

THE INFLUENCE OF WORK ENVIRONMENT ON THE PERFORMANCE OF LECTURERS IN MASTERS AND DOCTORAL PROGRAMS IN MEDAN CITY

Indah Sari Liza Lubis¹

¹Business and Humanities Faculty, Universitas Tjut Nyak Dhien, Medan, Indonesia

Email: Indah99_psycho@yahoo.com

Abstract

Many factors cause a decline in an organization's employee performance. Whether internal factors or external factors. This study found that the work environment is considered one factor that influences the increase and decrease in lecturer performance. Therefore, this study will test whether the work environment influences the performance of lecturers in master's and doctoral programs in Medan City. Data collection using quantitative methods and data processing using PLS. Two hundred twenty-five professors from Medan City's private universities made up the research sample. The study's findings demonstrated that the work environment favorably and significantly impacted lecturer job satisfaction. Furthermore, the work environment had a slight but favorable influence on the performance of lecturers. Additionally, the work environment positively and substantially impacted performance through job happiness among instructors in Masters and Doctoral Programs at private universities in Medan City. Job satisfaction also had a favorable and significant effect on lecturer performance. It was determined that their work environment impacted lecturers' performance at Medan City's private universities.

Keyword: Work Environment, Lecturer Performance, Masters and Doctoral Degrees, Private universities

INTRODUCTION

As higher education institutions, universities strive to meet the needs of society for graduates. Contextual performance is significant for organizations because what employees do will benefit the organization (Susanti and Arief, 2024; Amin et al., 2022). Fierce competition between private universities in Medan City, especially at the postgraduate level, leads to an increase in quality based on the quality of lecturers. Currently, competition between campuses must be supported by each employee and lecturer's level of ability and career level. Therefore, on campus, the work environment is considered to be one of the factors causing the increase and decrease in the quality of the campus itself.

Furthermore, their workplace influences lecturers' effectiveness in higher education. The work environment has become an essential part of supporting the abilities of lecturers and increasing the accreditation of higher education (Amal et al., 2022; Purba et al., 2019). The work environment is an essential factor for lecturers. Because a positive work environment will motivate every lecturer to improve their achievements. As stated by Purba et al. (2019), the work

environment has become one of the major driving factors for every lecturer and employee to strive to excel.

It is well acknowledged that the caliber of lecturers influences the caliber of the campus and the caliber of lecturers in higher education (Suryowibowo and Widodo, 2021; Herawati and Rinofah, 2019). Pratomo et al. (2024) found that job satisfaction positively impacted lecturer performance. The above picture illustrates the need to research and assess Medan City colleges offering master's and doctoral programs because various factors affect them. One is how well lecturers execute the Tridharma of Higher Education with other auxiliary elements. Thus, this study aims to investigate how lecturers in master's and doctoral programs at private universities in Medan City are affected by their work environment.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Performance

Employee performance refers to the quantity and quality of work that employees accomplish over a given period about a range of options, including predetermined standards, targets, and goals (Hayati et al., 2020; Lilawati and Mashari, 2017). According to Adnyaswari and Adnyani (2017), performance is defined as each employee's job results throughout a given period compared to various options, including standards, targets, and goals that have been specified or previously agreed upon. Performance is defined as actual behavior shown by each person and is indicated by the work results produced by employees according to their roles in the organization (Habib & Mourad, 2024; Purba et al., 2018). The work results and behavior achieved during a certain period of time in completing the tasks and responsibilities are called performance (Kasmir, 2018; Amin et al., 2021). These outcomes are thoroughly documented, allowing for an evaluation of the appropriate performance level. Employee performance is the quantity and quality of work, freedom, initiative, flexibility, and cooperation (Rohman & Ichsan, 2021; Siahaan et al., 2022).

Performance Aspects

Performance comprises task performance, contextual performance, and

counterproductive work behavior (Koopmans et al., 2014). Aspects of lecturer performance are measured by the workload of lecturers, which covers planning and executing the learning process, conducting learning evaluations, supervising and training, conducting research, performing community service, and performing additional tasks (Lestari, 2019; Ingtias et al., 2022). An organization's performance is crucial since it will define its efficacy. Performance is significant since it indicates how well managers can manage the company and its people. The Koopmans et al. (2014) theory, which considers task performance, contextual performance, and counterproductive work behavior, is applied in this study.

