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\textbf{ABSTRACT}

\textbf{Purpose:} The aim of this study was to analyse the effect of performance appraisal and work environment towards employee performance mediated by job satisfaction.

\textbf{Design/methodology/approach:} This study was quantitative with used scale measurement which had been exist previously.

\textbf{Findings:} The result of this study showed that performance appraisal has positive and significant effect towards job satisfaction, work environment had positive and significant effect towards job satisfaction, performance appraisal had positive and significant effect towards employee performance either directly and indirectly through partial mediation job satisfaction, work environment did not have effect towards employee performance but indirectly work environment had effect towards employee performance through full mediation job satisfaction, job satisfaction had positive and significant effect towards employee performance.

\textbf{Practical/implication:} Giving contribution to support previous theory and result of study and conviction in management practices related to the behaviour of effect performance appraisal variable and work environment towards job satisfaction and employee performance.

1 INTRODUCTION:

1.1 Research background:

Indonesia is a large country with a population of 255 million people in 2015, who worked as Civil Servants 4.3 million people in 2016. In Bali Province there are 7 (seven) offices which are the Technical Implementation Unit of the Directorate General of Sea Transportation of the Ministry of Transportation with the total number of employees are 421 people.

Achievement of work targets keep on to be encouraged in order employees can fulfill their work targets effectively and efficiently. Based on the data of the Employees of the Technical Implementation Unit Office of the Directorate General of Sea Transportation in Bali Province in 2017 the achievement of work targets reached an average of 55.52% of the 60% achievement target. And the average of work behaviour achievement is 33.29% of the 40% achievement target. Indeed the percentage of these achievements can still be increased again.

The result of preliminary observations indicated that employees felt less satisfied with the process and the results of performance appraisal because performance appraisal was the basis for determining the position and allowance of employees. And complaints regarding work environment often was the reason for employees to work more effectively and efficiently.

1.2 Research gap:

Empirical studies are conducted to see the effect of performance appraisal and work environment to increase satisfaction so that performance also increases. At the stage of empirical study found different results between the effects of performance appraisal towards employee performance. Several studies have shown significant results (Girma, 2016 and Sajuyigbe, 2017); but other studies show insignificant results (Subekti, 2016).

The differences results of empirical studies were also found on the effect of the work environment towards em-
employee performance. Several studies show significant positive (Rahmawanti, 2014), but other studies show insignificant results (Arianto, 2013).

This study adopts job satisfaction as a mediating of the effect of performance appraisal and work environment towards employee performance, after observing the development that happened on the field and the results of previous studies. The results of previous studies that found a positive effect of performance appraisal towards job satisfaction (Subekti, 2016), as well as the effect of work environment towards job satisfaction (Haedar, 2015), including the effect of job satisfaction towards employee performance was found positive and significant (AlAjlouni, 2015).

1.3 Formulation of research problem: The phenomenon and research gap are arranged into a series of problems in this study, namely: Does the performance appraisal and work environment have a significant positive effect towards employee satisfaction and performance, does job satisfaction have a significant positive effect towards employee performance, and does job satisfaction significantly play a role as a mediation between the effect of performance appraisal and work environment towards employee performance.

2 LITERATURE REVIEW:

2.1 Performance appraisal: According to Mangkunegara (2011: 67) states that employee performance appraisal is a process of employee work achievement appraisal that are carried out systematically by company leaders based on the work assigned to him. Meanwhile Rivai and Basri (2004: 18) performance appraisal is a systematic study of the working conditions of employees that are carried out formally which is related with performance standards that have been determined by the company.

In the Republic of Indonesia Government Regulation Number 46 of 2011 concerning Performance Appraisal of Civil Servants, that there are five indicators to measure performance appraisal, namely: objective, measurable, accountable, participatory, and transparent.

2.2 Work environment: According Sutrisno (2009: 118) work environment is the overall work facilities and infrastructure around employees who are doing work that can affect the implementation of work. Meanwhile, according to Nitisemito (2000: 183) states the work environment is everything that exists around the workers who can influence themselves in carrying out the tasks entrusted.

There are seven indicators of the work environment according to Sedarmayanti (2009: 46) include: lighting, air temperature, noise, color usage, space needed, ability to work and employee relations.

2.3 Job satisfaction: According to Handoko (2001: 193) suggested that job satisfaction is a pleasant or unpleasant emotional condition which employees regard their work, it can be seen in the positive attitude of employees towards work and everything that is encountered in the work environment. Meanwhile in simply way, job satisfaction can be concluded as what makes people want and like working because they feel happy in doing their work (Sutanto and Tania, 2013).

