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ABSTRACT
This study aimed to determine the Effect of Incentives and Work Environment on Civil Service Performance and Job Satisfaction as Intervening Variables in Disperkimtan. South Sulawesi. The method in this study was a descriptive method with a quantitative approach with the aim to determine the effect of the variables studied. The population in this study were all Civil Servants covered by Disperkimtan Sulsel, amounting to 135 people. While the sample used in this study amounted to 134 people. Data collection techniques using survey methods through observation, questionnaires, and literature study. Data analysis was performed using SPSS (Statistical Package for the Social Science) version 25. The results of this study indicated that direct incentives and work environment have a positive and significant effect on job satisfaction and employee performance in Disperkimtan South Sulawesi. There was no positive and significant effect between incentives on performance through job satisfaction as an intervening variable. While job satisfaction as an intervening variable that mediates between work environment and performance has no positive and significant effect. In this case job satisfaction weakened the influence of the work environment on the performance of civil servants.
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INTRODUCTION
The performance evaluation of the state civil servant can begin with an assessment of work performance by measuring employee attendance and work discipline levels so that it is expected to lead to an increase in the performance of the state civil servants.

According Gibson et al (1989), the performance was referring to the successful and achieve the vision and mission of an organization. Measuring the performance of an organization is said to be good and optimal when goals are well achieved.

So to raise the level of motivation to refer to improving the performance of most companies or agencies will provide compensation that is directly proportional to the work that employees carry out.

According Handoko (2006), In every organization should provide compensation or remuneration that is adequate for its employees which is a reward for employee responses generally balanced consideration given to the work or performance that they provide to the organization. So that compensation or compensation becomes a reference for improving employee performance.

According to Dessler (2015), the incentive is salary /honorarium are given to employees at one time. Incentives are usually given for m enaikkan productivity and efficiency of the organization to the employees who tend to work is not optimal or not
discipline so hopefully with incentives to make the performance of employees in accordance with the expectations of the organization.

Rivai (2004), revealed that the provision of incentives is one way that is done based on employee performance. Mangkunegara (2003), also argues that incentives are a form of financial motivation based on work ethics or a form of appreciation for employee performance.

In general, job satisfaction is reflected in work, tasks and everything that it faces will be manifested in activities or positive attitudes. The main factor to get good work results is satisfaction in working so productivity increases optimally.

Aryasri (2008), revealed that aspects of the quality of supervision, the relationship between employees, promotion opportunities and salaries are one of the concepts of job satisfaction. Meanwhile, this researcher's opinion also summarizes that job satisfaction increases because of the high percentage of work and causes high feedback as well.

The Department of Housing, Settlement and Land Areas is one of the organizations at the provincial level of South Sulawesi to assist Regional Heads in the field of public housing, residential and land areas with the aim of improving the welfare of employees, by providing incentives in the form of Additional Employee Income Benefits (TPP) expected in order to become more productive civil servants and have a positive impact on the organization. The Granting of Government Employee Benefits refers to the South Sulawesi Governor Regulation Number 36 Year 2019 concerning the third Amendment to the South Sulawesi Governor Regulation Number 130 Year 2017.

Total quantity and acceptable amount of employees is measured by two basic provision of the TPP is the behavior and work objectives, while the indicator ratings on the behavior of the work that is discipline, commitment, integrity, service orientation, leadership and teamwork.

The provision of incentives should be able to improve employee performance based on the Employee Performance Target (SKP) as a basis for evaluating work performance so that it shows a fairly good level of achievement, but in actual conditions the level of discipline in the DISPERKIMTAN South Sulawesi has not been able to achieve the expected target.

Based on the foregoing, this study aims to determine the effect of incentives and work environment on the performance of Civil Servants and Job Satisfaction as Intervening Variables in Disperkimtan Prov. South Sulawesi.

