Management Studies and Entrepreneurship Journal
Vol 7(2) 2026:1674-1681

The Effect Of Work Environment, Organizational Culture,2 And Job Satisfaction On Educational Support Staff Performance At Universitas Muhammadiyah Bandung

Pengaruh Lingkungan Kerja, Budaya Organisasi, Dan Kepuasan Kerja Terhadap Kinerja Tenaga Kependidikan Pada Universitas Muhammadiyah Bandung

Abdul Rohim[1], Nina Nurani[2]
Universitas Widyatama, Indonesia[1,2]
rohim.abdul@widyatama.ac.id[1], nina.nurani@widyatama.ac.id[2]

**Corresponding Author*

ABSTRACT
This study examines the association of work environment, organizational culture, and job satisfaction with educational support staff performance at Universitas Muhammadiyah Bandung. A quantitative, descriptive-verificative, cross-sectional survey was conducted using a saturated sampling approach covering 87 permanent educational support staff. The questionnaire comprised 44 items rated on a five-point Likert scale, and data were analyzed with IBM SPSS Statistics 25. The study employed descriptive analysis, instrument testing, diagnostics, and multiple linear regression. Because the Glejser test indicated heteroskedasticity for job satisfaction (p = 0.027), hypothesis inference used heteroskedasticity-consistent standard errors (HC3). Work environment (B = -0.053; p = 0.797) and organizational culture (B = -0.092; p = 0.553) were not statistically significant. Job satisfaction was positively associated with performance (B = 0.506; p = 0.021). The joint HC3 test was not significant (F(3,83) = 2.149; p = 0.100). Model explanatory power was limited (R^2 = 0.072; adjusted R^2 = 0.039). These findings highlight job satisfaction as the clearest partial correlate within this model, while suggesting the need for broader evidence-based assessments of staff performance.
Keywords: Work Environment; Organizational Culture; Job Satisfaction; Staff Performance; HC3 Robust Regression

ABSTRAK
Penelitian ini menganalisis hubungan lingkungan kerja, budaya organisasi, dan kepuasan kerja dengan kinerja tenaga kependidikan Universitas Muhammadiyah Bandung. Penelitian menggunakan pendekatan kuantitatif deskriptif-verifikatif dengan desain survei potong lintang dan teknik sampling jenuh terhadap 87 tenaga kependidikan tetap. Instrumen terdiri atas 44 pernyataan berskala Likert lima kategori. Data diolah menggunakan IBM SPSS Statistics 25 melalui analisis deskriptif, pengujian instrumen, uji asumsi klasik, dan regresi linier berganda. Uji Glejser menunjukkan indikasi heteroskedastisitas pada kepuasan kerja (p = 0,027), sehingga pengujian hipotesis menggunakan robust standard errors HC3. Hasil menunjukkan bahwa lingkungan kerja (B = -0,053; p = 0,797) dan budaya organisasi (B = -0,092; p = 0,553) tidak memiliki koefisien yang signifikan. Kepuasan kerja berhubungan positif dan signifikan dengan kinerja (B = 0,506; p = 0,021). Uji simultan HC3 tidak signifikan (F(3,83) = 2,149; p = 0,100). Nilai R^2 sebesar 0,072 dan adjusted R^2 sebesar 0,039 menunjukkan kemampuan penjelasan model yang terbatas. Temuan tersebut menempatkan kepuasan kerja sebagai prediktor parsial yang paling menonjol, sekaligus mendorong kajian lanjutan mengenai faktor kinerja lainnya.
Kata kunci: Lingkungan Kerja; Budaya Organisasi; Kepuasan Kerja; Kinerja Tenaga Kependidikan; Regresi HC3

1. Introduction

Educational support staff are central to the continuity of university administration, academic services, student affairs, finance, information management, and institutional operations. As higher education institutions face growing expectations for responsive and accurate services, the performance of non-academic employees becomes an important organizational concern. Staff performance is not limited to task completion, but also includes

Copyright © 2026 THE AUTHOR(S). This article is distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International license, http://journal.yrpipku.com/index.php/msej

quality, output quantity, timeliness, resource effectiveness, and independence in performing responsibilities (Robbins, 2016)

Universitas Muhammadiyah Bandung provides a relevant institutional setting for examining these issues because educational support staff undertake different service and operational functions across units. The present study focuses on three aspects of human resource management: work environment, organizational culture, and job satisfaction. These constructs represent distinct but related domains of employees' daily experiences, shared behavioral expectations, and evaluation of their work (Robbins et al., 2023).

