

Volume 1 Number 1, 2026

Jurnal Usaha Kecil dan Menengah

STIE KRAKATAU, Indonesia

Work Environment and Discipline on Employee Performance via Motivation and Satisfaction

Suprpto Suprpto^{1*}, Sukesi Sukes², Nurul Agustia³

Universitas Dr. Soetomo, Surabaya, Indonesia^{1,2,3}

zoetenx@gmail.com^{1*}

ARTICLE INFO

Received: 7 April 2026;

Revised: 30 April 2026;

Revised: 11 May 2026;

Revised: 26 May 2026;

Accepted: 13 June 2026;

Volume 1, Number 1

2026, pp 43-54

<https://doi.org/10.61401/jukm.v1i1.580>

Corresponding author:

Suprpto Suprpto

Universitas Dr. Soetomo, Surabaya,
Indonesia

E-mail: zoetenx@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Purpose: This study investigates the influence of the work environment and work discipline on employee performance at the East Java Customs and Excise Regional Office 1, examining work motivation and job satisfaction as intervening variables.

Methodology: A quantitative, causal research design was employed. Data were collected via structured questionnaires from all 68 employees of the office using a total sampling technique, and hypotheses were tested using Structural Equation Modeling with Partial Least Squares (SEM-PLS) through SmartPLS.

Results: The work environment and work discipline each exert a significant positive effect on work motivation and job satisfaction. However, neither variable directly and significantly affects employee performance. Motivation does not significantly influence performance, whereas job satisfaction does so positively and significantly. Mediation analysis shows that motivation does not significantly mediate the relationship between the two independent variables and performance, while job satisfaction significantly mediates the effect of the work environment on performance but not the effect of work discipline on performance.

Conclusions: Job satisfaction, rather than motivation, is the more consequential psychological mechanism linking organizational conditions to performance in this public-sector setting.

Limitations: The cross-sectional single-institution design and modest sample size constrain causal inference and generalizability.

Contributions: The study extends motivation-satisfaction-performance theory to an Indonesian customs administration context, offering practical guidance for public human-resource management and refining the boundary conditions under which motivation mediates performance outcomes in bureaucratic organizations.

Keywords: *Employee Performance, Job Satisfaction, Work Discipline, Work Environment, Work Motivation*

How to Cite: Suprpto, S., Sukesi, S., & Agustia, N. (2026). Work Environment and Discipline on Employee Performance via Motivation and Satisfaction. *Jurnal Usaha Kecil dan Menengah*, 1(1), 43-54.

1. Introduction

Employees constitute the central resource through which organizations translate strategy into results, because they carry the talent, energy, and creativity needed to achieve organizational goals ([Hermawan et al., 2020](#)). As competitive pressures intensify across both private and public sectors, organizations are compelled to pay closer attention to the potential of their workforce and to actively cultivate conditions that improve employee performance ([Pinaraswati et al., 2022](#)). This imperative is particularly salient for public institutions responsible for revenue collection and border control, where the East Java Customs and Excise Regional Office 1 occupies a strategic position within Indonesia's fiscal and trade-facilitation architecture. Customs and excise administrations exist in nearly every country as instruments of state revenue and economic protection, and their operational effectiveness depends heavily on the performance of front-line and administrative personnel ([Tahir, Noor, & Musarat, 2020](#)).

Preliminary field observations at the East Java Customs and Excise Regional Office 1 indicate that employee performance failed to meet organizational targets and exhibited a declining trend throughout 2023, with a quarter-on-quarter deterioration that has, in turn, eroded institutional output relative to prior years. Several converging factors appear to explain this decline. First, the physical work environment is reported by employees as uncomfortable, characterized by heat, noise, and a lack of harmonious interpersonal relations among staff, consistent with evidence that a poorly designed workplace suppresses both well-being and output ([Lee, Tao, Li, & Sun, 2021](#)). Second, work discipline appears deficient, as reflected in elevated rates of absenteeism and tardiness; discipline functions as a mechanism for shaping employee conduct so that performance standards are consistently met ([Nguyen, Trinh, & Nguyen, 2022](#)). Third, motivation is reported to be low, evidenced by unmet task deadlines and a perceived mismatch between compensation and workload, echoing findings that inadequate reward alignment undermines effort ([Sharma & Dhar, 2020](#)). Fourth, job satisfaction appears constrained by limited promotional opportunities and the absence of a structured reward system for employees who meet targets, a pattern associated elsewhere with diminished enthusiasm and discretionary effort ([Malik, Garg, & Jain, 2023](#)).

The theoretical literature offers converging but not fully consistent explanations of how environmental and disciplinary conditions translate into performance. Some studies report that a supportive work environment and firm work discipline directly enhance performance ([Sari, Handayani, & Nugroho, 2023](#)), while others find that these effects operate indirectly, channeled through psychological states such as motivation and satisfaction rather than acting on performance directly ([Kwon & Kim, 2020](#)). This inconsistency suggests that the environment-discipline-performance relationship is contingent on mediating mechanisms whose relative strength may vary by organizational context, and that public-sector bureaucracies, with their distinctive incentive structures and civil-service constraints, may exhibit mediation patterns that differ from those observed in private commercial firms ([Lee, Kim, & Park, 2023](#)).

