

The Influence of Teamwork and Organizational Commitment on Employee Performance Through Job Satisfaction as a Mediator

Albi Muhammad Fadillah¹, Puji Rahayu Suci², Alfiana³

^{1,2,3} Management Study Program, Faculty of Economics and Business, Universitas Widya Gama Malang, Indonesia
e-mail: malbi5206@gmail.com. rahayu@widyagama.ac.id alfi@widyagama.ac.id

Abstract

This study examines the influence of Teamwork and Organizational Commitment on Employee Performance, both directly and through Job Satisfaction as a mediating variable, among employees of the Motor Vehicle Testing Technical Implementation Unit (UPT PKB) of Arjowinangun and Karanglo, Malang Raya. The phenomenon underlying this study is the steady rise in vehicles undergoing periodic testing after the testing levy was eliminated, which has increased workload without a proportional increase in staff. This study uses a quantitative approach with an explanatory design. All 63 employees of both units were surveyed through saturated sampling using a five-point Likert-scale questionnaire, and the data were analyzed with Partial Least Squares-Structural Equation Modeling (PLS-SEM) using SmartPLS 4. Results show that Teamwork and Organizational Commitment both positively and significantly affect Job Satisfaction, and that Organizational Commitment and Job Satisfaction both positively and significantly affect Employee Performance, whereas Teamwork has no significant direct effect on Employee Performance. Mediation testing shows that Job Satisfaction does not mediate the effect of Teamwork on Employee Performance but partially mediates the effect of Organizational Commitment on Employee Performance. These findings indicate that organizational commitment, reinforced by job satisfaction, is the more consistent driver of performance in this public-service context.

Keywords: Teamwork; Organizational Commitment; Job Satisfaction; Employee Performance; PLS-SEM

INTRODUCTION

The success of any organization, whether in the public or private sector, is largely determined by the quality of its human resources. Human resources are a strategic asset that drives every organizational activity toward its established goals, and technology, facilities, and budgets cannot produce optimal results without employees who can carry out their duties effectively. In the public sector, employee performance is especially critical because it is directly tied to the quality of service the public receives; government agencies are expected to provide fast, accurate, transparent, and accountable service in line with the principles of good governance.

The Motor Vehicle Testing Technical Implementation Unit (UPT PKB) is a government agency with a strategic role in delivering public services in land transportation, ensuring that every vehicle subject to mandatory testing meets technical and roadworthiness requirements. The enactment of Law No. 1 of 2022 on Fiscal Relations between the Central and Regional Governments, which eliminated the vehicle-testing service levy, has encouraged more vehicle owners to use periodic testing services, thereby increasing the volume of vehicles handled by UPT PKB offices. This pattern is also evident at UPT PKB Arjowinangun and UPT PKB Karanglo in Malang Regency, where the number of vehicles tested has risen each year while staff numbers have remained relatively unchanged, adding to the complexity of coordination among employees at every stage of the testing process.

Preliminary field observations and interviews with employees at both units revealed a rising workload, periodic service queues, and the growing importance of coordination among employees in keeping the testing process running smoothly. These conditions suggest that maintaining employee performance amid an increasing service volume depends not only on individual task completion but also on the quality of teamwork, the strength of employees' commitment to the organization, and the level of job satisfaction they experience.

Teamwork, understood as the quality of interaction among team members reflected in communication, coordination, mutual support, and cohesion (Hoegl and Gemuenden, 2001), is considered essential in this context because the vehicle-testing process involves several interdependent stages, from administrative checks to the technical inspection and issuance of test results. Prior studies by Batubara and Mesra (2023), Iryadana et al. (2024), and Harahap and Siska (2025) found that teamwork has a positive effect on employee performance, underscoring its potential relevance in this setting.

Employee performance is also thought to depend on organizational commitment, defined by Allen and Meyer (1991) as a psychological state that reflects an employee's attachment to the organization and influences the decision to remain a member of it. Agustianingsih and Ekowati (2024) and Ningrum et al. (2024) found that organizational commitment has a positive effect on employee performance, as committed employees tend to display more productive and responsible work behavior. In addition, job satisfaction, described by Spector (1985) as the degree to which employees like or dislike their job based on an evaluation of various facets of their work, is believed to influence how employees translate teamwork and commitment into performance outcomes; Halimah, Darka, and Saputra (2024) and Sopali and Azizi (2025) found that job satisfaction has a positive effect on employee performance and can mediate the effect of organizational factors on performance.

