

Work Environment and Organizational Learning Towards Employee Performance: The Mediating Role of Organizational Commitment

¹La Hatani, ²Muh. Hikbal Bulang, ¹Rahmat Madjid, ¹Murdjani Kamaluddin,

¹Nursaban Rommy, ¹A.S Aidin Hudani, ¹La Ode Kalimin and ¹Zaludin

¹Department of Management, Faculty of Economics and Business

²Department of Management Science, Halu Oleo University, Kendari Indonesia

Abstract: The purpose main of this study was to examined and explain the strength of influence between work environment and organizational learning on organizational commitment and employee performance. Further, the current study empirically investigated and examined the mediating role of organizational commitment in Agriculture Department of Muna Regency, Southeast Sulawesi Province of Indonesia. Design in the study used the quantitative approach is based on review of literature and previous studies findings. The data collecting the study employed a survey method conducted in cross-section using the instrument in the form of a questionnaire. The method of sampling is stratified proportional random sampling using the formula Solvin, the obtained sample 60 people. The data were statistically analyzed and interpretations made with Partial Least Square (PLS) path modeling approach. Results from this study shows that that work environment has a positive and significant influence on organizational commitment but on the employee's performance has not significant effect. The elevated organizational learning positively and significantly contributes to the enhanced organizational commitment and employee performance. Further, the organizational commitment positively and significantly contribute to the enhanced employee performance. The influence between work environment and employees performance should be interpreted with consideration of the employee's commitment to their organization. This shows the crucial role of organizational commitment, not only as a predictor variable but also as a mediator variable which provides a meaningful impact on the influence among other organizational factors. Thus, the role of mediation of organizational commitment in the research model can be said as complete mediation. Last, the results were found that organizational learning is significantly mediated with organizational commitment, showing a strong prediction on employee's performance, therefore, the mediating nature of the influence of organizational learning on employee performance through organizational commitment is partial mediation.

Key words: Work environment, organizational learning, organizational commitment, employee performance, mediating nature, partial mediation

INTRODUCTION

Implementation governments in Indonesia there have been changes, especially, for government agencies at the central level to the regions. This condition is reflected in the determination of government administration more autonomous regions and centralization, rather than with the old paradigm that everything is centralized and under the direct control of the central government. HRM development patterns that were previously government officials nationally integrated turn toward coaching separately with the return of the rights of regional autonomy. That pattern in turn has implications for the HRM strategy changes, work environment, learning,

organizational commitment and performance of employees between the central government and local governments.

HRM issues in the apparatus of government in Indonesia are still in the spotlight. This condition can be observed from the many responses from the public on the performance of government officials who have demonstrated high performance and unprofessional in their duties lead to low public confidence in the performance of government officials. The fact is reflected in the many irregularities that occurred in the bureaucracy that was allegedly caused by the poor performance of HRM in the government agencies. Another problem that greatly interferes with the performance of the government

bureaucracy is a condition of inadequate work environment, organizational learning process that is less structured and the low organizational commitment.

HRM is a critical asset an organization that not only included in the organization's philosophy but also in the strategic planning process. A change in strategy will determine the direction of each function of the organization including the function's strategy HRM. Today more and realized changes in the work environment have an impact on the organization. Work environment is a key factor affecting organizational commitment and employee performance (Garry, 2009). The successes of public organizations are determined ability to design work environments in order to increase the commitment that can ultimately lead to the achievement of the performance. According, Robbins (2010) stated that work environment is outside forces that potentially affect the performance of the organization.

Much previous research has proved that the work environment has a positive and significant influence on organizational commitment and employee performance. Although, earlier empirical research examined the influence between work environments on organizational commitment, the findings are inconsistent. Some studies found a positive and significant influence (Vanaki and Vagharseyyedin, 2009; Ramay 2012; Khuong and Vu, 2014; Pitaloka and Sofia, 2014; Ghoniyah and Masurip, 2015; Hanaysha, 2016) while others have not a significant influence (Suroso, 2016; Srieati, 2016). Furthermore, the results of research (Ajayi *et al.*, 2011, Malik *et al.*, 2011; Aragon *et al.*, 2014, Sunwondo and Sutanto, 2015; Ghoniyah and Masurip, 2015; Srieati, 2016) found that the work environment had a positive effect and significant on employee performance. There is a contradiction in the research findings by Munandar (2015)'s, Suroso (2016) and Gustiatun (2015) found the work environment not significant effect on employee performance, Purwanto (2015) while others have noted a significant negative influence. Therefore, contradictions previous research findings is blamed for the research and re-testing.

Improving the performance of employees is also supported by a good organizational learning. Research result which has proved organizational learning has a positive and significant influence on organizational commitment (Rose *et al.*, 2011, Usefi *et al.*, 2013, Salarian *et al.*, 2015; Hanaysha, 2016). Hsu (2009) shows the creating and encouraging organizational learning is the basic mechanism to increase organizational commitment. Furthermore, Rose *et al.* (2011); Winarno *et al.* (2012) and Aragon *et al.* (2014) found that organizational learning has a positive and significant

influence on employee performance. The findings of previous studies are research gap by Gomes and Wojahn (2016) find organizational learning not significant effect on employee performance. However, Kitapci and Celik (2014) while others have noted a significant negative influence the organizational learning on employee performance. This study was also conducted to examine the influence between organizational commitment variable on employee performance. Results research by Almutairi, 2016; Ramsukun *et al.*, 2011; Cuyper and Witt, 2011; Harris, 2015; Ghoniyah and Masurip, 2015) finds organizational commitment and significant positive effect on employee performance. However, research by Harwiki (2016) found that organizational commitment not significant influence of on employee performance.

Further, this research has also included the study empirically investigated and examined the mediating role of organizational commitment. It is therefore this study also employs contingency theory (Thompson, 1967) and Knowledge Based View (KBV) by Grant (1996) which states that if the organization wants to have high performance, it is very important to master the management of knowledge in which there is organizational learning. The results of previous research by Ghoniyah and Masurip (2015), Gustiatun (2015) and Srieati (2016) found organizational commitment to act as mediating the influence of work environment on employee performance. Then, Rose *et al.* (2011) finds organizational commitment as mediating influence of organizational learning with employee performance. However, Suroso (2016) found that organizational commitment cannot act as mediating influence between work environment and employee performance. The discovery gap is still debatable both theoretically and empirically, so that, earlier researchers suggested re-testing both universally and contingently by Rose *et al.* (2011), Suroso (2016) and Srieati (2016).

Based on the theoretical review and the results of previous research the influence between the variables studied in this study has largely proved that the work environment, organizational learning and organizational commitment can improve employee performance. But the empirical from some researchers are still going on contradictory both as universal and contingency perspective. Therefore, researchers are interested in testing back and get clear of the relationship between these variables is integrated. Thus, the key issues from this study whether the work environment and organizational learning affect the employee performance, both directly and the mediation of organizational commitment. The following specifically research question in this study are:

- Does the work environment and organizational learning have influence on organizational commitment and employee performance?
- Does organizational commitment have influence on employee performance?
- Does organizational commitment play a role as mediating the influence of work environment and organizational learning on employee performance?

Finally, the purpose of this study is to examine the structural influence exploratory the work environment and organizational learning on organizational commitment and employee performance. Further, the purpose of this study was to the empirically investigated and examined the mediating role of organizational commitment. Research is expected to contribute to the development of the theory of HRM and organizational behavior. Furthermore, could be obtained integrated concept both as universal and contingency influence work environment, organizational learning and organizational commitment on employee performance. In particular, the management at the Department of Agriculture Muna Regency can formulate strategies in the management of employees, policies and programs to improve work environment conditions, organizational learning, organizational commitment and employee performance.

