



## The Influence of Teamwork and Work Environment on Service Quality through Job Satisfaction

Ariesta Agustin Indasari<sup>1</sup>, Sugeng Mulyono<sup>2</sup>, Djuni Farhan<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Master of Management, Postgraduate, Universitas Gajayana Malang

<sup>2,3</sup> Lecturer Faculty of Economics and Business, Universitas Gajayana Malang

**ABSTRACT:** Optimal service for public service users is a necessity for increasing citizen satisfaction. The determinant of service quality lies in employee performance. There are several factors that influence service quality, including team work, work environment and job satisfaction. This research aims to: examine the influence of team work and the work environment on job satisfaction; examine the influence of team work, work environment and job satisfaction on service quality; and examine the influence of teamwork and work environment on service quality through job satisfaction.

The population of this study was 49 Civil Servants (PNS) of the Investment and One-Stop Integrated Services Service, Mojokerto Regency, East Java. Meanwhile, determining the sample size uses a saturated sampling technique, that is, the entire population is taken as a sample. Meanwhile, data collection uses a questionnaire distributed to respondents. The data analysis technique uses SEM PLS.

The research results show that: (1) teamwork and the work environment have a significant effect on job satisfaction; (2) team work, work environment, and job satisfaction have a significant effect on service quality; and (3) teamwork and the work environment influence service quality through job satisfaction but are not significant. For this reason, if the management of the Mojokerto Regency One Stop Investment and Integrated Services Department seeks to improve the quality of service to citizens, this can be done by strengthening teamwork and creating a conducive work environment for employees.

**KEYWORDS:** Job satisfaction, Service quality, Teamwork, Work environment.

### INTRODUCTION

One stop service is a licensing and non-licensing activity whose management process starts from the application stage to the document issuance stage in one place. Minister of Home Affairs Regulation no. 24 of 2006 concerning Guidelines for the Implementation of One Stop Integrated Services, article 2, states that the aim of implementing one stop service is to improve the quality of public services and provide wider access to the public in obtaining public services.

One of the challenges faced by government bureaucratic officials in public services is displaying professionalism and independence. Various demands for services in terms of quantity, quality and speed of service are highly expected by the community in line with the increase in population, the need for administrative documents and increasing welfare. Various cases in public service practice still often occur, such as slowness, uncertainty and even complicated bureaucratic processes, which is why the public often complains about them. A number of deficiencies in public services need to be corrected immediately.

The government is making efforts to improve public services by providing one stop service to the community. Ideally, this form of service is expected to allow the public to receive public services in an affective and efficient manner. However, the implementation of one stop service still finds many irregularities and is carried out less than optimally. In terms of licensing, for example, many people complain about the difficulty of obtaining a permit. Even though the statutory regulations state that all agency authorities fall under one integrated service door.

One of the weaknesses in optimizing public services includes: lack of management freedom, as well as excessive political interference in the management of public services; dual role in public services, namely between commercial and social goals, and implementing staff who are less competent and unprofessional in the field of service (Saleh, 2004). Several notes also illustrate that public service organizations in general have structures that are not lean and human resources are less qualified.

One of the efforts to improve public services in the licensing sector is to comprehensively improve the management of human resources with the aim of ensuring that they perform optimally in providing services to the community. Because human resources



are the main component in an organization so they need to be managed well in order to contribute to the organization through the willingness to provide quality services to the community.

As an effort to improve the quality of public services, it is deemed necessary to increase the capacity of human resources, bearing in mind that human resources of service personnel have a strategic role as drivers of bureaucratic reform. The direction of development policy in the field of state apparatus is to increase the professionalism, neutrality and welfare of human resources in the apparatus. Improving human resource management in apparatus is directed at creating professional, neutral and prosperous human resources in the apparatus, inseparable from individual, organizational and work environment aspects (Robbins & Judge, 2017).

One of the individual aspects that needs to be considered to optimize the function of employees so that they are willing to provide optimal public services is engineering work behavior through synergistic work and forming work teams and providing their satisfaction at work. A work team can generate positive synergy through coordinated efforts. Their individual efforts produce a level of performance greater than the sum of the individual inputs. According to Robbins and Judge (2017), a work team is a group whose individual efforts produce a performance that is greater than the sum of the individual input.