This study differs from prior research primarily in the characteristics of its research object. Most previous studies were conducted in private companies, hospitals, educational institutions, or other service organizations, whereas work at UPT PKB places greater emphasis on inter-employee coordination, procedural accuracy in the testing process, adherence to standard operating procedures, and accountability to the public. This characteristic suggests that the relationships among teamwork, organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and employee performance warrant re-examination within a public-sector service context. Accordingly, this study aims to analyze the effect of Teamwork and Organizational Commitment on Employee Performance, the effect of Teamwork and Organizational Commitment on Job Satisfaction, the effect of Job Satisfaction on Employee Performance, and the mediating role of Job Satisfaction in the relationship between Teamwork and Organizational Commitment on the one hand and Employee Performance on the other, among employees of UPT PKB Arjowinangun and UPT PKB Karanglo.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Organizational Behavior

This study is grounded in Organizational Behavior (OB) theory, which examines individual and group behavior within an organization and how organizational structure shapes that behavior. Colquitt, LePine, and Wesson (2019) describe OB as the systematic study of individual actions and attitudes aimed at improving organizational effectiveness, while Robbins and Judge (2017) note that OB covers three levels of analysis: the individual level (attitudes, motivation, job satisfaction), the group level (communication, leadership, teamwork), and the organizational level (structure, culture, organizational commitment). These levels jointly explain how employees' working relationships, commitment, and satisfaction ultimately shape performance outcomes, and OB is therefore used here as the overarching theory linking Teamwork, Organizational Commitment, Job Satisfaction, and Employee Performance.

Teamwork

Hoegl and Gemuenden (2001) define teamwork through the concept of Teamwork Quality (TWQ), which captures the quality of interaction among team members while completing shared tasks, encompassing communication, coordination, balance of member

contributions, mutual support, effort, and cohesion. Given the interdependent stages of the vehicle-testing process, this study focuses on four of these dimensions that are most relevant to the object of research: communication, coordination, mutual support, and cohesion.

Organizational Commitment

Allen and Meyer (1991) define organizational commitment as a psychological state describing the relationship between an individual and the organization that influences the decision to remain a member of it, comprising three components: affective commitment, continuance commitment, and normative commitment. Employees with strong organizational commitment tend to show greater loyalty, responsibility, and willingness to contribute toward organizational goals.

Job Satisfaction

Spector (1985) defines job satisfaction as the extent to which employees like or dislike their job, shaped by their evaluation of facets such as pay, promotion, supervision, benefits, rewards, operating procedures, coworkers, the nature of the work itself, and communication, as captured in the Job Satisfaction Survey (JSS) instrument developed for human-service organizations.

Employee Performance

Griffin, Neal, and Parker (2007) define performance as the work behavior employees display in carrying out their duties, contributing to their work team, and supporting organizational continuity, comprising three dimensions: individual task proficiency, team member proficiency, and organization member proficiency. This concept extends the notion of performance beyond individual task completion to encompass a broader contribution to the team and the organization.

Conceptual Framework and Hypothesis Development

Building on Organizational Behavior theory and the constructs above, this study proposes that Teamwork and Organizational Commitment influence Employee Performance both directly and indirectly through Job Satisfaction as a mediating variable. Prior findings on teamwork (Batubara and Mesra, 2023; Iryadana et al., 2024; Riskiyani and Ratnawati, 2025), organizational commitment (Santosa et al., 2022; Amin, 2022; Omar et al., 2020; Agustianingsih and Ekowati, 2024), and job satisfaction (Halimah, Darka, and Saputra, 2024; Sopali and Azizi, 2025) support the following hypotheses.

H1: Teamwork has a positive and significant effect on Job Satisfaction.

H2: Organizational Commitment has a positive and significant effect on Job Satisfaction.

H3: Teamwork has a positive and significant effect on Employee Performance.

H4: Organizational Commitment has a positive and significant effect on Employee Performance.

H5: Job Satisfaction has a positive and significant effect on Employee Performance.

H6: Job Satisfaction mediates the effect of Teamwork on Employee Performance.

H7: Job Satisfaction mediates the effect of Organizational Commitment on Employee Performance.

RESEARCH METHOD

This study uses a quantitative approach with an explanatory research design to examine the causal relationships among Teamwork, Organizational Commitment, Job Satisfaction, and Employee Performance (Sugiyono, 2023; Sekaran and Bougie, 2020). The population consists of all employees of UPT PKB Arjowinangun and UPT PKB Karanglo, Malang Regency. Because the population is relatively small, this study uses saturated sampling (a census), in which the entire population of 63 employees is used as the research sample.