Factors Affecting Performance

Sedarmayanti (2017) stated that work performance, expertise, behavior, and leadership are some components that affect employee performance. Then Timpe and Kallrath (2000) stated that two components affect performance. The first is internal factors, which include qualities such as intellectual ability, ability to communicate with others, workload, reasoning, and type of hard worker. The second is external factors, including things that come from a person's environment, such as coworkers' behavior, attitudes, and actions, superiors or leaders, facilities, and workplaces. In addition, Kude and Hinele (2023) showed that work fatigue is essential in determining how good or bad a person's performance is. Lack of employee discipline, high workload, and educational background that is not by the job are some factors that affect employee performance (Khair, 2018; Irawati and Carrollina, 2017). Work fatigue and workload affect performance in this study, based on the theory of factors that affect performance above.

Work environment

Afandi et al. (2018) propose that the work environment encompasses all aspects surrounding employees and can significantly impact their job satisfaction, ultimately leading to optimal work outcomes. The employees' surroundings also constitute their work environment, which affects how well they carry out their duties. Employees generally do their work in the workplace. It is impossible to isolate employees from their workplace. Their environment can also influence the optimization of an individual's performance. Everything surrounding employees at work impacts how they carry out their allocated responsibilities.

According to Panjaitan (2018), job satisfaction among employees is highly and favorably impacted by their work environment. A safe, comfortable, and healthy work environment allows employees to do their duties as effectively, swiftly, and skilfully as possible. The work environment, according to Nabawi (2019), consists of everything in a person's workplace, which can affect how they perform the tasks assigned to them. Things like cleanliness and music are some examples. An Experts that participated in this study provided multiple definitions of the term "work environment," defining it as everything that is physically and non-physically surrounding employees and has the potential to boost their motivation and job satisfaction.

This indicates that the work was finished accurately and on schedule. He will have a strong sense of willpower, and those in charge will keep an eye on him. Januari (2019) says a positive work atmosphere boosts motivation and output. Working with motivated individuals, however, has the benefit that the task can be finished correctly. This indicates that the work was completed accurately and on schedule. He will have a strong sense of resolve, and everyone involved will watch his performance.

METHOD

This research employs a quantitative methodology. According to Sugiyono (2019), quantitative methods derived from positivism aim to characterize and assess the researcher's hypotheses. Postgraduate instructors from PhD programs at private universities in Medan City participated in this study. This study used 51 indicators, meaning there were five times as many research samples as 255 people as there were indicators. A proportionate sample approach was used to calculate the number of samples needed for each university.

Operational Definition of Variables

The operational definition of each research variable is presented in Table 1.

Table 1. Operationalization of Research Variables

Variable	Operational Definition	Dimensions	Indicator	Scale

Work environment (X ₁)	Everything that is around lecturers when working, both physical and non-physical, that can improve lecturer performance and satisfaction.	Physical Work Environment	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Workplace building 2. Adequate work equipment 3. Adequate facilities 	Interval
		Non-Physical Work Environment	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Work Atmosphere 2. Relationship between superiors and employees 3. Cooperation between employees 	
Job satisfaction (Z ₁)	Something that is generally felt by lecturers is reflected in the lecturer's positive attitude towards work and everything that is faced or assigned to him in the work environment	The job itself	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Satisfaction in doing work 2. Satisfaction in completing work 3. A sense of pride in work 	Interval
		Superior	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A wise boss 2. A boss who respects his subordinates 3. A fair boss 	

		Work colleague	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Mutual respect 2. Collaborative colleagues 3. Responsible colleagues 	
		Promotion	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Career ladder 2. Facilities 3. Position allowance 	
		Salary/Wages	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Regular salary increases 2. Performance allowances 3. Job security 	
Lecturer Performance (Y)	Achievement of duties and responsibilities of lecturers within the scope of the Tridharma of higher education and supporting elements (PO BKD 2021)	Implementation of Education	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Implementation of teaching 2. Implementation of guidance for students 3. Development of lecture materials 	Interval
		Research Implementation	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Conducting research 2. Publication of scientific works 3. Generating patents 	

		Implementation of Community Service	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Carrying out community service 2. Implementing training/counseling 3. Providing services to the community. 	
		Supporting Implementation	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Active participation in institutions on campus 2. Active participation as a member of a profession 3. Active participation in scientific meetings 	

Primary and secondary data make up the research data. Questionnaires were given to chosen respondents, and documentation studies were used to obtain data. Tests for validity and reliability were performed to evaluate the questionnaire's suitability for research. Reliability and validity tests indicate that the questionnaire is a tool researchers need to ask or observe respondents to obtain the information they need. Thirty respondents who were not part of the research sample underwent validity and reliability tests. For data processing, structural equation modeling, or SEM, was employed. When latent variables are used in research, causal links are

predicted by the inner model. Latent variables are those that are not amenable to direct measurement. The variation in changes in independent and dependent variables is measured using the R^2 value, which assesses the PLS model. A high R^2 score indicates a robust prediction model.

