



Article

The Effect of Job Satisfaction, Work Discipline and Environment on Employee Job Performance

Wenny Desty Febrian ^{a,*} and Yanthy Herawati Purnama ^a

^a Department of Management, Faculty of Business and Administration, Universitas Dian Nusantara, Jakarta, Indonesia; yanthy.herawati.purnama@undira.ac.id

* Correspondence: wenny.desty.febrian@undira.ac.id

Citations: Febrian, W.D., & Purnama, Y.H. (2022). The Effect of Job Satisfaction, Work Discipline and Environment on Employee Job Performance. *International Journal of Advances in Social Sciences and Humanities*, 1 (1), 34-41.

Academic Editor: Mursyidin Zakaria.

Received: 27 December 2021

Accepted: 18 February 2022

Published: 28 February 2022

Abstract: Today, employee job performance has become main focus of organization or business industry due to their contribution to business performance. This study investigates the relationship of work discipline, work environment, and job satisfaction on employee job performance at Bank Syariah Indonesia (BSI) West Jakarta, Indonesia. This study is designed using a quantitative approach through survey questionnaire. A total of 75 employees from BSI West Jakarta Branch have participated and collected using random sampling technique. The data analyzed using structural equation modeling (SEM) partial least square (PLS) method. The study result indicated that work discipline and job satisfaction influence job performance. Besides that, this study indicated that work environment has no significant relationship with employee job performance. In conclusion, this study has successfully investigated the determinant factors of employee job performance. The study findings indicated that work environment and job satisfaction can enhance the employee performance in Bank Syariah Indonesia (BSI) West Jakarta, Indonesia.

Keywords: work discipline; work environment; job satisfaction; employee job performance.



Copyright: © 2022 by the authors. Submitted for possible open access publication under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

1. Introduction

Organizational performance refers to how the process of carrying out activities to achieve the business goals (Mulyasana et al., 2020). It is also realized that employee performance does not run by itself, but there are several factors that influence it (Mayangsari et al., 2020), including organizational leadership, work atmosphere, work environment, and time or working hours (Pavithra & Deepak, 2021). To get a picture of a person's performance, it is necessary to specify the study the motivation related to employee job performance (Mayangsari et al., 2020). One of the organization goal is to increase their employee job performance (Nurwulansari & Rikumahu, 2018). Performance is defined as the quality and quantity of work achieved by an employee in carrying out their duties (Muradli & Ahmadov, 2019). A community is a combination of organizations (Bajorek & Bevan, 2015). Organizations are a combination of groups, and groups are a combination of individuals (Laras et al., 2021). Employees are social beings who are the main wealth of every organization (Gross et al., 2021).

In this case, the company must continue to spur the performance of its employees so that the expected targets can be achieved (Arifin et al., 2019). Agarwal & Gupta (2021) stated that an organization's success is threatened if its

employees fail to accept its missions, goals, and objectives and fail to believe in what it stands for. Also, (Jiménez, 2018) stated that perceived organizational support affects employee engagement positively and employee engagement (Son et al., 2021). Kamaruddin et al. (2021) showed a positive effect on affective commitment and employee performance. Jing et al. (2019) argued that performance includes standards that are set as the basis for achieving work activities and these standards also determine. Whether employee performance is good or bad (Bayu Kuta Waringin & Dewi, 2018). Gandung (2022) stated that performance assessment is based on an understanding of knowledge, skills, expertise, and behavior necessary to do a good job and a more extensive analysis of the attributes and behavior of individuals (Yusliza et al., 2021). On this basis, a company needs to conduct coaching and development of employees in order to reduce the cost of the waste. Bhardwaj et al. (2020) added that an employee cannot complete the job properly and relies on tasks assigned to other employees (Raub et al., 2021).

