

# Impact of Workplace Environment on Employee Performance in the Telecommunication Sectors in Afghanistan

<sup>1</sup>Ghousddin Noorzad, <sup>2</sup>Dr. Joseph P.D

<sup>1</sup>Ph. D Scholar, Department of Business Administration – TTM, Mangalore University, Karnataka, India

<sup>2</sup>Associate Professor, Department of Business Administration – TTM, Mangalore University, Karnataka, India

## ABSTRACT

Enhancing the workplace environment is the most important thing, any organization must consider. To sustain their consistent upward trajectory, organizations must uphold their work environment's productivity, effectiveness, and efficiency through various facilities. The most crucial thing that employees desire from their workplace is comfort. Since a well-equipped workplace in the telecommunications sector can favorably affect employee performance. Ergonomic furniture, enough lighting, and optimal ventilation are necessary to maintain worker health and productivity in the telecommunications sector. This is especially true in customer service centers where staff members may spend long hours at their computers. This research aims to study the relationship between workplace environment and employee performance in the telecommunication sectors in Afghanistan. The type of research is qualitative and quantitative, and random sampling was employed in this study with a sample size of 316 workers from the telecommunication sectors in Afghanistan. The data collection technique used in this study was a questionnaire for analyzing data and testing the hypothesis used from SPSS version 25. The significant finding showed that the workplace environment positively impacts on employee performance. These four sectors are recommended to provide continuous facilities for employees to perform well.

**KEYWORDS:** Employee Performance, Telecommunication Sectors, Workplace Environment, Afghanistan.

**DOI:** 10.7176/EJBM/16-9-05

**Publication date:** November 30th 2024

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Humans are the most vital component of an organization. Without human intervention, an organization cannot function, even with all essential production factors present. Humans are the driving force behind an organization and define its trajectory. The human element is something that an organization needs to consider, and an organization's ability to successfully manage its people resources determines how successfully it will achieve its objectives. According to Jumady, et al. (2021), one of the key factors influencing an organization's success or failure is its human resource base. For an organization to survive and grow, it must effectively manage its human resources. As a result, the caliber of an organization's human resources plays a significant role in determining its operational processes' performance.

One factor that can impact an individual's performance is their work environment. Employees are more likely to work intently and perform well when they are in a comfortable and supportive work environment that facilitates the completion of tasks. According to Havaei, et al. (2020), the work environment is anything in the vicinity of employees and can affect how well they do their allocated responsibilities. Badrianto, et al. (2020), stated that performance can be enhanced in an office setting that prioritizes the needs of its workers. On the other hand, a poor working environment will result in lower performance. And, eventually, lower employee motivation. Al Sabei, et al. (2020), the management of an organization should take great notice of its work environment. Although the work environment does not carry out the production process within a company, it directly affects the employees who do so. Gasmadia, et al. (2022), good performance from human resources will eventually translate into good employee performance. As a result, work standards must be applied. As a standard to compare what was accomplished with what was anticipated. Kale, et al. (2014), stated that another significant element influencing worker performance is the workplace.

The study conducted in Afghanistan aims to understand how the workplace environment impacts on employee performance in the telecommunication sectors. Afghanistan's telecommunication sector has grown remarkably since 2001. The industry has changed from a basic state-controlled structure to a dynamic one characterized by the broad adoption of mobile phone technology. Connectivity was transformed by GSM technology, particularly in underdeveloped areas with a shortage of traditional landlines. With investments in infrastructure like fiber optics and microwave links, several telecom operators entered the market and eventually expanded mobile network coverage across urban areas and subsequently into outlying regions.

Improvements in internet access have also been consistent, with mobile broadband made possible by 3G and 4G networks playing a significant part in boosting connection, especially in urban areas. The government's

initiatives to create regulatory frameworks and liberalize the telecom industries have increased investment and encouraged competition. The industry is growing despite obstacles like economic volatility and security risks, and it is well-positioned to go farther into rural regions and integrate more deeply into the global digital economy.