Meanwhile, job satisfaction is needed because psychologically employees who feel job satisfaction will contribute optimally to the organization. Several research results prove that job satisfaction has a significant positive effect on employee work behavior (Hidayah & Harnoto, 2018; Hanafi & Syah, 2021). This means that the higher an employee's job satisfaction is measured through indicators of job characteristics, salary, promotion opportunities, supervision and support from co-workers, the higher it will of course be. However, if one of the indicators of job satisfaction is not met, employee performance will decrease.

Furthermore, the work environment also needs to be considered because it has an influence on employee performance. According to Saputra, et al. (2021), the physical and non-physical work environment has a direct or indirect influence on employee performance. Meanwhile, according to Nasir, et al. (2020) that a conducive work environment can increase employee morale to contribute to organizational progress through improving performance. A work environment that is conducive and provides a feeling of comfort will support productivity which has an impact on increasing employee performance which of course provides output as well as service quality. On the other hand, if the work environment is inadequate, it can disrupt employee concentration, resulting in errors.

Various research results on the influence of the work environment on performance conclude that the comfort of the work environment has a significant positive effect on employee performance (Nasir, et al., 2020; Vivaldy & Toni, 2020; and Hanafi & Syah, 2021). This means that the better the working environment conditions, both physical and non-physical work environments, will be able to trigger employee enthusiasm to continue working, thereby increasing their performance. However, if one aspect of the work environment is not met, it can reduce employee performance. As the results of research conducted by Lopez, et al. (2022) who found that a bad non-physical work environment due to less harmonious relations between employees or between superiors and subordinates has a negative effect on employee performance. Thus, the physical and non-physical work environment needs to be created conducive for organizational members so that they are willing to contribute optimally to achieving organizational goals.

Based on the background of the existing problem, the problem formulation is: (1) Do teamwork and the work environment have a positive and significant effect on job satisfaction?; (2) Do teamwork, work environment and service quality have a positive and significant effect on service quality?; (3) Does teamwork have a positive and significant effect on service quality through job satisfaction? and (7) Does the work environment have a positive and significant effect on service quality through job satisfaction?

## LITERATURE REVIEW AND HYPOTHESIS

Public services are all forms of public service activities carried out by government agencies at the center, regions and within State/Regional Owned Enterprises in the form of goods or services, both in the context of efforts to fulfill community needs and in the context of implementing the provisions of statutory regulations (Men- PAN No. 81 of 1993). The new paradigm in public services places citizens as citizens who have the right to receive adequate public services from the state. The New Public Service firmly offers a new doctrine, namely: serving citizens optimally by prioritizing human values, not just pursuing productivity (Denhardt & Denhardt, 2007). The effectiveness of public services is determined, among other things, by government officials as the implementation of policies in carrying out service functions optimally. Good governance in the aspect of human resources in the bureaucracy is a necessity so that services to the community can be effective and efficient.



In the behavioral approach, human resource management can be optimally carried out through individual, group or system approaches (Robbins & Judge, 2017). In order to be effective, the implementation of this approach needs to be carried out comprehensively. Therefore, paying attention to variables such as job satisfaction, motivation, work environment, work team, leadership and organizational culture is a necessity for efforts to manage individual work behavior in organizations so that they can be more productive (Dessler, 2020).

Employee work behavior will improve if they are actively involved and participate and become part of the team in the activity process in the organizational unit where they work. According to Mangkunegara (2009), team work is a group whose individual efforts produce higher performance than the results obtained if the work is completed alone. Team work consists of a group of employees coordinated by a team leader and/or a manager to produce positive synergy through coordinated efforts. Employee performance can be improved by teamwork for effective and efficient achievements and eliminating unemployed employees (Arifin, 2020).

The research results of Dewi et al. (2018), Pandelaki (2018) and Priskilla & Santika (2019) prove that teamwork has a significant positive influence on employee performance. However, the research results of Silvani and Triatmanto (2017) show that teamwork does not have a significant positive influence on employee performance. This is due to a lack of trust in colleagues so that teamwork cannot improve employee performance.