Literature review: Based on the theoretical review which became a reference in testing and measuring the relationship between variable in this study refers to the basic theory of HRM and organizational behavior. According, Mathis and Jackson (2011) stated that HRM deals with the formal design system of the organization to determine the effectiveness and efficiency of employee talents to realize organizational goals. Similarly, Robbins (2010) argued that HRM as part of a management study that focuses on how to recruit, hire, train, motivate and retain employees. Also by Garry (2009) describes that HRM is the process of obtaining, training, assessing, compensating employees, paying attention to work relations, health, security and justice issues. Furthermore, organizational behavior is the study of human behavior in organizational settings, from the relationship between human and organizational behavior and of the organization itself (Ricky and Gregory, 2014). As stated, Stephen and Timothy (2015) specifically focused on how organizational behavior improve productivity, decrease absenteeism, turnover and deviant behavior in the workplace, job satisfaction and employee performance.

Work environment: Work environment is the study of human interaction with nature from time to time ranging widely known, since, the 1960 and 1970's. Work

environment is a key factor affecting employee commitment and performance. Work environment refers to the atmosphere of an organization where employees do their research. The work environment includes research relationship formed between fellow employees and research relationships between subordinates and superiors as well as the physical environment where employees work John and Robinson (2009). The work environment is related to the organizational climate in which employees perform their duties (Danish *et al.*, 2013). Similarly, Render and Heizer (2010) and Giffords (2009) argued that work environment is a key factor that has the contributors to increase organizational commitment and employee's performance.

Robbins (2010) suggested the work environments are forces beyond that could potentially affect the performance of the organization and (Sofyandi, 2008) a series of factors that affect performance. Khuong and Vu (2014) suggest that employees who are comfortable with the work environment tend to work more effectively and enjoy the research process than uncomfortable employees. Based on the above argument, it can be concluded that the work environment is a condition around the workplace that affects employees perform activities both physically and non-physically. Last, the organization's success is largely determined design capabilities in order to improve the work environment and work motivation commitment that can ultimately lead to the achievement of the performance and the results were favorable.

Previous research has proven that the majority of the work environment has a positive and significant influence on organizational commitment (Vanaki and Vagharseyyedin, 2009; Ramay, 2012; Khuong and Vu, 2014; Pitaloka and Sofia 2014; Suwondo and Sutanto, 2015; Ghoniyah and Masurip, 2015; Hanaysha, 2016). But, there is a gap of research the work environment not significant effect on organizational commitment by Suroso (2016) and Srieati (2016). Further, findings of the study that of the environmental work positive and significant effect on employee performance (Ajayi *et al.* 2011, Malik *et al.*, 2011; Aragon *et al.*, 2014; Suwondo and Sutanto, 2015; Ghoniyah and Masurip, 2015; Srieati, 2016). There is a contradiction of the findings of research by Munandar (2015), Suroso (2016) and Gustiatun (2015) found the work environment not significant effect on employee performance. Purwanto (2015) found the work environment a significant negative effect on employee performance. Based on the contradictions of previous research findings, it is a blemish to conduct research and re-testing. All of reviews arguments theoretical and empirical lead to following first and second hypothesis:

- H₁: work environment has a significant effect on organizational commitment
- H₂: work environment has a significant influence on employee performance

Organizational learning: The concept of organizational learning began widely known in the 1970s, introduced by Argyros and Schon. Although, widely known after Senge (2006). Therefore, kraft of organizational learning can defined as the ability of an organization to continuously perform the self learning, so that, the organization has a 'speed of thinking and acting' in responding to various changes that arise. According, Senge (2006) "organizations where people continually expand their capacity to create the results they truly desire where new and expansive patterns of thinking are nurtured where the collective aspiration is set free and where people are continually learning to see the whole together". Learning organization is a process of acquiring knowledge of individuals and groups who are willing to apply it to work and make decisions (Khandekar and Sharma, 2006).

Learning organization as a membership organization to create, acquire, interpret, transfer and sharing of knowledge which is aimed at modifying its behavior Garvin (2000). According, Hoe and McShane (2010) describes that learning organizations strengthen the capability of the organization to promote and implement the necessary knowledge to adapt to external environmental conditions. Organizational learning is a competitive advantage for the achievement of organizational performance Mehrabi *et al.* (2013) and Usefi *et al.* (2013) states that poor organizational learning may decrease organizational performance, subsequent organizational management inefficiency and effectiveness. Similarly, Salarian *et al.* (2015) argued that organizational learning is a set of organizational activities that include: knowledge acquisition, information sharing, interpreting information and realizing a positive influence on organizational culture. Increased employee performance and high commitment also does not axles of a learning organization. Robbins (2008) and Jackson *et al.* (2009) that organizational learning is a core competency, so, it is seen as a process of reconstructing knowledge in order to create and enhance the commitment and organizational performance. From the argument theoretical set forth above, we can conclude that learning organizations continuously and planned facilitate its members to be able to constantly evolve and transform themselves both collectively and individually in order to achieve better results and in accorandce with the perceived needs of joint organizations and individuals in it.

The results previous studies that have proven organizational learning have positive and significant impact on organizational commitment (Rose *et al.*, 2011; Usefi *et al.*, 2013; Salarian *et al.*, 2015; Hanaysha, 2016). Similarly, Hsu (2009) stated that creating and encouraging organizational learning is the basic mechanism for increasing organizational commitment. Furthermore, the results of research (Rose *et al.*, 2011; Winarno *et al.*, 2012; Aragon *et al.*, 2014) found that learning organizations have positive and significant influence on employee performance. The findings of previous studies are research gap by Gomes and Wojahn (2017) find learning organization not significant influence on employee performance. Kitapci and Celik (2014) found that organizational learning has a negative and not significant influence on employee performance. Accordingly, from all of the above theoretical arguments and empirical, we can expect the following hypothesis:

- H₃: organizational learning has significant effect on organizational commitment
- H₄: organizational learning has significant effect on employee performance

Organizational commitment and employee performance:

Organizational commitment is the relative strength of the introduction of someone involvement of individuals within the organization. Building commitment is very important for all organizations as employees are a major source of success and organizational performance. Commitment of the organization is a key factor in determining the competitiveness of the organization, increasing motivation, engagement and employee performance. Organizational commitment also has a strong relationship with the employee's behavior and performance. As stated by Robbins (2010) if people participate in goal setting they are more likely to accept even a difficult goal than if they are arbitrarily assigned it by their boss. The reason is that individuals are more committed to chaises in which they have a part. According, Meyer and Allen (1991) conceptualized a model of organizational commitment and identified three components: "Affective commitment, involves the employee's emotional attachment to identification with and involvement in organization. Continuance commitment, involves commitment based on the costs that the employees associates with leaving organization. This may be because of the loss of seniority for promotion or benefits. Normative commitment, involves employees feelings of obligation to stay with the organization because they should it is the right thing to do.

It was said by Luthans (2003) organizational commitment is the relative strength of an individual's identification with and involvement in a particular organization. Also, Robbins (2010) commitment is defined as a state in which an employee identifies with a particular organization and its goals and wishes to maintain membership. Mercurio (2015) "affective commitment was found to be an enduring, demonstrably indispensable and central characteristic of organizational commitment". Commitment is defined conviction employees to accept organizational goals as well as the desire to live together in such organizations by Mathis and Jackson (2006). As stated by LePine and Wesson (2009) organizational commitment as the desire of employees to be a part or member of the organization and Dey (2012) commitment of the organization is the level of engagement of individuals in the organization research. Also, Kreitner and Kinicki (2008), commitment of the organization reflects the extent to which an individual identifies the organization and its goals. The results of the literature search by the researchers to conclude that organizational commitment is love and loyalty, a concept further formation of employee loyalty, an emotional bond was very strong and tightly from individuals in identical active role to always sided with the objectives and values of the organization seeks performance goals-organizational goals that lead to the similarity of existing values to the results that are believed, dynamic and become a pre-requisite for the establishment of the credibility of the organization.

