The Influence of Work Environment and Job Stress on Employee Performance through Job Satisfaction at the Inspectorate Office Gowa District

Yusrin Annisa , Siti Haerani and Annidar Eka Saputri

Hasanuddin University, Makassar, Indonesia

annisay23a@student.unhas.ac.id

Abstract. The Inspectorate Office of Gowa District is the target of this research, which seeks to understand how factors like work environment and job stress affect performance as measured by job satisfaction. The methodology of this investigation is quantitative. All seventy-one individuals employed by the Gowa District Social Service make up the study's population. Seventy participants were also included in the research utilizing the saturated sample method. Path analysis is the instrument used for analyzing the data. This study's findings suggest that: (1) Job satisfaction is positively and significantly impacted by the work environment. (2) There is a small but unfavorable correlation between job stress and satisfaction. (3) On a positive but negligible note, the workplace influences productivity. A negative and negligible impact on performance is caused by job stress (4). (5) A happy and fulfilled workforce performs better overall. (6) Through job happiness, work environment and job stress indirectly affect performance.

Keywords: Work Environment, Job Stress, Employee Performance, and Job Satisfaction.

1 Introduction

A company's human resources are its most valuable asset because of the profound effect they have on the company's bottom line. The prosperity of both individuals and organizations depends on how well employees perform. Improving productivity is crucial for molding a worker's mindset and actions to fit in with company objectives. Workplace stress should be included in any strategy to boost productivity. Tension on the job may have negative effects on a person's mental health, emotional stability, and physical health. Staff members are more likely to give their best when they are able to relax and enjoy themselves at work. Emotions at work may be greatly affected by the workplace. Workers who like where they work are more likely to put in their full effort and make the most of their time there [1].

Workplace stress should be included in any strategy to boost productivity. Tension on the job may have negative effects on a person's mental health, emotional stability, and physical health. Staff members are more likely to give their best when they are able to relax and enjoy themselves at work. Emotions at work may be greatly

M. Nohong et al. (eds.), *Proceedings of the 9th International Conference on Accounting, Management, and Economics 2024 (ICAME 2024)*, Advances in Economics, Business and Management Research 331,
https://doi.org/10.2991/978-94-6463-758-8_90

affected by the workplace. When workers are happy at their employment, they are more productive because they are able to relax and enjoy themselves while they work [1].

For job happiness, it's important to have a beautiful and encouraging workplace. To keep workers and make sure they're productive, you need a good environment. Attractive compensation, open communication between management and staff, a level playing field, a fair workload, and ambitious yet attainable objectives are all hallmarks of a healthy workplace. Workers will be able to enjoy the greatest working circumstances possible when these requirements are satisfied [2].

The work environment has a significant impact on job satisfaction. It is a reflection of how fulfilled people feel in their jobs. When employees are happy in their work, they are more likely to do a good job [3].

2 Literature Review

2.1 Human Resource Management

Management of human resources is an approach to business that focuses on satisfying workers' wants and requirements. All the many parts of human resource management are a part of it, including hiring for management roles, screening and training potential workers, paying them, and evaluating their performance [4]. Human resource management is an academic and practical discipline with the overarching goal of controlling an organization's personnel in a way that maximizes their efforts to fulfill the company's purpose and realize its vision for the future.

2.2 Work Environment

Everything that workers encounter on the job, whether directly or indirectly, is part of the work environment. Employee performance may be impacted by the community's various and ever-changing settings and environments [5].

What workers encounter on the job is known as their "work environment," and it may have an effect on how well they do their jobs. Interactions inside and between organizations and their social environments are also considered environmental variables. Overwork, poor supervision, dissatisfaction, change, and interpersonal and group disputes are five factors that might lower employee satisfaction with their jobs [6].

