study                             | X <sub>1.3.2</sub> | 15        | 20                                   | 9      | 3       | 2              | 30,61            | 40,82      | 18,37             | 6,12    | 4,08      | 3,88    |  |
| Assignments                       | $X_{1.3.3}$        | 16        | 19                                   | 9      | 3       | 2              | 32,65            | 38,78      | 18,37             | 6,12    | 4,08      | 3,90    |  |
|                                   |                    |           |                                      | Inc    | dicator | Average        | X <sub>1,3</sub> |            |                   |         |           | 3,91    |  |
|                                   | $X_{1.4.1}$        | 13        | 24                                   | 6      | 4       | 2              | 26,53            | 48,98      | 12,24             | 8,16    | 4,08      | 3,86    |  |
| Promotion                         | X <sub>1.4.2</sub> | 13        | 21                                   | 9      | 4       | 2              | 26,53            | 42,86      | 18,37             | 8,16    | 4,08      | 3,80    |  |
|                                   | X <sub>1.4.3</sub> | 15        | 19                                   | 9      | 4       | 2              | 30,61            | 38,78      | 18,37             | 8,16    | 4,08      | 3,84    |  |
|                                   |                    |           |                                      | In     | dicator | Average        | X <sub>1.4</sub> | Ź          |                   |         |           | 3,83    |  |
|                                   | Vari               | able In   | dicato                               | rs Ave | rage Hı | ıman Re        | source De        | velopment  | (X <sub>1</sub> ) |         |           | 3,81    |  |

Sumber: Data Primer di Olah Tahun 2024

The table above shows that the human resource development variable has been well perceived by the respondents which is marked by an average score of 3.81. This means that the respondents have assessed well the development of human resources in Motui District, North Konawe Regency when perceived from education and training indicators, non-training activities, learning assignments, and promotions.

Based on respondents' answers to three indicators of the human resource development variable, the education and training indicator with an average score of 3.72 is the lowest rated indicator by employees including the good

category. This means that training is able to improve the ability and knowledge of employees in carrying out their duties and responsibilities, participating in training in accordance with the employee's position and duties and carrying out employee work supported by appropriate knowledge or educational background. Furthermore, the indicators of non-training activities are considered good with an average of 3.76. This can be interpreted that non-training activities are considered good by employees. This means that employees always strive to develop themselves by learning independently, developing themselves through various non-training activities and non-training activities such as seminars and workshops are able to improve employee performance.

The promotion indicator is rated good with an average of 3.83. This can be interpreted that the promotion is considered good by the employee. This means that employees have a good level of discipline at work, both for themselves and for their duties, promotions are given based on the employee's work productivity in carrying out their duties and always have honesty with themselves, friends and leaders. Then the learning task indicator was rated good with an average of 3.91. This can be interpreted that the learning assignment is considered good by the employee. This means that employees are given the opportunity to take part in learning assignments that aim to improve their abilities, learning tasks are able to improve employee performance and are followed according to needs.

## 4.1.2 Work Discipline Variable

Based on the results of the research obtained through the questionnaire, the objective conditions for the work discipline variables intended in this study are measured by 5 (five) indicator items, namely: (1) attendance, (2) compliance with work regulations, (3) compliance with work standards, (4) high level of employee vigilance, and (5) work ethics. The results of the measurement of each item of the variable indicator of work discipline can be seen in table 4.3. The following.

Table 4.3. Distribution of Respondents' Answers to Work Discipline Variables

|                                    | 4.5. DISC   | Distribution of Respondents' Answers |    |        |          |          |                  |       |            |            |      |         |
|------------------------------------|---|--------------------------------------|----|--------|----------|----------|------------------|-------|------------|------------|------|---------|
| Variable<br>Indicators             | Item  |                                      | ]  | Freque | ncy      |          |                  | Per   | centage (% | <b>%</b> ) |      | Average |
| indicators                         |   | SS                                   | S  | N      | TS       | STS      | SS               | S     | N          | TS         | STS  |         |
|                                    | $X_{2.1.1}$   | 13                                   | 30 | 3      | 1        | 2        | 26,53            | 61,22 | 6,12       | 2,04       | 4,08 | 4,04    |
| Presence                           | $X_{2.1.2}$   | 13                                   | 25 | 8      | 1        | 2        | 26,53            | 51,02 | 16,33      | 2,04       | 4,08 | 3,94    |
|                                    | $X_{2.1.3}$   | 10                                   | 28 | 8      | 1        | 2        | 20,41            | 57,14 | 16,33      | 2,04       | 4,08 | 3,88    |
| Average Indicator X <sub>2.1</sub> |   |                                      |    |        |          |          |                  |       |            |            |      | 3,95    |
| Compliance                         | $X_{2,2,1}$   | 14                                   | 26 | 6      | 1        | 2        | 28,57            | 53,06 | 12,24      | 2,04       | 4,08 | 4,00    |
| with work                          | X <sub>2.2.2</sub>                                  | 10                                   | 25 | 11     | 1        | 2        | 20,41            | 51,02 | 22,45      | 2,04       | 4,08 | 3,82    |
| rules                              | X <sub>2.2.3</sub>                                  | 11                                   | 24 | 11     | 1        | 2        | 22,45            | 48,98 | 22,45      | 2,04       | 4,08 | 3,84    |
|                                    |   |                                      |    | Ave    | erage Iı | ndicator | $X_{2,2}$        |       |            |            |      | 3,88    |
| . 11                               | X <sub>2.3.1</sub>                                  | 13                                   | 24 | 7      | 3        | 2        | 26,53            | 48,98 | 14,29      | 6,12       | 4,08 | 3,88    |
| Adherence to work standards        | X <sub>2.3.2</sub>                                  | 19                                   | 18 | 4      | 5        | 3        | 38,78            | 36,73 | 8,16       | 10,20      | 6,12 | 3,92    |
| work standards                     | $X_{2.3.3}$   | 22                                   | 15 | 4      | 5        | 3        | 44,90            | 30,61 | 8,16       | 10,20      | 6,12 | 3,98    |
|                                    |   |                                      |    | Ave    | erage ir | ndikator | X <sub>2.3</sub> |       |            |            |      | 3,93    |
| High alout                         | $X_{2.4.1}$   | 11                                   | 25 | 8      | 3        | 2        | 22,45            | 51,02 | 16,33      | 6,12       | 4,08 | 3,82    |
| High alert<br>level                | $X_{2.4.2}$   | 15                                   | 19 | 10     | 3        | 2        | 30,61            | 38,78 | 20,41      | 6,12       | 4,08 | 3,86    |
| ievei                              | $X_{2.4.3}$   | 19                                   | 15 | 10     | 3        | 2        | 38,78            | 38,78 | 20,41      | 6,12       | 4,08 | 3,94    |
|                                    |   |                                      |    | Ave    | rage in  | dikator  | X <sub>2.4</sub> |       |            |            |      | 3,87    |
|                                    | $X_{2.5.1}$   | 20                                   | 16 | 8      | 3        | 2        | 40,82            | 32,65 | 16,33      | 6,12       | 4,08 | 4,00    |
| Work Ethics                        | $X_{2.5.2}$   | 23                                   | 12 | 9      | 3        | 2        | 46,94            | 24,49 | 18,37      | 6,12       | 4,08 | 4,04    |
|                                    | $X_{2.5.3}$   | 11                                   | 23 | 10     | 3        | 2        | 22,45            | 46,94 | 20,41      | 6,12       | 4,08 | 3,78    |
|                                    |   |                                      |    | Ave    | erage ir | ndikator | $X_{2.5}$        |       |            |            |      | 3,94    |
|                                    | Average Work Discipline Variables (X <sub>2</sub> ) |                                      |    |        |          |          |                  |       |            |            |      | 3,91    |

Source: Primary Data in the Year 2024

In table 4.3. showed that the work discipline variable had been well perceived by the respondents which was marked by an average score of 3.91. This means that the respondents have assessed well the work discipline of Motui District, North Konawe Regency when perceived from the indicators of attendance, compliance with work regulations, compliance with work standards, high level of employee vigilance, and work ethics.