Furthermore, employee performance is an expression of intervention skills, proficiency and expertise in order to increase productivity by Silalahi (2004). Performance Appraisal is the process of evaluating how well the employee doing his job compared to standard, then communicating with employees by Mathis and Jackson (2006). As such, employee performance can be interpreted as a picture of the level of achievement of the implementation of the activities, programs or policies in realizing the goals, objectives, mission and vision of the organization as stated in the strategic plan of the organization. Also, Prabu (2009) the employee's performance is the result of the quality and quantity of research accomplished by an employee in carrying out their duties in accordance responsibilities given. Performance is the ability of employees to complete their obligations in accordance with the time and plan or as expected. Abdullah (2014) states that the employee's performance is the result of the work accomplished by the individual based on the job requirements the performance of a real and measurable. Based on the above opinion can

be concluded that the performance of employees is the results achieved universal employee who is the operational effectiveness of the organization, part of the organization and its employees, based on the standards and criteria established.

Based on theoretically by Robbins (2010) and Armstrong (2003) argued that there is a strong relationship between organizational commitments to employee performance. An important key to getting employees commitment is to help employees actualize themselves to achieve performance (Garry, 2009). The results show that organizational commitment has a significant effect on employee performance (Cuyper and Witte, 2011; Ramasukun *et al.*, 2015; Kristanto, 2015; Ghoniyah and Masurip, 2015; Almutairi, 2016). But, there is the results gap by Ellinger *et al.* (2013) and Anto Triyono that organizational commitment have a negative effect and insignificant on employee performance. In addition, Harwiki (2016) found that there was not significant relationship between organizational commitment and employee performance. Based on those theories and research findings, the hypothesis proposed:

- H₂: organizational commitment has a significant influence on employee performance

Mediation role of organizational commitment: The approach in investigated and examined the organizational commitment mediation approach KBV. According, Grant (1996) argued that the KBV approach states that if an organization wants to have high performance, it is essential to master the management of knowledge in which there is organizational learning. Therefore, in testing the mediating role of organizational commitment refers to the contingency theory (Thompson, 1967). The previous study (Ghoniyah and Masurip, 2015; Gustiatun, 2015; Srieati, 2016) found that organizational commitment acts as a mediating influence of the work environment on employee performance. Rose *et al.* (2011) finds organizational commitment as mediating influence of organizational learning with employee performance. However, Suroso (2016) find commitment of an organization cannot act as a mediating influence of the work environment with employee performance. Gaps findings of these studies is still being debated both theoretically and empirically, so that, the previous researchers suggest that testing back both as universal and contingency by (Rose *et al.*, 2011; Ghoniyah and Masurip, 2015; Srieati, 2016). Based on the review of the literature as described above, we propose to test the following two related hypothesis:




Fig. 1: Conceptual framework and hypothesis research

- H₆: the mediating role of organizational commitment has a significant influence between work environment and employee performance
- H₇: the mediating role of organizational commitment has a significant influence between organizational learning and employee performance

Based on the theoretical study and gap results of previous studies, this study was designed using four variables: the work environment, organizational learning, organizational commitment and employee performance. On the basis of the testing of four constructions that researchers are trying to develop a conceptual framework of this study, presented in Fig. 1.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

This study is an exploratory study based on hypothesis testing to explain the influence work environment and organizational learning on organizational commitment and employee performance in Agriculture Department of Muna Regency, Southeast Sulawesi Province of Indonesia. In the study, used the quantitative approach is based on review of literature and previous studies findings. Therefore, the design of this study is an explanatory intended to provide an explanation of causal

relationships between variables through hypothesis testing or aims to obtain appropriate testing in drawing conclusions that are causal between variables and subsequently choosing an alternative action (Cooper and Schindler, 2006). This study adapted an instrument from theories and prior studies, so, based on review of literature and prior studies a questionnaire was developed for data collection and to get response from employee. Furthermore, seen from the time aspect of data collection, this research uses cross section design where data is only once collected (Uma, 2006) that is research activity done at a certain time to explain condition of respondent.

Population and sample: The population of this study is all employees in Agriculture Department of Muna Regency, Southeast Sulawesi Province of as many 147 people. Distribution of based office employees as follows: head = 1 people, secretary office = 1 people, head of field = 3 people; Head of section/Sub division = 14 people and staff = 128 people (Head of Human Resources in Agriculture Department of Muna Regency, 2016). The sample size of this study was determined by using the formula Slovin (Uma, 2006) as follows:

$$n = \frac{N}{1 + N(e)^2} = \frac{147}{1 + 147(0.10)^2} = 59.51 \text{ or } 60 \text{ people}$$

Where:

n = Sample size

N = Population size

e = Percentage of inaccuracy tolerance due to sampling error (0.01 or 10%)

The sampling technique is stratified proportional random sampling, the first classifying the population into sub-populations according to the position/part. At the level of precision of 10% of the total population of 147 employees that the quantity of sample of 60 people. Furthermore, collecting the data this study used a survey method. Questionnaire created are closed that inquiries are made such that the respondents are limited in giving an answer to some of the alternatives only or to one answer. Questionnaire conducted with employee's and explain the questionnaire and waiting when the lift can be taken back. Further interviews will also be conducted in order to complete supporting information needed. Interview do by contacting some of the respondents were considered to have a good knowledge and ability to provide an explanation for this research.

Data analysis: In this study, the data were analyzed using Partial Least Square (PLS) with the aid of the SmartPLS software. According, Hair *et al.* (2017) the integrated these definitions of PLS is a variance based Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) method and PLS is a powerful analytical method because it can be applied to any data scale does not require many assumptions and the sample size does not have to be large. Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modeling (PLS-SEM) was used in this study for two reasons are: the main focus of this study was the prediction of endogenous variables employee performance and the incremental character in this research, i.e., organizational commitment as a mediating between work environment and organizational learning with employee performance. Figure 1 used in order to evaluate the hypothesized in this study. Furthermore, PLS-SEM method has advantages because it integrates various statistical processes for parameter assessment and hypothesis testing simultaneously (Henseler *et al.*, 2016) and allows researchers to test or modify theories and models (Hair *et al.*, 2017).

PLS-SEM allows researchers to assess the casual relationship between indicators and the relationship between latent constructs. Variants of endogenous latent construction are maximized by PLS-SEM (Hair *et al.*, 2017). PLS path modeling, a variance-based SEM was used to analyze the data and PLS path-modeling algorithm analysis is conducted to validate the relationships between the constructs. Therefore, Hair *et al.* (2017)

describe this feature makes PLS-SEM particularly useful for exploratory research purposes and PLS-SEM is employed in the study because of its relaxed distributional assumptions, ability to use smaller sample size (while still achieving high levels of statistical predictive power) and also because of its ability to formatively measure constructs. SmartPLS Software is used for current research to measure PLS-SEM analysis (Ringle *et al.*, 2014). Thus, the in this study SmartPLS Version 3.0 was utilized for analyzing the data collected and can test the hypothesized model.

Operational variables and measurements: Based on theoretical review and previous research results, the following describes the operational definitions and measurements from each of the variables to be studied in this study, namely.