Previous research has not reached uniform conclusions. (Nabawi, 2019) reported no significant individual association of work environment or job satisfaction with performance in a public works agency, whereas (Idris & Santoso, 2023) identified significant relationships between work environment, organizational culture, and educational support staff performance at another Bandung university. (Wahyudi & Tupti, 2019) found organizational culture and job satisfaction to be non-significant individually, while more recent evidence from university administrative staff reported significant relationships involving organizational culture and job satisfaction (Mardiana et al., 2026). These mixed findings indicate a contextual empirical gap, rather than establishing that the variables must operate identically across institutions.

The contribution of this study is a context-specific comparison of three organizational and attitudinal predictors of educational support staff performance at Universitas Muhammadiyah Bandung, using both descriptive evidence and inferential results robust to a detected heteroskedasticity concern. The study addresses five objectives: describing the four research constructs; examining the partial relationships of work environment, organizational culture, and job satisfaction with performance; and testing the predictors jointly. The cross-sectional design supports examination of statistical associations, not definitive causal attribution.

2. Literature Review

Work Environment

Work environment denotes the physical and non-physical conditions surrounding employees in their daily work. Sedarmayanti (2017) distinguishes physical aspects, such as lighting, thermal conditions, air circulation, noise, and workplace safety, from non-physical aspects, including communication, interpersonal relationships, supervisory relationships, and psychological comfort. Appropriate conditions can facilitate task execution; however, empirical findings vary. Nabawi (2019) reported a non-significant partial result, whereas Idris and Santoso (2023) reported a significant relationship in higher education. Accordingly, the first hypothesis is formulated as H1: work environment is associated with educational support staff performance.

Organizational Culture

Organizational culture comprises shared norms, values, and behavioral expectations within an institution. Drawing on Robbins, Wibowo (2016) identifies seven characteristics: innovation and risk taking, attention to detail, outcome orientation, people orientation, team orientation, aggressiveness, and stability. Cultural practices may guide coordination and work routines, but they are not uniformly predictive of performance. Wahyudi and Tupti (2019) identified a positive yet non-significant coefficient, while Susrini et al. (2026) reported a significant association in higher education. The second hypothesis is H2: organizational culture is associated with educational support staff performance.

Job Satisfaction

Job satisfaction reflects an individual's positive evaluation of their work and related conditions (Robbins & Judge, 2023). The thesis operationalizes satisfaction through aspects of the work itself, compensation and recognition, career development, working relationships, and organizational conditions. Positive employee attitudes may be relevant to engagement and daily performance, but the strength of this relationship requires empirical investigation. Nabawi (2019) observed no statistically significant partial effect, whereas Susrini et al. (2026) found a positive, significant relationship. The third hypothesis is H3: job satisfaction is associated with educational support staff performance.

Performance and Research Hypotheses

Educational support staff performance is operationalized through work quality, work quantity, timeliness, resource effectiveness, and independence (Robbins, 2016). Organizational behavior theory acknowledges that performance reflects factors located at the individual, group, and structural levels (Robbins & Judge, 2023). Consequently, a three-variable model may capture only part of performance variation. The fourth hypothesis is H4: work environment, organizational culture, and job satisfaction are jointly associated with educational support staff performance. The conceptual model treats performance as the dependent variable and the other three constructs as predictors.

3. Research Methods

This study used a quantitative, descriptive and verificative cross-sectional survey design. The research site was Universitas Muhammadiyah Bandung, Indonesia. According to the thesis, the target population comprised 87 active permanent educational support staff in 2026; employees holding contract status were outside the specified population. The study used saturated sampling (a census of the defined population), resulting in 87 analyzed respondents. The thesis states that all eligible members were included, but the record of questionnaires distributed, returned, or excluded should be confirmed from the original survey administration before journal submission.

Primary information was obtained through a structured questionnaire with five Likert response categories, from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5). There were 44 items: 10 measuring work environment (X1), 14 organizational culture (X2), 10 job satisfaction (X3), and 10 staff performance (Y). Work environment covered physical and non-physical dimensions; organizational culture comprised seven cultural dimensions; satisfaction covered five aspects of work experience; and performance included five task-related dimensions. The measures were modeled through summed scores for each construct.