Based on respondents' answers to five indicators of the work discipline variable, the indicator of high level of alertness of employees with an average score of 3.87 is the indicator that is rated the lowest by employees including the good category. This can be interpreted that the high level of vigilance of employees is considered good by employees. This means that employees carry out work tasks until they are completed every day carefully, work in accordance with the work plan and targets that have been set and pay attention to work safety in carrying out work every day. Furthermore, the indicator of compliance with work regulations is considered good with an average of 3.88. This means that employees always follow the applicable rules that have been set, understand the rules that have been set and obey the responsibilities given by the leader.

The indicator of compliance with work standards was rated good with an average of 3.93. This can be interpreted that compliance with work standards is considered good by employees, meaning that employees always wear work clothes or uniforms that have been set, always use identification when working in accordance with what has been set and do all work according to the work standards that have been set. Furthermore, the work ethics indicator is rated good with an average of 3.94 This can be interpreted that work ethics are considered good by employees. This means that employees tidy up the work equipment after they are finished, complete tasks according to the specified time and always

ask permission from their superiors when they cannot come to the office. Then the attendance indicator is rated good with an average of 3.95 This can be interpreted that attendance is considered good by employees. This means that employees are present at the workplace on time before the set working hours, always return to rest according to the set time and always go home to work according to the set time

#### 4.1.3 Work Climate Variables

Based on the results of the research obtained through the questionnaire, the objective conditions for the work climate variable intended in this study are measured by 5 (five) indicators, namely: (1) the state of the physical environment of the workplace, (2) the state of the social environment, (3) the implementation of the management system, (4) the physical and psychological conditions of the employees, and (5) the work culture. The respondents' responses to the variable indicators of the work climate can be seen in Table 4.4. The following.

Table 4.4. Distribution of Respondents' Answers to Work Climate Variables

| Variable                  |                                    | Distribution of Respondents' Answers |           |        |         |                |                  |                  |       |      |         |      |  |
|---------------------------|------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|-----------|--------|---------|----------------|------------------|------------------|-------|------|---------|------|--|
| Variable<br>Indicator     | Item                               |                                      | Frequency |        |         | Precentage (%) |                  |                  |       |      | average |      |  |
| indicator                 |                                    | SS                                   | S         | N      | TS      | STS            | SS               | S                | N     | TS   | STS     |      |  |
| The state of the physical | X <sub>3.1.1</sub>                 | 10                                   | 29        | 7      | 2       | 1              | 20,41            | 59,18            | 14,29 | 4,08 | 2,04    | 3,92 |  |
| environment               | X <sub>3.1.2</sub>                 | 10                                   | 25        | 11     | 2       | 1              | 20,41            | 51,02            | 22,45 | 4,08 | 2,04    | 3,84 |  |
| of the<br>workplace       | X <sub>3.1.3</sub>                 | 8                                    | 27        | 11     | 2       | 1              | 16,33            | 55,10            | 22,45 | 4,08 | 2,04    | 3,80 |  |
|                           | Average Indicator X <sub>3.1</sub> |                                      |           |        |         |                |                  |                  |       |      |         |      |  |
| State of the              | $X_{3.2.1}$                        | 8                                    | 31        | 7      | 2       | 1              | 16,33            | 63,27            | 14,29 | 4,08 | 2,04    | 3,88 |  |
| social                    | X <sub>3.2.2</sub>                 | 6                                    | 31        | 8      | 3       | 1              | 12,24            | 63,27            | 16,33 | 6,12 | 2,04    | 3,78 |  |
| environment               | X <sub>3.2.3</sub>                 | 8                                    | 29        | 8      | 3       | 1              | 16,33            | 59,18            | 16,33 | 6,12 | 2,04    | 3,82 |  |
|                           |                                    |                                      |           | Av     | erage I | Ndicator       | X <sub>3.2</sub> |                  |       |      |         | 3,83 |  |
| Implementati              | $X_{3.3.1}$                        | 14                                   | 25        | 7      | 2       | 1              | 28,57            | 51,02            | 14,29 | 4,08 | 2,04    | 4,00 |  |
| on of the                 | $X_{3.3.2}$                        | 14                                   | 23        | 9      | 2       | 1              | 28,57            | 46,94            | 18,37 | 4,08 | 2,04    | 3,96 |  |
| management<br>system      | X <sub>3.3.3</sub>                 | 10                                   | 26        | 10     | 2       | 1              | 20,41            | 53,06            | 20,41 | 4,08 | 2,04    | 3,86 |  |
|                           |                                    |                                      |           | Av     | erage I | ndicator       |                  |                  |       |      |         | 3,98 |  |
| Physical and              | $X_{3.4.1}$                        | 7                                    | 30        | 9      | 2       | 1              | 14,29            | 61,22            | 18,37 | 4,08 | 2,04    | 3,82 |  |
| psychiatric               | $X_{3.4.2}$                        | 11                                   | 25        | 9      | 3       | 1              | 22,45            | 51,02            | 18,37 | 6,12 | 2,04    | 3,86 |  |
| condition of the employee | X <sub>3.4.3</sub>                 | 7                                    | 28        | 10     | 3       | 1              | 14,25            | 57,14            | 20,14 | 6,12 | 2,04    | 3,76 |  |
|                           |                                    |                                      |           | Av     | erage I | ndicator       | X <sub>3.4</sub> |                  |       |      |         | 3,81 |  |
|                           | $X_{3.5.1}$                        | 10                                   | 28        | 8      | 2       | 1              | 20,41            | 57,14            | 16,33 | 4,08 | 2,04    | 3,90 |  |
| Work Culture              | $X_{3.5.2}$                        | 8                                    | 24        | 14     | 2       | 1              | 16,33            | 48,98            | 28,57 | 4,08 | 2,04    | 3,73 |  |
|                           | $X_{3.5.3}$                        | 13                                   | 24        | 9      | 2       | 1              | 26,53            | 48,98            | 18,37 | 4,08 | 2,04    | 3,94 |  |
|                           |                                    |                                      |           |        |         | ndicator       |                  |                  |       |      |         | 3,86 |  |
|                           | .1 37                              | 2024                                 | Ave       | rage W | ork Dis | cipline V      | ariables (X      | ( <sub>3</sub> ) |       |      |         | 3,86 |  |

Source: Primary Data in the Year 2024

The table above shows that the work climate felt by employees in Motui District, North Konawe Regency is in the good category which is shown by the average score value of the assessment for the work climate variable of 3.86, this shows that the work climate owned by employees in Motui District, North Konawe Regency is good assessed from the state of the physical environment of the workplace, the state of the social environment, the implementation of the management system, the physical and psychological condition of the employees, and the work culture.

The variable of work climate measured through the indicators of the physical and psychological condition of employees in the good category which is shown with an average score of 3.81 means that the physical and psychological condition of employees which is measured by mutual trust between employees in the office, receives support from colleagues in completing daily tasks and overcoming work obstacles at work. Furthermore, the indicator of the state of the social environment in the good category is shown with an average score of 3.83, meaning that the state of the social environment as measured by the relationship with harmonious colleagues increases work morale, a pleasant work environment motivates in work, and establishes good relationships with other employees.

The indicator of the physical environment of the workplace in the good category is shown with an average score of 3.85, which means that the good and conducive working atmosphere provides peace of mind at work, safety in the workplace and the facilities provided are in accordance with the job. Furthermore, the work culture indicator in the good category is shown with an average score of 3.86, which means that the work culture measured by employees has a high attitude of discipline, so they are always enthusiastic in their work, always honest in working at work, and always evaluate the work that has been done so that the work becomes better. Then the indicator of the implementation of the management system in the good category which is shown with an average score of 3.98 means that the implementation of the management system which is measured by the existence of effective management communication, has the opportunity to solve a problem in one's own work without having to ask the boss and the work in this office is clearly defined and structured.