On February 1, 2021, which coincided with 19 Jumadil Akhir 1442 H, it became a historical marker of the joining of Bank Syariah Mandiri, BNI Syariah, and BRI Syariah into one entity, namely Bank Syariah Indonesia (BSI). This merger will unite the advantages of the three Islamic Banks so as to provide more complete services, wider reach, and have better capital capacity. Supported by synergy with holding companies (Mandiri, BNI, BRI) and government commitment through the Ministry of SOEs, Bank Syariah Indonesia is encouraged to be able to compete at the global level. However, this study is written to investigate the relationship of work discipline, work environment, and job satisfaction on employee job performance at Bank Syariah Indonesia (BSI) West Jakarta, Indonesia

2. Literature Review

Human elements greatly determine the success of the organization is the relationship of dependence between humans and organizations in the sense that humans are no longer possible to achieve their goals without using organizational paths and on the contrary, every organization will achieve its goals and objectives through the efforts of a group of people (Jung et al., 2021). The direct factor is the lack of quality resources so that doing the work is less than optimal, while the indirect factor is due to the personality or characteristics of these resources (Mayangsari et al., 2020). Performance is the result of work in quality and quantity achieved by an employee in carrying out his duties in accordance with the responsibilities given (Mustafa et al., 2021). (Pavithra & Deepak, 2021) added that performance is a result achieved by a person in carrying out the tasks assigned to him. Work performance is defined as the fulfillment of work-related tasks or skills by an employee (Son et al., 2021).

Mulyasana et al., (2020) stated that performance is influenced by the quality and ability of employees, namely matters related to education/training, work ethic, work motivation, mental attitude, and physical condition of employees. The company must first research the regulations that will be applied, and whether the regulations are in accordance with the abilities of the employees or not (Muradli & Ahmadov, 2019). It is necessary to take a more precise and accurate way out so as to improve optimal employee performance, especially in the service sector, which a company wants to achieve through increasing employee discipline (Tomažević & Aristovnik, 2019). Discipline is an effort to regulate one's behavior so that one is accustomed to doing something as it should be stimulated by punishment and rewards. Meanwhile, according to Pattarani et al. (2021), work discipline is a tool used by managers to communicate with employees so that they are willing to change behavior as well as an effort to increase their awareness and willingness to obey all company regulations and applicable social norms (Pavithra & Deepak, 2021). Mayangsari et al., (2020) defined that discipline as a form of obedience and self-control that is closely related to rationalism, conscious, not emotional.

The work environment is an important factor and can affect employee performance, but currently, there are still many companies that do not pay attention to these conditions of the work environment around their company (Gross et al., 2021). Haosana & Hatane (2015) explained that the physical work environment is one component of the work environment, in addition to the human environment and the organizational environment. The results of this research reveal a positive influence of the work environment on job satisfaction, especially the physical work environment. The non-physical work environment includes the relationship between superiors and subordinates and relationships between co-workers. Indicators of the relationship between superiors and subordinates are the close relationship with superiors and transparency (Son et al., 2021). Laras et al. (2021) revealed that superiors do not give respect to subordinates, and superiors show rude behavior to subordinates. Employees who have a high level of job satisfaction will tend to be more committed and contribute and have high dedication to the company and ultimately have the will to work harder and be more productive. On the other hand, employees with low levels of job satisfaction tend to have a turnover, as well as decreased discipline and work productivity (Mayangsari et al., 2020).

3. Materials and Methods

The quantitative study involved as much as 75 employees from BSI West Java, Indonesia and collected using random sampling technique. The data analyzed using two statistical analysis, namely descriptive and inferential

statistics. The descriptive statistics, involving frequency and percentage. Inferential statistics, including structural equation modeling with partial least square (SEM-PLS). The data analysis was assisted with SMARTPLS 3.

4. Results

4.1. Demography Profile of Respondent

The result of descriptive statistics is presented in Table 1. There are 75 employees who work to run the company's daily operations, and they all come from different backgrounds. Demographic data of BSI West Jakarta employees can be seen in the Table below:

Table 1. Demographic Profile of Respondents'

Demography	Category	Frequency	Percentage
Employee Status	Permanent Staff	75	100.0
	Contract	0	0.0
Gender	Male	36	48.0
	Female	39	52.0
Age	< 20 Years Old	0	0.0
	20-40 Years Old	53	70.7
	> 40 Years Old	22	29.3
Education	Bachelor	72	96.0
	Master	2	2.7
	Doctor	1	1.3

Table 1 displays all employee are permanent staff. Employee gender mostly is female (e.g., 39 or 52 percent) and male only 36 or 48 percent. Most of respondents aged 20 to 40 years old as much as 53 or 70.7 percent. Followed by higher 40 years old as much as 22 or 29.3 percent. For employee level of education, this study found that majority of respondent education level is bachelor's degree is 72 or 96 percent. Remaining 3 respondents are master and doctoral as much as 4 percent

4.2. Evaluation of Measurement Model

From the results of the factor loading test above, it can be seen that all the statements in the questionnaire when tested are valid.