RESEARCH RESULTS

Work Environment Variables

Respondents' answers to work environment variables are given in Table 2.

Table 2. Respondents' Answers to Work Environment Variables

Indicator	Choice					Average Score	Category
	1	2	3	4	5		
X1_01	0	23	42	144	46	3.84	High
X1_02	6	2	24	174	49	4.01	High
X1_03	0	12	60	128	55	3.89	High
X1_04	0	11	33	118	93	4.15	High
X1_05	0	15	20	175	45	3.98	High
X1_06	3	12	20	184	36	3.93	High

Table 2 shows that the highest indicator, X1_04 (work atmosphere), has an average score of 4.15 with the category "high." Next, indicator XI_02 (adequate work equipment) has an average score of 4.01 in the "high." Then indicator XI_05 (superior-employee relationship) has an average score of 3.98 with the category "high." Then indicator XI_03 (adequate facilities) has an average score of 3.89 with the category "high." Furthermore, indicator XI_06 (Cooperation between employees) has an average score of 3.93 with the category "high." The lowest indicator, X1_01 (workplace building), has an average score of 3.84 with the category "high".

Job Satisfaction Variable

Respondents' answers to the job satisfaction variable are given in Table 3.

Table 3. Respondents' Answers to the Job Satisfaction Variable

Indicator	Choice	Average	Category
-----------	--------	---------	----------

	1	2	3	4	5	Score	
Z1_01	0	15	14	113	113	4.27	Very High
Z1_02	0	15	23	149	68	4.06	High
Z1_03	0	14	12	155	74	4.13	High
Z1_04	0	17	21	154	63	4.03	High
Z1_05	0	21	23	161	50	3.94	High
Z1_06	0	9	32	162	52	4.01	High
Z1_07	0	6	15	128	106	4.31	Very High
Z1_08	0	14	15	154	72	4.11	High
Z1_09	0	15	6	154	80	4.17	High
Z1_10	6	6	20	135	88	4.15	High
Z1_11	0	5	39	150	61	4.05	High
Z1_12	3	0	15	146	91	4.26	Very High
Z1_13	0	20	33	149	53	3.92	High
Z1_14	3	15	11	121	105	4.22	Very High
Z1_15	0	12	23	164	56	4.04	High

Table 3 shows that the highest indicator, Z1_07 (mutual respect), has an average score of 4.31 with the category "very high." Next, it is followed by indicator Z1_01 (satisfaction in doing work), which has an average score of 4.27 with the category "very high." From the side of the indicator, Z1_12 (position allowance) has an average score of 4.26 with the category "very high." Furthermore, indicator Z1_14 (performance allowance) has an average score of 4.22 with the category "very high." Then indicator Z1_09 (responsible coworkers) has an average score of 4.17 with the category "high." Indicator Z1_10 (career ladder) has an average score of 4.15 with the category "high." Furthermore, indicator Z1_03 (sense of pride in work) has an average score of 4.13 with the category "high." The indicator Z1_08 (colleagues who work together) has an average score of 4.11 with the category "high." Then indicator Z1_02 (satisfaction in completing work) averages 4.06 with the category "high." Furthermore, indicator Z1_15 (job security) averages 4.04 with the "high." Continued with indicator Z1_04 (wise superior), which averages

4.03 in the "high." Then indicator Z1_06 (fair superior) averages 4.01 with the "high." Furthermore, indicator Z1_05 (superiors who appreciate subordinates) averages 3.94 with the category "high." The lowest indicator is indicator Z1_13 (periodic salary increases), which has an average score of 3.92 with the category "high".

Lecturer Performance Variables

Respondents' answers to the lecturer performance variables are given in Table 4.