#### 4.1.4 Employee Performance Variables

Based on the results of the research obtained through the questionnaire, the objective conditions for the employee performance variables intended in this study are measured by 4 (four) indicators, namely: (1) quality, (2) quantity, (3) time, (4) cost, (5) service orientation, (6) commitment, (7) work initiative, (8) cooperation and (9) leadership. The respondents' responses to the variable indicators of employee performance can be seen in Table 4.5. The following.

LIMEHD 1263

Table 4.5. Distribution of Respondents' Answers to Employee Performance Variables

| Variable                           |                    | Distribution of Respondents' Answers                 |      |         |          |            |                     |            |            |            |      |       |  |
|------------------------------------|--------------------|--|------|---------|----------|------------|---------------------|------------|------------|------------|------|-------|--|
| Indicator                          | Item               | Frequency Percentage (%) SS S N TS STS SS S N TS STS |      |         |          |            |                     |            |            | avera      |      |       |  |
| Indicator                          |                    | SS   | S    | N       | TS       | STS        | SS                  | S          | N          | TS         | STS  | ge    |  |
|                                    | $Y_{1.1.1}$        | 19   | 17   | 10      | 2        | 1          | 38,78               | 34,69      | 20,41      | 4,08       | 2,04 | 4,04  |  |
| Quality                            | $Y_{1.1.2}$        | 17   | 19   | 10      | 2        | 1          | 34,69               | 38,78      | 20,41      | 4,08       | 2,04 | 4,00  |  |
|                                    | $Y_{1.1.3}$        | 14   | 22   | 10      | 2        | 1          | 28,57               | 44,90      | 20,41      | 4,08       | 2,04 | 3,94  |  |
|                                    |                    |  |      |         | Average  | Indicato   | or Y <sub>1.1</sub> |            |            |            |      | 3,99  |  |
|                                    | $Y_{1.2.1}$        | 15   | 29   | 2       | 2        | 1          | 30,61               | 32,65      | 4,08       | 4,08       | 2,04 | 4,12  |  |
| Quantity                           | $Y_{1.2.2}$        | 16   | 28   | 2       | 2        | 1          | 32,65               | 57,14      | 4,08       | 4,08       | 2,04 | 4,14  |  |
|                                    | Y <sub>1.2.3</sub> | 21   | 21   | 4       | 2        | 1          | 42,86               | 42,86      | 8,16       | 4,08       | 2,04 | 4,20  |  |
|                                    |                    |  |      |         | Average  | Indicato   | or Y <sub>1.2</sub> |            |            |            |      | 4,16  |  |
| Time                               | $Y_{1.3.1}$        | 13   | 28   | 5       | 2        | 1          | 26,53               | 57,14      | 10,20      | 4,08       | 2,04 | 4,02  |  |
| Time                               | $Y_{1.3.2}$        | 18   | 21   | 6       | 3        | 1          | 36,73               | 42,86      | 12,24      | 6,12       | 2,04 | 4,06  |  |
|                                    | Y <sub>1.3.3</sub> | 20   | 19   | 6       | 3        | 1          | 40,82               | 38,78      | 12,24      | 6,12       | 2,04 | 4,10  |  |
|                                    |                    |  |      |         | Average  | e Indicato | or Y <sub>1.3</sub> |            |            |            |      | 4,06  |  |
|                                    | $Y_{1.4.1}$        | 20   | 24   | 2       | 2        | 1          | 40,82               | 48,98      | 4,08       | 4,08       | 2,04 | 4,22  |  |
| Cost                               | Y <sub>1.4.2</sub> | 19   | 22   | 2       | 5        | 1          | 38,78               | 44,90      | 4,08       | 10,20      | 2,04 | 4,08  |  |
|                                    | Y <sub>1.4.3</sub> | 20   | 21   | 2       | 5        | 1          | 40,82               | 42,86      | 4,08       | 10,20      | 2,04 | 4,10  |  |
|                                    |                    |  |      |         | Average  | Indicato   | or Y <sub>1.4</sub> |            |            |            |      | 4,14  |  |
| C                                  | $Y_{1.5.1}$        | 18   | 22   | 6       | 2        | 1          | 36,73               | 44,90      | 12,24      | 4,08       | 2,04 | 4,10  |  |
| Service<br>Orientation             | Y <sub>1.5.2</sub> | 10   | 26   | 9       | 3        | 1          | 20,41               | 53,06      | 18,37      | 6,12       | 2,04 | 3,84  |  |
|                                    | Y <sub>1.5.3</sub> | 12   | 24   | 9       | 3        | 1          | 24,49               | 48,98      | 18,37      | 6,12       | 2,04 | 3,88  |  |
|                                    |                    |  |      |         | Average  | Indicato   | or Y <sub>1.5</sub> |            |            |            |      | 3,94  |  |
| C :                                | Y <sub>1.6.1</sub> | 16   | 27   | 3       | 2        | 1          | 32,65               | 55,10      | 6,12       | 4,08       | 2,04 | 4,12  |  |
| Commitme                           | Y <sub>1.6.2</sub> | 17   | 27   | 2       | 2        | 1          | 34,69               | 55,10      | 4,08       | 4,08       | 2,04 | 4,16  |  |
| nt                                 | Y <sub>1.6.3</sub> | 8  | 34   | 4       | 2        | 1          | 16,33               | 69,39      | 8,16       | 4,08       | 2,04 | 3,94  |  |
|                                    |                    |  |      |         | Average  | Indicato   | or Y <sub>1.6</sub> |            |            |            |      | 4,01  |  |
| XX7 1                              | Y <sub>1.7.1</sub> | 12   | 23   | 5       | 2        | 1          | 24,49               | 59,18      | 10,20      | 4,08       | 2,04 | 4,00  |  |
| Work<br>Initiative                 | Y <sub>1.7.2</sub> | 16   | 25   | 6       | 3        | 1          | 32,65               | 46,94      | 12,24      | 6,12       | 2,04 | 4,02  |  |
| initiative                         | Y <sub>1.7.3</sub> | 18   | 21   | 6       | 3        | 1          | 36,73               | 42,86      | 12,24      | 6,12       | 2,04 | 4,06  |  |
|                                    |                    |  |      |         | Average  | Indicato   | or Y <sub>1.7</sub> | •          |            | •          |      | 4,03  |  |
|                                    | Y <sub>1.8.1</sub> | 15   | 29   | 2       | 2        | 1          | 30,61               | 59,18      | 4,08       | 4,08       | 2,04 | 4,12  |  |
| Teamwork                           | Y <sub>1.8.2</sub> | 16   | 25   | 2       | 5        | 1          | 32,65               | 51,02      | 4,08       | 10,20      | 2,04 | 4,02  |  |
|                                    | Y <sub>1.8.3</sub> | 14   | 27   | 2       | 5        | 1          | 28,57               | 55,10      | 4,08       | 10,20      | 2,04 | 3,98  |  |
|                                    |                    |  |      |         | Average  | Indicato   | or Y <sub>1.8</sub> |            |            |            |      | 4,04  |  |
| T 191 4                            |                    |  |      |         |          |            | of Respon           | dents' Ans | wers       |            |      |       |  |
| Indikator                          | Item               |  |      | Freque  |          |            |                     |            | centage (% | <b>6</b> ) |      | Avera |  |
| Variabel                           |                    | SS   | S    | Ń       | TS       | STS        | SS                  | S          | N          | TS         | STS  | ge    |  |
|                                    | Y <sub>1.9.1</sub> | 18   | 22   | 6       | 2        | 1          | 36,73               | 44,90      | 12,24      | 4,08       | 2,04 | 4,10  |  |
| Leadership                         | Y <sub>1.9.2</sub> | 11   | 25   | 9       | 3        | 1          | 22,45               | 51,02      | 18,37      | 6,12       | 2,04 | 3,86  |  |
|                                    | Y <sub>1.9.3</sub> | 12   | 24   | 9       | 3        | 1          | 24,49               | 48,98      | 18,37      | 6,12       | 2,04 | 3,88  |  |
| Average Indicator Y <sub>1.9</sub> |                    |  |      |         |          |            |                     |            |            |            | 3,95 |       |  |
|                                    |                    |  |      |         | arciago  | muicati    | 1 1.9               |            |            |            |      | 3,73  |  |
|                                    |                    |  | Aver | age Ind | icator E | Employee   | Performa            | nce (Y)    |            |            |      | 4,03  |  |
|                                    |                    |  |      | 3       |          | 1 ,        |                     | ` '        |            |            |      |       |  |