Table 2. Result of Construct Validity and Reliability

Variable	Cronbach's Alpha	Composite Reliability	Average Variance Extracted (AVE)
Work Discipline	0.946	0.952	0.572
Work Environment	0.926	0.940	0.661
Job Satisfaction	0.877	0.905	0.577
Job Performance	0.916	0.929	0.546

Table 2 captures the result of construct validity and reliability. The result of analysis found that the variable of work discipline, work environment, job satisfaction and job performance is higher than 0.60 (Hair, 2009). The composite reliability value for all studied variables are higher than 0.70 (Hair, 2009). It means that the variables are used in this study is reliable. The convergence validity of variable, this study uses average variance extracted (AVE). The threshold for confirming the variable is convergent is AVE value should be higher than 0.50. The result displayed that all of the variables are higher than the mentioned threshold. Thus, we can conclude that the variables are fulfilling the requirement of convergent validity.

Table 3. Result of Discriminant Validity using Fornell and Lucker Criterion

Variable	Work Discipline	Work Environment	Job Satisfaction	Job Performance
Work Discipline	0.756			
Work Environment	0.812	0.813		
Job Satisfaction	0.631	0.756	0.760	
Job Performance	0.689	0.702	0.716	0.739

Table 3 describes the result of discriminant validity using Fornell and Lucker Criterion. The result indicated that the square root of AVE is higher than the other variables. It means this study variables are fulling the requirement of discriminant validity. Similar report can be seen in Table 4.

Table 4. Result of Discriminant Validity using Cross-Loading

Item	Work Discipline	Work Environment	Job Satisfaction	Job Performance
WD_1	0.753	0.571	0.493	0.603
WD_10	0.716	0.523	0.460	0.456
WD_11	0.731	0.697	0.545	0.588
WD_12	0.782	0.739	0.550	0.476
WD_13	0.801	0.706	0.493	0.454
WD_14	0.739	0.609	0.513	0.560
WD_15	0.726	0.674	0.516	0.538
WD_2	0.773	0.544	0.438	0.507
WD_3	0.717	0.587	0.424	0.518
WD_4	0.779	0.646	0.530	0.549
WD_5	0.719	0.541	0.417	0.450
WD_6	0.791	0.608	0.446	0.494
WD_7	0.806	0.654	0.482	0.543
WD_8	0.773	0.545	0.411	0.477
WD_9	0.728	0.544	0.407	0.525
WE_1	0.644	0.864	0.741	0.705
WE_2	0.655	0.700	0.554	0.589
WE_3	0.718	0.879	0.740	0.694
WE_4	0.711	0.853	0.714	0.654
WE_5	0.687	0.824	0.574	0.527
WE_6	0.660	0.788	0.478	0.492
WE_7	0.585	0.819	0.661	0.552
WE_8	0.619	0.762	0.578	0.536
JS_1	0.406	0.535	0.700	0.518
JS_2	0.468	0.606	0.798	0.654
JS_3	0.492	0.604	0.703	0.582
JS_4	0.409	0.538	0.729	0.565
JS_5	0.543	0.658	0.775	0.649
JS_6	0.549	0.637	0.839	0.754
JS_7	0.470	0.591	0.773	0.576
JP_1	0.659	0.804	0.819	0.822
JP_10	0.486	0.445	0.511	0.735
JP_11	0.366	0.374	0.480	0.709
JP_2	0.539	0.559	0.585	0.749

JP_3	0.652	0.569	0.648	0.730
JP_4	0.446	0.556	0.662	0.749
JP_5	0.382	0.443	0.460	0.705
JP_6	0.594	0.583	0.555	0.781
JP_7	0.378	0.460	0.557	0.703
JP_8	0.377	0.389	0.438	0.705
JP_9	0.579	0.653	0.747	0.862

Table 4 captures the result of Cross Loading Factor. The result shows that the loading factor on the intended construct is higher than other constructs. Thus, we concluded that there is no problem of discriminant validity.