Table 4. Respondents' Answers to the Lecturer Performance Variables

Indicator	Choice					Average Score	Category
	1	2	3	4	5		
Y_01	0	9	35	120	91	4.15	High
Y_02	0	6	44	111	94	4.15	High
Y_03	0	12	20	113	110	4.26	Very High
Y_04	0	9	36	134	76	4.09	High
Y_05	0	9	14	185	47	4.06	High
Y_06	0	15	26	134	80	4.09	High
Y_07	0	8	12	101	134	4.42	Very High
Y_08	0	3	30	195	27	3.96	High
Y_09	0	18	5	165	67	4.1	High
Y_10	0	3	14	157	81	4.24	Very high
Y_11	0	6	13	157	79	4.21	Very high
Y_12	0	15	14	114	112	4.27	Very high

From Table 5. it can be seen that the highest indicator, Y_07 (carrying out community service), has an average score of 4.42 with a "very high" category. Next, followed by indicator Y_12 (activeness in scientific meetings) has an average score of 4.27 with a "very high" category. Indicator Y_03 (development of lecture materials) has an average score of 4.26 with a "very high" category. Indicator Y_10 (activeness as a member of the profession) has an average score of 4.24 with a very high category. After that, indicator Y_11 (activeness as a member of the profession) has an average score of 4.21 with a "very high" category.

Then, indicator Y_01 (teaching implementation) and indicator Y_02 (guidance implementation for students) have the same average score of 4.15, which is in the "high" category. In addition, indicator Y_09 (providing services to the community) has an average score of 4.1 with a "high" category. However, followed by indicator Y_04 (implementation of research) and indicator Y_06 (producing patents/intellectual property rights) have the same average score of 4.09 with the category "high." Then, the next indicator, followed by Y_05 (publication of scientific papers), has an average score of 4.06 in the category "high." The lowest indicator is in indicator Y_08 (implementation of training/counseling), with an average score of 3.96 in the category "high."

Convergent Validity Test

SmartPLS data processing produces Loading Factor values to assess each indicator's suitability with each research variable, as presented in Table 6. These values indicate that several indicators do not meet the requirements because their values are less than 0.7. Indicators X2_02, X2_09, Z1_03, Y_10, Y_11, and Y_12 are removed from the model. The following table shows the revised model.

Table 6. Initial Model Loading Factor Values

Variable	Indicator	LoadingFactor	Conclusion
Work Environment	X1_01	0.745	Fulfill
	X1_02	0.816	Fulfill
	X1_03	0.752	Fulfill
	X1_04	0.780	Fulfill
	X1_05	0.752	Fulfill
	X1_06	0.865	Fulfill
Job Satisfaction	Z1_01	0.788	Fulfill
	Z1_02	0.806	Fulfill
	Z1_03	0.691	Not Fulfilled
	Z1_04	0.740	Fulfill

	Z1_05	0.717	Fulfill
	Z1_06	0.706	Fulfill
	Z1_07	0.710	Fulfill
	Z1_08	0.741	Fulfill
	Z1_09	0.741	Fulfill
	Z1_10	0.811	Fulfill
	Z1_11	0.746	Fulfill
	Z1_12	0.742	Fulfill
	Z1_13	0.813	Fulfill
	Z1_14	0.774	Fulfill
	Z1_15	0.790	Fulfill
Lecturer Performance	Y_01	0.748	Fulfill
	Y_02	0.766	Fulfill
	Y_03	0.795	Fulfill
	Y_04	0.718	Fulfill
	Y_05	0.704	Fulfill
	Y_06	0.773	Fulfill
	Y_07	0.752	Fulfill
	Y_08	0.770	Fulfill
	Y_09	0.795	Fulfill
	Y_10	0.415	Not Fulfilled
	Y_11	0.456	Not Fulfilled
	Y_12	0.552	Not Fulfilled

The updated model's loading factor values are displayed in Table 6. As observed, each variable's indicators already have a loading factor of at least 0.7. Convergent validity was further tested by looking at each variable's Average Variance Extracted (AVE) value. Every research variable has an AVE value greater than 0.5, as indicated in Table 8. As a result, the requirements for the concurrent validity test are met.

Table 7. Revised Model Loading Factor Values

Variables	Indicator	Loading Factor	Conclusion
Work Environment	X1_01	0.745	Fulfill
	X1_02	0.815	Fulfill
	X1_03	0.752	Fulfill
	X1_04	0.781	Fulfill
	X1_05	0.752	Fulfill
	X1_06	0.865	Fulfill
Job Satisfaction	Z1_01	0.793	Fulfill
	Z1_02	0.807	Fulfill
	Z1_04	0.733	Fulfill
	Z1_05	0.709	Fulfill
	Z1_06	0.714	Fulfill
	Z1_07	0.724	Fulfill
	Z1_08	0.740	Fulfill
	Z1_09	0.747	Fulfill
	Z1_10	0.819	Fulfill
	Z1_11	0.739	Fulfill
	Z1_12	0.738	Fulfill
	Z1_13	0.813	Fulfill
	Z1_14	0.778	Fulfill
	Z1_15	0.788	Fulfill
Lecturer Performance	Y_01	0.755	Fulfill
	Y_02	0.774	Fulfill
	Y_03	0.805	Fulfill
	Y_04	0.725	Fulfill
	Y_05	0.713	Fulfill