Work Environment (WE): which is defined in this study are the social environment conditions psychological and physical at the Department of Agriculture of Muna Regency which affects employees in performing their duties. Therefore, the measurement of work environment variables in this study consisted of 6 indicators and 16 items, namely: four indicators of physical work environment and two indicators of non-physical work environment, adopted from Alex (2004), Siagian (2008), Sedarmayanti (2010) and Robbins (2010) which is adapted to the conditions in the field, namely: Physical work environment are WE1: Temperatures in the Workplace, WE2: Spatial at Work, WE3: Circulation of water in the Workplace and WE4: Lighting at Work. Non-physical work environment, namely; WE5: Relationship with peers and WE6: Relationship with leaders.

Measurement work environment indicators both physical and non-physical is adopted from result of previous research by Suwondo and Sutanto (2015), Ghoniyah and Masurip (2015) and Hanaysha (2016). Furthermore, the work environment indicators variable is measured using Likert scale. The scale range used is 1-5, scale with "1" indicating "strongly disagree" and "5" indicating "strongly agree" (Cooper and Schindler, 2006).

Organizational Learning (OL): Is employee's knowledge and skills in organizational to create, acquire, interpret, transfer and share knowledge, aiming to modify the behavior of its members to develop new knowledge and insights. The organizational learning theory in this study was adopted from Senge (2006) developed by Watkins and Marsick (1993); Luthans (2003); Levitt and March (1988); Garvin (2000); Khandekar and Sharma, 2006); Robbins (2010). Thus, the measurement of organizational

learning consists of six indicators, namely: OL1; System thinking, OL2; The mental model, OL3; Personal skills, OL4; Teamwork, OL5; Building a shared vision adopted from Peter (1990) and Marquardt (2002) measurements that add OL6: Dialogue/discussion. Furthermore, the measurement of organizational learning variables is also adopted from research Winarno *et al.* (2012); Kitapci and Celix (2014); Aragon *et al.* (2014); Gomes and Wojahn (2017) and Hanaysha (2016). The indicators for each variable organizational learning were generated through a comprehensive literature review, that represented by 6 indicators and 12 items, using a five-point Likert scale with “1” indicating “strongly disagree” and “5” indicating “strongly agree” adopted from Naresh (2010).

Organizational Commitment (OC): The relative strength of the employee in identifying himself or herself in the organization or feeling strongly to be part of the organization. Then the nature of an individual's relationship with the organization that allows to remain part of the organization, willingness to strive for the interests of the organization, trust and acceptance of the values of organizational goals. Organizational commitment measurement in this study namely: OC1; Affective commitment, OC2; Continuous commitment and OC3; Normative commitment adopted from organizational commitment theory by Mowday *et al.* (1982), Meyer and Allen (1991); Luthans (2003); Robbins (2010) and Lepine and Wessen (2009) research results Kristanto (2015); Ghoniyah and Masurip (2015), Harwiki (2016), Almutairi (2016) and Hanaysha (2016). As such in this study organizational commitment measure includes three indicators and 12 items has a five-point scale Likert. The respondents provided their perceived rating of various organizational commitment measures, where “1” indicates “strongly disagree” and “5” indicates “strongly agree”.

Employee Performance (EP): The work achieved by employees in a certain period of time associated with the implementation of tasks in terms of quality, quantity, time, service orientation, integrity, discipline, cooperation and leadership compared to standards, targets or criteria has been mutually agreed upon. In this research, the employee performance measurement refers to the government regulation number 46 years 2011 which is elaborated through the decision of the state employment agency number 1 year 2013 that the performance appraisal of civil servants systemically combines employee work objectives and work behavior. Employee job goals are measured through three indicators, namely: EP1; Quantity work, EP2; Quality work and EP3; Work time. While the assessment of work behavior consists of five indicators,

namely: EP4; Orientation of service, EP5; Integrity, EP6; work discipline, EP7; Cooperation and EP8; Leadership. The employee's performance measurement in this study was also synthesized with performance theory adopted by Edwin (2002); Robbins (2010); Garry (2009) and Sedamayanti (2010) and the results of Malik *et al.* (2011); Aragon *et al.* (2014); Ghoniyah and Masurip (2015), Suwondo and Sutanto (2015), Srieati (2016) and Almutairi (2016). Therefore this in research, employee performance measurement using a five-point Likert scale with “1” indicating “strongly disagree” and “5” indicating “strongly agree” adopted from Naresh (2010) and Cooper and Schindler (2006).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The Muna Regency Agricultural Development Policy, harmonized with a more decentralized governance system with autonomy at the district level. The approach of agricultural development has changed from centralized to regional autonomy from the target approach to commodity production system and agribusiness development. Furthermore, from the handling of the government shifted to the movement of public participation or business world. Finally, the development of sub-sectors is directed to regional development. In facing the challenges of agricultural development in the future the Agriculture Office of Muna Regency as the responsible and coordinating node in agricultural development has established the agricultural development policy as stated in the agricultural development work plan with the grand strategy, that is: food security enhancement program, agribusiness development and farmer welfare improvement program. The role of the agricultural sector in the regional economy is still quite dominant over the last 5 years. The agricultural sector contribution to the formation of Gross Regional Domestic Product in Muna Regency in years 2012 amounted to 40.54-44.27% in years 2016.

Summary statistics of respondents: In this research, that made as respondent is civil servant at agriculture Department of Muna Regency counted 60 people. Description of demographic characteristics aims to explain the characteristics of the employees who were sampled in this study. Demographic characteristics of the respondent sample were extracted by asking questions on gender, age, education level, work experience and marital status. Table 1 summarizes the demographic information of the sample population in this study. Most of the respondent's gender was male and education level of majority is Bachelor. Majority of the respondents were

Table 1: Summary statistics of respondents

Demographic characteristics	Samples (%)
Gender	
Male	41.67
Female	58.33
Age (Years)	
32-38	46.67
39-44	31.67
45-49	16.67
50-55	5.00
Education level	
Secondary	13.33
Diploma	3.33
Degree	76.67
Postgraduate	6.67
Work experience (Years)	
2-9	28.33
10-16	55.00
17-22	6.67
23-29	10.00
Marital status	
Married	80.00
Single	5.71

n = 60

married and productive age/young (aged 32-44 years). Most were already experienced employees having worked more than 10 years on the Agriculture Department of Muna Regency.

Results of PLS analysis: Data analysis method in this research employs Partial Least Square Structural Equation Modeling (PLS-SEM) technique. PLS path modeling, a variance-based SEM was used to analyze the data and test the research hypothesis with SmartPLS Version 3.0 Program. PLS-SEM was used in this study for data is analyzed and interpreted with a two-stage analytical procedure are: first stage is the assessment and refinement of testing the measurement model, i.e., (discriminant validity, convergent validity and composite reliability) and second stage is the examining and evaluation of the structural model, followed by hypothesis testing.

Evaluation of measurement model: Evaluation and assessment of testing the measurement model in this research aims to assess observed variables that reflect a construct or latent variables. This study uses four latent variables with reflective indicators (i.e., work environment, organizational learning, organizational commitment and employee performance). According, Hair *et al.* (2017) suggest that the measurement model (outer model) was tested to assess the discriminant validity, composite reliability and convergent validity of the latent variables. Therefore, there are three criteria to evaluation and assessment of testing the measurement model (outer model) of the constructs used in this study (i.e., discriminant validity, composite reliability and convergent validity) which can be explained as follows.

Table 2: Mean, discriminant validity and correlations of the latent variables

Latent constructs	Mean	AVE	\sqrt{AVE}	Correlations of the latent variables			
				WE	OL	OC	EP
WE	3.48	0.574	0.758	1.000	-	-	-
OL	3.57	0.639	0.799	0.729	1.000	-	-
OC	3.83	0.763	0.873	0.539	0.585	1.000	-
EP	3.82	0.535	0.731	0.598	0.646	0.697	1.000

Discriminant validity: Discriminant validity is the degree to which a construct is distinct from other constructs in the model (Joseph *et al.*, 2010).