Given the strategic importance of human resources to institutional performance, and the specific performance decline documented at the East Java Customs and Excise Regional Office 1, it is necessary to examine systematically how the work environment and work discipline influence employee performance, and whether work motivation and job satisfaction serve as the psychological pathways through which these organizational conditions take effect. The novelty of this study lies in its simultaneous modeling of two intervening variables, motivation and satisfaction, within a single structural framework applied to an Indonesian customs administration, an occupational setting that has received comparatively little empirical attention relative to manufacturing, banking, and hospitality contexts that dominate the existing literature. Accordingly, this study aims to determine the influence of the work environment and work discipline on work motivation and job satisfaction; to determine the influence of work motivation and job satisfaction on employee performance; and to determine the influence of the work environment and work discipline on employee performance through work motivation and job satisfaction at the East Java Customs and Excise Regional Office 1. The findings are expected to inform evidence-based human-resource policy for public revenue institutions seeking to reverse performance decline through

targeted improvements in workplace conditions, discipline enforcement, and psychological engagement.

2. Literature Review and Hypotheses Development

2.1 Work Environment

The work environment encompasses the physical, social, and psychological conditions surrounding employees as they perform their tasks, including temperature, noise, lighting, spatial layout, and the quality of interpersonal relationships among colleagues and supervisors ([Taheri, Miah, & Kamaruzzaman, 2020](#)). Contemporary human-resource scholarship increasingly frames the work environment not merely as a hygiene factor but as an active driver of engagement: supportive, ergonomically sound, and socially cohesive settings reduce strain and free cognitive resources for productive effort, whereas noisy, uncomfortable, or socially fragmented settings increase fatigue and withdrawal behaviors ([Lee, Tao, Li, & Sun, 2021](#)). In public-sector organizations, where budget constraints often limit facility upgrades, the social dimension of the environment, namely trust, communication, and collegial support, has been shown to compensate partially for physical shortcomings ([Van Zoonen, Verhoeven, & Vliegenthart, 2021](#)).

Empirical findings on the direct environment-performance link remain mixed. Several Indonesian public-sector studies report a positive but statistically insignificant direct effect of the work environment on employee performance, suggesting that environmental improvements alone are insufficient to raise output unless channeled through motivational or affective states ([Warongan et al., 2022](#); [Sabilalo et al., 2020](#)). Conversely, studies in manufacturing and procurement settings find a significant direct effect, implying that the strength of this relationship is moderated by task structure and the degree of employee autonomy ([Susanti, Widagdo, & Dahliani, 2024](#)). This inconsistency reinforces the theoretical rationale for testing indirect pathways through motivation and satisfaction rather than assuming a uniform direct effect across organizational types.

In addition to its physical and social dimensions, the work environment also influences employees' psychological perceptions of organizational support and well-being. A workplace that provides adequate facilities, open communication, and supportive supervisory practices fosters a sense of security and belonging, encouraging employees to invest greater effort in their work. These favorable conditions not only enhance day-to-day job experiences but also strengthen work motivation and job satisfaction, which subsequently contribute to improved employee performance. Consequently, the work environment is expected to exert both direct and indirect effects on performance through employees' motivational and affective responses ([Susanti et al., 2024](#)).

2.2 Work Discipline

Work discipline refers to an employee's willingness and ability to observe organizational rules, procedures, and time commitments, and is widely regarded as a foundational element of workforce reliability ([Nguyen, Trinh, & Nguyen, 2022](#)). In bureaucratic and civil-service contexts, discipline is often codified through formal regulations governing attendance, punctuality, and conduct, and its enforcement is associated with reduced absenteeism and improved procedural compliance ([Tahir, Noor, & Musarat, 2020](#)). Contemporary treatments distinguish preventive discipline, which cultivates self-regulation through clear expectations, from corrective discipline, which applies sanctions after infractions; the former is generally associated with more sustainable performance gains because it operates through internalized norms rather than fear of punishment ([Lee, Kim, & Park, 2023](#)).

As with the work environment, the empirical record on discipline's direct effect on performance is uneven. Some studies conducted in Indonesian regional government offices report that work discipline exerts no significant direct effect on performance once psychological mediators are included in the model by [Ali and Simamora \(2022\)](#), while others operating in single-firm settings without mediators report significant direct effects ([Sari, Handayani, & Nugroho, 2023](#)). This divergence again points toward the importance of examining discipline's indirect influence through motivation and job satisfaction, particularly in institutions such as customs offices where task execution

is procedure-bound and where the consequences of non-compliance can be institutionally significant.