LITERATURE REVIEW
Relationship of Incentives and Job Satisfaction

According to Veithzal (2008), satisfaction is a picture of a happy attitude or not in achieving the work done. The incentives received are the first thing that every employee evaluates against the company. Leaders who are fair, wise, and have a good name will make employees stay in the organization (Luthans, 2012). Thus the provision of incentives can motivate employees to improve work productivity. This is supported by the results of research Adisaksana et al (2015), which shows that incentives have a positive and significant effect on job satisfaction.

Relationship of Work Environment and Job Satisfaction

A work environment that includes harmonious working relationships, clear targets, a dynamic work climate, adequate work facilities can also affect employee job satisfaction (Mangkunegara, 2005).
Research conducted by Aruan & Fakhri (2015) also shows that air temperature, air sources and the level of security that exists in the work environment can affect increased job satisfaction.

**Relationship between job satisfaction and performance**

Wibowo (2012) revealed a relationship between performance and job satisfaction. Job satisfaction can cause an increase in one's performance. Whereas on the other hand job satisfaction is caused by work performance or performance so that more creative workers will get satisfaction.

The results of this study support research conducted by Indrawati (2013), which gives special attention to employee job satisfaction can improve performance. This shows a conducive work environment, a good relationship between employees and superiors can increase employee job satisfaction.

**Relationship of Incentives and Performance**

Research Al-Musadieq et al (2017) states that the organization must understand the incentives of the initial needs of each employee. Providing what is needed by employees can increase work motivation in an effort to meet their needs.

**Relationship of Work Environment and Performance**

The influence of the work environment on employee performance is expressed by Winardi (2004), that the work environment influences employee performance if the work environment in the agency is very good. A pleasant work environment for employees can enhance a harmonious relationship with superiors, colleagues, and subordinates, and supported by adequate facilities and infrastructure in the workplace will have a positive impact on employees, so that employee performance can improve.

A good environment really determines the performance of employees and agencies. If the work environment to get attention from the agency then the benefits would be very large and useful, both for the present and the future, agencies gain the advantage of achieving goals and high productivity for employees and will gain high performance. Research Sofyan (2013), shows that the working environment has a significant influence on employee performance BAPPEDA District X.

**RESEARCH METHODS**

**Research design**

The method in this study was a descriptive method with a quantitative approach with the aim to determine the effect of the variables studied. Nazir (2004) explained that the descriptive method is a method of examining the status of a group of people, an object, a condition, a system of thought or an event in the present.

**Population and Sample**

Sugiyono (2014), explained that the population is an object that has certain characteristics determined by researchers to be studied and then drawn conclusions. Based on this understanding, then the population is all Civil Servants covered by the Provincial Disperkimtan. Sulsel, amounting to 135 people.

Furthermore, *nonprobability sampling* is a sampling technique that does not provide equal opportunity / opportunity for each element or member of the population to be selected as a sample. Therefore, the authors chose the sample using the saturated sample technique because the population is relatively small, so the sample used in this study amounted to 134 people.
Method of collecting data

The method used in this study to meet the required data, the survey data collection method was used. Survey method is a method of collecting data obtained directly from the original source. This method requires contact or relationship with respondents who are the object of research to obtain the required data. The technique used in the collection of survey methods uses observation, questionnaires (questionnaire) and literature study.

Data analysis method

Data analysis was performed using validity and reliability testing. Validity test is used to measure the level of validity of the instrument. In this study, the validity testing process is carried out using the SPSS program, then the correlation value of the statement form obtained or the calculated r value compared with the r table value. If the value of r count is greater than r table, then the questionnaire is declared valid. Conversely, if the value of r count is smaller than r table, the questionnaire is declared invalid. The reliability test in this study was carried out using the 25th SPSS (Statistical Package for the Social Science) program.