	Y_06	0.784	Fulfill
	Y_07	0.756	Fulfill
	Y_08	0.781	Fulfill
	Y_09	0.810	Fulfill

Table 8. Average Variance Extracted Value (AVE)

Variabel	Average Variance Extracted(AVE)
Job Satisfaction	0.579
Lecturer Performance	0.589
Work Environment	0.618

Discriminant Validity Test

Fornell Larcker A technique for assessing a structural model's discriminant validity is called a criterion. The findings demonstrate that each variable's AVE root value is higher than the correlation coefficient between them. Consequently, it can be said that the requirements for legal discrimination have been satisfied.

Composite Reliability

Reliability testing evaluates the precision, accuracy, and consistency of the instruments used to measure the construct (Ghozali, 2021). There are two techniques for assessing construct dependability when using reflecting indicators: Cronbach's dependability (Dillon-Goldstein) and Composite Reliability, frequently referred to as Cronbach's Alpha. Table 9 shows the composite reliability values for each variable.

Table 9. Construct Validity and Reliability Results

Variabel	Cronbach's Alpha	rho_A	Composite Reliability
Job Satisfaction	0.944	0.945	0.951
Lecturer Performance	0.913	0.913	0.928
Work Environment	0.875	0.877	0.906

Table 9 demonstrates that all research constructs have Composite dependability and Cronbach's Alpha values of more than 0.70, satisfying the dependability standards.

Structural Model Evaluation (Inner Model)

Table 10. Direct Influence Between Variables

Influence Between Variables	Original Sample (O)	Sample Mean (M)	Standard Deviation (STDEV)	T Statistics (O/STDEV)	P Values
Job Satisfaction > Lecturer Performance	0.631	0.614	0.062	10.242	0.000
Work Environment > Job Satisfaction	0.574	0.574	0.038	15.238	0.000
Work Environment > Lecturer Performance	0.075	0.089	0.054	1.392	0.165

Meanwhile, the indirect influence between variables is given in Table 11 and the total influence between variables is given in Table 12.

Table 11. Indirect Influence Between Variables

Indirect Influence	Original Sample (O)	Sample Mean (M)	Standard Deviation (STDEV)	T Statistics (O/STDEV)	P Values
Work Environment > Satisfaction Work > Lecturer Performance	0.362	0.353	0.043	8.362	0.000

Table 13. Total Influence Between Variables

Total Influence	Original Sample (O)	Sample Mean (M)	Standard Deviation (STDEV)	T Statistics (O/STDE)	P Values
Job Satisfaction > Lecturer Performance	0.631	0.614	0.062	10.242	0.000

Work Environment > Job Satisfaction	0.574	0.574	0.038	15.238	0.000
Work Environment > Lecturer Performance	0.437	0.442	0.045	9.742	0.000

Model Quality Evaluation

The evaluation of the quality of the research model consists of R-Square, F-Square, and Q-Square.

R-Square

The R-Square values for each mediator variable and dependent variable are given in Table 14.

Table 14. R-Square Results

Variable	<i>R Square</i>	<i>R Square Adjusted</i>
Job Satisfaction	0.927	0.927
Lecturer Performance	0.959	0.958

The structural (inner) model is tested using the R Square (R²) value. To find out if exogenous latent factors significantly affect endogenous latent variables, one can use R-Square. According to Hair et al. (2011), 0.75 denotes strength, 0.50 is moderate, and 0.25 is weakness. Table 14 shows that the variation in the work environment, competence, and job satisfaction constructions accounts for 92.7% of the variation in the R Square value, which accounts for variation in the lecturer performance construct (MB). The model is considered vital because only 7.3% of the variation in other constructs can be explained by the variation in the work satisfaction construct.

F-Square

The F-square values for each research variable are given in Table 15.

Table 15. F-Square Results

	Job Satisfaction	Lecturer Performance
Job Satisfaction		0.665
Lecturer Performance		

Work Environment	1.386	0.014
------------------	-------	-------

Based on Table 15, it is concluded that :

- a. Work environment on Job satisfaction = 1.386 has a very strong influence
- b. Job satisfaction on lecturer performance = 0.665 has a very strong influence
- c. Environment on lecturer performance = 0.014 has a weak influence

Q² Predictive Relevance

The Q² values for each research variable are given in Table 16.