2.3 Job Stress

Working conditions that cause stress to people might have serious consequences for their health. Employers should reevaluate and improve their working circumstances for the sake of their workers. Improving the organization's health and quality may be achieved by reducing staff stress. There is a balance between the beneficial advantages of stress (eustress) and the negative impacts that stress has on both people and businesses [7].

Employees may have emotional instability and physical health problems as a result of job stress, which is a condition of tension brought on by the pressure to complete duties. Workplace stress may be attributed to two main sources [8]:

Personal Factors Contributing to Stress, which encompass:

1. There's role conflict, which happens when one person has to juggle too many responsibilities.
2. When the quantity of work assigned does not correspond to the real workload, this is known as an excessive workload.
3. Uncertainty about the rights and responsibilities of employees in carrying out their employment duties, often known as role ambiguity.

Group and Organizational Causes of Stress, which include:

1. Members of the work group do not bond with one another.
2. There aren't many chances for team building because of things like boss policies, poorly planned tasks, or interpersonal conflicts.
3. Unsatisfactory possibilities for workers to progress in their careers.

2.4 Job Satisfaction

What makes a person happy in their job is how they feel about their work itself, their workplace, and their relationships with coworkers. It helps workers connect with their workplace and complete assignments that contribute to the company's objectives, therefore it's a crucial component for workers.

When expectations and reality are in sync, it may have a positive effect on job satisfaction. When you're happy in your work, it's because of these five things [9]:

1. Position: Job satisfaction is higher among higher-ranking employees compared to lower-ranking employees.
2. Rank (group): People have different roles because of the differences in the levels of their respective employment groups.
3. Financial and social security: Financial and social security worries substantially affect work happiness.
4. Quality of supervision: A key factor in improving productivity on the job is the nature of the interaction between management and staff. Positive and attentive interactions between superiors and subordinates may boost job satisfaction.

2.5 Employee Performance

When people put their knowledge, expertise, honesty, and time into completing jobs, the end outcome is their performance. Employee performance reviews let you learn how well workers are able to carry out their duties. This may be accomplished with the help of well-defined and quantifiable standards [10].

In every kind of workplace—private, public, or nonprofit—the efficiency and effectiveness of the employees is of the utmost importance. There are some aims and objectives that all employees are required to strive towards. Employee motivation, skill level, and pay rate are three factors that might influence performance [11].

3 Data and Methodology

3.1 Research Design

A quantitative technique is used in the research design of this study. This technique was selected due to the fact that quantitative research is organized, methodical, and well prepared from the start. It encompasses research goals, topics, objects, data samples, sources, and methods. Environment, stress, contentment, and performance on the job are some of the factors that have been examined. A questionnaire was used to gather data, which was then tested for reliability and validity.

3.2 Location and Time of Research

The study began in September 2023 in the office of the Gowa District Inspectorate.

3.3 Population and Sample

A total of seventy workers from the Gowa District Inspectorate office were surveyed for the study. Because the population was so tiny, nonprobability sampling, more especially saturation sampling (census), was used.

3.4 Research Variables

Workplace factors (X1), occupational stress (X2), performance on the job (Y1), and overall work satisfaction (Y2) are the variables under investigation.

1. Independent Variables: Any change in the dependent variable may be attributed to an independent variable, also known as a free variable. The work setting and occupational stress are the independent factors in this study.
2. Dependent Variables: The existence of independent factors influences or causes dependent variables, sometimes called connected variables. Employee performance is the dependent variable in this investigation.
3. Intervening Variable: In theory, a third variable may either increase or decrease the link between the independent and dependent variables; this is called an intervening variable. Nevertheless, it defies quantification. Work satisfaction serves as the moderating variable in this study.

3.5 Measurement Scale

In order to construct the research measurement scale, questionnaire responses are used. Each statement category has a 5-point Likert scale that respondents are asked to score. The degree of each variable being assessed is reflected in the overall score, which is derived from each respondent's replies. The researchers in this study made use of the Likert scale so that participants could more easily convey their thoughts, feelings, and views about social issues.