Beyond ensuring compliance with organizational rules, work discipline contributes to the development of a structured and accountable work culture that supports consistent employee performance. Employees who demonstrate high discipline are more likely to complete tasks on time, adhere to established procedures, and maintain professional standards, thereby enhancing both individual and organizational effectiveness. Moreover, when disciplinary practices are perceived as fair and consistently enforced, they can strengthen employees' motivation and job satisfaction by reinforcing a sense of organizational justice and role clarity ([Sari et al., 2023](#)). Accordingly, work discipline is expected to influence employee performance not only directly but also indirectly through these psychological mechanisms.

2.3 Work Motivation

Work motivation describes the internal and external forces that direct, energize, and sustain goal-oriented behavior in the workplace ([Kuvaas, Buch, Weibel, Dysvik, & Nerstad, 2017](#)). Contemporary motivation research distinguishes intrinsic motivation, arising from the inherent interest or meaning employees find in their tasks, from extrinsic motivation, driven by external rewards such as pay, promotion, or recognition; the two forms relate differently to performance outcomes, with intrinsic motivation more consistently predicting discretionary effort and extrinsic motivation more closely tied to compliance-oriented behavior ([Kuvaas et al., 2017](#)). Compensation-based motivational theory further suggests that when extrinsic rewards are perceived as inadequate relative to workload, motivational deficits emerge regardless of how favorable other working conditions may be ([Kim, Fulmer, & Gerhart, 2023](#)).

Despite motivation's theoretical centrality, several recent studies in Indonesian public institutions report that motivation does not significantly predict performance once job satisfaction is modeled alongside it, suggesting that motivation may operate primarily as an antecedent of satisfaction rather than as an independent driver of output ([Cahya et al., 2021](#)). This pattern is consistent with expectancy-based reasoning: motivation shapes the intention to perform, but whether that intention converts into sustained performance depends on whether the broader work experience, captured by satisfaction, reinforces continued effort ([Malik, Garg, & Jain, 2023](#)).

2.4 Job Satisfaction

Job satisfaction reflects an employee's overall affective and evaluative response to their job, encompassing attitudes toward pay, promotion opportunities, supervision, coworker relations, and the intrinsic nature of the work itself ([Sausan, Nasution, & Sabrina, 2021](#)). Job satisfaction has been theorized both as an outcome of favorable working conditions and as an antecedent of performance, positioning it as a pivotal mediating construct in Human Resource Management (HRM) models ([Malik, Garg, & Jain, 2023](#)). Organizational justice research further indicates that perceptions of fairness, particularly in promotion and reward allocation, are strong predictors of satisfaction, and that unfair or opaque promotion systems, as reported at the East Java Customs and Excise Regional Office 1, are likely to suppress satisfaction even when other conditions are adequate ([Kim & Beehr, 2018](#)).

A substantial body of evidence supports a significant positive relationship between job satisfaction and employee performance across sectors ([Paparang, Areros, & Tatimu, 2021](#); [Rodríguez-Fernández, Herrera, & Ciruela-Lorenzo, 2024](#)). This relationship is generally more robust and more consistently significant than the motivation-performance relationship, suggesting that satisfied employees translate favorable affective states into sustained behavioral commitment more reliably than motivated-but-dissatisfied employees do ([Sugianto, 2018](#)).

2.5 Employee Performance and the Mediating Framework

Employee performance is conventionally defined as the extent to which an individual accomplishes assigned tasks in accordance with quality, quantity, and timeliness standards set by the organization ([Sari & Hadijah, 2016](#)). In public administration, performance additionally carries accountability dimensions tied to public trust and regulatory compliance, making the determinants of performance

in customs and excise institutions both an HRM concern and a governance concern ([Indrayani, Fermayani, Egim, Chen, & Andra, 2025](#)).

Integrating the constructs reviewed above, this study adopts a mediated framework in which the work environment and work discipline are treated as exogenous organizational conditions, work motivation and job satisfaction as parallel intervening psychological states, and employee performance as the ultimate outcome. This framework is consistent with recent SEM-PLS studies that model motivation and satisfaction jointly rather than singly, and that report differentiated mediation effects depending on which psychological state is activated by which organizational condition ([Rejeki, Linawati, Sofiati, & Marzuki, 2022](#); [Adinda, Firdaus, & Agung, 2023](#)). The present study extends this line of work to a customs administration setting, where procedural rigidity and civil-service employment security may alter the relative salience of motivation versus satisfaction as performance mechanisms, and thereby contributes new boundary-condition evidence to the motivation-satisfaction-performance literature.

2.6 Hypotheses Development

Based on the theoretical framework and empirical evidence reviewed in the preceding sections, this study proposes twelve hypotheses to examine the direct and indirect relationships among the research variables. The direct hypotheses assess the effects of the work environment and work discipline on work motivation, job satisfaction, and employee performance, as well as the effects of work motivation and job satisfaction on employee performance. The mediation hypotheses examine the indirect effects of the work environment and work discipline on employee performance through work motivation and job satisfaction ([Rejeki et al., 2022](#); [Kuvaas et al., 2017](#); [Nguyen et al., 2022](#)).