Source: Primary Data in the Year 2024

The data in the table shows that the performance of employees in Motui District, North Konawe Regency is in the good category which is shown by the average score value of the assessment for the employee performance variable of 4.03, this shows that the performance owned by employees in Motui District, North Konawe Regency is both assessed from quality, quantity, time, cost, service orientation, commitment, work initiatives, cooperation and leadership.

Employee performance variables measured through service orientation indicators in the good category which are shown with an average score of 3.94 means that the service orientation measured by employees communicating with colleagues in doing work as an effort to provide the best service to the community, provide good service and provide the best service by showing the quality of work exceeding the set standards. Furthermore, the leadership indicator in the good category is shown with an average score of 3.95, which means that the leadership measured by employees is able to place themselves wherever they are in accordance with the rules that apply to the area, provide a good example in the implementation of their duties and do not impose opinions in discussions/meetings.

The quantity indicator in the good category is shown with an average score of 3.99, which means that the quantity measured by employees is completed in accordance with the amount that must be completed, always works with a target orientation in achieving work and the ability to work to meet the expectations of the organization. Furthermore, the commitment indicator in the good category is shown with an average score of 4.01, which means that the commitment measured by employees provides services to other employees in general without discriminating between ranks and groups, prioritizing excellent service wherever the placement is given and your work commitment affects work results.

The work initiative indicator in the good category is shown with an average score of 4.03, which means that the work initiative measured by employees is given the opportunity to take their own initiative to complete the work, given the opportunity to innovate in risky work and realize mistakes and correct those mistakes before being reprimanded by the boss. Furthermore, the cooperation indicator in the good category is shown with an average score of 4.04, which means that the cooperation measured by employees always prioritizes cooperation with colleagues to complete work,

express opinions in easy-to-understand language based on agreed rules and respect the results of cooperation among colleagues.

The time indicator in the good category is shown with an average score of 4.06, which means that the measured time of the employee does the work according to the specified time, completes the work faster than the specified time and is able to work optimally throughout working hours. Furthermore, the cost indicator in the good category is shown with an average score of 4.14, meaning that the costs measured from employees always prioritize work compared to the costs incurred in carrying out work, the salary provided is sufficient for daily living expenses and is large and the type of allowance received is appropriate. Then the quality indicator in the good category which is shown with an average score of 4.16 means that the quality measured by employees always carry out work according to the established procedures, as much as possible to minimize work errors and work deftly and quickly.

#### 4.1.5 Results of Analysis and Testing Hypothesis

The data analysis method in this study uses the Partial Least Square (PLS) analysis technique with the Smart PLS Program. The results of PLS analysis can be done by evaluating the structural equation model. The evaluation of the PLS model in this study begins with testing the linearity assumption and then measure of fit on the measurement model. In this study, there are two basic evaluations in PLS analysis, namely: First, the evaluation of the measurement model (outer model) to determine the validity and reliability of indicators that measure latent variables; The validity and reliability test criteria of this research instrument refer to discriminant validity, convergent validity, and composite reliability. Second, assess the inner model or structural model to see the relationship between constructs, significance values and R-square of the research model. Testing the inner model of the PLS method is done through bootstrap resampling.

Finally, test the structural model and research hypothesis by looking at the value of the path coefficient from exogenous to endogenous variables and looking at the significance value. Testing of the structural model in PLS was carried out through boostrap resampling. Evaluation of structural models and hypotheses aims to find out how much information can be explained by structural models (relationships between latent variables).

#### 4.1.5.1 Classical Assumption Test

In evaluating PLS, a linearity assumption test is first carried out, namely the relationship between the latent constructs tested has a linear relationship. The purpose of the linearity test in this study is to see if the model used is a linear model or the estimated construction relationship is linear. Therefore, the first step in PLS analysis is to test these assumptions. The linearity assumption test in this study uses the Curve of Fit method using SPSS software, the results are presented in the Appendix. The results of the linearity test of the relationship between variables are presented in the following table:

| Deletionskin Detrocon Verickles   | Linearity Testing |       |        |  |  |  |  |
|---|-------------------|-------|--------|--|--|--|--|
| Relationship Between Variables  | F                 | Sig.  | Result |  |  |  |  |
| Human Resource Development $(X1)\rightarrow$ Employee Performance $(Y)$ | 4,536             | 0,001 | Linear |  |  |  |  |
| Work Discipline (X2) → Employee Performance (Y)                         | 4,308             | 0,000 | Linear |  |  |  |  |
| Work Climate (X3) $\rightarrow$ Employee Performance (Y1)               | 5.852             | 0.000 | Linear |  |  |  |  |

The table above shows that the relationship between resource development (X1) and employee performance (Y), the relationship between work discipline (X2) and employee performance (Y), and the relationship between work climate (X2) and employee performance (Y) have a significance level of less than 5% (p  $\alpha = 0.05$ ), so it can be said to be linear. The results of the linearity assumption test can be concluded that all relationships between variables contained in the structural model are linear, so that the linearity assumption in the PLS analysis is fulfilled. Thus, it can be proved that the data used in this study meet the requirements of linearity and can be further analyzed.

# 4.1.5.2 Measurement Model Testing

There are three criteria to assess the outer model, namely Convergent Validity, Discriminant Validity and Composite Reliability. Based on the results of the test using SEM PLS, it is known that all questionnaire items (indicators) in the variables of democratic leadership style, work culture, motivation and employee performance have a loading factor above 0.5, which means that the data is valid, namely with a convergent validity result of > 0.5. What is meant by valid is valid, can be used in research or applies in accordance with what is determined and has been tested.

Therefore, in the collection of research data, all questionnaire items can be used to collect data in the study and can subsequently be used for subsequent research and data analysis.

Validity is a measure related to the level of accuracy achieved by an indicator in measuring what should be measured, namely to ensure that the measuring tool used, in this case the questionnaire questions match the object to be measured. The value of the average variance extracted (AVE) variables of human resource development, work discipline and work climate on employee performance > 0.5 as a determinant of convergent validity. So it can be concluded that the construct has good validity.

The Discriminant Validity of the measurement model with reflective indicators is assessed based on the Cross Loading measurement with the construct. Composite reliability tests the reliability value between the indicators of the construct that forms it. The composite reliability result is said to be good, if the value is above 0.70.

Co-responding Author: Neliwati LIMEHD

#### 4.1.5.3 Structural Model Testing

Furthermore, hypothesis testing is carried out by running bootstrappings on Partial Least Square (PLS) to see and determine the influence between variables designed in this study. From the PLS output, structural model and hypothesis testing is carried out by looking at the path coefficient estimates and seeing the significance value by comparing the T Statistics value with the T Table value or the P-Value value <0.05.