Discriminant validity testing in the study used square root of Average (AVE) and cross loading with the aim of checking whether the research instrument was valid in explaining or reflecting latent variables. In this study, researcher used two methods to assess discriminant validity: first, the used criterion comparing the correlation between the constructs and the square root of the AVE for that construct. In order to achieve discriminant validity, the square root of the AVE for each latent variable must exceed the correlation value for the same construct. The results of testing discriminant validity in research showed of the square root of AVE of each latent variable must be greater than its correlations with all other latent variable.

As shown in Table 2, the results indicate adequate discriminant validity with the AVE square root values being higher than the correlation values in the rows and columns. Therefore, the result of this research showed the square root of AVE for each construct is larger than its correlations with all other constructs. Thus, all the first-order constructs also meet the criterion of discriminant validity. Additionally, discriminant validity can also be known through the value of cross loading. Discriminant validity is verified with factor loadings exceeding cross-loadings on all other constructs. The value of cross loading of each latent variable indicator is greater than that of other variable loading, then the indicator is said to be valid. Table 3 summarizes the loading and cross loading values, all cross loading values obtained were above the recommended value of 0.60 (Ghozali, 2010; Solimun, 2010). Therefore, it is constructed validated by recommended loading values.

Convergent validity and composite reliability: Convergent validity measures the validity of the indicators as a construct gauge which can be seen from the outer loading. The indicator is considered valid if it has an outer loading value of = 0.70, highly recommended, however the loading factor 0.50-0.60 can still be tolerated with a $p < 0.05$. Hair *et al.* (2017) recommend retaining indicators with weaker factor loadings if other indicators with high loadings can explain at least 50% of the variance

Table 3: Outer loadings and cross loadings

Reflective indicators	Latent constructs			
	WE	OL	OC	EP
EP1	0.511	0.616	0.405	0.698
EP2	0.456	0.358	0.501	0.714
EP3	0.595	0.387	0.478	0.719
EP4	0.468	0.418	0.437	0.731
EP5	0.592	0.457	0.366	0.771
EP6	0.486	0.459	0.410	0.768
EP7	0.449	0.533	0.539	0.743
EP8	0.337	0.440	0.333	0.707
OC1	0.461	0.431	0.888	0.556
OC2	0.435	0.430	0.820	0.478
OC3	0.531	0.516	0.911	0.609
OL1	0.630	0.797	0.404	0.517
OL2	0.573	0.796	0.287	0.409
OL3	0.790	0.881	0.385	0.529
OL4	0.381	0.744	0.289	0.306
OL5	0.613	0.833	0.417	0.583
OL6	0.608	0.736	0.382	0.487
WE1	0.768	0.590	0.303	0.424
WE2	0.734	0.550	0.344	0.370
WE3	0.687	0.465	0.215	0.404
WE4	0.791	0.513	0.338	0.404
WE5	0.818	0.575	0.462	0.577
WE6	0.738	0.417	0.267	0.380

Value of cross loading of each latent variable indicator is greater than that of other variable loading, then the indicator is said to be valid and cross loading values recommended = 0.60 (Hair *et al.*, 2017). WE = Work Environment, OL = Organizational Learning, OC = Organizational Commitment, EP = Employee Performance

(AVE = 0.50). As shown in Table 4, indicator loadings range from 0.687-0.911 and are significant at the 0.001 level, all cross loading values obtained were above the recommended value of 0.60 (Solimun, 2010; Ghozali, 2010). Therefore, it is constructed validated by recommended loading values. Next, composite construct reliabilities range from 0.889-0.914 (Table 4) and AVE ranges from 0.535-0.763 (Table 2). The results indicate that all the first-order constructs (indicators) have high levels of reliabilities and convergent validities. Thus, the results of this study can be concluded that the measurement model was assessed by convergent and discriminant validity and reliability, a have met the criteria or are eligible to be used in the overall measurement of latent variables because of their high suitability and reliability.

Evaluation of goodness of fit model: The test result of goodness of fit overall model, to determine whether hypothetic model is supported by empiric data. Hair *et al.* (2017) suggest that in addition to describing the significance of the relationships, researchers should also report the coefficient of determination (R^2), effect size (f^2) and predictive relevance (Q^2). In this research the structural results still indicate a strong model. The structural model is evaluated by considering the Q^2 predictive relevance model that measures how well the observed values are generated by the model. Q^2 scores

from the blindfolding procedure well-exceed zero, validating the predictive relevance of exogenous constructs on the endogenous constructs (Hair *et al.* 2017). Q^2 is based on the coefficient of determination of all endogenous variables. Quantity Q^2 with range $0 < Q^2 < 1$, getting closer to value 1 means better model. Structural model: the R^2 values for the Organizational Commitment (OC) = 0.369 and Employee Performance (EP) = 0.584. Based on the coefficient of determination (R^2) can be known Q^2 with the following calculation:

$$Q^2 = 1 - (1 - R_1^2)(1 - R_2^2) = 1 - \{(1 - 0.369)(1 - 0.584)\} \\ = 1 - 0.2625 = 0.7375$$

The result of predictive-relevance (Q^2) value was 0.7375 suggesting that 73.75% of variance in the extent of employee performance can explained by work environment, organizational learning and organizational commitment. The remaining 26.25% is explained by another variable not found in this research model. Therefore, all exogenous constructs of this study have predictive relevancy to employee performance endogenous construct.

Structural model and hypotheses testing: The result of structural model and hypothesis testing is presented in Fig. 2 and Table 5. In this study, the result may clearly show the significant relationship between exogenous variable and endogenous variable if the $p < 0.05$ or < 0.01 (Henseler *et al.*, 2016). The structural model aims to examine the causal relationships between the constructs (Solimun, 2010). In this research, Hair *et al.* (2017) states that the bootstrapping technique with resampling (5,000 resamples) was employed to estimate the statistical significance of the hypothesized model. The results of the structural model evaluation are described in Fig. 2, shows that indicate that work environment (H_1 : $N = 0.241$, $t = 2.241$ and $p = 0.029 < 0.05$) has a significant positively effect on organizational commitment as was hypothesized (H_1 accepted). Surprisingly, the results for the PLS path coefficients revealed that work environment (H_2 : $N = 0.161$, $t = 1.250$ and $p = 0.216 > 0.05$) had no significant direct effect on employee performance (H_2 rejected). Further, organizational learning is positively and significantly (H_3 : $N = 0.409$, $t = 3.614$ and $p = 0.001 < 0.05$) effect on organizational commitment which lends support for H_3 . Also, organizational learning (H_4 : $N = 0.261$, $t = 2.110$ and $p = 0.039 < 0.05$) is significantly positively effect on employee performance (H_4 accepted). Similarly, organizational commitment is positively and significantly (H_5 : $N = 0.458$, $t = 3.540$ and $p = 0.001 < 0.05$) effect on employee performance which provides support for H_5 .