## 2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Saxena, et al. (2014), the workplace environment includes all factors that affect an employee's body and mind. Work performance increases while a pleasant environment minimizes weariness, monotony, and boredom. Because it covers components of the physical, psychological, and social aspects of working environments, the workplace environment is one of the most comprehensive ideas. The work environment can impact workers' psychological well-being in favorable and unfavorable ways. As per Afandi's (2018) statement, an employee who finds satisfaction in their work environment is more likely to feel easy and optimize their working hours. Al Sabei, et al. (2020), the management of a corporation should take great notice of its work environment. The work environment directly affects the employees who carry out the production process within a company, even though it does not carry out the process. According to Havaei, et al. (2020), the work environment is anything in the vicinity of employees and can affect how well they do their allocated responsibilities. According to Jayaweera's (2015), research in hotels located in Bristol, England, the work environment and employee performance have a noteworthy impact on each other, with job motivation acting as a mediator.

Nabawi (2020), stated that performance is the process of engaging in actions about the components of a procedure that results in an output. Audenaert, et al. (2019), stated that performance results from work that a person or group of people within an organization can accomplish through their respective roles and responsibilities to meet its objectives. Badrianto, et al. (2020), performance can be enhanced in an office setting that prioritizes the needs of its workers. On the other hand, poor working conditions will result in lower performance. On the other hand, subpar working conditions will lower productivity and, eventually, lower employee motivation. Kloutsiniotis, et al. (2020), a person's performance is determined by how much effort and behavior they put out to finish prescribed tasks and commitments within a given time frame. Schleu, et al. (2021), performance is a tool to enhance decision-making and accountability. Peng, et al. (2020), stated that performance is increased by work that is closely linked to the organization's strategic goals, customer satisfaction, and the economy. Wang, et al. (2022), the process of analyzing and assessing an employee's performance is known as performance assessment. Maden, et al. (2020), indicated that the worker's performance is what the company and the workers want it to be. Virgiawan, et al. (2021), a standard definition of employee performance is the value of a range of behaviors that positively impact accomplishing organizational objectives.

Zhenjing, et al. (2022), the study's empirical results highlighted the importance of a happy work environment on employee performance. Additionally, it emphasizes the link between employee commitment and enhanced task performance and the impact of an ability to achieve even under challenging circumstances. The study also contends that motivating practices within organizational cultures contribute to employee commitment, eventually improving individual and corporate performance. Salim, et al. (2023), employee performance is significantly affected by the work environment. Saidi, et al. (2019), this study identifies a causal link between job safety, the physical workplace, interpersonal interactions among coworkers, supervisor support, working hours, and worker performance. Notably, the most significant influence on employee performance is supervisor assistance. Putri, et al. (2019), the study's findings emphasized the importance of the workplace environment in affecting employee performance and work ethics. It underlines how crucial work discipline is for improving performance.

Nadeem, et al. (2017), the study emphasized how closely employee performance and company success are related. It highlighted how important the work environment is in influencing performance, particularly in response to shifting commercial trends. International businesses have affected local organizations by establishing standards for the caliber of the workplace. Employee support from supervisors is more critical to Pakistani workers than the actual working environment, which suggests that firms should emphasize improving supervisor support for better employee performance. Gitahi (2014), this researcher conducted an empirical study to examine how the workplace environment affects the performance of retail bank employees in Nakuru Town. The results indicated that psychosocial factors play a more significant role in improving employee performance than both work-related and physical workplace factors. According to the research by Naharuddin, et al. (2013), job assistance and the actual workplace environment significantly impacted employees' performance, while supervisor support alone had no discernible effect.

## 3. SCOPE OF THE STUDY

The present study is about the impact of the workplace environment on employee performance in the telecommunications sectors in Afghanistan. Aims to explore the intricate connections between the workplace

environment, and employee performance within the telecommunications sectors in Afghanistan. This study seeks to elucidate the multifaceted relationships and their implications. It provides valuable insights for organizational leaders, H.R. practitioners, and policymakers in optimizing workplace environments to enhance employee performance in this dynamic industry.

#### 4. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK



The development of a conceptual framework for the present study takes place based on an analysis of the gap in existing studies about the workplace environment and its impact on employee performance. This model is the fundamental concept for the present investigation to accommodate the research objectives. The present study examines the impact of the workplace environment on employee performance in the telecommunications sectors in Afghanistan.

#### 5. RESEARCH QUESTION

How does the workplace environment impact employee performance within the telecommunication sectors?

#### 6. OBJECTIVE OF THE STUDY

To study the impact of workplace environment on employee performance within the telecommunication sectors.

#### 7. HYPOTHESIS

**H<sub>a1</sub>:** There is a significant relationship between workplace environment and employee performance within the telecommunication sectors.