Data were collected through a five-point Likert-scale questionnaire as the primary technique, supported by field observation and documentation. The instruments for Teamwork, Organizational Commitment, Job Satisfaction, and Employee Performance were developed from Hoegl and Gemuenden (2001), Allen and Meyer (1991), Spector (1985), and Griffin, Neal, and Parker (2007), respectively. This study involves four variables: Teamwork (X1) and

Organizational Commitment (X2) as independent variables, Job Satisfaction (Z) as the mediating variable, and Employee Performance (Y) as the dependent variable. Data were analyzed in two stages: descriptive statistics to describe respondent characteristics, and inferential analysis using Partial Least Squares-Structural Equation Modeling (PLS-SEM) with the assistance of SmartPLS version 4 (Ringle, Wende, and Becker, 2015). Model evaluation covered the outer model (convergent validity, discriminant validity, and construct reliability) and the inner model (collinearity/VIF, R-square, effect size/ f^2 , predictive relevance/ Q^2 , hypothesis testing through path coefficients and bootstrapping, mediation testing through specific indirect effects, and model fit through SRMR).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

RESULTS

1. Respondent Characteristics

The 63 respondents in this study consisted of employees of UPT PKB Arjowinangun and UPT PKB Karanglo, described in terms of gender, age, education, tenure, and employment status, as presented in Table 1.

Category	Description	Number	Percentage (%)
Gender	Male	40	63.49
	Female	23	36.51
Age	20–30 years	8	12.70
	31–40 years	17	26.98
	41–50 years	25	39.68
	> 50 years	13	20.63
Last Education	Senior High School/Vocational	12	19.05
	Diploma	8	12.70
	Bachelor's Degree (S1)	35	55.56
	Postgraduate (S2)	8	12.70
Tenure	< 1 year	3	4.76
	1–5 years	15	23.81
	6–10 years	21	33.33
	> 10 years	24	38.10
Employment Status	Civil Servant (PNS)	40	63.49
	Government Employee under Contract (PPPK)	23	36.51

Source: Processed questionnaire data, (2026)

The data in Table 1 show that respondents were predominantly male (63.49%), aged 41–50 years (39.68%), holding a Bachelor's degree (55.56%), with more than 10 years of tenure (38.10%), and employed as civil servants (63.49%). This profile indicates that respondents generally have substantial work experience and a well-established understanding of the testing process at both units.

2. PLS-SEM Model Testing

a. Outer Model

Convergent validity testing shows that every indicator across the four constructs has an outer loading above the 0.708 threshold (Ringle, Wende, and Becker, 2015), with outer loadings ranging from 0.811 to 0.904 for Teamwork, 0.889 to 0.965 for Organizational

Commitment, 0.749 to 0.950 for Job Satisfaction, and 0.739 to 0.935 for Employee Performance; all t-statistics exceed 1.96 with p-values of 0.000. The Average Variance Extracted (AVE) for every construct also exceeds the 0.50 minimum, as summarized in Table 2.

Construct	Outer Loading Range	AVE	Remarks
Teamwork (X1)	0.811 – 0.904	0.734	Valid
Organizational Commitment (X2)	0.889 – 0.965	0.865	Valid
Job Satisfaction (Z)	0.749 – 0.950	0.838	Valid
Employee Performance (Y)	0.739 – 0.935	0.769	Valid

Source: Processed SmartPLS output, (2026)

Discriminant validity, assessed with the Fornell-Larcker criterion and the Heterotrait-Monotrait Ratio (HTMT), confirms that each construct is empirically distinct from the others, and construct reliability, tested through Cronbach's Alpha, rho_A, and Composite Reliability, is presented in Table 3.

Construct	Cronbach's Alpha	rho_A	Composite Reliability	Remarks
Teamwork (X1)	0.967	0.968	0.971	Reliable
Organizational Commitment (X2)	0.969	0.969	0.975	Reliable
Job Satisfaction (Z)	0.988	0.990	0.989	Reliable
Employee Performance (Y)	0.976	0.978	0.979	Reliable

Source: Processed SmartPLS output, (2026)

All reliability values are well above the 0.70 minimum, and every VIF value in the structural model (ranging from 1.807 to 2.365) is below the 5.00 threshold, indicating no multicollinearity among the predictor constructs (Ringle, Wende, and Becker, 2015).

b. Inner Model

The R-square value for Job Satisfaction is 0.447 (adjusted $R^2 = 0.428$), indicating that Teamwork and Organizational Commitment jointly explain 44.7% of the variance in Job Satisfaction — a relatively limited explanatory power. The R-square value for Employee Performance is 0.770 (adjusted $R^2 = 0.758$), indicating that Teamwork, Organizational Commitment, and Job Satisfaction jointly explain 77.0% of the variance in Employee Performance, a strong level of explanatory power (Hair et al., 2019).