Another individual factor that also influences employee work behavior is job satisfaction. As a factor that influences whether an employee's performance is good or bad, job satisfaction is an employee's feelings and assessment regarding work in relation to whether the work they do can meet their expectations, needs and desires. When employees feel satisfied with their work, they will have a positive attitude, but if they are not satisfied, they will have a negative attitude towards their work (Tegar, 2019). Employees will work optimally if they feel job satisfaction (Rivaldo, 2021). Therefore, the higher the employee's job satisfaction, the higher their performance will be.

Job satisfaction has an important role in creating employee work quality (Rismayanti et al., 2018). According to Noor et al. (2016), job satisfaction is the attitude shown by employees when facing and completing a job, resulting in a feeling of satisfaction. Sari (2018) and Setia et al. (2020) stated that job satisfaction has a significant positive effect on employee performance. Several research results prove that job satisfaction has a significant positive effect on employee performance. This means that the higher the employee's job satisfaction as measured through indicators of job characteristics, salary, promotion opportunities, supervision and support from colleagues, the higher the employee's performance will be (Hidayah & Harnoto, 2018; Hanafi & Syah, 2021; Goetz & Wald, 2022). However, if one of the indicators of job satisfaction is not met then employee performance will decline, as per research results from Pahlawi and Fatolah (2020) which found the fact that employee perceptions regarding salary mismatch with workload accompanied by low co-worker support have an effect on decreasing employee performance.

Furthermore, one of the predictors that is closely related to employee work behavior is the work environment, as stated by Robbins and Judge (2017) that employees pay great attention to their work environment, both in terms of personal comfort and ease of doing work. The work environment can be divided into two, namely the physical work environment and the non-physical work environment. The physical work environment and non-physical work environment also influence employee motivation and work morale (Hanafi and Syah, 2021). If the organization's work environment is comfortable and enjoyable, employees will certainly improve their performance so as to support the smooth achievement of organizational goals. The better the physical and non-physical working environment conditions, the more it will stimulate employee enthusiasm to continue working to improve performance.

Several research results related to the influence of the work environment on employee performance prove that the work environment has a significant positive effect on employee performance. This means that the better the working environment conditions, the more enthusiastic the employees will be to improve their performance (Nasir, et al., 2020; Vivaldy & Toni, 2020; Hanafi & Syah, 2021). However, if one aspect of the work environment is not fulfilled, it can reduce employee performance, as research results by Lopez-Cabarcos, et al. (2022) which found the fact that a poor non-physical work environment is due to less harmonious relations between employees and between superiors and subordinates. negative effect on employee performance. Based on the previous explanation, the research hypothesis is formulated as follows:

H1: Team work influences employee job satisfaction.

H2: The work environment influences employee job satisfaction.

H3: Job satisfaction influences service quality



- H4: Team work influences service quality
- H5: The work environment influences service quality
- H6: Teamwork influences service quality through job satisfaction
- H7: The work environment influences service quality through job satisfaction.

## RESEARCH METHODS

The population of this study was 49 Civil Servants (PNS) of the Investment and One-Stop Integrated Services, Mojokerto Regency, East Java. Meanwhile, determining the sample size uses a saturated sampling technique, that is, the entire population is taken as a sample. The basis for determining the saturated sampling technique is the opinion of Arikunto (2014) that if the population is less than 100, it is better to take all of them as a sample.

To obtain relevant and valid data, the collection method uses a questionnaire distributed to respondents. The instrument measures 4 research variables, namely: teamwork, work environment, job satisfaction and service quality using a Likert scale with 5 variations of answers: strongly agree, agree, disagree, disagree and strongly disagree.

Next, data analysis was carried out using Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) – PLS. The decision to use the SEM PLS data analysis technique was based on the consideration that SEM PLS does not require normally distributed data, can use a small sample size (recommended at least 30), does not require sample randomization, can use measurement scales other than intervals, can use formative indicators to measure latent variables, is suitable for use as a procedure for developing theory at an early stage, and allows very complex models with many latent variables and indicators (Ghozali, 2014).

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### Evaluation of the Measurement Model (Outer Model)

The Outer Model is also called the measurement model. The outer model test aims to specify the relationship between latent variables and their indicators. Test this outer model using the PLS Algorithm procedure. The analysis stage in the outer model is measured using validity and reliability testing. There are 2 measurements of the outer model of PLS SEM, namely reflective and formative model measurements. The first PLS SEM model measurement in the outer model is a reflective measurement. The measurement model was assessed using validity and reliability.