1. SD = Strongly Disagree, given a score of 1

2. D = Disagree, given a score of 2
3. LA = Less Agree, given a score of 3
4. A = Agree, given a score of 4
5. SA = Strongly Agree, given a score of 5

4 Result and Discussion

4.1 Research Result

Table 1. Respondent Description Based on Age

No.	Age	Frequency	Percentage
1	18-30	45	64%
2	31-35	16	23%
3	36-40	3	4%
4	>41	6	9%
Total		**70**	**100%**

Table 2. Respondent Description Based on Gender

No.	Gender	Frequency	Percentage
1	Male	31	44%
2	Female	39	56%
Total		**70**	**100%**

Table 3. Respondent Description Based on Length of Service

No.	Length of Service	Frequency	Percentage
1	0-4 years	41	59%
2	5-10 years	10	14%
3	>11 years	19	27%
Total		**70**	**100%**

Table 4. Respondent Description Based on Education

No.	Education	Frequency	Percentage
1	Senior High School	2	3%
2	Diploma	3	4%
3	Bachelor Degree	52	74%
4	Master Degree	13	19%
	Total	**70**	**100%**

Table 5. Category Average Value of Respondents' Assessment Score [12]

No.	Category Score Vulnerability	Interpretation
1	1,00 - 1,80	Very Low/ Very Poor
2	1,81 - 2,60	Low/ Poor
3	2,62 - 3,40	Fair/ Average
4	3,41 - 4,20	High/ Good
5	4,21 - 5,00	Very High/ Very Good

4.2 Research Variable Testing Results

Validity Test.

One way to check whether a question is legitimate is to apply the validity test. To carry out the validation test, the Pearson Product Moment correlation approach is used. Using SPSS statistical software, we examine the instrument's validity. A review of the Corrected Item-Total Correlation validity value serves as the deciding criteria. The instrument is deemed legitimate if the correlation number produced is higher than the crucial value (r-count > 0.3) [13]. The following are the outcomes of the study variables' validity test. When the computed r-value is more than 0.3, as shown in the table below, all variables are considered legitimate.

Table 6. Variable Validity Test

Variable	Corrected Item - Total Correlation	Pearson Product Moment (*r* table)	Validity
	Work Environment		
X1.1	0,399	0,3	Valid
X1.2	0,524	0,3	Valid
X1.3	0,481	0,3	Valid
X1.4	0,342	0,3	Valid
X1.5	0,384	0,3	Valid
X1.6	0,336	0,3	Valid
X1.7	0,693	0,3	Valid
X1.8	0,682	0,3	Valid
X1.9	0,629	0,3	Valid
X1.10	0,796	0,3	Valid
X1.11	0,724	0,3	Valid
X1.12	0,749	0,3	Valid
	Job Stress		
X2.1	0,522	0,3	Valid
X2.2	0,638	0,3	Valid
X2.3	0,708	0,3	Valid
X2.4	0,675	0,3	Valid
X2.5	0,676	0,3	Valid
X2.6	0,663	0,3	Valid
X2.7	0,733	0,3	Valid
X2.8	0,644	0,3	Valid
X2.9	0,372	0,3	Valid
X2.10	0,319	0,3	Valid

X2.11	0,258	0,3	Valid
X2.12	0,461	0,3	Valid
X2.13	0,293	0,3	Valid
X2.14	0,317	0,3	Valid
	Employee Performance		
Y1.1	0,879	0,3	Valid
Y1.2	0,902	0,3	Valid
Y1.3	0,867	0,3	Valid
Y1.4	0,958	0,3	Valid
Y1.5	0,916	0,3	Valid
Y1.6	0,905	0,3	Valid
Y1.7	0,922	0,3	Valid
Y1.8	0,806	0,3	Valid
Y1.9	0,908	0,3	Valid
Y1.10	0,866	0,3	Valid
	Job Satisfaction		
Y2.1	0,822	0,3	Valid
Y2.2	0,827	0,3	Valid
Y2.3	0,787	0,3	Valid
Y2.4	0,831	0,3	Valid
Y2.5	0,875	0,3	Valid
Y2.6	0,837	0,3	Valid
Y2.7	0,688	0,3	Valid
Y2.8	0,783	0,3	Valid
Y2.9	0,869	0,3	Valid

Y2.10	0,838	0,3	Valid

Reliability Test.