H₁: The work environment has a positive effect on work motivation

H₂: Work discipline has a positive effect on work motivation

H₃: The work environment has a positive effect on job satisfaction

H₄: Work discipline has a positive effect on job satisfaction

H₅: The work environment has a positive effect on employee performance

H₆: Work discipline has a positive effect on employee performance

H₇: Work motivation has a positive effect on employee performance

H₈: Job satisfaction has a positive effect on employee performance

H₉: Work motivation mediates the positive effect of the work environment on employee performance

H₁₀: Work motivation mediates the positive effect of work discipline on employee performance

H₁₁: Job satisfaction mediates the positive effect of the work environment on employee performance

H₁₂: Job satisfaction mediates the positive effect of work discipline on employee performance

3. Methodology

This study employed a quantitative research method with a causal explanatory design intended to test the directional relationships among the work environment, work discipline, work motivation, job satisfaction, and employee performance. The research was conducted at the East Java Customs and Excise Regional Office 1. The population comprised all 68 employees of the office, and because the population size was small and finite, a total sampling technique was used, whereby the entire population served as the research sample. This approach eliminates sampling error associated with partial extraction and is consistent with common practice in small-population organizational studies ([Usman & Sandyaningrum, 2022](#)). Primary data were collected through a structured questionnaire administered directly to respondents, using closed-ended items measured on a five-point Likert scale ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree; secondary data were drawn

from internal performance reports and administrative records of the office to contextualize and corroborate the survey findings.

The study operationalized five latent constructs. The work environment (X_1) and work discipline (X_2) were treated as exogenous independent variables; work motivation (Z_1) and job satisfaction (Z_2) were treated as intervening variables; and employee performance (Y) was treated as the dependent variable. Each construct was measured with multiple indicators adapted from validated prior instruments and refined for the customs administration context. Data were analyzed using Structural Equation Modeling with Partial Least Squares (SEM-PLS) via the SmartPLS software application, a variance-based approach well suited to small-to-moderate sample sizes and to models involving multiple mediating pathways ([Hair, Hult, Ringle, & Sarstedt, 2022](#)). The analysis proceeded in two stages: evaluation of the outer (measurement) model through indicator loadings, convergent validity, and reliability statistics, followed by evaluation of the inner (structural) model through path coefficients, t-statistics obtained via bootstrapping, and variance accounted for by mediation, in accordance with standard PLS-SEM reporting conventions ([Hair et al., 2022](#)). A t-statistic threshold of 1.96 at the 5% significance level was applied to determine the significance of each hypothesized path, and specific indirect effects were used to test the mediating roles of motivation and job satisfaction.

Instrument validity was assessed through convergent validity criteria, requiring Average Variance Extracted (AVE) values above 0.50 and outer loadings above 0.70 for each indicator, while discriminant validity was assessed using the Fornell-Larcker criterion and the Heterotrait-Monotrait (HTMT) ratio, consistent with current PLS-SEM best practice ([Hair et al., 2022](#)). Reliability was evaluated using both Cronbach's alpha and composite reliability, with values above 0.70 considered acceptable. Prior to full data collection, the instrument was pilot-tested with a small group of employees to identify ambiguous wording and to confirm face validity within the customs administration context. Common-method bias was addressed procedurally by varying item wording and response formats and was assessed statistically using Harman's single-factor test, in line with recommended safeguards for single-source survey data ([Malik, Garg, & Jain, 2023](#)).

Structural model evaluation followed a sequential logic: assessment of collinearity among predictor constructs using Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) statistics, evaluation of the coefficient of determination (R^2) for each endogenous construct, assessment of effect size (f^2) for each structural path, and evaluation of predictive relevance (Q^2) using blindfolding procedures. Path significance and mediation effects were tested using a nonparametric bootstrapping procedure with 5,000 resamples, generating t-statistics and 95% confidence intervals for both direct and specific indirect effects. This analytical sequence ensures that the reported relationships are not merely descriptive correlations but statistically validated structural paths appropriate for theory testing in a moderately sized organizational sample ([Hair et al., 2022](#)).

4. Results and Discussion

Prior to structural model testing, the measurement model was evaluated for validity and reliability. All indicator loadings exceeded the 0.70 threshold, and Average Variance Extracted (AVE) values for each latent construct exceeded 0.50, confirming convergent validity. Discriminant validity was supported by both the Fornell-Larcker criterion and HTMT ratios below 0.90. Composite reliability and Cronbach's alpha values for all constructs exceeded 0.70, indicating adequate internal consistency. Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) values for all predictor constructs remained below 3.0, indicating no problematic collinearity. The coefficient of determination (R^2) for employee performance was 0.512, indicating that the model explains approximately 51 percent of the variance in performance, a moderate-to-substantial level for a five-construct behavioral model. R^2 values for motivation and job satisfaction were 0.487 and 0.463 respectively, and the Q^2 predictive relevance values for all endogenous constructs were positive, confirming the model's predictive adequacy.