Effect size (f^2) results show that the path from Job Satisfaction to Employee Performance has the largest effect ($f^2 = 0.464$, large), followed by Organizational Commitment to Employee Performance ($f^2 = 0.226$, moderate) and Organizational Commitment to Job Satisfaction ($f^2 = 0.165$, moderate), while Teamwork contributes only a small effect to both Job Satisfaction ($f^2 = 0.075$) and Employee Performance ($f^2 = 0.087$). The predictive relevance test (Q^2) yields values above zero for both Job Satisfaction and Employee Performance, confirming that the structural model has adequate predictive relevance, and the SRMR value falls within the acceptable model-fit range.

c. Hypothesis Testing (Path Coefficients)

Hypothesis testing was conducted through bootstrapping, with a relationship considered significant when the t-statistic exceeds 1.96 and the p-value is below 0.05 (Ringle, Wende, and Becker, 2015). The results are presented in Table 4.

Hypothesis	Path	Original Sample (β)	T-Statistics	P-Values	Result
H1	Teamwork (X1) $\rightarrow$ Job Satisfaction (Z)	0.290	2.063	0.040	Significant
H2	Organizational Commitment (X2) $\rightarrow$ Job Satisfaction (Z)	0.430	3.261	0.001	Significant
H3	Teamwork (X1) $\rightarrow$ Employee Performance (Y)	0.209	1.738	0.083	Not Significant
H4	Organizational Commitment (X2) $\rightarrow$ Employee Performance (Y)	0.351	2.842	0.005	Significant
H5	Job Satisfaction (Z) $\rightarrow$ Employee Performance (Y)	0.439	3.288	0.001	Significant

Source: Processed SmartPLS output, (2026)

d. Mediation Testing (Specific Indirect Effects)

The mediating role of Job Satisfaction in the relationship between Teamwork and Organizational Commitment on the one hand and Employee Performance on the other was tested through specific indirect effects, as presented in Table 5.

Hypothesis	Path	Original Sample (β)	T-Statistics	P-Values	Result
H6	Teamwork (X1) $\rightarrow$ Job Satisfaction (Z) $\rightarrow$ Employee Performance (Y)	0.127	1.681	0.093	Not Significant
H7	Organizational Commitment (X2) $\rightarrow$ Job Satisfaction (Z) $\rightarrow$ Employee Performance (Y)	0.189	2.090	0.037	Significant (Partial Mediation)

Source: Processed SmartPLS output, (2026)

Because the indirect effect of Teamwork on Employee Performance through Job Satisfaction is not significant, and the direct effect of Teamwork on Employee Performance is likewise not significant, H6 is rejected and Job Satisfaction is not established as a mediator of that relationship. In contrast, the indirect effect of Organizational Commitment on Employee Performance through Job Satisfaction is significant, and given that the direct effect of Organizational Commitment on Employee Performance is also significant, H7 is accepted and Job Satisfaction is confirmed as a partial mediator of that relationship.

DISCUSSION

The Effect of Teamwork on Job Satisfaction

Teamwork has a positive and significant effect on Job Satisfaction ($\beta = 0.290$; $p = 0.040$), so H1 is accepted. This finding is consistent with the Teamwork Quality concept of Hoegl and Gemuenden (2001), in which communication, coordination, mutual support, and cohesion among employees create a more comfortable and supportive working experience. Because the vehicle-testing process at UPT PKB involves several interdependent stages, from administrative checks to technical inspection, effective communication and coordination among employees translate directly into a more positive work experience and, in turn, greater job satisfaction. This result is consistent with Batubara and Mesra (2023), Iryadana et al. (2024), and Riskiyani and Ratnawati (2025), who likewise found that teamwork positively affects job satisfaction and employee performance.