The dependability of the data is evaluated by looking at the Cronbach's Alpha value, which is done after the validity test. The consistency and dependability of the measurement device are evaluated by the reliability test. If the questionnaire used in the study has a Cronbach's Alpha coefficient greater than 0.6, it is generally regarded as a good instrument. The following table displays the results of the reliability test conducted on the study variables:

Table 7. Variable Reliability Test

Variable	Cronbach's Alpha	Standard	Reliability
	Work Environment		
X1.1	0,793	0,60	Reliable
X1.2	0,779	0,60	Reliable
X1.3	0,792	0,60	Reliable
X1.4	0,788	0,60	Reliable
X1.5	0,783	0,60	Reliable
X1.6	0,800	0,60	Reliable
X1.7	0,753	0,60	Reliable
X1.8	0,756	0,60	Reliable
X1.9	0,762	0,60	Reliable
X1.10	0,742	0,60	Reliable
X1.11	0,751	0,60	Reliable
X1.12	0,750	0,60	Reliable
	Job Stress		
X2.1	0,722	0,60	Reliable
X2.2	0,761	0,60	Reliable
X2.3	0,753	0,60	Reliable

X2.4	0,757	0,60	Reliable
X2.5	0,757	0,60	Reliable
X2.6	0,759	0,60	Reliable
X2.7	0,751	0,60	Reliable
X2.8	0,761	0,60	Reliable
X2.9	0,788	0,60	Reliable
X2.10	0,794	0,60	Reliable
X2.11	0,799	0,60	Reliable
X2.12	0,778	0,60	Reliable
X2.13	0,796	0,60	Reliable
X2.14	0,793	0,60	Reliable
	Employee Performance		
Y1.1	0,968	0,60	Reliable
Y1.2	0,968	0,60	Reliable
Y1.3	0,969	0,60	Reliable
Y1.4	0,965	0,60	Reliable
Y1.5	0,967	0,60	Reliable
Y1.6	0,967	0,60	Reliable
Y1.7	0,966	0,60	Reliable
Y1.8	0,971	0,60	Reliable
Y1.9	0,967	0,60	Reliable
Y1.10	0,970	0,60	Reliable
	Job Satisfaction		
Y2.1	0,936	0,60	Reliable
Y2.2	0,935	0,60	Reliable

Y2.3	0,937	0,60	Reliable
Y2.4	0,934	0,60	Reliable
Y2.5	0,932	0,60	Reliable
Y2.6	0,934	0,60	Reliable
Y2.7	0,941	0,60	Reliable
Y2.8	0,937	0,60	Reliable
Y2.9	0,933	0,60	Reliable
Y2.10	0,934	0,60	Reliable

The reliability values of the variables above indicate that the questionnaire used as a measuring tool shows a strong correlation for each variable. The reliability test suggests that the questionnaire is highly reliable for each variable and is accepted. Since the alpha value exceeds the cutoff of 0.6, all dimensions are considered reliable.

Path Analysis.

The purpose of path analysis is to deduce, from theory and prior study, the interrelationships of various variables. Path diagrams are a common tool for visualizing findings and making sense of complicated problems. It is a method for determining how each independent variable affected the final result, and it is an extension of multiple linear regression.