Table 1. Path coefficients and significance of direct relationships

Relationship	Path Coefficient (T-Statistic)	Significance (T > 1.96)	Conclusion
Work Environment → Motivation	4.571	Significant	H_1 supported
Work Discipline → Motivation	4.591	Significant	H_2 supported
Work Environment → Job Satisfaction	3.074	Significant	H_3 supported
Work Discipline → Job Satisfaction	2.079	Significant	H_4 supported
Work Environment → Performance	0.238	Not significant	H_5 not supported
Work Discipline → Performance	1.761	Not significant	H_6 not supported
Motivation → Performance	0.722	Not significant	H_7 not supported
Job Satisfaction → Performance	2.748	Significant	H_8 supported

Table 1 shows the direct-effects results indicate that the work environment and work discipline each exert a statistically significant positive influence on both work motivation and job satisfaction, with all four t-statistics well above the 1.96 critical value. In contrast, neither the work environment nor work discipline directly and significantly predicts employee performance, and motivation likewise fails to reach significance as a direct predictor of performance. Job satisfaction is the only variable in the model that exerts a significant direct effect on employee performance, with a t-statistic of 2.748.

Table 2 reports the specific indirect effects used to test the mediating roles of work motivation and job satisfaction in the relationships between the two organizational conditions and employee performance.

Table 2. Specific indirect (mediation) effects

Indirect Path	T-Statistic	Significance (T > 1.96)	Mediation Conclusion
Work Environment → Motivation → Performance	0.619	Not significant	No mediation
Work Discipline → Motivation → Performance	0.740	Not significant	No mediation
Work Environment → Job Satisfaction → Performance	1.989	Significant	Mediation confirmed
Work Discipline → Job Satisfaction → Performance	1.870	Not significant	No mediation

Table 2 shows the mediation results show that work motivation does not significantly mediate the effect of either the work environment or work discipline on employee performance, as both indirect t-statistics fall below 1.96. Job satisfaction, however, significantly mediates the relationship between the work environment and employee performance, while its mediating role in the work discipline-performance relationship does not reach significance. Taken together, the pattern of results indicates that job satisfaction is the dominant psychological mechanism through which

organizational conditions, particularly the physical and social work environment, translate into performance outcomes at the East Java Customs and Excise Regional Office 1.

4.1 Discussion

The Influence of the Work Environment on Motivation. The results show a significant positive effect of the work environment on employee motivation ($T = 4.571$). This finding is consistent with [Sabilalo, Ilyas, and Nur \(2020\)](#), who found a positive relationship between the work environment and motivation, and it aligns with theoretical accounts holding that supportive physical and social conditions reduce psychological strain and free capacity for goal-directed engagement ([Lee, Tao, Li, & Sun, 2021](#)). Even though the physical environment at the office was described by employees as uncomfortable, the significant path suggests that incremental improvements to comfort and workplace relations would meaningfully raise motivation levels.

The Influence of Work Discipline on Motivation. Work discipline also significantly and positively affects motivation ($T = 4.591$), corroborating [Yanthi, Landra, and Sudja \(2019\)](#), who reported that work discipline significantly shapes employee motivation. Clear behavioral expectations appear to function as an external structuring mechanism that channels effort, consistent with the view that preventive discipline builds self-regulatory motivation over time ([Lee, Kim, & Park, 2023](#)). **The Influence of the Work Environment on Job Satisfaction.** A significant positive effect of the work environment on job satisfaction is confirmed ($T = 3.074$), in line with [Irma and Muhammad \(2020\)](#), who found a significant positive association between these constructs. This supports the broader HRM literature identifying environmental quality as a proximal determinant of affective job attitudes ([Taheri, Miah, & Kamaruzzaman, 2020](#)).

The Influence of Work Discipline on Job Satisfaction. Work discipline significantly and positively affects job satisfaction ($T = 2.079$), consistent with [Djari and Firdaus \(2017\)](#), who reported a significant effect of discipline on satisfaction. Predictable, consistently enforced rules appear to reduce ambiguity and perceived unfairness, thereby supporting satisfaction ([Van, Verhoeven, & Vliegenthart, 2021](#)). **The Influence of the Work Environment on Performance.** Contrary to a simple direct-effects expectation, the work environment does not significantly affect employee performance ($T = 0.238$), aligning with [Warongan, Areros, and Sambul \(2022\)](#), who likewise found no significant direct environment-performance effect. This reinforces the conclusion that environmental conditions operate on performance indirectly, through affective and motivational states, rather than directly ([Kwon & Kim, 2020](#)).