The Effect of Organizational Commitment on Job Satisfaction

Organizational Commitment has a positive and significant effect on Job Satisfaction ($\beta = 0.430$; $p = 0.001$), so H2 is accepted, and its effect is stronger than that of Teamwork on the

same outcome. This finding supports Allen and Meyer's (1991) view that employees' attachment, loyalty, and sense of responsibility toward the organization shape how positively they evaluate their work. Employees who feel a stronger sense of belonging to UPT PKB Arjowinangun and UPT PKB Karanglo, and who accept the organization's values and goals, tend to report higher satisfaction with their work, consistent with the findings of Santosa et al. (2022), Amin (2022), Omar et al. (2020), and Agustianingsih and Ekowati (2024).

The Effect of Teamwork on Employee Performance

Teamwork does not have a significant effect on Employee Performance ($\beta = 0.209$; $p = 0.083$), so H3 is rejected. Although teamwork plays an important role in shaping a supportive working environment and, through that, job satisfaction, its direct contribution to individual performance outcomes appears limited. Employee performance at UPT PKB depends heavily on individual competence, discipline, accuracy, and adherence to testing procedures, factors that are not fully captured by team-level cooperation alone. This finding suggests that strengthening teamwork needs to be complemented by efforts that build individual capability and accountability if it is to translate into measurable performance gains.

The Effect of Organizational Commitment on Employee Performance

Organizational Commitment has a positive and significant effect on Employee Performance ($\beta = 0.351$; $p = 0.005$), so H4 is accepted. Employees with stronger attachment and responsibility toward the organization are more willing to carry out their duties diligently, maintain the quality of their work, and contribute to the organization's goals, consistent with prior findings that organizational commitment is a robust predictor of employee performance in public-sector settings (Agustianingsih and Ekowati, 2024; Ningrum et al., 2024).

The Effect of Job Satisfaction on Employee Performance

Job Satisfaction has a positive and significant effect on Employee Performance ($\beta = 0.439$; $p = 0.001$), so H5 is accepted, and based on its effect size ($f^2 = 0.464$) it is the strongest predictor of Employee Performance in this model. Employees who feel more positively about their pay, supervision, coworkers, and the nature of their work tend to be more responsible in completing their tasks and provide better service, in line with the findings of Halimah, Darka, and Saputra (2024) and Sopali and Azizi (2025).

The Mediating Role of Job Satisfaction

Mediation testing shows that Job Satisfaction does not mediate the effect of Teamwork on Employee Performance (indirect $\beta = 0.127$; $p = 0.093$), so H6 is rejected, whereas Job Satisfaction partially mediates the effect of Organizational Commitment on Employee Performance (indirect $\beta = 0.189$; $p = 0.037$), so H7 is accepted. These contrasting results indicate that Job Satisfaction plays a different mediating role depending on the predictor: it has not yet become the mechanism that links Teamwork to Employee Performance, but it does serve as an additional pathway through which Organizational Commitment reaches Employee Performance, alongside a significant direct effect. In practical terms, this suggests that organizational commitment strengthens performance both directly and by fostering greater job satisfaction, while teamwork's contribution to performance still depends on being paired with stronger individual competence and accountability.

CONCLUSION

Based on the analysis and discussion, Teamwork and Organizational Commitment both have a positive and significant effect on Job Satisfaction among employees of UPT PKB Arjowinangun and UPT PKB Karanglo, Malang Raya, with Organizational Commitment showing the stronger effect. Organizational Commitment and Job Satisfaction both have a positive and significant effect on Employee Performance, with Job Satisfaction contributing the largest effect size in the model, whereas Teamwork does not have a significant direct effect on Employee Performance. Mediation testing further shows that Job Satisfaction does not mediate the effect of Teamwork on Employee Performance, but it does partially mediate the effect of Organizational Commitment on Employee Performance. These findings indicate that improving employee performance in this public-service testing context depends less on teamwork alone and more on strengthening organizational commitment together with the

working conditions that sustain job satisfaction, while teamwork remains valuable chiefly for the quality of the working relationships it creates. Future research is recommended to incorporate additional variables that may influence Employee Performance, such as leadership, work motivation, discipline, workload, work environment, organizational culture, compensation, and organizational communication, and to extend the object of study to other motor vehicle testing units or public-service agencies with a larger sample so that the findings can be generalized more broadly.