#### a. Reading R Square Value PLS output

After the estimated model meets the Outer *Model* criteria, the next structural model (*Inner Model*) test is carried out. Reading *the Inner Model* is evaluating the relationships between hypothesized constructs. Here is the R-Square value on the construct:

| Tabel R-Squar        | re       |
|----------------------|----------|
|                      | R-Square |
| Employee Performance | 0,841    |

Source: Processed primary data, 2024

The table above gives a value of 0.841 for the employee performance construct, which means that human resource development, work discipline and work climate are able to explain the employee performance variables by 84.1 percent and the rest are influenced by other factors that are not studied in this study, namely 15.9 percent.

#### b. Reading Result for Inner Weight

Furthermore, to determine whether a hypothesis is accepted or not, it is done by comparing t statistics with t tables, provided that if t statistics > t tables, then the hypothesis is accepted. For more details, please see the following table:

Tabel Results for Inner Weights

|   | Path Coefficient | T Statistic | P. Value | Result   |
|---|------------------|-------------|----------|----------|
| Human Resource Development → Employee Performance | 0,530            | 4,481       | 0,000    | Accepted |
| Work Discipline → Employee Performance            | 0,306            | 2,114       | 0,035    | Accepted |

Source: Primary data processed, 2024

Based on the test of the relationship between constructs hypothesis testing and direct influence path coefficients were obtained to prove that the proposed hypothesis can be accepted or rejected. The results of hypothesis testing can be explained as follows:

The results of the human resource development test on employee performance can be proven by the *estimated* value of the path coefficient of 0.530 in a positive direction. The path coefficient marked positively means that the relationship between human resource development and employee performance is positive. The result of the path coefficient is seen from the p-values of  $0.000 < \alpha = 0.05$  which is significant. The results of hypothesis testing (H1) prove that human resource development has a significant effect on employee performance in Motui District, North Konawe Regency. This means that the better the development of human resources, the more it will improve the performance of employees in Motui District, North Konawe Regency. Thus, one hypothesis proposed, namely: human resource development has a positive and significant effect on employee performance in Motui District, North Konawe Regency can be **accepted**.

The results of the work discipline test on employee performance can be proven by an *estimated value of* the path coefficient of 0.306 with a positive direction. The path coefficient marked positively means that the relationship between work discipline and employee performance is positive. The result of the path coefficient is seen from the p-values of  $0.035 < \alpha = 0.05$  is significant. The results of the hypothesis test (H2) prove that work discipline has a positive and significant effect on employee performance in Motui District, North Konawe Regency. Thus, the two hypotheses proposed, namely: work discipline has a positive and significant effect on employee performance in Motui District, North Konawe Regency can be **accepted**.

The results of the work climate test on employee performance can be proven by the *estimated* value of the line coefficient of 0.614 in a positive direction. The path coefficient marked positively means that the relationship between the work climate and employee performance is positive. The result of the path coefficient is seen from the p-values of  $0.000 < \alpha = 0.05$  which is significant. The results of the hypothesis test (H3) prove that the work climate has a positive and significant effect on employee performance in Motui District, North Konawe Regency. Thus, the three hypotheses proposed, namely: the work climate has a positive and significant effect on employee performance in Motui District, North Konawe Regency can be **accepted**.

#### 4.2 Discussions of Research Results

#### 4.2.1 Human Resource Development Affects Employee Performance

The results of the test in this study prove that human resource development has a positive and significant effect on employee performance. The results of the study can be concluded that human resource development has a positive and significant effect on employee performance. This means that the better the development of human resources, the better the performance of employees in Motui District, North Konawe Regency, will also be better. Therefore, a good improvement in employee performance in Motui District, North Konawe Regency can be achieved by increasing human resource development.

Co-responding Author: Neliwati

The results of the test in this study prove that human resource development has a positive and significant effect on employee performance. The results of the study can be concluded that human resource development has a positive and significant effect on employee performance. This means that the better the development of human resources, the better the performance of employees in Motui District, North Konawe Regency , will also be better. Therefore, a good improvement in employee performance in Motui District, North Konawe Regency can be achieved by increasing human resource development.

The results of the variable description showed that the human resource development variable had been well perceived by the respondents. This means that the respondents have assessed well the development of human resources in the Village in Motui District, North Konawe Regency when perceived from the indicators of education and training, non-training activities, learning assignments, and promotions.

Based on respondents' answers to three indicators of the human resource development variable, the education and training indicator is the indicator that is rated the lowest by employees, including the good category. This means that training is able to improve the ability and knowledge of employees in carrying out their duties and responsibilities, followed in accordance with the position and duties of employees and carrying out employee work supported by appropriate knowledge or educational background. Furthermore, the indicators of non-training activities are considered good. This can be interpreted that non-training activities are considered good by employees. This means that employees always strive to develop themselves by learning independently, developing themselves through various non-training activities and non-training activities such as seminars and workshops are able to improve employee performance.

Promotional indicators are considered good. This can be interpreted that the promotion is considered good by the employee. This means that employees have a good level of discipline at work, both for themselves and for their duties, promotions are given based on the employee's work productivity in carrying out their duties and always have honesty with themselves, friends and leaders. Then the indicators of learning tasks are considered good. This can be interpreted that the learning assignment is considered good by the employee. This means that employees are given the opportunity to take part in learning assignments that aim to improve their abilities, learning tasks are able to improve employee performance and are followed according to needs.

Human resource development has an influence on employee performance. Employee performance is the result of a certain work process in a planned manner at the time and place of the employee and the organization concerned according to Mangkuprawira (2011). Performance according to Simamora (2015) that in order to achieve the organization to function effectively and in accordance with the organization's goals, the organization must have good employee performance, namely by carrying out its duties in a reliable way. Government Regulation of the Republic of Indonesia Number 30 of 2019 concerning Performance Assessment of Civil Servants. The indicators in this study are quality, quantity, time, cost, service orientation, commitment, work initiative, cooperation and leadership.

The results of the description of the variables showed that the employee performance variables felt by employees in Motui District, North Konawe Regency were in the good category, this showed that the performance owned by employees in Motui District, North Konawe Regency was both assessed from quality, quantity, time, cost, service orientation, commitment, work initiative, cooperation and leadership.

Employee performance variables measured through service orientation indicators in the good category mean that the service orientation measured by employees communicating with colleagues in doing work as an effort to provide the best service to the community, provide good service and provide the best service by showing the quality of work exceeding the set standards. Furthermore, the leadership indicator in the good category means that the leadership measured by employees is able to place themselves wherever they are in accordance with the rules that apply to the area, provide a good example in the implementation of duties and do not impose opinions in discussions/meetings.

The quantity indicator in the good category means that the quantity measured by the employee is in accordance with the amount that must be completed, always works with a target orientation in achieving work and the ability to work to meet the expectations of the organization. Furthermore, the commitment indicator in the good category means that the commitment measured by employees provides services to other employees in general without discriminating between ranks and groups, prioritizing excellent service wherever the placement is given and your work commitment affects work results.

The work initiative indicator in the good category means that the work initiative measured by the employee is given the opportunity to take the initiative to complete the work, is given the opportunity to innovate in risky work and realizes the mistake and corrects the mistake before being reprimanded by the superior. Furthermore, the cooperation indicator in the good category means that the cooperation measured by employees always prioritizes cooperation with colleagues to complete work, express opinions in easy-to-understand language based on agreed rules and respect the results of cooperation among colleagues.

The time indicator in the good category means that the measured time of the employee does the work according to the specified time, completes the work faster than the specified time and is able to work optimally throughout the working hours. Furthermore, the cost indicator in the good category means that the costs measured from employees always prioritize work compared to the costs incurred in carrying out work, the salary provided is sufficient for daily living expenses and is large and the type of allowance received is appropriate. Then the quality indicator in the good category means that the quality measured by employees always carries out work according to the established procedures, as much as possible to minimize work errors and work deftly and quickly.

The results of this study are in line with the results of previous research conducted by Niluh Made Yuni Pradnyawati, et al. (2021) showing that human resource development has a positive and significant effect on employee

1267

performance. This is in line with research conducted by Yahya and David Ahmad Yani (2023), Rafli Hinelo, et al (2022) and Adela Pramesrianto, et al (2020) showing that human resource development has a positive effect on the performance of Civil Servants.