Table 4: Mean, outer loadings and composite reliability

Latent variable and reflective indicators	Mean	Outer loading	SD	t-statistics	p-value/Sig. t	Construct reliability
Work Environment (WE):						
WE1: temperatures in the Workplace	3.528	0.768	0.088	8.728	0.000	0.889
WE2: spatial at Work	3.461	0.734	0.137	5.359	0.000	
WE3: circulation of air in the Workplace	3.192	0.687	0.076	9.056	0.000	
WE4: lighting at Work	3.617	0.791	0.047	16.913	0.000	
WE5: relationship with peers	3.625	0.818	0.075	10.843	0.000	
WE6: relationship with leaders	3.433	0.738	0.125	5.898	0.000	
Organizational Learning (OL):						
OL1: system thinking	3.408	0.797	0.067	11.939	0.000	0.914
OL2: the mental model	3.758	0.796	0.110	7.231	0.000	
OL3: personal skills	3.533	0.881	0.045	19.751	0.000	
OL4: teamwork	3.467	0.744	0.100	7.470	0.000	
OL5: building a shared vision	3.583	0.833	0.064	12.954	0.000	
OL6: dialog/discussion	3.650	0.736	0.084	8.786	0.000	
Organizational Commitment (OC):						
OC1: affective Commitment	3.833	0.888	0.056	15.832	0.000	0.906
OC2: Continuous Commitment	3.767	0.820	0.065	12.520	0.000	
OC3: normative Commitment	3.900	0.911	0.068	13.331	0.000	
Employee Performance (EP):						
EP1: quantity of work	3.717	0.698	0.074	9.411	0.000	0.902
EP2: quality of work	3.700	0.714	0.194	3.684	0.001	
EP3: work time	3.717	0.719	0.074	9.673	0.000	
EP4: orientation of service	3.833	0.731	0.136	5.378	0.000	
EP5: integrity	3.933	0.771	0.088	8.753	0.000	
EP6: work discipline	3.850	0.768	0.086	8.887	0.000	
EP7: cooperation	3.850	0.743	0.094	7.862	0.000	
EP8: leadership	3.932	0.707	0.209	3.383	0.001	

p-value = significant at 0.001 level

Table 5: Path coefficients and hypothesis testing

Relationship (direct effects)	Mediation	Coefficients	t-values	p-values	Hypothesis test
Work environment	Organizational commitment	0.241	2.241	0.029*	H ₁ : accepted
Work environment	Employee performance	0.161	1.250	0.216 ^{ns}	H ₂ : rejected
Organizational learning	Organizational commitment	0.409	3.614	0.001*	H ₃ : accepted
Organizational learning	Employee performance	0.261	2.110	0.039*	H ₄ : accepted
Organizational commitment	Employee performance	0.458	3.540	0.001*	H ₅ : accepted
Mediation effects (indirect effects)					
Exogenous	Mediation	Endogenous	Coefficient	Mediation of nature	Hypothesis test
Work environment	Organizational commitment	Employee performance	0.110	Complete mediation	H ₆ : accepted
Organizational learning	Organizational commitment	Employee performance	0.187	Partial mediation	H ₇ : accepted

*Statistically significant at p-value = 0.05; ns = non-significant; n = 60




Fig. 2: Structural model and hypothesis testing

Finally, the mediating effect of organizational commitment between work environment and employee performance was subsequently examined (H_6). The result of examined to know the nature of organizational commitment mediation variable is presented in Fig. 2. Indicates that the p-value between the variable of work environment to the employee performance is not significant, then the work environment variable to organizational commitment is significant and organizational commitment to employee performance is also significant. Thus, variable organizational commitment in the research model can be said as a complete mediation which lends support for H_6 .

Further, the mediating effect of organizational commitment between organizational learning and employee performance was subsequently examined (H_7). The result of examined to know the nature of organizational commitment mediation variable that the value of p the influence of organizational learning has a significant effect on organizational commitment and employee performance. Then organizational commitment also has a significant effect on the performance of employees, thus, the nature of mediation influence organizational learning on employee performance through organizational commitment is partial mediation. This result means that the relationship between organizational learning can directly affect the performance of employees can also be through organizational commitment. The results of the examination there is enough empirical evidence that organizational learning has a significant effect on employee performance which is mediated by organizational commitment (H_7 accepted).

The purpose main of this study was to examined and explain the strength of influence between work environment and organizational learning on organizational commitment and employee performance. Further, the current study empirically investigated and examined the mediating role of organizational commitment. The results were found to be supportive and consistent with our objective that organizational commitment is significantly mediated with the work environment and organizational learning, showing a strong prediction on employee performance. The research presented here provides several important contributions to the literature on work environment, organizational learning, organizational commitment and employee performance among civil servants officers in Agriculture Department of Muna Regency. Thus, this study was undertaken to build a research model that included four constructs or latent variables. Through Partial Least Squares (PLS) path modeling technique, the study endeavored to test five hypothesis direct effects and two hypothesis indirect effects (Mediation).

Results of PLS analysis showed that work environment had a positive and significant influence on organizational commitment but on the employee's performance has not significant effect. It means that, changes in the improvement of work environment reflected through the condition of physical and psychological/non physical work environment that is the condition of good air temperature in the workplace, spatial, air circulation, good lighting level, good relationship between employees and employee relationship with leaders have a positive and significant contribution to the improvement of organizational commitment reflected through aspects of normative commitment, affective commitment and continuance commitment. These findings are supportive to the existing theoretical frameworks developed by Haggins (2011), Render and Heizer (2010) and Giffords (2009) said that the work environment plays an important role and is a key contribution in influencing and increasing organizational commitment. However, in results this study showed that work environment have not significant effect on employee performance, inconsistent with Robbins (2010) said that the work environment is outside forces that potentially affect the organization's performance and Sofyandi (2008) a series of factors affecting performance. The same opinion by Arep and Tanjung (2003), a good work environment can create work passion, productivity and job performance increased.

Consistent with the findings of prior studies (Vanaki and Vagharseyyedin, 2009; Ramay, 2012; Khuong and Vu, 2014; Pitaloka and Sofia, 2014; Ghoniyah and Masurip, 2015; Hanaysha, 2016), the findings of the current study confirm the positive and significantly influence between work environment on organizational commitment among the employees, so, supports the first hypothesis of this study. Nevertheless, there are differences in research findings by Suroso (2016) and Srieati (2016) found that the work environment is directly insignificant to organizational commitment. Furthermore, our findings have also supported the empirical survey carried out by Munandar (2015), Suroso (2016) and Gustiatun (2015) found that work environment directly has not significant influence on organizational commitment. But, the contradiction with the results of research Ajayi *et al.* (2011), Malik *et al.* (2011); Aragon *et al.* (2014); Suwondo and Sutanto (2015); Ghoniyah and Masurip (2015); Srieati (2016) that the work environment also has a positive and significant influence on employee performance.

The current study empirically investigated and examined the influence between organizational learning on organizational commitment and employee performance. These findings in study showed that the elevated organizational learning within organizations

positively and significantly contributes to the enhanced organizational commitment and employee performance, this finding supports the third and fourth hypothesis of this study. It means that, changes in organizational learning have a significant effect on increasing organizational commitment and employee performance. Increased organizational learning reflected through aspects of thinking systems, mental models, personal skills, teamwork, shared vision and dialogue/discussion has a positive and significant contribution to the improvement of organizational commitment reflected through affective commitment, continuance commitment and normative commitment, further improving employee performance reflected through work quantity aspect, quality, work time, service orientation, integrity, discipline of work, cooperation and leadership.

Results are supportive to the literature about the positive and significant influence of organizational learning on organizational commitment and employee performance (Luthans, 2003, Marquardt, 2002, Robbins, 2008). These results are consistent to the notion of organizational learning is a major competence, so it is seen as a process of reconstructing knowledge in order to increase the commitment and performance of the organization (Jackson *et al.*, 2009). Thus, it means that organizational learning are an increase in intellectual and capabilities productive among employees which helps in improving the employee performance in terms of the achievement of behavior and targets of work. Further, these findings can confirm previous studies by Hsu (2009), Rose *et al.* (2011), Usefi *et al.* (2013), Salarian *et al.* (2015) and Hanaysha (2016) found that organizational learning has a positive and significant impact on organizational commitment. Moreover, research results supported by research findings Rose *et al.* (2011), Winarno *et al.* (2012), Aragon *et al.* (2014) that organizational learning has a positive and significant effect on employee performance. But, these findings inconsistent with the findings of prior studies Gomes and Wojahn (2016) found organizational learning has a positive and insignificant effect on employee performance and Kitapci and Celik (2014) found organizational learning has a negative and insignificant effect on employee performance.