The analyses used IBM SPSS Statistics 25. Item-to-total Pearson correlations were compared with $r = 0.211$ for $n = 87$ (two-tailed, $\alpha = 0.05$). Reliability was assessed using Cronbach's alpha and the threshold adopted by the thesis (0.60); this threshold is permissive compared with the frequently preferred 0.70 benchmark. Residual normality was examined using Kolmogorov–Smirnov, multicollinearity through tolerance and VIF, and heteroskedasticity through the Glejser procedure and a residual scatterplot. Multiple linear regression estimated the associations of X1, X2, and X3 with Y. Since the Glejser test indicated heteroskedasticity, the principal inferential decisions used HC3 heteroskedasticity-consistent standard errors and a robust joint F test (Rajh-Weber et al., 2025, 2026). HC3 adjusts estimated uncertainty rather than removing heteroskedasticity or changing the ordinary least-squares coefficient estimates.

4. Results and Discussions

Descriptive Results

The 87 respondents provided generally favorable ratings across all four research variables. Nevertheless, a favorable descriptive category is not evidence that a variable has a statistically significant partial association with performance. Table 1 summarizes the thesis results using the five-point scale.

Table 1. Descriptive scores of the research variables

Construct	Mean	Category	Lowest-rated indicator (score)
Work environment (X1)	3.82	Good	Psychological comfort (307)
Organizational culture (X2)	3.64	Good	Inter-unit coordination (300)
Job satisfaction (X3)	3.60	Good	Pay and incentive fairness (297)
Staff performance (Y)	3.79	Good	Work-volume target attainment (313)

Source: Thesis data, 2026; N = 87.

The relatively low psychological comfort score suggests an area for monitoring even though the overall work environment is rated positively. For organizational culture, inter-unit coordination had the lowest score, which may be relevant to the continuity of university services. Perceived fairness of pay, benefits, and incentives received the lowest score within job satisfaction. Performance was also generally rated as good, although the ability to attain workload-volume targets was relatively weaker. These item-level patterns help contextualize organizational priorities without establishing that any specific item caused performance outcomes.

Instrument Quality and Regression Diagnostics

Based on the Pearson item-to-total criterion used in the thesis, all 44 questionnaire items exceeded the stated critical value. Internal consistency differed across constructs, with the strongest alpha observed for staff performance. The coefficients for work environment and job satisfaction were above 0.60 but below 0.70 and warrant a cautious interpretation of measurement reliability.

Table 2. Instrument reliability

Construct	Items	Cronbach's α
Work environment	10	0.666
Organizational culture	14	0.736
Job satisfaction	10	0.671
Staff performance	10	0.917

Source: Thesis SPSS output, 2026.

The Kolmogorov–Smirnov test of unstandardized residuals yielded $p = 0.076$ ($N = 87$), which did not indicate a departure from normality at the 5% level. Tolerance values ranged from 0.531 to 0.712 and VIF values from 1.405 to 1.884, providing no evidence of problematic multicollinearity under the thesis criteria. The Glejser test, however, yielded $p = 0.729$ for work environment, $p = 0.533$ for organizational culture, and $p = 0.027$ for job satisfaction. The latter indicated possible heteroskedasticity. Although the residual scatterplot did not exhibit a pronounced pattern, visual inspection did not supersede the statistical warning; HC3 was therefore adopted for coefficient and joint-model inference (Rajh-Weber et al., 2026).

Multiple Regression and Hypothesis Testing

The estimated ordinary least-squares regression equation was $\hat{Y} = 26.335 - 0.053X1 - 0.092X2 + 0.506X3$. Because the predictors and outcome were totals of Likert-scale items, coefficient interpretation refers to one-point changes in summed scores while holding the other predictors constant. The constant has limited substantive meaning outside the observable score ranges. Table 3 presents the HC3-based inferential results.

Table 3. Multiple regression with HC3 robust standard errors

Predictor	B	Robust SE	t	p
Constant	26.335	8.332	3.161	0.002
Work environment (X1)	−0.053	0.204	−0.258	0.797
Organizational culture (X2)	−0.092	0.155	−0.596	0.553
Job satisfaction (X3)	0.506	0.216	2.344	0.021

Source: Thesis HC3 output, 2026; dependent variable: performance total score.