Based on the results of the discussion above, it can be seen that human resource development has a positive and significant effect on employee performance in Motui District, North Konawe Regency. Thus, the development of human resources in Kelurahaan in Motui District, North Konawe Regency is in accordance with what is expected.

# **4.2.2** Work Discipline Affects Employee Performance

The results of the analysis of the second hypothesis test are that work discipline has an influence on employee performance in Motui District, North Konawe Regency was found positive and significant. This can be interpreted that the increase in employee performance is due to the better work discipline of employees in Motui District, North Konawe Regency.

Good discipline is reflected in the magnitude of a person's sense of responsibility for the tasks given to him. Sinambela (2019:332) "so regulations are very necessary to create good order in the office where they work, because the discipline of an office or workplace is said to be good if some employees obey the existing regulations".

Agustini (2019:81) "work discipline is also the willingness and obedience to behave in accordance with the regulations in the agency concerned". Rivai in Rizki and Suprajang (2017) "work discipline has several components such as attendance, obedience to work regulations, obedience to work standards, high level of vigilance, and ethical work". According to Rivai in Alfiah (2019) there are five indicators of work discipline, namely attendance, obedience to work regulations, obedience to work standards, level of vigilance and work ethics.

The results of the variable description showed that the work discipline variable had been well perceived by the respondents which was characterized by an average score of 3.91. This means that the respondents have assessed well the work discipline of the Village in Motui District, North Konawe Regency if perceived from the indicators of attendance, compliance with work regulations, compliance with work standards, high level of employee vigilance, and work ethics.

Based on respondents' answers to five indicators of work discipline variables, the indicator of high level of employee alertness is the indicator that is rated the lowest by employees including the good category. This can be interpreted that the high level of vigilance of employees is considered good by employees. This means that employees carry out work tasks until the end of every day carefully, work in accordance with the work plan and targets that have been set, and pay attention to work safety in carrying out work every day. Furthermore, the indicator of compliance with work regulations is considered good. This means that employees always follow the applicable rules that have been set, understand the rules that have been set and obey the responsibilities given by the leader.

The indicator of compliance with work standards is considered good. This can be interpreted that compliance with work standards is considered good by employees, meaning that employees always wear work clothes or uniforms that have been set, always use identification when working in accordance with what has been set and do all work according to the work standards that have been set. Furthermore, work ethics indicators are considered good. This can be interpreted that work ethics are considered good by employees. This means that employees tidy up the work equipment after they are finished, complete tasks according to the specified time and always ask permission from their superiors when they cannot come to the office. Then the attendance indicator is considered good. This can be interpreted that attendance is considered good by employees. This means that employees are present at the workplace on time before the set working hours, always return to rest according to the set time and always go home to work according to the set time.

Work discipline can affect employee performance. Performance according to Simamora (2015) that in order to achieve the organization to function effectively and in accordance with the organization's goals, the organization must have good employee performance, namely by carrying out its duties in a reliable way. Government Regulation of the Republic of Indonesia Number 30 of 2019 concerning Performance Assessment of Civil Servants. The indicators in this study are quality, quantity, time, cost, service orientation, commitment, work initiative, cooperation and leadership.

The results of the description of the variables showed that the employee performance variables felt by employees in Motui District, North Konawe Regency were in the good category, this showed that the performance owned by employees in Motui District, North Konawe Regency was both assessed from quality, quantity, time, cost, service orientation, commitment, work initiative, cooperation and leadership.

Based on the results of the discussion above, it can be seen that work discipline has a positive and significant effect on employee performance in Motui District, North Konawe Regency. Thus, the better the leadership in Motui District, North Konawe Regency, the better the performance of employees.

# **4.2.3** Work Climate Affects Employee Performance

The results of this study have a positive and significant influence between the work climate and employee performance. This means that the better the employee work climate, the better the employee performance felt by the employee. To improve employee performance, the working climate of employees needs to be improved.

The working climate in a company is very important. The climate in a company has an impact on the high and low morale of a person. The work climate is influenced by the internal environment or the psychology of the company. The high and low morale of employees is also influenced by the state of the work climate that takes place where they work. Controlling the work climate is one of the ways that can be used to increase the productivity of human resources. According to Sugiono in the book Agutini (2010) states that "The Work Climate is the environment of an organization or company that can create a good and bad working atmosphere for employees". Wirawan (2007) The dimensions of

Co-responding Author: Neliwati IJMEHD 1268

the work climate, namely the state of the physical environment of the workplace, the state of the social environment, the implementation of the management system, the physical and psychological conditions of the members of the workforce and the work culture.

The results of the variable description showed that the variable of the work climate felt by employees in Motui District, North Konawe Regency was in the good category, this showed that the work climate owned by employees in Motui District, North Konawe Regency was good assessed from the state of the physical environment of the workplace, the state of the social environment, the implementation of the management system, the physical and psychological conditions of the employees, and work culture.

The work climate variable which is measured through the indicators of the physical and psychological condition of the employees in the good category means that the physical and psychological condition of the employees which is measured by the mutual trust between employees in the office, receives support from colleagues in completing daily tasks and overcoming work obstacles at work. Furthermore, the indicator of the state of the social environment in the good category means that the state of the social environment measured from the relationship with harmonious colleagues increases work morale, a pleasant work environment motivates in work, and establishes good relationships with other employees.

The indicator of the state of the physical environment of the workplace in the good category means that the good and conducive working atmosphere provides peace of mind at work, safety in the workplace and the facilities provided are in accordance with the job. Furthermore, the work culture indicator in the good category means that the work culture measured by employees has a high attitude of discipline, so they are always enthusiastic at work, always honest in working at work, and always evaluate the work that has been done so that the work is better. Then the indicators of the implementation of the management system in the good category mean that the implementation of the management system is measured by the existence of effective management communication, has the opportunity to solve a problem in one's own work without having to ask the boss and the work in this office is clearly defined and structured.

The work climate has an influence on employee performance. Performance according to Simamora (2015) that in order to achieve the organization to function effectively and in accordance with the organization's goals, the organization must have good employee performance, namely by carrying out its duties in a reliable way. Government Regulation of the Republic of Indonesia Number 30 of 2019 concerning Performance Assessment of Civil Servants. The indicators in this study are quality, quantity, time, cost, service orientation, commitment, work initiative, cooperation and leadership.

The results of the description of the variables showed that the employee performance variables felt by employees in Motui District, North Konawe Regency were in the good category, this showed that the performance owned by employees in Motui District, North Konawe Regency was both assessed from quality, quantity, time, cost, service orientation, commitment, work initiative, cooperation and leadership.

Based on the results of the discussion above, it can be seen that the work climate has a positive and significant effect on employee performance in Motui District, North Konawe Regency. Thus, the better the working climate in Motui District, North Konawe Regency, the better the performance of employees.

## V. CONCLUSION

Based on the results of data analysis, hypothesis proofing and discussion of research results, the following conclusions can be drawn:

- 1. Human resource development has a positive and significant effect on employee performance in Motui District, North Konawe Regency. This means that every change in the increase in the variable indicators of human resource development can improve employee performance. The better the implementation of human resource development is able to improve employee performance in Motui District, North Konawe Regency.
- 2. Work discipline has a positive and significant effect on employee performance in Motui District, North Konawe Regency. This means that every change in the increase in work discipline variable indicators can improve employee performance. The better work discipline is able to increase employee performance motivation felt by employees in Motui District, North Konawe Regency.
- 3. The work climate has a positive and significant effect on employee performance in Motui District, North Konawe Regency. This means that every change in the increase in the variable indicators of the work climate can improve employee performance in Motui District, North Konawe Regency. The better the implementation of the work climate is able to improve employee performance in Motui District, North Konawe Regency.