Validity testing is carried out to determine whether the construct meets the requirements to continue in research. In this validity test, there are two types of evaluation that will be carried out, namely Convergent validity with a reflective indicator model assessed based on the correlation between the item score and the construct score by looking at the standardized loading factor. The correlation between item scores and construct values is said to be high if the outer loading value is  $> 0.7$ , whereas according to Chin et.al. (1998), an outer loading value between 0.5 – 0.6 is considered sufficient. Second, using discriminant validity, which is a measurement model with indicator reflection by comparing the root of the average variance extracted (AVE) value; If the root of the AVE value is more than 0.5 then the model is suitable or all items of the variable are valid. The results of the convergent validity test can be seen in the following table.

**Table 1 Convergent Validity Test Results**

Variables	Indicator	Loading Value	<i>p-value</i>
Teamwork	X1_1	(0.750)	<0.001
	X1_2	(0.900)	<0.001
	X1_3	(0.841)	<0.001
	X1_4	(0.897)	<0.001
Work environment	X2_1	(0.935)	<0.001
	X2_2	(0.938)	<0.001
	X2_3	(0.880)	<0.001
Job satisfaction	Y_1	(0.902)	<0.001
	Y_2	(0.876)	<0.001
	Y_3	(0.918)	<0.001



	Y_4	(0.938)	<0.001
	Y_5	(0.907)	<0.001
Service quality	Z_1	(0.612)	0.022
	Z_2	(0.651)	<0.001
	Z_3	(0.653)	<0.001
	Z_4	(0.795)	<0.001
	Z_5	(0.743)	<0.001
	Z_6	(0.667)	<0.001
	Z_7	(0.613)	<0.001

Based on table 1, it is known that all outer loading values for each item have a loading value > 0.5 so they are considered quite valid. Thus, the indicators for each latent variable have a strong level of validity and significance because they have a loading value > 0.5 and a P value < 0.005.

Apart from that, it is also necessary to look at discriminant validity which is assessed from the cross loading of the measurement with the construct. To evaluate the fulfillment of discriminant validity, we can see the loading of the latent construct, which will predict the indicator better than other constructs. If the correlation of the construct with the main measurement (each indicator) is greater than the other construct measures, then discriminant validity is fulfilled

**Table 2. Discriminant Validity Test Results**

	Team work	Work environment	Job satisfaction	Service quality
Team work	(0.837)	0.690	0.657	0.731
Work environment	0.690	(0.918)	0.692	0.769
Job satisfaction	0.657	0.692	(0.908)	0.676
Service quality	0.731	0.769	0.676	(0.885)

Based on table 2, it is known that the team work construct value is  $0.837 > 0.690, 0.657$  and  $0.731$ ; the work environment construct has a value of  $0.918 > 0.690, 0.692$  and  $0.769$ ; the job satisfaction construct has a value of  $0.908 > 0.657, 0.692$  and  $0.676$ ; and the service quality construct has a value of  $0.885 > 0.731, 0.769$  and  $0.676$ . Based on this description, it can be concluded that all constructs have met the criteria for discriminant validity.

**Reliability Test**

To measure the reliability of a construct in SEM-PLS two criteria are used, namely Cronbach's Alpha and Composite reliability. A construct is declared reliable if the composite reliability value is > 0.70. The following shows the results of the latent variable coefficients output.

**Table 3. Reliability Test Results**

Variabel	Composite Reliability	Cronbach's Alpha
Teamwork	0.921	0.891
Work environment	0.941	0.906
Job satisfaction	0.959	0.947
Service quality	0.962	0.954

Based on table 3, it is known that the Composite Reliability value for all items for each variable is > 0.7, so it can be concluded that all items for each variable are declared reliable.

**Structural Model Evaluation (Inner Model)**

The next stage is to carry out a structural evaluation (inner model) which includes model fit testing, path coefficient, and R2. In the model suitability test there are 3 test indices, namely average path coefficient (APC), average R-squared (ARS) and average variance factor (AVIF) with the APC and ARS criteria being accepted with the condition that p – value < 0.05 and AVIF < 5.