RESULTS

Validity test

| No | Statement code | r hitung | r table | Information |
|----|----------------|----------|---------|-------------|
| 1  | X1.1           | 0.701    | 0.159   | Valid       |
| 2  | X1.2           | 0.655    | 0.159   | Valid       |
| 3  | X1.3           | 0.752    | 0.159   | Valid       |
| 4  | X1.4           | 0.623    | 0.159   | Valid       |
| 5  | X1.5           | 0.718    | 0.159   | Valid       |
| 6  | X1.6           | 0.731    | 0.159   | Valid       |

Source: Data processed, 2020

Based on the validity test on the incentive variable as shown in table 1 it shows that the entire statement code is declared valid because the calculated r value is greater than the r table value (0.159). Furthermore, reliability testing can be done.
### Table 2. Test Results of work environment Variable Validity (X2)

| No | Statement code | r hitung | r table | Information |
|----|----------------|----------|---------|-------------|
| 1  | X2.1           | 0.569    | 0.159   | Valid       |
| 2  | X2.2           | 0.442    | 0.159   | Valid       |
| 3  | X2.3           | 0.527    | 0.159   | Valid       |
| 4  | X2.4           | 0.578    | 0.159   | Valid       |
| 5  | X2.5           | 0.417    | 0.159   | Valid       |
| 6  | X2.6           | 0.573    | 0.159   | Valid       |
| 7  | X2.7           | 0.520    | 0.159   | Valid       |
| 8  | X2.8           | 0.583    | 0.159   | Valid       |
| 9  | X2.9           | 0.496    | 0.159   | Valid       |
| 10 | X2.10          | 0.472    | 0.159   | Valid       |
| 11 | X2.11          | 0.459    | 0.159   | Valid       |

Source: Data processed, 2020

Table 2 shows the results of the validity test with work environment variables showing that the entire statement code is declared valid because the value of r count is higher than the value of r table 0.159. Furthermore, reliability testing can be done.

### Table 3. Test Results of Job Satisfaction Variable Validity (Y1)

| No | Statement code | r hitung | r table | Information |
|----|----------------|----------|---------|-------------|
| 1  | Y1.1           | 0.664    | 0.159   | Valid       |
| 2  | Y1.2           | 0.758    | 0.159   | Valid       |
| 3  | Y1.3           | 0.703    | 0.159   | Valid       |
| 4  | Y1.4           | 0.707    | 0.159   | Valid       |

Source: Data processed, 2020

Table 3 shows the results of testing based on job satisfaction variables, it looks as if all statement codes are valid. Because the calculated r value is higher than the value of r table 0.159. Furthermore, reliability testing can be done.

### Table 3. Test Results of Performance Variable Validity (Y2)

| No | Statement code | r hitung | r table | Information |
|----|----------------|----------|---------|-------------|
| 1  | Y2.1           | 0.585    | 0.159   | Valid       |
| 2  | Y2.2           | 0.502    | 0.159   | Valid       |
| 3  | Y2.3           | 0.565    | 0.159   | Valid       |
| 4  | Y2.4           | 0.622    | 0.159   | Valid       |
| 5  | Y2.5           | 0.659    | 0.159   | Valid       |
| 6  | Y2.6           | 0.675    | 0.159   | Valid       |
| 7  | Y2.7           | 0.633    | 0.159   | Valid       |
| 8  | Y2.8           | 0.628    | 0.159   | Valid       |

Source: Data processed, 2020
Table 4 shows the test results based on performance variables where all the statement codes obtained are valid. Because the value of \( r \) count is greater than the value of \( r \) table 0.159. Furthermore, reliability testing can be done.

**Reliability Test**

| Variabel          | Number of question | Croanbach’s Alpha | criteria | information |
|-------------------|--------------------|-------------------|----------|-------------|
| Incentive (X1)    | 6                  | 0.788             | > 0.6    | Reliabel    |
| Work environment (X2) | 11              | 0.698             | > 0.6    | Reliabel    |
| Job satisfaction (Y1) | 4                | 0.668             | > 0.6    | Reliabel    |
| performance (Y2)  | 8                  | 0.756             | > 0.6    | Reliabel    |

Source: Data processed, 2020

Table 5 shows the results of the reliability test where the incentives, work environment, job satisfaction and performance variables are stated to be reliable. Because the Cronbach's alpha value is above 0.60.