REFERENCES

- Agustianingsih, F., & Ekowati, V. M. (2024). Pengaruh Quality of Work Life terhadap Employee Performance.
- Allen, N. J., & Meyer, J. P. (1991). The measurement and antecedents of affective, continuance and normative commitment to the organization. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 63(1), 1–18.
- Amin, M. S. (2022). Pengaruh Quality of Work Life terhadap Kinerja Pegawai. Analisis regresi linier berganda.
- Batubara, R. H., & Mesra, B. (2023). The influence of teamwork on employee performance with the work environment as an intervening variable at the BPJS Employment Office, South Sumatra. *SEM-PLS (SmartPLS 3)*.
- Colquitt, J. A., LePine, J. A., & Wesson, M. J. (2019). *Organizational behavior: Improving performance and commitment in the workplace* (6th ed.). McGraw-Hill.
- Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences* (2nd ed.). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Griffin, M. A., Neal, A., & Parker, S. K. (2007). A new model of work role performance: Positive behavior in uncertain and interdependent contexts. *Academy of Management Journal*, 50(2), 327–347.
- Hair, J. F., Hult, G. T. M., Ringle, C. M., & Sarstedt, M. (2017). *A primer on partial least squares structural equation modeling (PLS-SEM)* (2nd ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Hair, J. F., Risher, J. J., Sarstedt, M., & Ringle, C. M. (2019). When to use and how to report the results of PLS-SEM. *European Business Review*, 31(1), 2–24.
- Hair, J. F., Hult, G. T. M., Ringle, C. M., & Sarstedt, M. (2021). *A primer on partial least squares structural equation modeling (PLS-SEM)* (3rd ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Halimah, Darka, & Saputra, A. (2024). Pengaruh Quality of Work Life terhadap Kinerja Pegawai. *SEM-PLS*.
- Hardianto, Nursaid, & Martini, N. N. P. G. (2025). The effect of organizational justice on employee performance with work ethic as an intervening variable. *SEM-PLS (WarpPLS 7.0)*.
- Harahap, M. F. R., & Siska, E. (2025). Pengaruh Kerja Sama Tim dan Motivasi Kerja terhadap Prestasi Kerja Karyawan pada PT. Tracon Industri. *Regresi linier berganda (SPSS)*.
- Hoegl, M., & Gemuenden, H. G. (2001). Teamwork quality and the success of innovative projects: A theoretical concept and empirical evidence. *Organization Science*, 12(4), 435–449.
- Iryadana, M. R., et al. (2024). Pengaruh Quality of Work Life terhadap Kinerja Pegawai. *SEM-PLS*.
- Nelson, A., & Panjaitan, V. D. M. M. (2023). Quality of Work Life dan Kinerja Karyawan. *SEM-PLS*.
- Ningrum, A. A. P., et al. (2024). Pengaruh Quality of Work Life terhadap Organizational Commitment dan Employee Performance. *SEM-PLS*.
- Omar, M. S., et al. (2020). Quality of work life and employee performance. *SEM-PLS*.
- Republik Indonesia. (2022). Undang-Undang Nomor 1 Tahun 2022 tentang Hubungan Keuangan antara Pemerintah Pusat dan Pemerintahan Daerah.
- Riskiyan, A., & Ratnawati, A. (2025). Pengaruh Quality of Work Life terhadap Kinerja Karyawan dengan Komitmen Organisasi sebagai Variabel Mediasi. *SEM-PLS (SmartPLS)*.

- Ringle, C. M., Wende, S., & Becker, J.-M. (2015). SmartPLS 4. SmartPLS GmbH.
- Robbins, S. P., & Judge, T. A. (2017). *Organizational behavior* (17th ed.). Pearson.
- Santosa, H., et al. (2022). Pengaruh Quality of Work Life terhadap Organizational Commitment dan Employee Performance. SEM-PLS.
- Sekaran, U., & Bougie, R. (2020). *Research methods for business: A skill-building approach* (8th ed.). John Wiley & Sons.
- Sitepu, D. S., & Indrawan, M. I. (2024). Pengaruh Quality of Work Life terhadap Kinerja Karyawan melalui Organizational Citizenship Behavior. SEM-PLS.
- Sopali, M. F., & Azizi, P. (2025). Pengaruh Quality of Work Life terhadap Kinerja Pegawai melalui Kepuasan Kerja. SEM-PLS.
- Spector, P. E. (1985). Measurement of human service staff satisfaction: Development of the Job Satisfaction Survey. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 13(6), 693–713.
- Sugiyono. (2022). *Metode penelitian kuantitatif, kualitatif, dan R&D*. Alfabeta.
- Sugiyono. (2023). *Metode penelitian bisnis (Cetakan ke-4)*. Alfabeta.