**Table 4. Conformity test results**

	Indeks	p-value	Criteria
APC	0.357	p = 0.002	p < 0.05
ARS	0.659	p < 0.001	p < 0.05
AARS	0.642	p < 0.001	p < 0.05
AVIF	2.265	-	AVIF < 3.3

The output results in table 4 explain that APC has an index of 0.357 with p value = 0.002. Meanwhile, ARS has an index of 0.659 with a p value < 0.001, so it can be said that APC has met the criteria because it has a p value < 0.001. Likewise, the p value of ARS is p < 0.001. AVIF value < 3.3 has been met. Based on these data, the inner model can be accepted.

**Hypothesis testing**

Hypothesis testing aims to determine direct and indirect effects. The results of the SEM PLS analysis parameter significance test on the direct effect were used to test hypotheses 1 to 5, while the indirect effect was used to test hypotheses 6 and 7. The results of the hypothesis test are as follows.

**Table 5. Hypothesis test results**

Influence	Coefficient	P-value
Teamwork → Job satisfaction	0.397	0.001
Work environment → Job satisfaction	0.428	<0.001
Teamwork → Service quality	0.329	0.006
Work environment → Service quality	0.359	0.003
Job satisfaction → Service quality	0.273	0.019
Teamwork → Job satisfaction → Service quality	0.108	0.134
Work environment → Job satisfaction → Service quality	0.134	0.116

Based on table 5, it can be seen that team work and the work environment have a significant positive effect on job satisfaction; Team work, work environment and job satisfaction have a significant positive effect on service quality. Furthermore, teamwork and the work environment have a positive effect on service quality through job satisfaction, but the effect is not significant, because the P value is > 0.05.

**DISCUSSION**

**Teamwork influences job satisfaction**

Based on table 5, it can be seen that team work has a significant effect on job satisfaction. This result can be seen from the convergent validity of team work on job satisfaction which has a value of p = 0.001 with an influence of 0.397 with a positive sign. This means that if team work is strengthened then job satisfaction will also increase. The results of this research are in accordance with the opinion of Suwatno and Priansa (2014), that interactions between fellow employees can create a certain atmosphere that can influence each individual's job satisfaction.

Team work has a big influence on good work performance and can influence job satisfaction such as increasing wages, increasing targets, and having good relationships between employees. Increasing teamwork can also increase the knowledge and skills possessed by employees and can support job satisfaction (Hanaysha & Tahir, 2016). Similar opinions were also expressed by Arifin (2020), Kim (2018) and Kelemba et al. (2017) that teamwork has a significant positive influence on job satisfaction so that if teamwork increases, job satisfaction will also increase.

**Work environment influences job satisfaction**

Furthermore, it is also known that the work environment has a significant effect on job satisfaction. This result can be seen from the convergent validity of the work environment on job satisfaction which has a value of p < 0.001 with an influence of 0.428



with a positive sign. These results mean that a pleasant physical and non-physical work environment can have a positive impact on job satisfaction. This research is relevant to the research of Niken et al. (2020) that the work environment which is measured based on two dimensions, namely the physical work environment and the non-physical work environment, has a significant influence on job satisfaction.

As is known, job satisfaction is a person's attitude towards work as a reflection of pleasant and unpleasant experiences with the work carried out along with hopes for the job in the future (Goetz & Wald, 2022). Job satisfaction can be obtained when there is comfort in the workplace. For this reason, the work environment in the organization needs to be considered because it has a direct influence on employees. A conducive work environment can increase employee satisfaction, while an inadequate work environment can reduce their satisfaction. The condition of the work environment is said to be good if people can carry out activities optimally, healthily, safely and comfortably, as Wursanto (2009) said, the work environment is everything that concerns the physical and psychological aspects which directly or indirectly will affect employees.

### **Teamwork influences service quality**

Team work has a significant effect on service quality. This result can be seen in the convergent validity of team work on service quality which has a value of  $p = 0.006$  with an influence of 0.329 with a positive sign. These results mean that teamwork solidity will have an impact on improving service quality. The results of this research support Nangoi's (2004) opinion that service quality is influenced, among other things, by leadership, teamwork, technology, and employee job satisfaction.