#### 8. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The study employed quantitative and qualitative research techniques. A descriptive and exploratory research design was considered more appropriate for the study because of the need to find the impact of workplace environment on employee performance in the telecommunication sectors in Afghanistan. The study population is defined to include all employees working in the sectors. The study selected a sample size of 316 respondents drawn from these four telecommunication sectors in Afghanistan. The sectors are Roshan, AWCC, Etisalat, and MTN. Random sampling techniques were used to select the employees. *The data was collected through the structured questionnaire, which used SPSS version 25 for the analysis. Also, the study employed descriptive, correlation, and regression analysis to analyze collected data.*

## 9. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

**Table 9.1 Demographic Analysis**

Variables	N/ Valid Case	Median	Std. Deviation
Gender	316	191 Male	0.489
Age	316	20 – 30 Years old	1.005
Marital status	316	199 Married	0.497
Education	316	195 Bachelor	0.802
Experience	316	108 5 – 10 Years	0.873
Income	316	21,000 to 30,000	1.066
Designation	316	126 Customer Care Agent	1.481
Organization	316	95 Etisalat	1.050

*Source: Survey Data*

The table indicates that out of 316 respondents, 192(60.4%) are males, and 136(43%) are between 20 – 30 years old. 199(62.9%) of them are married, 195(61.7%) of them have a bachelor's degree. Besides, 108(34.1%) have working experience between 5 – 10 years, and 78(24.1%) have a monthly income between 21,000 – 30,000. 126(39.8%) have the designation of customer care agent, and 95(30%) work at Etisalat.

**Table 9.2 Data Analysis and Interpretation of Workplace Environment**

Item	SD		D		N		A		SA		Total	Mean	Std. Deviation
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage			
1	9	3	5	2	9	3	159	50	134	42	316	4.2	0.8
2	74	23	140	44	31	10	44	14	27	9	316	2.3	1.2
3	6	2	20	6	24	8	187	59	79	25	316	3.9	0.8
4	5	2	22	7	28	9	167	53	93	29	316	4.0	0.8
5	4	1	15	5	28	9	176	56	93	29	316	4.0	0.8
6	82	26	173	55	19	6	31	10	11	3	316	2.1	1.0
7	74	23	168	53	28	9	34	11	12	4	316	2.1	1.0
8	6	2	18	6	23	7	189	60	80	25	316	4.0	0.8

*Source: Survey Data*

*Note: SD = Strongly Disagree, D = Disagree, N = Neutral, A = Agree, SA = Strongly Agree*

Based on the survey gathered from 316 staff of telecommunication sectors, for the statement, "A good workplace environment helps me to improve my performance and achieve organizational goals," around 92% of the respondents had a favorable opinion. In contrast, 5% of them were dissatisfied, and 3% of them were neither agreed nor disagreed, with the mean and standard deviation of 4.2 and 0.8, respectively. For the statement, "The overall atmosphere and culture in my workplace negatively impact my performance," 23% of respondents were agreed and strongly agreed. At the same time, 67% of them were disagreed and strongly disagreed, and 10% of them neither agreed nor disagreed, with the mean and standard deviation of 2.3 and 1.2, respectively. For the statement, "The working environment positively affects my performance in the organization," most respondents had a positive opinion, 84 percent. At the same time, 8% of them were disagreed and strongly disagreed, and 8% of them were neither agreed nor disagreed, with a mean and standard deviation of 3.9 and 0.8, respectively. For the statement, "Changes in the workplace environment would positively affect my productivity and well-being," around 82% of the respondents were satisfied, while 9% of them were dissatisfied, and 9% of them were neither agreed nor disagreed, with the mean and standard deviation of 4.0, and 0.8, respectively. For the statement, "The physical work environment (e.g., facilities, workspace) enhances my performance," 85% of the respondents were agreed and strongly agreed. In comparison, 6% of them were disagreed and strongly disagreed, and 9% of them were neither agreed nor disagreed, with a mean and standard deviation of 4.0 and 0.8, respectively. For the statement, "My workplace is not safe and secure to perform well," around 13% of the respondents had a favorable opinion, while 81% of them were disagreed and strongly disagreed, and 6% of them were neither agreed nor disagreed, with the mean and standard deviation of 2.1, and 1.0, respectively. For the statement, "My workplace is not safe and secures to perform well," 15% of the respondents were agreed and strongly agreed, at the same time, 76% of them were disagreed and strongly disagreed, and 9% of them were neither agreed nor disagreed, with the mean and standard deviation of 2.1, and 1.0, respectively. For the statement, "The working environment helps me to balance my work life," most of the respondents had a positive opinion of 85%, in contrast, 8% of them were disagreed and strongly disagreed, and 7% of them were neither agreed nor disagreed, with the mean and standard deviation of 4.0, and 0.8, respectively.