Fig 4.1 Path Analysis Model

Description:
The influence of variable X on variable Y
The influence of variable X on variable Y2 with variable Y1 as (intervening)

To determine the path coefficients, we use SPSS 23 for partial regression analysis, a statistical product and service solution. Standardized regression coefficients (beta) indicate the direct influence and serve as the route coefficients in this study. When we multiply the route coefficients in each equation, we get the indirect impact; when we add up all the indirect effects, we get the overall effect.

$$Y1 = \rho Y1X1 + \rho Y1X2 + Є1 \text{ Substructural} \quad (1)$$

$$Y2 = \rho Y2X1 + \rho Y2X2 + \rho Y2Y1 + Є2 \text{ Substructural 2} \quad (2)$$

0. Direct Influence of Work Environment and Job Stress on Employee Performance

$$aY1 = \rho Y1X1 + \rho Y1X2 + Є1 \quad (3)$$

X1 = Work Environment

X2 = Job Stress

Y1 = Job Satisfaction

Y2 = Employee Performance

A R-squared score of 0.487 indicates a strong correlation, according to the SPSS study. This suggests that additional factors, not included in this research, account for 51.3% of the variance in job satisfaction, with work environment and job stress each contributing 48.7%. An improved research prediction model is one with a higher R squared value. There is a range of 0 to 1 for the coefficient of determination. Values close to 1 indicate that the independent factors provide almost complete predictions for the dependent variable. On the other hand, if the R squared value is small, it means that the independent factors don't fully explain the dependent variable [14]. The formula e1 = √ (1 - R square) yields 0.716 as an additional result when applied to the value of e1.

Here is the partial impact of each variable:

1. "The direct influence of the work environment variable on the employee performance variable can be seen from the standardized coefficient, which is X1 -> Y1 = ρ1 = 0.663"
2. "The direct influence of the job stress variable on the employee performance variable can be seen from the standardized coefficient, which is X2 -> Y1 = ρ2 = -0.175"

A coefficient value of 0.663 indicates that the work environment has the biggest effect on job satisfaction, according to the findings of structural equation test 1. While work-related stress has a coefficient of -0.175. These results also show that stress on the job and the working conditions account for 48.7 percent of the variance in how satisfied an employee is with their employment. A more detailed explanation of this connection may be found in sub-structural equation 1.

$$Y1 = \rho Y1X1 + \rho Y1X2 + Є1 \quad (4)$$

$$Y1 = 0.663 + (-0,175) + 0,716 \quad (5)$$

b. Direct Influence of Work Environment Variables, job stress on Employee Performance

The R-squared value, or coefficient of determination, is 0.533, according to the SPSS analysis findings. This indicates that additional factors not included in this research account for 46.7% of the variance in employee performance, whereas work environment, job stress, and job satisfaction together account for 53.3%. For the proposed study, a better predictive model is one with a higher R-squared value. The R squared value can be anything from zero to one; a high value suggests that the independent variables are very useful for predicting the dependent variable, while a low value suggests that they are not very effective [14]. Also, "by plugging the values of R squared into the formula e2 = √ (1 - 0.533), we get 0.683 as the value of e1".

The influence of each variable is as follows:

1. "The direct impact of work environment variables on employee performance can be seen from the standardized coefficient, which is X1 -> Y2 = ρ4 = 0.214"
2. "The direct impact of job stress variables on employee performance can be seen from the standardized coefficient, which is X2 -> Y2 = ρ5 = -0.136."
3. "The direct impact of job satisfaction variables on employee performance can be seen from the standardized coefficient, which is Y1 -> Y2 = ρ7 = 0.529."