Work environment and organizational culture exhibited small negative estimated coefficients, but their large p values do not provide evidence of statistically significant partial relationships when the other predictors are held constant. Thus H1 and H2 were not supported. Job satisfaction showed a positive and statistically significant partial coefficient (B = 0.506; p = 0.021), supporting H3. Its standardized beta of 0.322 was also the largest absolute standardized coefficient among the three predictors; this establishes the strongest observed partial association within this model, not an exclusive causal determinant of performance.

Table 4. Model explanatory power and simultaneous test

Statistic	Value	Interpretation
R	0.269	Multiple correlation
R^2	0.072	7.2% of sample variance explained
Adjusted R^2	0.039	3.9% adjusted explanatory power
Robust F (3,83)	2.149	HC3 joint test; p = 0.100

Source: Thesis Model Summary and robust HC3 contrast test, 2026.

The robust joint F test was not significant at $\alpha = 0.05$ ($F(3,83) = 2.149$; $p = 0.100$), so H4 was not supported. A statistically significant individual coefficient alongside a non-significant joint F test is mathematically possible because the tests examine different null hypotheses. The model $R^2 = 0.072$ indicates that the included predictors account for only 7.2% of observed variation in performance scores, while adjusted $R^2 = 0.039$ reflects low explanatory capacity after adjustment for sample size and number of predictors. These figures should not be read as causal percentages.

Discussion of Work Environment

The absence of a significant partial coefficient for work environment is consistent with the individual-level findings of Nabawi (2019), who also reported a non-significant relationship. It contrasts with Idris and Santoso (2023), who found a positive and significant association among educational support staff at Universitas Islam Bandung. This divergence cautions against assuming that a construct that appears important in theory will have an equally detectable partial relationship in every university. Institution-specific responsibilities, response distributions, and differences in regression specifications may all matter, but this study did not directly test which mechanism accounts for the contrast.

A mean work environment score of 3.82 coexisted with a relatively low psychological comfort item score of 307. This indicates an aspect for service-management attention rather

than evidence that psychological comfort is the statistically significant driver of performance. Maintaining working conditions and supportive communication remains sensible for employee welfare, but the regression evidence does not justify a claim that changes in this construct alone will produce performance gains.

Discussion of Organizational Culture

Organizational culture was not a significant partial correlate of performance after controlling for work environment and job satisfaction. This is broadly in line with Wahyudi and Tupti (2019), who reported a non-significant cultural coefficient, yet differs from Susrini et al. (2026), whose study of higher education staff found significant relationships in a different structural model. The distinction is important: different model specifications and institutional populations prevent a direct assertion that one result invalidates the other.

Inter-unit coordination received the lowest culture item score (300), suggesting an operational issue for internal review. Cultural norms and teamwork can still serve important governance functions despite a non-significant coefficient. The university could consider clearer responsibilities, cross-unit coordination forums, and consistent procedures, while evaluating any future performance effects separately.

Discussion of Job Satisfaction

Job satisfaction was the only statistically significant partial correlate in the HC3 regression. This result is compatible with the organizational behavior perspective of Robbins and Judge (2023), which highlights employees' evaluation of their work as relevant to workplace attitudes and behavior, and with the significant findings of Susrini et al. (2026). At the same time, it differs from Nabawi (2019), demonstrating that the job satisfaction–performance relationship is not uniformly significant across settings.

Respondents rated satisfaction positively overall, but perceived fairness of salaries, benefits, and incentives scored lowest at 297. This is a practical point for institutional inquiry, not proof that remuneration fairness mediates the statistically observed satisfaction coefficient. Transparent reward criteria, career development opportunities, and employee feedback may be appropriate candidates for needs assessment. Future analyses could distinguish satisfaction dimensions and incorporate independent performance ratings to reduce common-source measurement concerns.

Simultaneous Findings, Explanatory Power, and Implications

The combined model was not significant, and its R^2 was small. This finding resembles the non-significant simultaneous result reported by Munawaroh et al. (2026), although the population and outcomes of that study were different. Idris and Santoso (2023) reported stronger explanatory power in a different two-predictor model; therefore, direct numerical comparisons are descriptive rather than evidence of model superiority. The most defensible interpretation is that work environment, culture, and satisfaction provide only a limited account of measured performance in this particular dataset.

Organizational behavior theory indicates that performance may also relate to staff capability, leadership, workload, motivation, technology, and appraisal arrangements (Robbins & Judge, 2023). None of these potential explanations was tested here, so they should be treated as hypotheses for future research, not established causes of the weak R^2. Furthermore, all measures were self-reported and collected at one point in time; as a result, common-source measurement, restricted score variation, and cross-sectional confounding cannot be ruled out.