Table 16. Results Q² Predictive Relevance

	SSO	SSE	Q ² (=1-SSE/SSO)
Job Satisfaction	3570.000	1674.585	0.531
Lecturer Performance	2295.000	1014.176	0.558
Work Environment	1530.000	1530.000	

As shown in Table 16, the model has predictive relevance because the Q² value is greater than 0. The model obtained is powerful in predicting job satisfaction and performance of lecturers in Masters and Doctoral Programs at Private Universities in Medan City, as evidenced by the Q² results of Purchase Intention (0.558), which is more excellent than 0.355, and Job Satisfaction (0.531), which is more significant than 0.355 (Ghozali, 2018).

Hypothesis Answer

The answers to the research hypothesis are presented in Table 17 from the data processing and analysis carried out in the previous section.

Table 17. Hypothesis Answers

	Hypothesis	Influence Coefficient	p-value	Conclusion
H1	The work environment positively and significantly influences the job satisfaction of lecturers in Masters and Doctoral Programs at Private Universities in Medan City	0.574	0.000	Accepted

H2	The work environment positively and significantly influences the performance of lecturers in Masters and Doctoral Programs at Private Universities in Medan City	0.075	0.165	Rejected
H3	Job satisfaction has a positive and significant effect on the performance of lecturers in Masters and Doctoral Programs at Private Universities in Medan City	0.631	0.000	Accepted
H4	The work environment has a positive and significant effect on performance through job satisfaction of Masters and Doctoral Program lecturers at Private Universities in Medan City	0.362	0.000	Accepted

Discussion

The hypothesis test results indicate that work environment characteristics significantly and favorably impact postgraduate professors at private universities in Medan City in terms of their job satisfaction. According to Muttaqijin (2021), a lecturer's contentment might be influenced by their work environment. The non-physical work environment X is thought to be generally fairly excellent (Hamka et al., 2023). This shows that the non-physical work environment has been running well according to the lecturer's expectations. According to simple regression results, the influence of physical environmental factors (x) on satisfaction (y) is powerful. Subagyo et al. (2023) studied job satisfaction as having a more significant impact on organizational commitment than the work environment.

Furthermore, the hypothesis test results indicate that postgraduate professors at private universities in Medan perform better and insignificantly due to work environment characteristics. This outcome is satisfactory. Analisa et al. (2023) discovered that the work environment impacts lecturer performance; Asi et al. (2021) observed that the work environment influences organizational commitment and lecturer performance; and Khoyrun (2020) found that the work

environment affects lecturer performance at private institutions.

The hypothesis test results indicate that postgraduate instructors at private universities in Medan perform better when they are satisfied with their jobs, a positive and noteworthy relationship. Arifin (2018) showed that the organizational behavior of lectures is negatively and negligibly impacted by job satisfaction. Furthermore, postgraduate students' performance and job satisfaction are positively and considerably affected by the work environment aspect at private universities in Medan. According to Hariani (2020), a significant and favorable correlation exists between the work environment and teacher performance. According to Mardikaningsih and Dermawan (2022), efforts to put quality first can influence workplace standards. The quality of the relationship between the academic community and the quality of learning and the external quality of activities in higher education must be supported by the work and learning environment.

CONCLUSION

Based on the results of this study, the environment and job satisfaction have a good and significant impact on the job satisfaction of Masters and Doctoral Program teachers at Private Universities in Medan City, according to the study's findings. Furthermore, there is a favorable and significant correlation between the job happiness of lecturers and the performance of Masters and Doctoral Program teachers at Private Universities in Medan City. Regarding the work environment, Masters and Doctoral Program teachers at Private Universities in Medan City report that it has a good and significant impact on their performance through job satisfaction.

REFERENCES

- Analisa, Bukhori, M, Dewi, W. 2023. Pengaruh Kompetensi, Motivasi, dan Lingkungan Kerja terhadap Kinerja Dosen di Institut Teknologi dan BisnisAsia Malang. *Jurnal Ilmiah Riset Aplikasi Manajemen*, 1(2).
- Amal, B. K., Pasaribu, F., & Purba, A. S. (2022). The Analysis Of The Benefits Of Expo Bank Sumatera Utara To Reduce Poverty. *Webology*, 19(1), 6900-6920.
- Adnyaswari, N. A., & Adnyani, I. G. A. D. (2017). *Pengaruh dukungan sosial dan burnout terhadap kinerja perawat rawat inap RSUP Sanglah* (Doctoral dissertation, Udayana University).
- Amin, Z., Burhanuddin, B., Shadiq, T. F., & Purba, A. S. (2021). How The Choice of Academic Majors