The Influence of Work Discipline on Performance. Work discipline similarly shows no significant direct effect on performance ($T = 1.761$), matching ([Ali & Simamora, 2022](#)). This suggests that at the East Java Customs and Excise Regional Office 1, disciplinary compliance alone, absent accompanying psychological engagement, is insufficient to raise output, a pattern also noted in other Indonesian public-sector studies ([Sari, Handayani, & Nugroho, 2023](#)). **The Influence of Motivation on Performance.** Motivation does not significantly influence performance ($T = 0.722$), consistent with [Cahya, Wahyuni, and Prasetyo \(2021\)](#). This finding is theoretically important: it implies that in this bureaucratic, procedure-bound setting, being motivated to perform does not reliably translate into measurable output unless motivation is reinforced by a broader sense of satisfaction with the job ([Malik, Garg, & Jain, 2023](#)).

The Influence of Job Satisfaction on Performance. Job satisfaction significantly and positively affects performance ($T = 2.748$), consistent with [Paparang, Areros, and Tatimu \(2021\)](#), who found a significant positive influence of satisfaction on performance. This is the strongest and most consequential direct pathway identified in the model, echoing the broader literature's emphasis on satisfaction as a robust performance predictor ([Sugiarto, 2018](#)). **The Influence of the Work Environment on Performance through Motivation.** The indirect effect is not significant ($T = 0.619$), consistent with [Cahya et al. \(2021\)](#), who found that motivation does not mediate the work environment-performance relationship. Motivation is therefore activated by environmental quality but does not itself carry that influence forward into performance.

The Influence of Work Discipline on Performance through Motivation. This indirect effect is also not significant ($T = 0.740$), aligning with [Islamiyah and Suhaeli \(2018\)](#), who found no indirect effect of the work environment on performance mediated by motivation, a conceptually parallel result for discipline in the present model. The Influence of the Work Environment on Performance through Job Satisfaction. This indirect effect is significant ($T = 1.989$), consistent with [Ende and Firdaus \(2021\)](#), who found that the work environment significantly affects performance through job satisfaction. This is the study's central mediation finding: improving the physical and social work environment raises job satisfaction, which in turn meaningfully improves performance, even though the environment shows no significant direct effect on its own.

The Influence of Work Discipline on Performance through Job Satisfaction. This indirect path narrowly falls short of significance ($T = 1.870$), indicating that while work discipline strengthens job satisfaction, the chain from discipline through satisfaction to performance is weaker than the corresponding chain originating from the work environment. This asymmetry suggests that at the East Java Customs and Excise Regional Office 1, improving physical and social working conditions is likely to yield more reliable performance gains than tightening disciplinary enforcement alone, a nuance that has practical implications for resource allocation in public human-resource management ([Rejeki, Linawati, Sofiati, & Marzuki, 2022](#)).

Integrative Synthesis viewed as a whole, the discussion above reveals a consistent asymmetry between motivation and job satisfaction as performance mechanisms in this customs administration setting. Both organizational conditions, the work environment and work discipline, reliably strengthen employees' psychological states, yet only job satisfaction reliably converts those states into performance gains. This pattern departs somewhat from classical expectancy and goal-setting accounts, which typically assign motivation a central causal role ([Locke & Latham, 1990](#)), and instead aligns more closely with affective events and job-attitude theories that treat satisfaction as the more proximal determinant of sustained work behavior ([Malik et al., 2023](#)). A plausible explanation lies in the civil-service employment context of the East Java Customs and Excise Regional Office 1, because job security is largely independent of short-term performance fluctuations, transient motivational boosts from a better environment or firmer discipline may not translate into behavioral change unless accompanied by a broader, more durable sense of satisfaction with pay structures, promotion prospects, and organizational fairness ([Kim & Beehr, 2018](#)). This interpretation is consistent with the finding that the environment-satisfaction-performance chain is significant while the corresponding motivation chain is not, and it suggests that HRM interventions aimed at structural fairness and workplace comfort may yield more durable performance improvements than motivational campaigns or disciplinary tightening alone.

5. Conclusions

5.1 Conclusion

This study demonstrates that the work environment and work discipline significantly and positively influence work motivation and job satisfaction among employees of the East Java Customs and Excise Regional Office 1, but neither exerts a significant direct effect on employee performance. Motivation likewise does not significantly predict performance, whereas job satisfaction does so significantly and positively. Mediation analysis confirms that job satisfaction, rather than motivation, is the pathway through which the work environment translates into improved performance, while work discipline's influence on performance through either intervening variable remains statistically limited. These findings collectively indicate that performance improvement in this public-sector institution is more strongly leveraged through employee satisfaction-oriented interventions than through motivational or purely disciplinary measures alone.

Theoretically, the study contributes to the motivation-satisfaction-performance literature by demonstrating that, within a civil-service customs administration, job satisfaction functions as a more consequential mediating mechanism than work motivation, a boundary condition that qualifies the generality of motivation-centered performance models developed largely in private commercial settings. Practically, the findings suggest that managers at the East Java Customs and Excise Regional Office 1, and potentially at comparable public revenue institutions, should

prioritize investments in physical workplace comfort, transparent promotion systems, and structured reward mechanisms over motivational messaging or disciplinary enforcement alone, since these satisfaction-oriented levers are the ones most strongly and reliably linked to measurable performance improvement in this context.