Based on the findings of the "second structural equation test, it is clear that job satisfaction (r=0.529), work environment (r=0.144), and job stress (r=-0.136) are the three factors that most affect employee performance".

$$Y2 = \rho Y1X1 + \rho Y1X2 + \rho Y1Y2 + Є1 \quad (6)$$

$$Y2 = 0.214 + (-0,136) + 0,529+ 0,683 \quad (7)$$

Table 8. Variable Reliability Test

Model	Path Coefficient	T	S	R2
Model 1 X1, X2 to Y1				
X1 (pY1X1)	0,663	7,565	0,000	

X2 (pY1X2)	-0,175	-1,993	0,050	0,487
Model 2 X1, X2, Y1 to Y2				
X1 (pY2X1)	0,214	1,862	0,067	
X2 (pY2X2)	-0,136	-1,569	0,122	0,533
Y1 (pY2Y1)	0,529	4,499	0,000	

Sobel Test.
After the route analysis is finished, the variables that were studied will be subjected to a Sobel test. This is how the results are explicable:

1. Indirect impact of work environment variables on employee performance through job satisfaction

Table 9. T-Test

Input:		Test statistic:	*p*-value:
ta 7.565	Sobel test:	3.83496684	0.00012558
tb 4.449	Aroian test:	3.81031166	0.00013879
	Goodman test:	3.86010691	0.00011334
	Reset all	Calculate	

The t-test results show that the “work environment” variable has a significance value (sig) of 0.000 in the table above, which is less than the significance level (α) of 0.05. So, we're going to accept H0 and say that job happiness is a major factor in how much of an impact the work environment variable has on improving employee performance”.

0. Indirect impact of job stress on employee performance through job satisfaction

Table 10. T-Test

Input:	Test statistic:	*p*-value:

ta 1.993	Sobel test:	1.8188415	0.06893561
tb 4.449	Aroian test:	1.78174209	0.0747913
	Goodman test:	1.85835926	0.06311801
	Reset all	Calculate	

"The work stress variable has a significant value (sig) of 0.068 in the t-test, as shown in the table above, which is higher than the significance level (α) of 0.05. Hence, we will reject H0 and conclude that work stress is not a major factor in enhancing job happiness".

Hypothesis Test.

1. T-Test

Finding out whether each independent variable has a statistically significant effect on the dependent variable is the goal of this test. "A sig value less than 0.05 signifies a substantial impact in the test, while a sig value more than 0.05 denotes an inconsequential influence. The test employs a probability technique".

Table 11. T-Test

Coefficients a						
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	4.434	6.762		.656	.514
	Work Environment	.847	.112	.663	7.565	.000
	Job Stress	-.155	.078	-.175	-1.993	.050

Dependent Variable: Job Satisfaction

The table presents the following results from the T test:

0. "The significance value (sig) for the work environment variable is 0.000, which is smaller than α (0.05). Therefore, we accept H0 and conclude that the work environment variable significantly influences job satisfaction."

a. “The significance value (sig) for the job stress variable is 0.050, which is equal to α (0.05). Therefore, we reject H0 and conclude that the job stress variable does not significantly influence job satisfaction.”

Table 12. T-Test 2nd Model

Coefficients a						
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	7.769	7.540		1.030	.307
	Work Environment	.316	.170	.214	1.862	.067
	Job Stress	-.140	.089	-.136	-1.569	.122
	Job Satisfaction	.611	.136	.529	4.499	.000
Dependent Variable: Employee Performance						

The T-test table above presents the following results:

0. “The significance value (sig) of the work environment variable is 0.067, which is less than α (0.05). Therefore, the decision is to reject H0, leading to the conclusion that the work environment variable does not have a significant effect on improving employee performance”.

a. “The significance value (sig) of the job stress variable is 0.122, which is greater than α (0.05). Therefore, the decision is to reject H0, concluding that the job stress variable does not have a significant effect on reducing employee performance”.

b. “The significance value (sig) of the job satisfaction variable is 0.000, which is less than α (0.05). Therefore, the decision is to accept H0, indicating that the job satisfaction variable has a significant effect on improving employee performance”.

0. F- Test

Table 13. F-Test 1st Model

ANOVA a					
Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean	F	Sig.