- and Students' Future Achievements According to The Talent Path. *Nazhruna: Jurnal Pendidikan Islam*, 4(3), 672-684.
- Amin, Z., Burhanuddin, B., Shadiq, T. F., & Purba, A. S. (2021). What academia say on university choices in achieving the future goals of studying abroad: meta-analysis. *International Journal of Social Sciences*, 4(1), 114-121.
- Afandi, A., Sajidan, S., Akhyar, M., & Suryani, N. (2018). Pre-service science teachers' perception about high order thinking skills (HOTS) in the 21st century. *International Journal of Pedagogy and Teacher Education*, 2(1), 107-114.
- Arifin, A.H. 2018. Pengaruh Kepuasan Kerja, Komitmen Organisasi, dan Profesionalisme terhadap Perilaku Organisasi dan Kinerja Dosen. *Jurnal Ilmiah Ekonomi dan Bisnis*. Vol. 4, No. 2
- Asi, L.L, Gani, A, Sukmawati, ST. 2021. Pengaruh Budaya Organisasi, Motivasi Kerja, Lingkungan Kerja Terhadap Komitmen Organisasional dan Kinerja Dosen Universitas Negeri Gorontalo. *Journal of Management Science (JMS)*. 2(1).
- Ghozali, I. (2018). *Aplikasi Analisis Multivariate Dengan Pogram IBM SPSS Edisi Semblian*. Semarang: Badan Penerbit Universitas Diponegoro
- Herawati, J., & Rinofah, R. (2019). Faktor-faktor yang mempengaruhi kinerja dosen. *Akmenika: Jurnal Akuntansi dan Manajemen*, 16(2).
- Hayati, R., Arafat, Y., & Sari, A. P. (2020). Pengaruh komitmen organisasi dan motivasi kerja terhadap kinerja guru. *JMKSP (jurnal manajemen, kepemimpinan, dan supervisi pendidikan)*, 5(2), 100-111.
- Habib, A. M., & Mourad, N. (2024). The influence of environmental, social, and governance (ESG) practices on US firms' performance: Evidence from the coronavirus crisis. *Journal of the Knowledge Economy*, 15(1), 2549-2570.
- Hamka, R. A, Kurniawan, A.W, Tahir, Thamrin, Nurhaedah, Sutrisno. 2023. Faktor-Faktor Lingkungan Kerja Yang Mempengaruhi Kepuasan Kerja Dosen di Masa Pasca Pandemi Covid 19, *Journal of Economics and Business UBS*, Vol. 12, No. 3
- Hariani, S. 2020. Pengaruh Kepemimpinan Transformasional, Lingkungan Kerjaterhadap Kinerja Dosen Di FKIP Dosen. *Jurnal EduTech*. 6 (2).
- Irawati, R., & Carrollina, D. A. (2017). Analisis pengaruh beban kerja terhadap kinerja karyawan operator pada PT Giken Precision Indonesia. *Inovbiz: Jurnal Inovasi Bisnis*, 5(1), 51-58.
- Ingtias, F. T., Ampera, D., Farihah, F., Amal, B. K., & Purba, A. S. (2022). Implementation of teaching practitioners in improving the quality of learning and implementing the curriculum Merdeka Belajar. *Jurnal Studi Guru Dan Pembelajaran*, 5(2), 157-169.
- Kasmir. 2018. *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia (Teori dan Praktik)*. Depok: PT.Raja Grafindo Persada.
- Koopmans, L., Bernaards, C. M., Hildebrandt, V. H., Van Buuren, S., Van der Beek, A. J., & De Vet, H. C. (2014). Improving the individual work performance questionnaire using rasch analysis. *Journal of applied measurement*, 15(2), 160-175.
- Khair, H. 2018. *Pengaruh Gaya Kepemimpinan Dan Lingkungan Kerja Terhadap Kinerja Karyawan Dengan Kepuasan Kerja Sebagai Variabel Intervening*. Maneggio: *Jurnal Ilmiah Magister Manajemen*, 1(1), 59–70.
- Khoyrun, Huda, Sutanto, Aftoni, Hidayat, A.C . Pengaruh Kompetensi, Motivasi, dan Lingkungan