4.3. Evaluation of Structural Model

Table 5. Result of Coefficient Determination (R Square)

Variable	R Square	R Square Adjusted
Job Performance	0.716	0.704

Table 5 shows the result of the coefficient determination. The R-Square value for constructs work discipline, work environment and job satisfaction are 0.716. It means that the three studied variables can explain its relationship on employee job satisfaction as much as 71.6 percent, while about 29.4 percent is influenced by other variables which do not consider in this study.

Table 6. Hypothesis Testing

Variable	Original Sample	Std. Dev	T-Stats	P-Value	Decision
Work Discipline	0.269	0.102	2.651	0.008	Supported
Work Environment	0.037	0.132	0.279	0.780	Not Supported
Job Satisfaction	0.616	0.095	6.509	0.000	Supported

Table 6 displays the result of hypothesis testing. The result shows that work discipline and job satisfaction influence job performance. The regression coefficient of Work Discipline is 0.269, std.dev is 0.102, t-stat is 2.651 and p-value is 0.008. It means that by assuming the work discipline increase 1 percent and the employee job performance would be increase as much as 26.9 percent. Interestingly, this study found that regression coefficient of job satisfaction is 0.616, std.dev is 0.095, t-stat is 6.509 and p-value is 0.000. It means that by assuming the job satisfaction 1 percent and the employee job performance would be increase as much as 61.6 percent. Besides that, this study indicated that work environment has no significant relationship with employee job performance.

5. Discussion

Discipline is a procedure that corrects or punishes subordinates for violating rules or procedures. Discipline is a form of employee self-control and regular implementation and shows the level of sincerity of the work team in an organization, closely related to performance which is the result of work in quality and quantity achieved by an employee in carrying out his duties in accordance with the responsibilities given to them. The environment culture is an atmosphere or physical work environment in which a group of individuals work to achieve a goal, closely related to performance which is the result of work in quality and quantity achieved by an employee. Employees who have a high level of job satisfaction will tend to be more committed and contribute and have a high dedication to the company and ultimately have the willingness to work harder and more productively.

The result of this study found that work discipline has a significant effect on employee job performance. Similar findings reported by Arif et al., (2019), Maryani et al., (2021), Prayogi et al., (2019) and Thaeif & Baharuddin (2015), which indicated that employee job performance closely explained by work discipline. Also, the finding of this study indicated that job satisfaction has directly effect on employee job performance. The study results supported by Berliana et al., (2018), Crossman & Abou-Zaki, (2003), Dizgah et al., (2012) and Inuwa, (2016), which stated the job satisfaction can enhance the employee job performance. Besides that, this study found that work environment does not significant effect on employee job performance. The study finding is contrasted with previous studies were indicated that work

environment bring a positive and significant effect on employee job performance (Anitha, 2014; Badrianto & Ekhsan, 2020; Pawirosumarto et al., 2017; Ramli, 2019).

6. Conclusions

In conclusion, this study has successfully investigated the determinant factors of employee job performance. The study findings indicated that work environment and job satisfaction can enhance the employee performance in Bank Syariah Indonesia (BSI) West Jakarta, Indonesia. Also, this study identified that employees who have a high level of job satisfaction tends to be committed and dedicated to the company and ultimately have the willingness to work harder and more productive.

Author Contributions: Conceptualization, W.D.F. and Y.H.P.; methodology, Y.H.P.; software, W.D.F. and Y.H.P.; validation, W.D.F. and Y.H.P.; formal analysis, W.D.F.; investigation, W.D.F. and Y.H.P.; resources, W.D.F.; data curation, Y.H.P.; writing—original draft preparation, W.D.F. and Y.H.P.; writing—review and editing, W.D.F. and Y.H.P.; supervision, Y.H.P.; project administration, Y.H.P.; funding acquisition, W.D.F. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

Funding: This research received no external funding.

Institutional Review Board Statement: Not applicable.

Informed Consent Statement: Not applicable.

Data Availability Statement: Not applicable.

Acknowledgments: The author would like to thank Universitas Dian Nusantara for supporting this research and publication. We would also like to thank the reviewers for their constructive comments and suggestions.

Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest.