5.2 Research Limitations

The First, cross-sectional, single-institution design restricts causal inference and limits generalizability to other customs offices or public agencies with different organizational cultures. Second, the total sample of 68 employees, while appropriate given the population size, constrains statistical power for detecting smaller effect sizes and limits subgroup analysis by tenure, division, or job level. Third, data were collected exclusively through self-reported questionnaires, which may be subject to common-method bias and social-desirability effects, particularly for sensitive items concerning discipline and performance. Fourth, the study did not incorporate objective performance metrics such as supervisor ratings or administrative records, relying instead on employee self-assessment of performance-related indicators.

5.3 Directions and Future Study

Future research should consider longitudinal or multi-wave designs to better establish causal ordering among the work environment, discipline, motivation, satisfaction, and performance. Comparative studies across multiple customs and excise regional offices, or across other public revenue institutions, would strengthen the generalizability of the mediation pattern identified here. Incorporating objective performance data, such as supervisor evaluations or administrative output records, alongside self-reported measures would help triangulate findings and reduce common-method bias. Future studies might also examine additional mediators or moderators, such as organizational justice, leadership style, or digital transformation of customs processes, to build a more comprehensive model of performance determinants in public-sector revenue administration.

Acknowledgement

The authors would like to thank the management and staff of the East Java Customs and Excise Regional Office 1 for their cooperation and willingness to participate in this research, and Universitas Dr. Soetomo Surabaya for institutional support throughout the study.

References

- Adinda, T. N., Firdaus, M. A., & Agung, S. (2023). The influence of work motivation and work discipline on employee performance. *Indonesian Journal of Innovation Multidisciplinary Research*, 1(3). <https://doi.org/10.31004/ijim.v1i3.15>
- Ali, I. Y., & Simamora, R. (2022). Effect of Work Discipline and Work Motivation on Employee Performance. *Almana: Jurnal Manajemen dan Bisnis*, 6(1), 124-135.. <https://doi.org/10.36555/almana>
- Cahya, R., Wahyuni, S., & Prasetyo, D. (2021). Motivation as a mediator between work environment and employee performance in Indonesian public organizations. *Jurnal Manajemen dan Bisnis Indonesia*, 9(2), 145-158.
- Djari, A., & Firdaus, M. (2017). The effect of work discipline on job satisfaction of civil servants. *Jurnal Administrasi Publik*, 6(1), 33-41. <https://doi.org/10.46484/db.v7i2.52>
- Ende, T., & Firdaus, R. (2021). Work environment and employee performance: The mediating role of job satisfaction. *Jurnal Ekonomi dan Manajemen*, 8(2), 112-124.
- Hair, J. F., Hult, G. T. M., Ringle, C. M., & Sarstedt, M. (2022). *A primer on partial least squares structural equation modeling (PLS-SEM) (3rd ed.)*.
- Hermawan, A., Ilhamalimy, R. R., & Nurhayati, T. (2020). Human resources as an important organizational asset: A review of employee performance determinants. *Jurnal Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia*, 4(2), 55-66.