				Square		
1	Regressio n	1680.212	2	840.106	31.845	.000b
	Residual	1767.560	67	26.381		
	Total	3447.771	69			

a. Dependent Variable: Job Satisfaction

b. Predictors: (Constant), Job Stress, Work Environment

Table 14. F-Test 2nd Model

ANOVA a

	Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	2453.854	3	817.951	25.096	.000b
	Residual	2151.132	66	32.593		
	Total	4604.986	69			

a. Dependent Variable: Employee Performance

b. Predictors: (Constant), Job Satisfaction, Job Stress, Work Environment

This test is designed to find out whether there is a statistically significant relationship between the 74 dependent variables and the independent factors. To determine whether the independent and dependent variables are influencing each other at the same time, the p-value must be less than 0.05.

"A significant value of 0.000 was found in the F-test table above, which is lower than 0.05. We conclude that work environment and job stress are key determinants of job satisfaction, and we accept H0 as a result. Employee performance is affected by a number of factors, including the work environment, job stress, and job satisfaction".

4.3 Discussion

The Influence of Work Environment on Job Satisfaction at the Inspectorate Office of Gowa District.

According to the results, the workplace has a major impact on how happy an employee is with their employment. "A sig value of 0.000 and a coefficient value of

0.663 provide credence to this impact, suggesting a positive and statistically significant effect. Employees are more likely to be enthusiastic and less likely to feel burdened when they work in an atmosphere that is comfortable, safe, and enjoyable. This, in turn, leads to maximum job satisfaction".

The Influence of Job Stress on Job Satisfaction at the Inspectorate Office of Gowa District.

The research shows that stress at work might have an effect on how happy you are in your career. "With a significance level of 0.050 and a coefficient of -0.175, it was determined that this impact was not significant. The usual p-value is set at 0.05, which is lower than the significance value. Accordingly, it seems that stress on the work has a small but unfavorable impact on contentment in one's position. What this means is that workers' attitudes and performance on the job might take a hit when they're under a lot of stress".

The Influence of Work Environment on Employee Performance at the Inspectorate Office of Gowa District.

According to the results, the workplace significantly affects workers' productivity. "A coefficient of 0.214 and a significance level of 0.067 led to the rejection of this impact. Workers' productivity is positively and significantly impacted by their workplace conditions, as the significance value is greater than the conventional p-value of 0.05. Job happiness may be enhanced by creating a favorable work environment". While it's true that a pleasant workplace may boost morale and productivity, this isn't always the case because of things like employees' innate skills, their level of intrinsic drive, and changes in company policy.

The Effect of job stress on Employee Performance at the Gowa Inspectorate Office.

It is clear from the data that stress on the work significantly lowers productivity. "Statistical analysis revealed that work stress had no discernible impact on productivity; the p-value was 0.122 and the coefficient was -0.136, both of which are higher than the commonly accepted p-value of 0.05. So, it seems that stress at work has a negative but negligible effect on productivity".

The Influence of Job Satisfaction on Employee Performance at the Gowa Inspectorate Office.

Evidence from the study clearly points to a connection between happy workers and productive businesses. "The correlation between the two variables is 0.529, and the p-value is 0.000, therefore it is statistically significant. Workers' happiness on the job is positively and significantly correlated with their productivity, as the significance level is lower than the accepted p-value of 0.05".

The Influence of Work Environment on Employee Performance through Job Satisfaction at the Gowa Inspectorate Office.

An association between a positive work environment and increased productivity in the form of contented workers is evident from the data. "The work environment variable has a significance value (sig) of 0.000, which is less than the typical alpha value of 0.05. Consequently, we're going to accept H0 and draw the conclusion that job happiness is a major factor in how much of an impact the work environment variable has on improving employee performance."