- Kerja terhadap Kinerja Dosen Perguruan Tinggi Swasta Daerah Istimewa Yogyakarta, *Jurnal Ilmiah Ekonomi Global Masa Kini*, Vol. 11, No. 1
- Kude, L. A., & Hinely, R. (2023). Pengaruh Kelelahan Kerja Terhadap Kinerja Pegawai Pada Kantor Kpu Provinsi Gorontalo. *SEIKO: Journal of Management & Business*, 6(2).
- Lilawati, E, and Mashari, F. 2017. Pengaruh Kompetensi Dosen dan Kepuasan Kerja Dosen Terhadap Kinerja Dosen Di Universitas KH A Wahab Hasbullah Tambakberas Jombang. *DIRASAT: Jurnal Manajemen dan Pendidikan Islam*. Vol. 3, No. 1
- Lestari, F. A. P. (2019). Faktor–Faktor Yang Mempengaruhi Kualitas Kinerja Dosen Dalam Proses Belajar Mengajar. *Faktor: Jurnal Ilmiah Kependidikan*, 6(1), 69-76.
- Mardikaningsih, R, Darmawan, D. 2022. Tinjauan Tentang Kualitas Kehidupan Kerja, Kompensasi, Komitmen Organisasi Dan Kontribusi Terhadap Kinerja Dosen, *Jurnal Pendidikan dan Konseling*, Vol. 4, No. 6
- Muttaqijin, M. Imam. 2021. Pengaruh Disiplin Kerja dan Lingkungan Kerja Terhadap Kepuasan Kerja Dosen. *Jurnal Manajemen Bisnis*. Vol. 10, No. 2
- Nabawi, R. (2019). Pengaruh lingkungan kerja, kepuasan kerja dan beban kerja terhadap kinerja pegawai. *Maneggio: Jurnal Ilmiah Magister Manajemen*, 2(2), 170-183.
- Purba, A. S., Malihah, E., & Hufad, A. (2019). The implementation of multicultural education in senior high schools in Medan. *Budapest International Research and Critics Institute-Journal (BIRCI-Journal)*, 2(3), 226-233.
- Pratomo, W., Sapriya, S., Sundawa, D., & Fitriyani, S. (2024). Penguatan Good Character Mahasiswa melalui Pembelajaran Pendidikan Kewarganegaraan Sekolah Dasar Berbasis Metode Sariswara. *Jurnal Moral Kemasyarakatan*, 9(1), 1-14.
- Purba, A. S., Hufad, A., Negara, C. P., Nasrawati, N., & Ramdani, A. M. (2018, November). The implication of Baduy Dalam tribe's closure on Indonesia's rank in the World Economic Forum. In *Annual Civic Education Conference (ACEC 2018)* (pp. 426-428). Atlantis Press.
- Rohman, M. A., & Ichsan, R. M. (2021). Pengaruh Beban Kerja dan Stres Kerja Terhadap Kinerja Karyawan PT Honda Daya Anugrah Mandiri Cabang Sukabumi: Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia. *Jurnal Mahasiswa Manajemen*, 2(1), 1-22.
- Sedarmayanti. 2018. *Sumber Daya Manusia dan Produktivitas Kerja*. Bandung: CV. Mandar Maju.
- Suryowibowo, D. Y., & Widodo, A. P. (2021). Faktor-Faktor yang Mempengaruhi Kinerja Dosen di Universitas Teknologi Surabaya. *JDEP (Jurnal Dinamika Ekonomi Pembangunan)*, 4(2), 98-106.
- Siahaan, M., Anantadjaya, S. P., Kurniawan, I. M. G. A., & Purba, A. S. (2022). Syariah Technology Financial Potential to Reach Non-bank Financing. *Webology*, 19(1), 77-91.
- Sugiyono (2019). *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif, Kualitatif, dan R&D*. Bandung : Alfabeta.
- Subagyo, Amir, Makhfud, Widiarto, Eko, Jamaah, Akhmad. 2022. Pengaruh Lingkungan Kerja dan Kepuasan Kerja Terhadap Komitmen Organisasional Dosen Prodi Listrik Jurusan Elektro Politeknik Negeri Semarang, *Jurnal Orbith*, Vol. 18, No. 2
- Susanti, R. K., & Arief, M. Y. (2024). Disiplin Kerja Terhadap Kinerja Dosen Melalui Komitmen Organisasi Perguruan Tinggi Swasta Di Lingkungan Lldikti Wilayah Vii Jawa Timur. *CERMIN: Jurnal Penelitian*, 8(1), 311-322.
- Timpe, C. H., & Kallrath, J. (2000). Optimal planning in large multi-site production networks.

European journal of operational research, 126(2), 422-435.
Yanuari, Y. (2019). Analisis pengaruh motivasi kerja dan lingkungan kerja terhadap kinerja karyawan. *BASKARA: Journal of Business and Entrepreneurship*, 2(1), 45-54.