As is known, service organizations can win competition by consistently providing higher quality services than competitors and also exceeding customer expectations. According to Parasuraman (2014) service quality is built on comparing customer perceptions of the actual service they receive with the service they actually expect. If reality is the same as expectations, then the service is called satisfactory. But if the reality is lower than expected, then the service can be said to be of poor quality. To be able to obtain quality service, of course it really depends on the employee teamwork and the work environment. If employees are in a work atmosphere that supports each other and synergizes, of course they will work more optimally in providing service to customers. This argument is in accordance with the opinion of Pandelaki (2018) and Priskilla and Santika (2019) who state that teamwork has a significantly positive influence on employee work behavior.

### **The work environment influences service quality**

Based on table 5, it is known that the work environment has a significant effect on service quality. This result can be seen in the convergent validity of the work environment on service quality, which is  $p = 0.003$  with an influence of 0.359 with a positive sign. This means that a pleasant work environment has an impact on improving service quality, conversely if the work environment is inadequate it will reduce work behavior to provide optimal service to customers. For this reason, employees pay great attention to their work environment, both in terms of personal comfort and ease of doing their work well (Lopez-Cabarcos, et al., 2022).

The work environment is the physical and non-physical reality around employees that can influence a person in carrying out work. A comfortable work environment causes the level of employee concentration at work to increase and this condition causes the level of employee work productivity to increase. This means that the better the physical and non-physical working environment conditions can encourage employee enthusiasm to continue to improve their performance. This argument is in accordance with the research results of Hanafi & Syah (2021) and Nasir, et al. (2020) which states that the work environment has a significant effect on employee performance, including providing services to customers.

### **Job satisfaction influences service quality**

Based on table 5, it is known that job satisfaction has a significant effect on service quality. This result can be seen in the convergent validity of job satisfaction on service quality which has a value of  $p = 0.019$  with an influence of 0.273 with a positive sign. These results mean that employee job satisfaction has an impact on improving the quality of service to customers, conversely if employees are dissatisfied they will be able to reduce their work behavior to provide optimal service to customers.

As is known, job satisfaction is a person's attitude towards work as a reflection of pleasant and unpleasant experiences with the work carried out along with hopes for the job in the future (Goetz & Wald, 2022). Employees who are satisfied in carrying out their work will have motivation, commitment to the organization and high work participation which will lead to efforts to improve their performance, including in providing service to customers. The results of this research are in line with research conducted by



Goetz & Wald (2022), Hanafi & Syah (2021), Nasir, et al. (2020), Vivaldy & Toni (2020) that satisfaction with the work carried out has a significant effect on employee performance.

### **Teamwork has no significant effect on Service Quality through Job Satisfaction**

The results of the research show that teamwork has no significant effect on service quality through job satisfaction, because the indirect effect of teamwork on service quality through job satisfaction has a value of 0.108 but p-values = 0.134 > 0.05, so it can be said that there is an influence of teamwork on service quality through satisfaction work but not significant. The results of this research explain that job satisfaction as a mediating variable does not play a role, so this research does not support Devina's (2018) research that teamwork influences job satisfaction and subsequently has an impact on improving work quality. For this reason, efforts to increase positive employee behavior in providing services to citizens are more effective by strengthening team work.

### **Work Environment does not have a significant effect on Service Quality through Job Satisfaction**

The results of the research show that the work environment does not have a significant effect on service quality through satisfaction, because the indirect effect value of the work environment on service quality through job satisfaction is 0.134 with p-values = 0.116 > 0.05, so it can be said that there is an influence of the work environment on service quality through job satisfaction but not significant. The results of this research explain that job satisfaction as a mediating variable does not play a role, so the research strengthens the research of Nasir, et al., (2020) and Vivaldy & Toni (2020) that the work environment has a direct and significant effect on employee performance. This means that the better the working environment conditions, the more enthusiastic employees will be to improve their performance, including in providing services. For this reason, efforts to increase positive employee behavior in providing services to citizens are more effective by improving the physical and non-physical work environment.

### **CONCLUSION**

The quality of public services is an important factor for increasing the satisfaction of citizens using services and is also an indicator of good government governance. The quality of public services as a manifestation of optimal performance of government employees is caused by various variables, including team work, job satisfaction and work environment. In its position as an independent variable, it is proven that teamwork, job satisfaction and work environment have a positive and significant effect on service quality. When teamwork is solid, job satisfaction increases and the work environment is conducive, the quality of public services also increases.