There are six indicators of job satisfaction according to Luthans (2006: 244) include: the job itself, wages / salaries, promotion, supervision, co-workers, and working conditions.

2.4 Employee performance: According to Dessler (Kusumawati, 2008) states the performance is a comparison between work achievements, which is the comparison between work results with established standards. According to this definition, performance focuses on the results of its work. According to Siagian (2003: 140) Performance is universal concept which is the operational effectiveness of an organization, parts of the organization, and parts based on standards and criteria that had been determined.

Dempsey et al (Martini, 2018: 69) have detailed of performance indicators, both organizational and individual performance, into several sections in Integrated Performance Measurement Systems and can be done qualitatively, namely: financial, product quality and customer satisfaction, process efficiency), product and process innovation, competitive environment, management efficiency, human resource management and social responsibility.

There are nine indicators of employee performance in the Government Regulation of the Republic of Indonesia Number 46 of 2011 concerning Performance Appraisal of Civil Servants include: quantity, quality, time, cost, service orientation, integrity, commitment, discipline, cooperation and leadership. For leadership aspect that is considered only the leaders in the work unit that is assessed by echelon officials above him. For employees the leadership aspect is not assessed.

3 HYPOTHESES:

3.1 The effect of performance assessment towards job satisfaction: Saleem’s research result (2015) shows that there is a positive and appropriate relationship between the organization’s performance appraisal system and employee job satisfaction. Karimi (2011) states the results of her research that there is a positive and significant relationship between employee performance appraisal systems and employee satisfaction. Bowra (2014) states that fairness in performance appraisal has a positive effect on job satisfaction. Based on these descriptions it can be stated the hypothesis in this study as follows:

H1: Performance appraisal has a positive and significant effect towards job satisfaction.
3.2 The effect of work environment towards job satisfaction:
The research that was conducted by Raziq (2015) concluded that the work environment has a positive effect towards employee job satisfaction. Agbozo (2017) concluded from the results of his research that the work environment has a significant effect on employee satisfaction. Wibowo (2014) states that the physical work environment and non-physical work environment simultaneously have a significant effect towards employee job satisfaction. And non-physical work environment has a positive and significant effect on employee job satisfaction. Based on these descriptions it can be stated the hypothesis in this study as follows:

H2: The work environment has a positive and significant effect towards job satisfaction.

3.3 The effect of performance appraisal towards employee performance:
Girma (2016) in her research results reveal that there is a positive and significant relationship between work appraisal and employee performance. Shaharyar (2014) states that fair performance evaluations and appropriate training motivate employees that develop in performance improvement and reach organizational competitiveness. Sajuyigbe’s research results (2017) reveal that the performance appraisal system has a significant effect towards employee performance. Based on these descriptions it can be stated the hypothesis in this study as follows:

H3: Performance appraisal has a positive and significant effect on employee performance.

3.4 The effect of work environment towards employee performance:
The research that was conducted by Rahmawanti (2014) showed that the majority of respondents approve the physical work environment and non-physical work environment in the company has been good so that employee performance has improved. Moulana (2017) conclude his research that the work environment has a positive and significant effect towards employee performance. Jayaweera (2015) states work performance is strongly affected by the work environment. Based on these descriptions it can be stated the hypothesis in this study as follows:

H4: The work environment has a positive and significant effect towards employee performance.

3.5 The effect of job satisfaction towards employee performance:
The conclusion from Inuwa’s research (2016) that there is a positive and significant relationship between job satisfaction on employee performance of the University’s non-academic staff. Febriyana (2015) reveals the results of his research that job satisfaction towards the employee performance of PT. Kabepa Chakra has a positive and significant relationship. The result of Indrawait’s research (2013) states job satisfaction has a significant positive effect towards employee performance. Based on these descriptions it can be stated the hypothesis in this study as follows:

H5: Job satisfaction has a positive and significant effect towards employee performance.

4 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY:
This research used quantitative method research design to examine the models and instruments that previously have been developed by researchers through inferential statistics using Structural Equation Modeling (SEM), with the Partial Least Square (PLS) approach.

4.1 Variables and measures:
There are four variables which is involved in this study, namely; the indicators of performance appraisal were developed from the Government Regulation of the Republic of Indonesia Number 46 of 2011 concerning Performance Appraisal of Civil Servants, the indicators work environment were developed from Sedarmayanti (2009: 46), the indicators of job satisfaction were adopted from Sedarmayanti (2009: 46), the indicators of job satisfaction were adopted from Luthans (2006: 244) and indicators employee performance was adopted of Government Regulation of the Republic of Indonesia Number 46 of 2011 concerning Performance Appraisal of Civil Servants. The indicators of each construct have been empirically tested. All items as research instruments use five (5) Likert scale points ranging from "strongly disagree (1)" to "strongly agree (5)."