- Indrayani, T. I., Fermayani, R., Egim, A. S., Chen, L., & Andra, Y. (2025). Do Human Resource Management Practices Improve Employee Performance? The Mediation Role of Job Satisfaction in Indonesian MSMEs. *Jurnal Manajemen Bisnis*, 16(2), 418-441. <https://doi.org/10.18196/mb.v16i2.26310>
- Irma, S., & Muhammad, A. (2020). The effect of work environment on job satisfaction of employees. *Jurnal Ilmu Manajemen*, 9(1), 21-30.
- Islamiyah, N., & Suhaeli, D. (2018). The indirect effect of work environment on employee performance mediated by motivation. *Jurnal Riset Manajemen*, 7(3), 199-210..
- Kim, J. H., Fulmer, I. S., & Gerhart, B. (2023). Compensation and performance: A review and recommendations for the future. *Personnel Psychology*, 76(2), 189-229. <https://doi.org/10.1111/peps.12580>
- Kim, M., & Beehr, T. A. (2018). Thriving on fairness: Exploring why and when perceived justice promotes thriving at work. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 39(3), 266-279. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.2263>
- Kuvaas, B., Buch, R., Weibel, A., Dysvik, A., & Nerstad, C. G. L. (2017). Do intrinsic and extrinsic motivation relate differently to employee outcomes? *Journal of Economic Psychology*, 61, 244–258. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.joep.2017.05.004>
- Kwon, K., & Kim, T. (2020). An integrative review of employee engagement and performance. *Human Resource Management Review*, 30(2), 100704. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2019.100704>
- Lee, J., Kim, H., & Park, S. (2023). Work discipline and employee performance in Korean public sector organizations. *International Journal of Human Resource Studies*, 13(1), 88-104. <https://doi.org/10.5296/ijhrs.v13i1.20782>
- Lee, Y., Tao, W., Li, J. Y. Q., & Sun, R. (2021). Enhancing employees' well-being and performance through supportive work environments. *Public Relations Review*, 47(1), 101982. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pubrev.2020.101982>
- Locke, E. A., & Latham, G. P. (1990). *A theory of goal setting and task performance*.
- Malik, P., Garg, P., & Jain, R. (2023). Linking HR practices and employee performance: The mediating role of motivation. *International Journal of Manpower*, 44(4), 742-759. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJM-08-2021-0482>
- Nguyen, P. V., Trinh, H., & Nguyen, T. M. (2022). Work discipline and employee performance: Evidence from emerging economies. *Employee Relations*, 44(5), 1167-1184. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ER-11-2020-0512>
- Paparang, N. C. P., Areros, W. A., & Tatimu, V. (2021). The influence of job satisfaction on employee performance. *Productivity*, 2(2), 119-124.
- Pinaraswati, D., Susanto, H., & Rahmawati, I. (2022). Human resource competitiveness and employee performance improvement strategies. *Jurnal Bisnis dan Manajemen*, 10(1), 15-27..
- Rejeki, S., Linawati, L., Sofiati, S., & Marzuki, A. (2022). The influence of motivation, discipline, work environment, and work commitment on employee performance at Sregep Yogyakarta. *Indonesian Journal of Accounting and Business Research*, 2(4), 1119-1135. <https://doi.org/10.32477/jrabi.v2i4.614>
- Rodríguez-Fernández, M., Herrera, J., De Las Heras-Rosas, C., & Ciruela-Lorenzo, A. M. (2024). Practical implications of the organizational commitment model in healthcare: The case of nurses. *Journal of Nursing Management*, 2024, Article 6455398. <https://doi.org/10.1155/2024/6455398>

- Sabilalo, M. A., Ilyas, G. B., & Nur, Y. (2020). The effect of work environment, competence and workload on employee performance through work motivation. *International Journal of Advanced Science and Technology*, 29(5), 8206-8217..
- Sari, D. P., Handayani, R., & Nugroho, Y. (2023). Work discipline, leadership, and employee performance: Empirical evidence from Indonesian firms. *Journal of Asian Finance, Economics and Business*, 10(2), 345-354. <https://doi.org/10.13106/jafeb.2023.vol10.no2.0345>
- Sari, R. N. I., & Hadijah, H. S. (2016). Improving employee performance through job satisfaction and work discipline. *Journal of Office Management Education*, 1(1), 204-214..
- Sausan, N. S., Nasution, A. M. U., & Sabrina, H. (2021). The influence of job satisfaction and employee loyalty on employee performance in foods manufacture. *Economics, Business and Management Science Journal*, 1(1), 6-13. <https://doi.org/10.34007/ebmsj.v1i1.3>
- Sharma, A., & Dhar, R. L. (2020). Role of compensation and rewards in shaping employee motivation and performance. *Journal of Organizational Effectiveness: People and Performance*, 7(2), 197-215. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JOEPP-01-2020-0006>
- Sugiarto, I. (2018). Organizational climate, organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and employee performance. *Diponegoro International Journal of Business*, 1(2), 112-120. <https://doi.org/10.14710/dijb.1.2.2018.112-120>
- Susanti, S., Widagdo, S., & Dahliani, Y. (2024). The influence of work environment, compensation, work discipline, workload, and work life balance on employee job satisfaction. *JMBI: Journal of Business Management and Informatics*, 5(1). <https://doi.org/10.31967/prodimanajemen.v5i1.1106>
- Taheri, R. H., Miah, M. S., & Kamaruzzaman, M. (2020). Impact of working environment on job satisfaction. *European Journal of Business and Management Research*, 5(6), 1-5..
- Tahir, S., Noor, S., & Musarat, M. A. (2020). Workplace discipline and job performance: Evidence from public sector institutions. *Journal of Public Affairs*, 20(4). <https://doi.org/10.1002/pa.2132>
- Usman, O., & Sandyaningrum, M. (2022). Effect of work discipline, work motivation, and work environment on employee performance. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4126970>
- Van Zoonen, W., Verhoeven, J. W. M., & Vliegenthart, R. (2021). Understanding internal communication: Employee communication behavior and the role of leadership communication. *Corporate Communications: An International Journal*, 26(3), 600-616. <https://doi.org/10.1108/CCIJ-09-2020-0115>
- Warongan, J., Areros, W. A., & Sambul, S. A. P. (2022). The effect of work environment on employee performance. *Productivity*, 3(1), 29-35.
- Yanthi, N. P., Landra, N., & Sudja, N. (2019). The effect of work discipline on employee motivation and performance. *International Journal of Contemporary Research and Review*, 10(3), 21456-21464. <https://doi.org/10.15520/ijcrr.v10i03.674>