#### REFERENCES

Abdul Choliq. 2011 Pengantar Manajemen. Yogyakarta: Mitra Cendikia.

Adela Pramesrianto, Edward dan Shofia Amin (2020) "Pengaruh pengembangan sumber daya manusia dan kemampuan kerja terhadap kinerja karyawan PT. Jambi Media Grafika "Tribun Jambi". Jurnal Dinamika Manajemen Vol.8. No.3, September– Desember 2020 ISSN: 2338-123X (print); 2355-8148 (online)

Adkon, Riduwan. (2006). Metode dan Teknik Menyusun Tesis. Bandung: Alfabeta

Afandi, Pandi. 2016. Concept & Indicator Human Resources Management for Management Research. Yogyakarta: Cv Budi Utama.

Agustini, Fauziah, 2010. Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia Lanjutan. Medan: Madenatera. Agustini, Fauzia. (2019). Strategi Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia. Medan: UISU Press.

Alfiah, D. (2019). Pengaruh Lingkungan Kerja dan Disiplin Kerja Terhadap Kinerja Karyawan Tetap. Semarang.

Amstrong, Michael. 2003. the Art of HRD: Strategic Human Resource Management a Guide to Action Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia Stratejik Panduan Praktis Untuk Bertindak, alih bahasa oleh ati cahyani. Jakarta: PT Gramedia.

Andrew E. Sikula. 2011. Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia, Erlangga. Bandung.

Ansory, A. F dan Indrasari. 2018. Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia. Edisi Revisi. Indonesia Pustaka. Sidoarjo.

Arthur, Sutikno (2009), Cara menghitung nilai MPN uji coliform, Universitas Sebelas Maret

As'ad. 2003. Kepemimpinan Efektif Dalam Perusahaan. Ed.2. Liberty. Yogyakarta.

Asmini, Andi adawiah, Umar, Mansur, dan Muhammad Fadil (2023) "Pengaruh Disiplin Kerja Terhadap Kinerja Pegawai Pada Kantor Kelurahan Appanang Kecamatan Liliriaja Kabupaten Soppeng". Jurnal Ilmiah Metansi (Manajemen dan Akuntansi) Volume 6 Nomor 2, Oktober2023 DOI: 10.57093/metansi.v6i2.222 p-ISSN:2621-4547 e-ISSN:2723-7478

Bohlander, George., and Snell, Scott. (2010). Principles of Human Resource. Management, 15th ed. Mason, OH: South Western – Cengage Learning.

Brotoharsojo, Hartanto & Wungu, Jiwo, 2003, Tingkatkan Kinerja Perusahaan dengan Merit System, PT. Rajagrafindo Persada, Jakarta.

Chandra Riawan, Trisnowati Josiah, dan E Ahmad Hudallil (2021) "Iklim Kerja Dan Motivasi Kerja Terhadap Kinerja Pegawai". jurnal Dinamika Ekonomi, Manajemen dan Bisnis Pascasarjana Saburai p-ISSN , e-ISSN x <a href="https://doi.org/10.24967/xx.v8i">https://doi.org/10.24967/xx.v8i</a>

Chris Rowley & Keith Jackson. 2012. Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia TheKey Concepts, Cetakan Kesatu, PT Rajagrafindo Persada, Jakarta.

Depdiknas. 2003. Undang-undang RI No.20 tahun 2003. tentang sistem pendidikan nasional.

Depdagri-LAN.2007. Modul Kebijakan Pelayanan Publik, Diklat Teknis Pelayanan Publik, Akuntabilitas dan Pengelolaan Mutu (Public Service Delivery, Accountability and Quality Management). Jakarta LAN.

Dessler Gary, 2013. Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia Human Reources. Jilid 2. Prenhalindo. Jakarta.

Dessler, G. (2015). Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia. Jakarta: Salemba Empat.

Dewi, P. D., dan Harjoyo. 2019. Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia. Tangerang Selatan: UNPAM PRESS.

Diana, Ascarya dan Yumanita.2005. Bank Syariah: Gambaran Umum. Pusat Pendidikan dan Studi Kebanksentralan (PPSK) Bank Indonesia. Jakarta.

Edy Sutrisno, (2019). Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia. Cetak ke sebelas. Prananda Media Group, Jakarta.

Fandy Tjiptono dan Gregorius Chandra. 2005. Service, Quality, and Satisfaction. Andi. Yogyakarta.

Farida, U., dan Hartono, S., (2016), Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia II, Ponorogo, Universitas Muhammadiyah Ponorogo.

Ghozali, Imam. 2011. "Aplikasi Analisis Multivariate Dengan Program SPSS". Semarang: Badan Penerbit Universitas Diponegoro.

Ghozali, Imam. (2015). Aplikasi Analisis Multivariate dengan Program IBM SPSS 23. Semarang : Badan Penerbit Universitas Diponegoro.

Ghozali, Imam, Hengky Latan. 2015. Konsep, Teknik, Aplikasi Menggunakan Smart PLS 3.0 Untuk Penelitian Empiris. BP Undip. Semarang Harnanto. 2017. Akuntansi Biaya: Sistem Biaya Historis. Yogyakarta: BPFE.

G.R Terry. 2010. The Management Of Human Resource Development Based On The Action, Planning, Organizing, And Controling. Jurnal Manajemen, 10 (2), pp. 129-142.

George R.Terry, dan Leslie W.Rue. 2010. Dasar-Dasar Manajemen. Jakarta: Bumi Aksara.

Jogiyanto Hartono dan Abdillah, Willy. 2014. Partial Least Square (PLS). Yogyakarta: Andi.

Jusmaliani. 2011. Pengelolaan Sumber Daya Insani, Jakarta: Bumi Aksara.

Handoko. T. Hani. 2001. Manajemen Personalia dan Sumber Daya Manusia, Edisi II. BPFE Yogyakarta: Yogyakarta.

Handoko, T. Hani. 2011. Manajemen Personalia dan Sumberdaya Manusia. Yogyakarta: Penerbit BPFE.

Hariandja, Marihot Tua Efrndi. 2005. Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia. Jakarta: PT. Grasindo.

Hasan, I. (2006). Analisis Data Penelitian dengan Statistik. Jakarta : Bumi Aksara.

Hasibuan, Malayu SP. 2016. Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia. EdisiRevisi. Jakarta: Penerbit PT Bumi Aksara.

Hasibuan, Malayu. (2017). Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia. Jakarta: Bumi Aksara.

Kadarisman, 2014. Manajemen Pengembangan Sumber Daya Manusia. Rajawali Pers. Jakarta.

Kadarisman, M., 2015. Manajemen Kompensasi. Jakarta: PT. RajaGrafindo Persada.

Kaswan. 2012. Coaching dan Mentoring Untuk Pengembangan SDM dan Peningkatan Kinerja Organisasi, Bandung: Alfabeta.

Khasanah, Nur. (2016). Analisis Disiplin Kerja Pegawai Pada Kantor Camat Raya Kota Pekanbaru. Jurnal Program Studi Ilmu Administrasi Negara. Universitas Riau.

Maludin Panjaitan, 2014. Pengaruh Lingkungan Kerja Terhadap Produktivitas Kerja Karyawan. Medan : Jurnal Manajemen Vol 3. No. 2, dalam www.ejournal.Imiimedan.net, diakses 29 Oktober 2015.

Mangkunegara, A.A Anwar Prabu. 2005. Manajemen Sumber daya Manusia Perusahaan. Bandung : PT Remaja Rosdakarya.

Mangkunegara, A.A. Anwar Prabu. 2020. Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia Instansi. Edisi XIV. Bandung: PT Remaja Rosdakarya.

Mangkuprawira, Sjafri. 2011. Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia Strategik (edisi kedua). Ghalia Indonesia: Bogor.

Manullang. 1982. Perilaku Organisasi: Konsep Dasar dan Aplikasinya. cetakan ke 6. Jakarta: PT.Rajawali Press.