4.2 Construct validity and reliability:
The validity and reliability test was done by involving 30 respondents. This test was done by finding the significant correlation and Cronbach Alpha of each dimension and construct. The indicators is valid if each r value > 0.30 and the significance value of the correlation is < 95% or a = 0.05. The construct is declared reliable if it has a Cronbach Alpha value > 0.60. Table 1 explains the validity values of all indicators > 0.30 and Cronbach Alpha for each construct and the dimensions shows values above 0.6.

4.3 Population and Sample:
Population in this research amount to 421 people. Determination of sample’s numbers in this research using Slovin’s so that the amount was representative. From the calculation was obtained the number of sample was 80 people. Proportional random sampling method was used in order to make all offices can be represented in this

5 DATA ANALYSIS:
The usage of loading 0.5 to 0.6 in this research is considered sufficient, because it is the initial stage of developing
**Table 1. The Result of Validity Test and Reliability of Research Instrument**

| Variable               | Indicator                          | Corrected Item-Total Correlation | Cronbach Alpha |
|------------------------|------------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------|
| Performance Appraisal  | Objective (X1.1)                   | 0.773                            |                |
|                        | Performance Measured (X1.2)        | 0.718                            |                |
|                        | Accountable (X1.3)                 | 0.815                            | 0.850          |
|                        | Participatory (X1.4)               | 0.712                            |                |
|                        | Transparent (X1.5)                 | 0.577                            |                |
|                        | Lighting (X2.1)                    | 0.724                            |                |
| Work Environment (X2)  | Air temperature (X2.2)             | 0.819                            |                |
|                        | Noise (X2.3)                       | 0.817                            |                |
|                        | Color usage (X2.4)                 | 0.814                            | 0.917          |
|                        | Space needed (X2.5)                | 0.541                            |                |
|                        | Ability to work (X2.6)             | 0.755                            |                |
|                        | Employee relations (X2.7)           | 0.786                            |                |
|                        | The work itself (Y1.1)             | 0.859                            |                |
| Job Satisfaction (Y1)  | Wages or salaries (Y1.2)           | 0.869                            | 0.927          |
|                        | Promotion (Y1.3)                   | 0.808                            |                |
|                        | Supervision (Y1.4)                 | 0.737                            |                |
|                        | Co-workers (Y1.5)                  | 0.711                            |                |
|                        | Working Conditions (Y1.6)          | 0.802                            |                |
|                        | Quantity (Y2.1)                    | 0.675                            |                |
|                        | Quality (Y2.2)                     | 0.866                            |                |
|                        | Time (Y2.3)                        | 0.841                            |                |
|                        | Cost (Y2.4)                        | 0.559                            |                |
|                        | Service orientation (Y2.5)         | 0.794                            | 0.934          |
|                        | Integrity (Y2.6)                   | 0.773                            |                |
|                        | Commitment (Y2.7)                  | 0.809                            |                |
|                        | Discipline (Y2.8)                  | 0.804                            |                |
|                        | Cooperation (Y2.9)                 | 0.890                            |                |

Table 2. Average Variant Extracted (AVE)

| Variable               | AVE     |
|------------------------|---------|
| Performance Appraisal  | 0.552   |
| Work Environment (X2)  | 0.535   |
| Job Satisfaction (Y1)  | 0.627   |
| Employee Performance (Y2) | 0.635 |

Table 3 shows Composite reliability can be said to be good if it has a value above 0.70. Composite reliability value was obtained in this research is above 0.70 thus it is in convenient with the criteria.

Analysis of the coefficient of determination (R2) is a measure of accuracy for model predictions. Both the two exogenous compensation variables and the work environment show the moderate of R Square criterion value.

The result of inner model evaluation based on Q-Square predictive relevance are obtained of 0.8575 or 85.75%. This value can be interpreted that the information which contained in the data is 85.75% can be explained by the model, while the remaining 14.25% is explained by errors and other variables which is not contained in this research. The quantity Q2 has a value in the range 0 <Q2 <1, where the closer to 1 means the better the model is.