**Table 9. 3 Data Analysis and Interpretation of Employee Performance**

Item	SD		D		N		A		SA		Total	Mean	Std. Deviation
Number	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage			
1	85	27	154	49	23	7	38	12	16	5	316	2.1	1.1
2	4	1	22	7	29	9	193	61	68	22	316	3.9	0.8
3	9	3	18	6	28	9	203	64	58	18	316	3.8	0.8
4	73	23	185	59	25	8	23	7	10	3	316	2.0	0.9
5	16	5	20	6	26	8	167	53	87	28	316	3.9	1.0
6	70	22	177	56	22	7	34	11	12	4	316	2.1	1.0
7	15	5	41	13	17	5	171	54	72	23	316	3.7	1.0
8	6	2	17	5	21	7	172	54	100	32	316	4.0	0.8

Source: Survey Data

Note: SD = Strongly Disagree, D = Disagree, N = Neutral, A = Agree, SA = Strongly Agree

Based on the survey collected from 316 staff of telecommunication sectors, for the statement, "Organizational well-being negatively impacts my performance," around 17% of the respondents were agreed and strongly agreed, while 76% of them were disagreed and strongly disagreed, and 7% of them were neither agreed nor disagreed, with a mean and standard deviation of 2.1, and 1.1, respectively. For the statement, "Organizational values positively impact my performance," most of the respondents had a positive opinion of 83 percent. In contrast, 8 percent of them were disagreed and strongly disagreed, and 9% of them were neither agreed nor disagreed, with the mean and standard deviation of 3.9, and 0.8, respectively. For the statement, "I receive timely and constructive feedback on my performance from my supervisor," 82% of the respondents were agreed and strongly agreed, while 9% of them were disagreed and strongly disagreed, and 9% of them were neither agreed nor disagreed, with the mean and standard deviation of 3.8, and 0.8, respectively. For the statement, "I don't have complete responsibility for my job performance," around 10% of the respondents had a favorable opinion, while 82% of the respondents were disagreed and strongly disagreed, and 8% of them were neither agreed nor disagreed, with the mean and standard deviation of 2.0, and 0.9, respectively. For the statement, "I have cordial relations with my colleagues in the organization," most of the respondents were agreed and strongly agreed with the statement 81 percent. In compression, 11% of them were disagreed and strongly disagreed, with the mean and standard deviation of 3.9, and 1.0, respectively. For the statement, "I am not able to discuss my work problems with my supervisor," around 15% of the respondents were agreed and strongly agreed, while 78% of them were disagreed and strongly disagreed, and 7% of them were neither agreed nor disagreed, with the mean and standard deviation of 2.1, and 1.0, respectively. For the statement, "I get encouragement from my superiors to be innovative," 77% of the respondents had a positive opinion. In contrast, 18% of them were disagreed and strongly disagreed, and 5% of them were neither agreed nor disagreed, with the mean and standard deviation of 3.7, and 1.0, respectively. For the statement, "I feel proud to work in this organization," around 86% of the respondents were agreed and strongly agreed, while 7% of them were disagreed and strongly disagreed, and 7% of them were neither agreed nor disagreed, with the mean and standard deviation of 4.0, and 0.8, respectively

**H<sub>a1</sub>: There is a significant relationship between workplace environment and employee performance within the telecommunication sectors.**

**Table 9.4 Correlation Matrix of the Variables**

	Workplace Environment	Employee Performance
Workplace Environment	1	
Employee Performance	.263**	1

\*\* . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Source: Survey Data

The above table indicates correlation coefficient (r) value between workplace environment and employee performance  $r = 0.267$  which shows a low positive relationship between both variables. The P value is  $< 0.01$ , which means the relationship is statistically significant. So, it explains that increase in the level of workplace environment can also increase the performance of employees, hence H1 is accepted.