Mathis Robert, Jackson John. 2002. Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia. Jakarta :Salemba empat.

------ 2006. Human Resource Management: Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia. Terjemahan Dian Angelia. Jakarta: Salemba Empat.

Mathis, Robert L dan John H. Jackson, 2012. Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia. Buku 1, Alih Bahasa: Jimmy Sadeli dan Bayu. Prawira Hie, Salemba Empat. Jakarta.

Mei Surya Ningsih, Ikhwan Maulana Haeruddin, dan Tenri S.P Dipotmodjo (2022) "Pengaruh disiplin kerja terhadap kinerja pegawai pada kantor kelurahan". Volume 19 Issue 4 (2022) Pages 774-778 KINERJA: Jurnal Ekonomi dan Manajemen ISSN: 1907-3011 (Print) 2528-1127 (Online)

Moekijat. 2010. Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia. CV. Mandar Maju. Bandung.

Moenir, H.AS, 2008. Manajemen Pelayanan Umum Di Indonesia, Bumi Aksara. Jakarta.

Nasution, Arman. H., 2008. Perencanaan dan Pengendalian Produksi. Edisi Pertama. Yogyakarta: Graha Ilmu.

Niluh Made Yuni Pradnyawati, Nengah Landra dan Ida Bagus Made Widiadnya (2021) "Pengaruh Pengembangan Sumber Daya Manusia, Disiplin Kerja dan Iklim Kerja Terhadap Kinerja Pegawai Pada Dinas Perumahan, Kawasan Permukiman dan Pertanahan Kota Denpasar". VALUES, Volume 2, Nomor 2, Tahun 2021 e-ISSN: 2721-6810

Noe dan Wilk Mondy.1993. Motivation and Work Behavior. Mc Graw Hill Book Co, New York.

Notoatmodjo, Soekidjo, 2003, Pengembangan Sumber Daya Manusia, Jakarta: PT. Rineka Cipta.

Pasolong, Harbani. 2011. Teori Administrasi Publik. Bandung: Alfabeta.

Peraturan Pemerintah Republik Indonesia Nomor 46 tahun 2011 Tentang Penilaian prestasi kerja pegawai negeri sipil

Peraturan Kepala Badan Kepegawaian Negara Nomor 1 Tahun 2013 Tentang Ketentuan Pelaksanaan Peraturan Pemerintah Nomor 46 Tahun 2011 Tentang Penilaian Prestasi Kerja Pegawai Negeri Sipil

Peraturan Pemerintah Republik Indonesia Nomor 30 Tahun 2019 tentang Penilaian Kinerja Pegawai Negeri Sipil

Peraturan Menpan RB atau Permenpan RB Nomor 8 Tahun 2021 Tentang Sistem Manajemen Kinerja PNS (Pegawai Negeri Sipil)

Priyono, Andreas. 2008. Bahan Ajar Penelitian Tindakan Kelas. Program sertifikasi guru jalur Pendidikan. Unnes.

Purwanto, Ngalim. (2006). Psikologi Pendidikan. Bandung: PT Remaja Rosdakarya.

Rafli Hinelo, Lisda L. Asi dan Ambar Nabiilah Arsjad (2022) "Pengaruh Pengembangan Sumber Daya Manusia Terhadap Kinerja Pegawai Negeri Sipil Pada Dinas Pekerjaan Umum Dan Penataan Ruang Kota Gorontalo". JURNAL ILMIAH MANAJEMEN DAN BISNIS P-ISSN 2620-9551 E-ISSN 2622-1616 JAMBURA: Vol 5. No 2. September 2022 Website Jurnal: <a href="http://ejurnal.ung.ac.id/index.php/JIMB">http://ejurnal.ung.ac.id/index.php/JIMB</a>

Rizki, A. dan Suprajang, S. E. (2017). Analisis Kedisiplinan Kerja Dan Lingkungan Kerja Terhadap Kinerja Pada Karyawan PT Griya Asri Mandiri Blitar. Jurnal Penelitian Manajemen Terapan (Penataran), 2, 49–56.

Rivai. Veithzal. 2016. Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia Untuk Perusahaan dari Teori Ke Praktik. Edisi pertama. Raja Grafindo Persada. Jakarta.

Robbins, S.P dan Judge T.A. 2015. Perilaku Organisasi, Salemba Empat, Jakarta.

Salim, Agus, 2006. Teori dan Paradigma Penelitian Sosial. Yogyakarta: Tiara Wacana.

Santy Silawati Saramony, I Ketut Setia Sapta, dan Nengah Sudja (2021) "Pengaruh Iklim Kerja, Disiplin Kerja dan Kompetensi Terhadap Kinerja Pegawai Pada Badan Kepagawaian Pendidikan dan Pelatihan Di Kabupaten Sumba Barat". VALUES, Volume 2, Nomor 2, Tahun 2021 e-ISSN: 2721-6810

Sastradipoera, Komaruddin. 2006. Strategi Pembangunan Sumber Daya Berbasis Pendidikan Kebudayaan. Bandung : Kappa Sigma.

Sedarmayanti. 2016. Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia Reformasi Birokrasi Dan Manajemen Pegawai Negeri Sipil. Bandung: PT. Refika Aditama.

Sekaran, Uma, 2006. Metodologi Penelitian untuk Bisnis. Edisi 4. Buku 1. Jakarta: Salemba Empat.

Siagian. Sondang P. 2012. Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia. Edisi I. Cetakan Ketiga Belas. Bumi aksara. Bumi Aksara. Jakarta.

Simamora Henry. 2015. Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia. Yogyakarta : SIE YKPN.

Sinambela, Sartono. 2019. Manajemen Kinerja Pengelolaan, Pengukuran, dan Implikasi Kinerja. Depok: PT Rajagrafindo Persada

Siregar, A. 2009. Pemberian ASI Ekskusif dan Faktor-faktor yang Mempengaruhinya. Jurnal : Universitas Sumatra Utara.

Soeprihanto, John. 2001. Penilaian Kinerja dan Pengembangan Karyawan. BPFE. Yogjakarta.

Sudjana. 2001. Metode & Teknik Pembelajaran Partisipatif. Bandung: Falah Production.

Sugiyono. 2016. Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif, Kualitatif dan R&D. Bandung: Afabeta.

Sujarweni, V. Wiratna. 2015. Metodologi Penelitian Bisnis Dan Ekonomi, 33. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Baru Press.

Sulistiyani, Ambar Teguh dan Rosidah. 2003. Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia: Konsep, Teori dan Pengembangan dalam Konteks Organisasi Publik. Graha Ilmu. Yogyakarta.

Supranto, Aji. 2005. Pengantar Teknologi Informasi. Salemba Infotek. Jakarta.

Sutrisno, Edy. 2014. Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia. Cetak Ke Enam. Pranada Media Group, Jakarta.

Sutrisno, Edy. 2015. Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia (Cetakan ke tujuh). Jakarta: Kencana Prenada Media Group.

Stoner, James dan Edward Freeman eds, 2015, Manajemen Jilid I, terj. Alexander. Sindoro, Prahallindo, Jakarta.

- Yahya dan David Ahmad Yani (2023) "Pengaruh Pengembangan Sumber Daya Manusia dan Motivasi Kerja terhadap Kinerja Pegawai pada Kantor Kelurahan Blambangan Umpu Kecamatan Blmbangan Umpu Kabupaten Way Kanan". Jurnal Relevansi: Ekonomi, Manajemen Dan Bisnis ISSN: 2622-0415.
- Willson and Heyyel. 1987. Hand Book Of Modern Office Management and Administration Service. Mc Graw Hill Inc. New Jersey.
- Wirawan 2007. "budaya dan iklim organisasi": teori dan aplikasi penelitian jakarta salemba Hlm 128-130

Co-responding Author: Neliwati IJMEHD