**6 RESULTS:**

**6.1 Hypothesis Test:**

Table 4 below shows the results of the hypothesis test that mentioned 4 (four) hypotheses were accepted and 1 (one) hypothesis was rejected. Where all accepted hypotheses have t-statistics > t-tables (1.96) and rejected hypothesis have t-statistics < t-tables (1.96). The results of this hypothesis test inform the support for H1 that performance appraisal has a positive and significant effect towards job satisfaction. The work environment positively and significantly affects toward job satisfaction thus H2 is accepted. Performance appraisal is found positively and significantly affects toward employee performance thus H3 is accepted.
The work environment has no effect towards employee performance thus H4 is rejected. The last hypothesis, H5 is accepted, it shows job satisfaction positively and significantly affects employee performance. Figure 1

6.2 The Role of Mediation:
The method of testing mediation variables in this research is guided by the method of Hair et al. (2010) namely: (a) Examine the direct effect of independent variables on the dependent variable to the model by involving mediation variable, (b) Examine the effect of independent variables on the dependent variable to the model without involving mediation variable, (c) Examine the effect of independent variables on mediation variable, (d) Examine the effect of mediation variable on the dependent variable.

In the presentation of Table 5, job satisfaction is able to mediate positively and significantly on the indirect effect of performance appraisal towards employee performance and play a role as partial mediation. These results are shown from the mediation testing which is carried out, look at the effects of C, D and A have significant values. Job satisfaction is able to mediate positively and significantly on the indirect effect of work environment towards employee performance and play a role as full mediation. These results are shown from the mediation testing which is conducted look at the effects of C, D has a significant value and A has a value that is not significant.

7 DISCUSSION:
The testing of all hypotheses has been through the results of empirical studies that have been done previously. Performance appraisal is proven having a positive and significant effect towards job satisfaction supporting previous findings made by Saleem (2015) and Bowra (2014). The results of this research also support the findings of Haedar (2015) and Wibowo (2014) which show the work environment has a significant direct effect towards job satisfaction. Performance appraisal is proven having a positive and significant effect towards employee performance supporting the findings of Sajuyigbe (2017) and Girma (2016). The work environment has no effect towards employee performance, in line with findings from Arianto (2015) and Lankeshwara (2016). The work environment has no effect towards employee performance because on average 65% of the total number of employees in each office are employees who work outdoors and rarely work indoors, indicators on work environment variables such as lighting, air temperature, noise, colour usage, the space needed, the ability to work and employee relations have fulfilled the minimum standards and have been applied in the work environment that required by employees and the main task from the manager which is carried by each employee must be carried out and completed with full responsibility in any situation. As well as the results of this research also support the findings of Inuwa (2016) and Febriyana (2015) which state that job satisfaction has a significant positive effect towards employee performance.

8 CONCLUSION:
8.1 Managerial and research implications:
The organization should optimize the achievement of employee performance and job satisfaction by paying more attention and improving performance appraisal and work environment to a better way. Enhancement performance appraisal can directly improve employee performance. And job satisfaction variable can be a mediation for performance appraisal and work environment in improving employee performance

8.2 Limitations and future lines of research:
Limitation that can be conveyed from this research is based on access of time which is cross-sectional. This limitation certainly impacts the low level of research generalization, considering the problems which is faced by employees are relatively complex and dynamic all the time. For the future researchers can replicate this research model through the longitudinal approach model (from time to time) and enable to be used in other institutes by adding and developing indicators and other variables. Figures 2 and 3
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Table 4. The Result of Direct Effect

| Variable | Original Sample (O) | T Statistics (|O/STDEV|) | P Values | Information |
|----------|---------------------|-----------------------------|----------|-------------|
| Performance Appraisal (X1) -> Job Satisfaction (Y1) | 0.349 | 3.662 | 0.000 | Significant |
| Performance Appraisal (X1) -> Employee performance (Y2) | 0.429 | 5.004 | 0.000 | Significant |
| Work Environment (X2) -> Job Satisfaction (Y1) | 0.505 | 5.692 | 0.000 | Significant |
| Work Environment (X2) -> Employee Performance (Y2) | 0.142 | 1.163 | 0.245 | No Effect |
| Job Satisfaction (Y1) -> Employee Performance (Y2) | 0.349 | 2.835 | 0.005 | Significant |

Table 5. Recapitulation of The Mediation Variable Testing Result

| Mediation of Job Satisfaction Variables (Y1) | Effect | A | C | D | Mediated |
|---------------------------------------------|--------|---|---|---|----------|
| Performance Appraisal (X1) -> Employee Performance (Y2) | 0.429 (sig) | 0.541 (sig) | 0.349 (sig) | 0.349 (sig) | Partial Mediated |
| Work Environment (X2) -> Employee Performance (Y2) | 0.142 (no sig) | 0.333 (sig) | 0.505 (sig) | 0.349 (sig) | Full Mediated |

Note: Significant (Sig) = T-statistic > 1.96 on α: 5%

Figure 2. Outer Model
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