For university management, the strongest directly observed partial relationship concerns job satisfaction, meriting structured follow-up on reward transparency and career opportunities. Work environment and culture should remain part of routine organizational

evaluation because of their broader operational and welfare significance, not because this analysis proved they predict staff performance. Multi-source appraisal, periodic workload audits, and research incorporating additional predictors would be prudent next steps. Any intervention should be evaluated rather than presumed effective.

5. Conclusion

Among 87 permanent educational support staff at Universitas Muhammadiyah Bandung, work environment, organizational culture, job satisfaction, and performance were all rated in the good category. In the multiple regression using HC3 robust standard errors, neither work environment ($p = 0.797$) nor organizational culture ($p = 0.553$) had a significant partial coefficient. Job satisfaction showed a positive, significant partial association with performance ($B = 0.506$; $p = 0.021$), while the joint test was not significant ($F(3,83) = 2.149$; $p = 0.100$). The model explained 7.2% of sample performance variation (adjusted $R^2 = 3.9\%$).

These findings suggest that job satisfaction deserves additional organizational attention, while caution is required in interpreting the limited explanatory power of the model. The study is restricted to one institution, a cross-sectional self-report design, and a comparatively small population. Further research should examine other theoretically motivated predictors, validate data collection and sampling records, and employ additional performance measures. Because heteroskedasticity was indicated, robust inference remains important when replicating comparable regression analyses.

References

Idris, I., & Santoso, A. B. (2023). Pengaruh budaya organisasi dan lingkungan kerja terhadap kinerja tenaga kependidikan di Universitas Islam Bandung. Fair Value: Jurnal Ilmiah Akuntansi dan Keuangan, 5(6), 2645–2657. https://doi.org/10.32670/fairvalue.v5i6.2950

Munawaroh, V. A., Firayanti, Y., & Marhamah. (2026). Pengaruh kepuasan kerja lingkungan kerja dan budaya organisasi terhadap kinerja guru di Madrasah Aliyah Hidayaturrahman Kabupaten Ketapang. Prosiding Konferensi Akuntansi Khatulistiwa, 5 (Prosiding 2025), 35–43. https://jurnal.untan.ac.id/index.php/prosidingKAK/article/view/104529

Nabawi, R. (2019). Pengaruh lingkungan kerja, kepuasan kerja dan beban kerja terhadap kinerja pegawai. Maneggio: Jurnal Ilmiah Magister Manajemen, 2(2), 170–183. https://doi.org/10.30596/maneggio.v2i2.3667

Rajh-Weber, H., Huber, S. E., & Arendasy, M. (2025). A practice-oriented guide to statistical inference in linear modeling for non-normal or heteroskedastic error distributions. Behavior Research Methods, 57, Article 338. https://doi.org/10.3758/s13428-025-02801-4

Rajh-Weber, H., Huber, S. E., & Arendasy, M. (2026). Using heteroskedasticity-consistent standard errors and the bootstrap for linear regression analysis available in SPSS: A tutorial. Advances in Methods and Practices in Psychological Science, 9(1), 1–9. https://doi.org/10.1177/25152459251408046

Robbins, S. P. (2016). Perilaku organisasi. Salemba Empat.

Robbins, S. P., & Judge, T. A. (2023). Organizational behavior (19th ed.). Pearson.

Sedarmayanti. (2017). Tata kerja dan produktivitas kerja: Suatu tinjauan dari aspek ergonomi atau kaitan antara manusia dengan lingkungan kerjanya. Mandar Maju.

Susrini, Utami, H. N., & Nuh, M. (2026). Peran kepuasan kerja dalam pengaruh struktur dan budaya organisasi terhadap kinerja tenaga kependidikan. Jurnal Ilmu Manajemen, 14(3), 599–613. https://doi.org/10.26740/jim.v14n3.p599-613

Wahyudi, W. D., & Tupti, Z. (2019). Pengaruh budaya organisasi, motivasi dan kepuasan kerja terhadap kinerja. Maneggio: Jurnal Ilmiah Magister Manajemen, 2(1), 31–44. https://doi.org/10.30596/maneggio.v2i1.3363

Wibowo. (2016). Budaya organisasi: Sebuah kebutuhan untuk meningkatkan kinerja jangka panjang (ed. ke-2). Rajawali Pers.