The findings the current study show that organizational commitment positively and significantly contribute to the enhanced employee performance this finding supports the five hypotheses in this study. While previous studies reported a direct influence positive and significant between organizational commitment on employee performance (Cuyper and Witte, 2011; Rumasukun *et al.*, 2015; Kristanto, 2015; Ghoniyah and

Masurip, 2015; Almutairi, 2016). The earlier literature review and our findings related to the organizational commitment and employee performance are found to be relying on the concept of 'attitudes and organization behavior' (Triandis, 1971; Robbins, 2010) and 'organizational commitment theory' (Ghoniyah, 2003; Garry, 2009) asserts that the key to getting commitment is to help employees actualize themselves to achieve performance.

Finally, the findings also support the six and seven hypothesis of this study about the mediator role of organizational commitment for the influence between work environment and organizational learning with employee performance. Consistent with Knowledge Based View (KBV) by (Grant, 1996) which states that if the organization wants to have high performance, it is very important to master the management of knowledge in which there is organizational learning. Moreover, in testing the role of mediation organizational commitment also refers to the theory of contingency (Thompson, 1967) that methods can be applied in all conditions but there is no best way to design an organization, so, it can be done both universally and contingently. The PLS-SEM results indicate that civil servants perception of work environment had an indirect influence on employee's performance through their organizational commitment. The significant influence of work environment on employee's performance became insignificant when organizational commitment was added in the model as a mediator. That is, the influence between work environment and employees performance should be interpreted with consideration of the employee's commitment to their organization. This shows the crucial role of organizational commitment, not only as a predictor variable but also as a mediator variable which provides a meaningful impact on the influence among other organizational factors. Thus, the role of mediation of organizational commitment in the research model can be said as complete mediation.

Further in this study, also we have examined the influence between organizational learning with employee's performance and later both the variables have been mediated with organizational commitment. The results were found to be supportive and consistent with our objective that organizational learning is significantly mediated with the dimensions of organizational commitment, showing a strong prediction on employee's performance, so, the mediating nature of the influence of organizational learning on employee performance through organizational commitment is partial mediation. Thus, the findings of the study was in alignment with past research, that has proven organizational commitment as mediating

influence between work environment on employee performance (Ghoniya and Masurip, 2015; Gustiatun, 2015; Srieati, 2016). Furthermore, organizational commitment acts as a mediation influence between organizational learning on employee performance is supported by research Rose *et al.* (2011).

CONCLUSION

This study built a research model to examine and explain the influence of work environment and organizational learning on organizational commitment and employee performance, then investigated and examined the mediating role of organizational commitment. The findings in this research showed a positive and significant influence work environment (condition of physical and psychological/non physical work environment) on organizational commitment but the on employee's performance has not significant influence. The findings imply that condition work environment contributes to the elevation of organizational commitment among employees. Consequently, the successful implementation of organizational commitment contributes positively to the enhanced employee performance. In conclusion, good condition work environment as the bedrock and key to getting commitment by way to help employees actualize themselves to achieve performance.

The results from this study also suggest that organizational learning has a positive and significant influence on organizational commitment and employee performance. This means that changes in organizational learning are reflected through aspects of system thinking, the mental model, personal skills, teamwork, building a shared vision and dialogue/discussion has a positive and significant contribution to the improvement of organizational commitment reflected through affective commitment, continuous commitment and normative commitment. Finally, can improve the performance of employees reflected through aspects of quantity of work, quality, work time, service orientation, integrity, work discipline, cooperation and leadership. It is concluded that findings of this study have made a significant contribution to the literature, providing direction to integrate work environment and organizational learning on commitment levels for achieving employee performance. This shows the crucial role of organizational commitment, not only as a predictor variable but also as a mediator variable which provides a meaningful impact on the relationship among other organizational factors. Thus, the role of mediation of organizational commitment in the research model can be said as complete mediation.

LIMITATIONS

Limitations of this study are the collected data were self-reported because of that, generalizability of the findings is limited and should be done with caution. In addition, the time this study was conducted, just rotation of some employees in Department of Agriculture, Muna Regency, so that, this condition affects the answers given by the respondents in this study. Future studies should focus on a different and larger population sample. In the current study, improves the understanding of the complicated influence of work environment and organizational learning on organizational commitment and employee performance. Limitations the researchers used a cross-sectional research design in observing the influence between work environment and organizational learning on employee performance with organizational commitment as a mediating variable.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Furthermore, the results were found to be supportive and consistent with our objective that organizational learning is significantly mediated with the dimensions of organizational commitment, showing a strong prediction of employee's performance, so, the mediating nature of the influence of organizational learning on employee performance through organizational commitment is partial mediation.

REFERENCES

- Abdullah, M., 2014. Employee Performance Management and Evaluation. Aswaja Pressindo, Yogyakarta, Indonesia.
- Ajayi, I.A., O.O. Awosusi, B.B. Arogundade and H.T. Ekundayo, 2011. Work environment as correlate of academic staff job performance in South West Nigerian universities. *Eur. J. Educ. Stud.*, 3: 1-9.
- Alex, S.N., 2004. Personnel Management. Ghalia Indonesia Publisher, Jakarta, Indonesia, ISBN:81-7648-620-5, Pages: 104.
- Almutairi, D.O., 2016. The mediating effects of organizational commitment on the relationship between transformational leadership style and job performance. *Intl. J. Bus. Manage.*, 11: 232-241.
- Armstrong, M., 2003. Strategic HRM: A guide to action. Kogan Page Ltd Kogan Page Ltd, London, England, UK.
- Aragon, M.I.I., A.J. Jimenez and R.S. Valle, 2014. Training and performance: The mediating role of organizational learning. *BRQ. Bus. Res. Q.*, 17: 161-173.