References

- Agarwal, R., & Gupta, B. (2021). Innovation and Leadership: A Study of Organizations Based in the United Arab Emirates. *Foundations of Management*, 13(1), 73–84. <https://doi.org/10.2478/fman-2021-0006>
- Anitha, J. (2014). Determinants of employee engagement and their impact on employee performance. *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management*.
- Arif, M., Syaifani, P. E., Siswadi, Y., & Jufrizen, J. (2019). Effect of Compensation and Discipline on Employee Performance. *Proceeding UII-ICABE*, 263–276.
- Arifin, A. H., Saputra, J., Puteh, A., & Qamarius, I. (2019). The Role of Organizational Culture in the Relationship of Personality and Organization Commitment on Employee Performance. In *International Journal of Innovation, Creativity and Change*. www.ijicc.net (Vol. 9).
- Badrianto, Y., & Ekhsan, M. (2020). Effect of work environment and job satisfaction on employee performance in pt. Nesinak industries. *Journal of Business, Management, & Accounting*, 2(1).
- Bajorek, Z. M., & Bevan, S. M. (2015). Performance-related-pay in the UK public sector: A review of the recent evidence on effectiveness and value for money. *Journal of Organizational Effectiveness*, 2(2), 94–109. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JOEPP-03-2015-0011>
- Bayu Kuta Waringin, G. N., & Dewi, L. G. K. (2018). Pengaruh Employee Stock Option Plan (ESOP) pada Earnings Management dan Leverage Sebagai Variabel Pemoderasi. *E-Jurnal Akuntansi*, 25, 553. <https://doi.org/10.24843/eja.2018.v25.i01.p21>
- Berliana, M., Siregar, N., & Gustian, H. D. (2018). The model of job satisfaction and employee performance. *International Review of Management and Marketing*, 8(6), 41.
- Bhardwaj, A., Mishra, S., & Jain, T. K. (2020). An analysis to understanding the job satisfaction of employees in banking industry. *Materials Today: Proceedings*, 37(Part 2), 170–174. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.matpr.2020.04.783>
- Crossman, A., & Abou-Zaki, B. (2003). Job satisfaction and employee performance of Lebanese banking staff. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 18(4), 368–376.
- Dizgah, M. R., Chegini, M. G., & Bisokhan, R. (2012). Relationship between job satisfaction and employee job performance in Guilan public sector. *Journal of Basic and Applied Scientific Research*, 2(2), 1735–1741.
- Gandung, M. (2022). The Effect of Work Supervision and Discipline on Employee Performance at PT . Personel Alih Daya (Persero) Jakarta Selatan. *International Journal of Education , Information Technology*, 5(2), 10–24. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.6400028>