The existence of job satisfaction as a mediating variable for the influence of teamwork and work environment on service quality is proven to be positive but not significant. For this reason, management at the Department of Investment and Integrated Services of Mojokerto Regency, East Java seeks to improve the quality of service more effectively by strengthening team work and creating a conducive work environment for employees.

### **REFERENCES**

1. Arifin, A. (2020). Pengaruh Kepemimpinan dan Kerja Sama Tim terhadap Kepuasan Kerja dan Kinerja Karyawan. *Ekonomi Dan Bisnis*. 17(2), 186 – 193.
2. Chin, Wynne W. 1998. *The partial Least Square Approach to Structural Equation Modeling*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publisher. University of Huston.
3. Denhardt, Janet V. and Denhardt, Robert B., (2007). *The New Public Service, Serving Not Steering*, Expanded Edition. London, England: M.E.Sharpe.
4. Dessler, G. (2020). *Human Resource Management* 16 th edition. New York: Pearson Education.
5. Devina, G. (2018). Pengaruh Teamwork terhadap Kepuasan Kerja Karyawan pada PT. Federal International Finance Cabang Surabaya 2. *Jurnal Ilmu Manajemen (JIM)*, 6(1), 1–9.
6. Goetz, N. & Wald, A. (2022). Similar but different? The influence of job satisfaction, organizational commitment and person-job fit on individual performance in the continuum between permanent and temporary organizations. *International Journal of Project Management*, 40, 251-261. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijproman.2022.03.001>