**DISCUSSION**

The results showed that incentives had a positive and significant effect on job satisfaction, where the significance value was 0.039 < 0.05. This indicates that the factors of financial incentives and non-financial incentives have a positive and significant effect on job satisfaction. These results meant that the higher the level of financial incentives provided by the organization, the higher the level of employee job satisfaction.

The results of this study are supported by research by Mery & Riana, (2017), conducted at PT. Freight Express Indonesia Denpasar Branch requires that financial incentive variables have a positive relationship with job satisfaction.

While the work environment has a positive and significant effect on job satisfaction where the significance value obtained is 0.000 < 0.05. This indicates that with a good work environment such as cool temperatures, good lighting, comfortable atmosphere away from noise, adequate work environment, and a good working relationship between leaders and employees and among fellow employees will increase employee job satisfaction. This result supported with result by Al Katsury, Munir, and Kadir (2019) in their study.

From the results of research that has been done showed that job satisfaction does not have a significant effect on performance where the significance value obtained is 0.057 > 0.05. This indicates that job satisfaction does not significantly affect performance improvement. This departs from the cultural conditions and characteristics of civil servants who assume that what has been obtained so far in the form of salaries and awards is something that is mediocre. So sometimes civil servants tend to work improvised and not optimal.

These findings are not in line with Indrawati's (2013) research, which shows that with the implementation of a good compensation and career system, a conducive work environment, a good relationship between coworkers and superiors will trigger employee job satisfaction.

Incentives have a positive and significant effect on performance, which is shown from the significance value 0.004 < 0.05. This means that an increase in incentives will be followed by a significant increase in employee performance and vice versa. The results of this study
are in line with research by Al-Musadieq et al. (2017), which shows that material and non-material incentives have a significant or significant effect on performance.

The work environment has a positive and significant effect on performance where the significance value obtained is 0.000 < 0.05. The results of this study are in line with the study of Sofyan (2013), which shows that the work environment has a significant influence between the work environment on employee performance in BAPPEDA Regency X.

Job satisfaction is not significant as a mediating variable for incentives on the performance of civil servants. The results of this study are in line with research by Fitriansasari et al. (2013), arguing that incentives affect indirectly on employee performance through job satisfaction. When civil servants are given the appropriate incentives, they will try to improve their performance, so that civil servants will feel job satisfaction and vice versa. When civil servants do not get incentives, their performance will decrease and job satisfaction is not achieved.

According to Naharuddin & Sadegi (2013), a good work environment can reduce the level of boredom at work and will affect the level of employee performance. Previous research conducted Made et al. (2016), explains that the relationship between superiors, subordinates and co-workers have a significant effect on performance. The results of this research are supported by research Takwim (2012), which says that a productive and pleasant work environment will produce a good relationship between superiors, subordinates and colleagues, and mutual respect.

However, the results of this study indicate that job satisfaction as a mediating variable weakens the influence of the work environment on the performance of civil servants. This study is in line with research by Tjio & Anggela (2015), which states that job satisfaction is an intermediate variable that weakens the influence of work environment and employee performance at the "X" Hotel in Surabaya.

**CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

Based on the results and discussion above, it can be concluded that directly the incentives and work environment have a positive and significant effect on job satisfaction and the performance of the Provincial Disperkimtan employees. South Sulawesi. There is no positive and significant effect between incentives on performance through job satisfaction as an intervening variable. While job satisfaction as an intervening variable that mediates between work environment and performance has no positive and significant effect. In this case job satisfaction weakens the influence of the work environment on the performance of civil servants. It is expected that organizations / agencies will further improve the work satisfaction of civil servants so that in work employees are more motivated to work. The high level of job satisfaction of civil servants can improve their performance.
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