- Gross, H. P., Ingerfurth, S., & Willems, J. (2021). Employees as reputation advocates: Dimensions of employee job satisfaction explaining employees' recommendation intention. *Journal of Business Research*, 134(May), 405–413. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2021.05.021>
- Haosana, Y., & Hatane, S. E. (2015). Peranan Employpess Stock Ownership Program , Human Cost Efficiency Dan Total Asset. *Business Accounting Review*, 3(1), 456–465.
- Inuwa, M. (2016). Job satisfaction and employee performance: An empirical approach. *The Millennium University Journal*, 1(1), 90–103.
- Jiménez, M. (2018). Leadership style, organizational performance, and change through the lens of emotional intelligence. *Foundations of Management*, 10(1), 237–250. <https://doi.org/10.2478/fman-2018-0018>
- Jing, C., Keasey, K., Lim, I., & Xu, B. (2019). Financial constraints and employee satisfaction. *Economics Letters*, 183, 108599. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.econlet.2019.108599>
- Jung, J. H., Yoo, J. J., & Arnold, T. J. (2021). The influence of a retail store manager in developing frontline employee brand relationship, service performance and customer loyalty. *Journal of Business Research*, 122(December 2019), 362–372. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2020.09.010>
- Kamaruddin, S. N. A. A., Omar, K., Saputra, J., Shakur, E. S. A., Rahim, N. A. A. A., & Razali, M. K. A. M. (2021). Determinants of female employees' job performance in Malaysia. *Management Science Letters*, 11, 233–238. <https://doi.org/10.5267/j.msl.2020.8.011>
- Laras, T., Jatmiko, B., & Tri Nugroho, F. J. H. (2021). The Influence Of Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) And Organizational Culture On The Performance Of Education Employees As Mediated By Job Satisfaction (Survey At The Private University Of Sleman Regency In Yogyakarta). *Kinerja*, 25(2), 307–332. <https://doi.org/10.24002/kinerja.v25i2.4814>
- Maryani, Y., Entang, M., & Tukiran, M. (2021). The relationship between work motivation, work discipline and employee performance at the Regional Secretariat of Bogor City. *International Journal of Social and Management Studies*, 2(2), 1–16.
- Mayangsari, L., Restianti, T., Saputra, J., & Rahadi, R. A. (2020). The relationship between self-employed motivation and individual work performance among online drivers in West Java, Indonesia. *International Journal of Innovation, Creativity and Change*, 13(3), 513–530.
- Mulyasana, D., Mulyasa, E., Santosa, P., & Sarihati, T. (2020). The Effect Of Organization Characteristics On Optimal Leadership Decision. *Journal of Security and Sustainability Issues*, 10(Oct), 382–398. [https://doi.org/10.9770/jssi.2020.10.Oct\(31\)](https://doi.org/10.9770/jssi.2020.10.Oct(31))
- Muradli, N., & Ahmadov, F. (2019). Managing contradiction and sustaining sustainability in inter organizational networks through leadership: A case study. *Entrepreneurship and Sustainability Issues*, 6(3), 1255–1269. [https://doi.org/10.9770/jesi.2019.6.3\(14\)](https://doi.org/10.9770/jesi.2019.6.3(14))
- Mustafa, M., Coetzer, A., Ramos, H. M., & Fuhrer, J. (2021). Exploring the effects of small- and medium-sized enterprise employees' job satisfaction on their innovative work behaviours: the moderating effects of personality. *Journal of Organizational Effectiveness: People and Performance*, 8(2), 228–250. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JOEPP-07-2020-0133>
- Nurwulansari, & Rikumahu, B. (2018). Determinants of Dividend Payout Ratio : A Study of Listed Companies in Indonesia Stock Exchange. *International Seminar & Conference on Learning Organization*, 31–51.
- Pattarani, A., Rivai, N. I., & Erawati, H. (2021). The Effect of Work Ability and Work Motivation on the Performance of the State Civil Apparatus at Regional Inspectorates Sidrap District. *International Journal of Management Progress*, 3(1), 21–36.
- Pavithra, S., & Deepak, K. V. (2021). The effect of social media on employees' job performance with reference to information technology (IT) sector in Bangalore. *Materials Today: Proceedings*, xxx. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.matpr.2020.11.067>
- Pawirosumarto, S., Sarjana, P. K., & Gunawan, R. (2017). The effect of work environment, leadership style, and organizational culture towards job satisfaction and its implication towards employee performance in Parador Hotels and Resorts, Indonesia. *International Journal of Law and Management*.
- Prayogi, M. A., Lesmana, M. T., & Siregar, L. H. (2019). The influence of communication and work discipline to employee performance. *First International Conference on Administration Science (ICAS 2019)*, 423–426.
- Ramli, A. H. (2019). Work environment, job satisfaction and employee performance in health services. *Business and Entrepreneurial Review*, 19(1), 29–42.
- Raub, S., Borzillo, S., Perretten, G., & Schmitt, A. (2021). New employee orientation, role-related stressors and conflict at work: Consequences for work attitudes and performance of hospitality employees. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 94, 102857. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2020.102857>
- Son, J. H., Kim, J. H., & Kim, G. J. (2021). Does employee satisfaction influence customer satisfaction? Assessing coffee shops through the service profit chain model. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 94(January), 102866. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2021.102866>

Thaief, I., & Baharuddin, A. (2015). Effect of training, compensation and work discipline against employee job performance. *Rev. Eur. Stud.*, 7, 23.

Tomažević, N., & Aristovnik, A. (2019). Factors of trust in immediate leaders: An empirical study in police service environment. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 16(14). <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph16142525>

Yusliza, M. Y., Faezah, J. N., Muhammad, J. S. Z., & Ramayah, T. (2021). Analyzing the Relationship Between Supportive Work Environment and Employee Retention. *11th Annual International Conference on Industrial Engineering and Operations Management*, 3088–3096.