**9.5 REGRESSION ANALYSIS**

**Table 9.5 Model Summary**

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square
1	.263 <sup>a</sup>	.069	.066

a. Predictors: (Constant), Workplace Environment

Source: Survey Data

**Table 9.6 ANOVA<sup>a</sup>**

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	194.083	1	194.083	23.348	.000 <sup>b</sup>
	Residual	2601.803	315	8.312		
	Total	2795.886	316			

a. Dependent Variable: Employee Performance

b. Predictors: (Constant), Workplace Environment

Source: Survey Data

**Table 9.7 Coefficients**

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	19.499	1.379		14.142	.000
	Workplace Environment	.245	.051	.263	4.832	.000

a. Dependent Variable: Employee Performance

Source: Survey Data

The regression analysis model shows a weak relationship between workplace environment and employee performance. The correlation coefficient ( $R = 0.263$ ) indicates a low positive correlation between the variables. The R square value of 0.069 suggests that the workplace environment explains 6.9% of the variation in employee performance, which is not very effective.

The results of the ANOVA analysis show that there is a weak correlation between the independent and dependent variables. The two variables have a low positive relationship with a correlation coefficient of 0.263. The R square value of 0.69 explains that just 6.9% of the variation in employee performance can be measured in the workplace environment. The workplace environment does not account for most variance (93.1%), indicating that it has some explanatory power in calculating employee performance. The overall finding shows that the workplace environment impacts employee performance.

The coefficient result indicates that the constant value is 19.499, showing the employee performance if the workplace environment value is zero. This prediction is reliable, as explained by the low standard and t-value of 14.142, with a significant value of 0.000. For the independent variable workplace environment. Also, the unstandardized coefficient level is 0.245, explaining that an increase in the workplace environment will increase 0.245 units for employee performance, a significant result indicating that the relationship between the two variables is positive and meaningful. The standardized coefficient (Beta) value of 0.263 confirms that an improvement to the workplace environment has a significant impact on employee performance.

## CONCLUSION

The study conducted in the telecommunication sectors in Afghanistan aims to find out how much the workplace environment has impacted employee performance. Based on the findings of the regression analysis, workplace environment and employee performance statistically have a significant relationship. The workplace environment accounts for 6.9% of the variation in employee performance. Moreover, the analysis demonstrates that improvement in the workplace environment has a favorable impact on employee performance, with a 0.245 unit increase in performance for every unit rise in the workplace environment. However, the

significance level is low, the t-value is high, and the impact size is small, but it is considerable and supported that the workplace environment impacts employee performance.

## RECOMMENDATION

According to the findings, which show a weak but statistically significant relationship between the workplace environment and employee performance, it is recommended that the telecommunication sectors keep improving their office settings because even a tiny change can positively impact employee performance.