7. Ghozali, Imam. (2014). *Structural Equation Modeling, Metode Alternatif dengan Partial Least Square (PLS)*. Edisi 4. Semarang : Badan Penerbit Universitas Diponegoro.
8. Hanafi, K. M. & Syah, T. Y. R. (2021). The moderating role of demographic factors in the relationship among job satisfaction, work environment, work motivation to employee performance. *Jurnal Dinamika Manajemen*, 12(1), 12-28. <https://doi.org/10.15294/jdm.v10i1.17359>
9. Hanaysha, J., & Tahir, P. R. (2016). Examining the Effects of Employee Empowerment, Teamwork, and Employee Training on Job Satisfaction. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*. 219 (2016), 272–282. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2016.05.016>
10. Hidayah, S. & Harnoto. (2018). Role of organizational citizenship behavior (OCB), perception of justice and job satisfaction on employee performance. *Jurnal Dinamika Manajemen*, 9(2), 170-178. <https://doi.org/10.15294/jdm.v9i2.14191>
11. Kelemba, J., Chepkilot, R., & Zakayo, C. (2017). Influence of Teamwork Practices on Employee Performance in Public Service in Kenya. *African Research Journal of Education and Social Sciences*, 4(3), 1–9.
12. Keputusan menteri Negara Pendayagunaan Aparatur Negara (Men-PAN) No 81 Tahun 1993
13. Kim, J.-H. (2018). Effects of Team Leadership Behavior of SME Organization on Teamwork and Job Satisfaction. *Journal of Convergence for Information Technology*, 8(2), 105–112.
14. Lopez-Cabarcos, M. A., Vazquez-Rodriguez, P. & Quinoa-Pineiro, L. M. (2022). An approach to employees' job performance through work environmental variables and leadership behaviours. *Journal of Business Research*, 140, 361-369. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2021.11.006>
15. Mangkunegara, Anwar, Prabu. (2009). *Evaluasi Kinerja SDM*, Bandung : Refika Aditama
16. Nangoi, (2004). *Pemberdayaan di era ekonomi pengetahuan*. Jakarta: PT. Gramedia.
17. Nasir, M., Murfat, M. Z., Basalamah, J. & Basalamah, A. (2020). An analysis of work discipline, work environment and employment satisfaction towards performance. *Jurnal Manajemen Bisnis*, 11(1), 65-75. <https://doi.org/10.18196/mb.11188>
18. Niken, K.S., Edy Supriyadi, Tabroni. (2020). Pengaruh Work life Balance dan Lingkungan Kerja Terhadap Kepuasan Kerja Melalui Employee Engagement Dengan Kesehatan Mental Sebagai Variabel Moderator Pada Karyawan Generasi Milenial ( Studi Kasus: Direktorat Keuangan PT. Angkasa Pura 1 (Persero). *EKOBISMAN*, 5 (2), 88-109.
19. Noor, N., Rahardjo, K., & Ruhana, I. (2016). Pengaruh Stres Kerja dan Kepuasan Kerja terhadap Kinerja Karyawan pada PT. Jasa Raharja (Persero) Cabang Jawa Timur Surabaya. *Jurnal Administrasi Bisnis*, 31(1), 9–15
20. Parasuraman. (2014). *The Behavioral Consequences Of Service Quality*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
21. Pahlawi, L. A. I. & Fatonah, S. (2020). The role of leadership in improving performance through organization commitment, motivation and job satisfaction of introduction village employees. *Jurnal Manajemen Bisnis*, 11(1), 105-120. <https://doi.org/10.18196/mb.11191>
22. Pandelaki, M. T. (2018). Pengaruh Teamwork dan Budaya Kerja terhadap Kinerja Karyawan Yayasan Titian Budi Luhur di Kabupaten Parigi Moutong. *Katalogis*, 6(5), 35–46.
23. Priskilla, N. M., & Santika, I. P. (2019). Implikasi Gaya Kepemimpinan Transformasional, Iklim Organisasi dan Kerjasama Tim terhadap Kinerja Karyawan di Puri Saron Hotel Seminyak. *Journal of Applied Management Studies*, 01(1), 61–73.
24. Robbins. S.P and Judge T.A. (2017). *Organizational Behavior*. 13th edition. New Delhi: Pearson Prentice-Hall.
25. Rivaldo, Y. (2021). Leadership and motivation to performance through job satisfaction of hotel employees at D'Merlion Batam. *The Winners*, 22(1), 25-30. <https://doi.org/10.21512/tw.v22i1.7039>
26. Saleh, Syafiuddin. (2004). *Pelayanan Publik Yang Buruk dan Upaya Perbaikan Pelayanan Serta Moral Pegawai/Pejabat Publik*. Falsafah Sains/PPS.
27. Saputra, A., Kirana, K. C. & Septyarini, E. (2021). Pengaruh lingkungan kerja, motivasi kerja dan kepuasan kerja terhadap organizational citizenship behavior (OCB). *Inovator: Jurnal Manajemen*, 10(2), 85-92.
28. Sari, O. R. (2018). Pengaruh Kepuasan dan Motivasi Kerja terhadap Kinerja Karyawan dengan Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) sebagai Variabel Intervening. *Management Analysis Journal*, 64 (1), 28–35. <https://doi.org/10.15294/maj.v4i1.7221>



29. Setia, A., Marnis, & Garnasih, R. (2020). Analisis Pengaruh Pelatihan, Kepuasan Kerja, dan Teamwork terhadap Kinerja Karyawan dengan Kepemimpinan sebagai Variabel Moderasi pada PT. Perkebunan Nusantara V (PTPN V) Pekanbaru. *Jurnal Ilmiah Manajemen*, 8(2), 202–215.
30. Suwatno dan Priansa, D.J. (2014). *Manajemen SDM dalam Organisasi Publik dan Bisnis*. Bandung: Penerbit Bandung.
31. Silvani, E., & Triatmanto, B. (2017). Pengaruh Komunikasi, Motivasi dan Kerjasama Tim terhadap Peningkatan Kinerja Karyawan. *Jurnal Manajemen Dan Kewirausahaan*, 5(1), 47–57.
32. Tegar, N. (2019). *Manajemen SDM dan pegawai*. Yogyakarta: Quadrant.
33. Vivaldy, J. C. & Toni, N. (2020). The effect of job satisfaction, organizational communication, work environment, and work motivation on the church's employee performance. *BISMA (Bisnis dan Manajemen)*, 13(1), 69-80. <https://doi.org/10.26740/bisma.v13n1>

---

*Cite this Article: Ariesta Agustin Indasari, Sugeng Mulyono, Djuni Farhan (2024). The Influence of Teamwork and Work Environment on Service Quality through Job Satisfaction. International Journal of Current Science Research and Review, 7(2), 1385-1394*