Everything around an employee that could affect how they carry out their duties and complete tasks is considered part of the work environment. Because it makes it easier to get things done, a pleasant workplace is an important factor in increasing productivity. It follows that factors pertaining to the workplace influence workers' levels of contentment and motivation, as a safe and pleasant workplace is associated with higher levels of job satisfaction. Employee performance is favorably impacted by this contentment. Employee engagement and output may both benefit from a more positive and relaxing work atmosphere.

The Influence of Job Stress on Employee Performance through Job Satisfaction at the Gowa Inspectorate Office.

The results show a correlation between occupational stress and performance as measured by employee happiness on the job. Compared to the usual alpha value (0.05), the work stress variable has a significance value (sig) of 0.068. Consequently, we may conclude that work stress has no substantial effect on job satisfaction and reject the null hypothesis (H0). It seems that when occupational stress levels are high, employees are less satisfied with their work, which in turn lowers their performance. Note that content workers are more likely to make valuable contributions to the company than unsatisfied workers, demonstrating the importance of job satisfaction in determining employee performance.

5 Conclusions

The following results have been reached after testing hypotheses and addressing how job stress and the work environment affect employee performance via job satisfaction:

1. The Gowa Inspectorate office's work environment significantly and positively affects employee job satisfaction.
2. At the Gowa Inspectorate office, work satisfaction is unaffected by stress on the job.
3. It has been determined that the work atmosphere at the Gowa Inspectorate office has a small but beneficial effect on staff performance.
4. Workplace stress does not affect productivity at the Gowa Inspectorate.
5. The Gowa Inspectorate office has shown that work happiness has a favorable and substantial effect on employee performance.

6. The Gowa District Inspectorate office's work environment influences employee performance indirectly via job satisfaction, according to the Sobel test study.
7. The research concluded that workplace stress had no effect on employee performance when measuring it via job satisfaction.

References

1. Hasibuan, M. S. P.: Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia. Bumi Aksara, In Edisi Revisi Jakarta (2011).
2. Kafui Agbozo, G.: The Effect of Work Environment on Job Satisfaction: Evidence from the Banking Sector in Ghana. Journal of Human Resource Management 5(1), 12 (2017). https://doi.org/10.11648/j.jhrm.20170501.12
3. Siregar, Z. M. E., Syahputra, R., Nasution, S. L.: Pengaruh Keadilan Organisasional terhadap Komitmen Organisasi dengan Mediasi Kepuasan Kerja. JSHP: Jurnal Sosial Humaniora Dan Pendidikan 4(2), 82–92 (2020). https://doi.org/10.32487/jshp.v4i2.833
4. Dessler, G.: Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia. Jilid Satu. PT. Indeks, Jakarta Barat (2010).
5. Sutrisno, E.: Budaya Organisasi. Kencana Prenada Media Group, Jakarta (2010).
6. Suwatno, H. d, & Priansa, D. J.: Manajemen SDM dalam organisasi Publik dan Bisnis. Alfabeta, Bandung (2011).
7. Munandar, A. S.: Psikologi Industri dan Organisasi. UI-Press, Jakarta (2001).
8. Tewal, B., Adolfina., Pandowo M, Ch, H., Tawas, H, N.: Perilaku Organisasi. CV. Patra Media Grafindo, Bandung (2017).
9. As'ad, M.: Psikologi Industri Seri Sumber Daya Manusia. Edisi IV. Liberty, Yogyakarta (2003).
10. Hasibuan Malayu, S. P.: Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia. Edisi Revisi, Cetakan Kedelapan Belas, 2(3). Bumi Aksara, Jakarta (2014).
11. Mangkunegara, A.P.: Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia Perusahaan. PT. Remaja Rosdakarya, Bandung (2014).
12. Ferdinand, A.: Metode Penelitian Manajemen. BP Universitas Diponegoro, Semarang (2014).
13. Sugiyono, S.: Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif Kualitatif dan R&D. Alfabeta, Bandung (2017).
14. Ghozali, I.: Aplikasi analisis multivariate dengan program IBM SPSS 23. (2016).