## REFERENCE

- Afandi, P. (2018). Human resource management (Theory, concept and indicators). *Riau: Zanafa Publishing*, 3.
- Al Sabei, S. D., Labrague, L. J., Miner Ross, A., Karkada, S., Albashayreh, A., Al Masroori, F., & Al Hashmi, N. (2020). Nursing work environment, turnover intention, job burnout, and quality of care: The moderating role of job satisfaction. *Journal of Nursing Scholarship*, 52(1), 95-104.
- Al Sabei, S. D., Labrague, L. J., Miner Ross, A., Karkada, S., Albashayreh, A., Al Masroori, F., & Al Hashmi, N. (2020). Nursing work environment, turnover intention, job burnout, and quality of care: The moderating role of job satisfaction. *Journal of Nursing Scholarship*, 52(1), 95-104.
- Audenaert, M., Decramer, A., George, B., Verschuere, B., & Van Waeyenberg, T. (2019). When employee performance management affects individual innovation in public organizations: The role of consistency and LMX. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 30(5), 815-834.
- Badrianto, Y., & Ekhsan, M. (2019). The effect of work environment and motivation on employee performance of pt. Hasta multi sejahtera cikarang. *Journal of Research in Business, Economics, and Education*, 1(1).
- Gasmadia, G., Firman, A., & Hamzah, M. (2022). The Influence of Leadership, Work Motivation, Organizational Culture and School Climate on the Performance of Public Elementary School Teachers in Tinambung District, Polewali Mandar Regency. *Journal of Business & Entrepreneurship*, 11(2).
- Gitahi, N. S. (2014). *Effect of workplace environment on the performance of commercial bank employees in Nakuru town* (Doctoral dissertation, Kabarak University).
- Havaei, F., Astivia, O. L. O., & MacPhee, M. (2020). The impact of workplace violence on medical-surgical nurses' health outcome: A moderated mediation model of work environment conditions and burnout using secondary data. *International journal of nursing studies*, 109, 103666.
- Havaei, F., Astivia, O. L. O., & MacPhee, M. (2020). The impact of workplace violence on medical-surgical nurses' health outcome: A moderated mediation model of work environment conditions and burnout using secondary data. *International journal of nursing studies*, 109, 103666.
- Jayaweera, T. (2015). The Influence of Work Environment Factors on Job Performance, Mediating Role of Work Motivation: A Study of Hospitality Sector in UK. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 10 (3), 271-278.
- Jumady, E., Sugiarto, S., & Latief, F. (2021). Management performance analysis based on total quality management principles. *Point Of View Research Management*, 2(1), 10-18.
- Kale, S. S., & Mazaheri, N. (2014). Natural resources, development strategies, and lower caste empowerment in India's mineral belt: Bihar and Odisha during the 1990s. *Studies in Comparative International Development*, 49, 343-369.
- Kloutsiniotis, P. V., & Mihail, D. M. (2020). The effects of high-performance work systems in employees' service-oriented OCB. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 90, 102610.
- Maden Eyiusta, C., & Alten, O. (2020). Expansion-Oriented Job Crafting Behaviors and Employee Performance: A Moderated Mediation Model. In *Academy of Management Proceedings* (Vol. 2020, No. 1, p. 16872). Briarcliff Manor, NY 10510: Academy of Management.
- Nabawi, R. (2019). The Influence of Work Environment, Job Satisfaction and Workload on Employee Performance. *Maneggio: Jurnal Ilmiah Magister Manajemen*, 2(2), 170-183.
- Nadeem, K., & Ahmad, A. (2017). Impact of work environment factors on employee performance; Empirical evidence from manufacturing industry of Lahore. *Journal of Managerial Science*, 11, 422-436.
- Naharuddin, N., & Sadegi, M. (2013). Factors of workplace environment that affect employee's performance: A case study of Miyazu Malaysia. *International journal of independent research and studies*, 2(2), 66-78.



- Peng, X., Lee, S., & Lu, Z. (2020). Employees' perceived job performance, organizational identification, and pro-environmental behaviors in the hotel industry. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 90, 102632.
- Putri, E. M., Ekowati, V. M., Supriyanto, A. S., & Mukaffi, Z. (2019). The effect of work environment on employee performance through work discipline. *International Journal of Research-granthaalayah*, 7(4), 132-140.
- Saidi, N. S. A., Michael, F. L., Sumilan, H., Lim, S. L. O., Jonathan, V., Hamidi, H., & Ahmad, A. I. A. (2019). The relationship between working environment and employee performance. *Journal of Cognitive Sciences and Human Development*, 5(2), 14-22. doi: <https://doi.org/10.33736/jcshd.1916.2019>
- Salim, F., & Ernanda, Y. (2023). Effect of work discipline, work environment and work motivation on employee performance at PT. Autostar Mandiri Technotama. *Journal of Management Science (JMAS)*, 6(1), 5-9.
- Saxena, H., & Kaur, G. (2014). Impact of Work Environment on Job Satisfaction. *Global Advancements in Hrm: Innovations and Practices*, 145.
- Schleu, J. E., & Hüffmeier, J. (2021). Simply the best? A systematic literature review on the predictive validity of employee performance for leader performance. *Human Resource Management Review*, 31(2), 100777.
- Triansyah, F. A., Hejin, W., & Stefania, S. (2023). Factors Affecting Employee Performance: A Systematic Review. *Journal Markcount Finance*, 1(3), 150-159. <https://doi.org/10.55849/jmf.v1i2.102>
- Virgiawan, A. R., Riyanto, S., & Endri, E. (2021). Organizational culture as a mediator motivation and transformational leadership on employee performance. *Academic Journal of Interdisciplinary Studies*, 10(3), 67-79.
- Wang, X., Guchait, P., Paşamehmetoğlu, A., & Wen, X. (2022). Hospitality employees' affective experience of shame, self-efficacy beliefs and job behaviors: The alleviating role of error tolerance. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 102, 103162.
- Zhenjing, G., Chupradit, S., Ku, K. Y., Nassani, A. A., & Haffar, M. (2022). Impact of Employees' Workplace Environment on Employees' Performance: A Multi-Mediation Model. *Frontiers in Public Health*, 10, 890400. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpubh.2022.890400>