- Arep, I. and H. Tanjung, 2003. Human Resource Management. Tri Sakti University, Jakarta, Indonesia.
- Cooper, D.R. and P.S. Schindler, 2006. Business Research Methods. 8th Edn., McGraw-Hill, New York, USA.,
- Cooper, D.R., P.S. Schindler and J. Sun, 2006. Business Research Methods. 9th Edn., McGraw-Hill/Irwin, New York, NY.
- Cuyper, N.D. and H.D. Witte, 2011. The management paradox: Self-rated employability and organizational commitment and performance. *Personnel Rev.*, 40: 152-172.
- Danish, R.Q., S. Ramzan and F. Ahmad, 2013. Effect of perceived organizational support and work environment on organizational commitment; Mediating role of self-monitoring. *Adv. Econ. Bus.*, 1: 312-317.
- Dey, T., 2012. Predictors of organizational commitment and union commitment: A conceptual study. *IUP. J. Organiz. Behav.*, 11: 62-75.
- Edwin, B.F., 2002. [Personel Management]. 7th Edn., Erlangga Publisher, Jakarta, Indonesia, (In Indonesia).
- Ellinger, A.E., C.C.F. Musgrove, A.D. Ellinger, D.G. Bachrach and A.B.E. Bas *et al.*, 2013. Influences of organizational investments in social capital on service employee commitment and performance. *J. Bus. Res.*, 66: 1124-1133.
- Garry, D., 2009. Human Resource Management. 10th Edn., PT. Indeks, Jakarta, Indonesia, .
- Garvin, D.A., 2000. Learning in Action: A Guide to Putting the Learning Organization to Work. Harvard Business School Press, Boston, Massachusetts, ISBN:9781578512515, Pages: 256.
- Ghoniya, N. and W. Masurip, 2015. Improving employee performance through leadership, work environment and commitment. *J. Dinamika Manajemen*, 2: 118-129.
- Ghozali, I., 2010. Structural Equations Model Concepts and Applications with AMOS Program 19. Diponegoro University, Semarang, Indonesia.,
- Giffords, E.D., 2009. An examination of organizational commitment and professional commitment and the relationship to work environment, demographic and organizational factors. *J. Soc. Work*, 9: 386-404.
- Gomes, G. and R.M. Wojahn, 2017. Organizational learning capability, innovation and performance: Study in small and Medium-Sized Enterprises (SMES). *Rev. Administracao*, 52: 163-175.
- Grant, R.M., 1996. Contemporary Strategy Analysis Concept, Techniques, Application. 2nd Edn., Blackwell, Oxford, England, UK., ISBN:9781557865137, Pages: 452.
- Gustiatur, A., 2015. Effect of compensation, work discipline and work environment on performance with organizational commitment as intervening variable at PT cartenz adventure karanganyar. Master Thesis, STIE-AUB, Surakarta, Indonesia.
- Haggins, R., 2011. A correlational study of work environment factors and organizational commitment in Southern California staff nurses. Ph.D Thesis, University of Phoenix, Tempe, Arizona.
- Hair, J.F., G.T.M. Hult, C.M. Ringle and M. Sarstedt, 2017. A Primer on Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modeling (PLS-SEM). 2nd Edn., Sage Publisher, Thousand Oaks, California.,
- Hanaysha, J., 2016. Testing the effects of employee engagement, work environment and organizational learning on organizational commitment. *Procedia Soc. Behav. Sci.*, 229: 289-297.
- Harwiki, W., 2016. The impact of servant leadership on organization culture, organizational commitment, Organizational Citizenship Behaviour (OCB) and employee performance in women cooperatives. *Procedia Soc. Behav. Sci.*, 219: 283-290.
- Henseler, J., G. Hubona and P.A. Ray, 2016. Using PLS path modeling in new technology research: Updated guidelines. *Ind. Manage. Data Syst.*, 116: 2-20.
- Hoe, S.L. and S. McShane, 2010. Structural and informal knowledge acquisition and dissemination in organizational learning: An exploratory analysis. *Learn. Organiz.*, 17: 364-386.
- Hsu, H.Y., 2009. Organizational learning culture's influence on job satisfaction, organizational commitment and turnover intention among R&D professionals in Taiwan during an economic downturn. Ph.D Thesis, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minnesota.
- Jackson, S.E., R.S. Schuler and S. Werner, 2009. Managing Human Resources. 10th Edn., South-Western Cengage Learning, Mason, Ohio, Pages: 358.
- John, P. and M. Robinson, 2009. Strategic Management-Formulation, Implementation and Control. 11th Edn., Irwin-McGraw-Hill, Boston, Massachusetts, ISBN:9780071263757, Pages: 928.
- Joseph, F.H., W.C. Black, B.J. Babin and R.L. Tatham, 2010. Multivariate Data Analysis: A Global Perspective. 7th Edn., Pearson Education, London, England, UK., ISBN:9780135153093, Pages: 800.
- Khandekar, A. and A. Sharma, 2006. Organizational learning and performance: Understanding Indian scenario in present global context. *Educ. Training*, 48: 682-692.

- Khuong, M.N. and P.L. Vu, 2014. Measuring the effects of drivers organizational commitment through the mediation of job satisfaction: A study in Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam. *Intl. J. Curr. Res. Acad. Rev.*, 2: 1-16.
- Kitapci, H. and V. Celik, 2014. The relationship between ambidexterity, organizational learning capacity and firm quality performance: An empirical study. *Procedia Soc. Behav. Sci.*, 109: 827-836.
- Kreitner, R. and A. Kinicki, 2008. *Organizational Behavior*. Salemba Four Publisher, Jakarta, Indonesia.
- Kristanto, H., 2015. Organizational justice, organizational commitment and employee performance. *JMK.*, 17: 86-98.
- LePine, J.A.C. and M.J. Wesson, 2009. *Organizational Behavior: Improving Performance and Commitment in the Workplace*. McGraw-Hill, New York, USA.,.
- Levitt, B. and J.G. March, 1988. Organizational learning. *Ann. Rev. Sociol.*, 14: 319-340.
- Luthans, F., 2003. *Organizational Behaviour*. 9th Edn., McGraw-Hill, New York, USA.,.
- Malik, M.I., A. Ahmad, S.F. Gomez and M. Ali, 2011. A study of work environment and employees' performance in Pakistan. *Afr. J. Bus. Manage.*, 5: 13227-13232.
- Marquardt, M., 2002. *Building the Learning Organization: Mastering the 5 Elements for Corporate Learning*. Davis-Black Publishing, Mountain View, California, ISBN:9780891061656, Pages: 266.
- Mathis, L.R. and J.H. Jackson, 2006. *Human Resource Management*. 10th Edn., Thompson Educational Publishing, Inc., Toronto, Ontario.
- Mathis, R.L. and J.H. Jackson, 2011. *Human Resource Management*. Penerbit Salemba Empat, Jakarta, Indonesia.
- Mehrabi, J., M. Jadidi, F.A. Haery and M. Alemzadeh, 2013. The Relationship between organizational commitment and organizational learning (Boroojerd telecommunication company as case study). *Intl. J. Acad. Res. Bus. Soc. Sci.*, 3: 130-139.
- Mercurio, Z.A., 2015. Affective commitment as a core essence of organizational commitment: An integrative literature review. *Hum. Resour. Dev. Rev.*, 14: 389-414.
- Meyer, J.P. and N.J. Allen, 1991. A three-component conceptualization of organizational commitment. *Hum. Resour. Manage. Rev.*, 1: 61-89.
- Mowday, R.T., L.W. Porter and R.M. Steers, 1982. *Employ Organization Linkages: The Psychology of Commitment Abstein and Turn Over*. Academic Press, London, England, UK., ISBN:9780125093705, Pages: 253.
- Munandar, A., 2015. The influence of organizational culture, work environment, compensation to performance through job satisfaction and employee motivation (study on population and civil registry agency of klaten regency). Master Thesis, STIE-AUB Surakarta, Indonesia.
- Naresh, M., 2010. *Marketing Research: An Applid Orientantion*. The Prentice-Hall Inc, New Jersey, USA., ISBN:978-81-317-3181-9, Pages: 929.
- Peter, M.S., 1990. *The Fifth Dicipline, the Art and Practice of the Learning Organization*. Doubleday Dell Publishing Group Inc, Bantam, Indonesia, ISBN:9780385260954, Pages: 423.
- Pitaloka, E. and I.P. Sofia, 2014. The affect of work environment, job satisfaction, organization commitment on OCB of internal auditors. *Intl. J. Bus. Econ. Law*, 5: 10-18.
- Prabu, M.A., 2009. *Human Resource Management Company*. Remaja Rosdakarya Publiser, Bandung, Indonesia.
- Purwanto, D., 2015. Influence education training and work environment on performance through and organizational culture employee job satisfaction in the secretary Boyolali. Master Thesis, STIE-AUB, Surakarta, Indonesia.
- Ramay, I.M., 2012. Antecedents of organizational commitment of banking sector employees in Pakistan. *Serb. J. Manage.*, 7: 89-102.
- Render, B. and J. Heizer, 2010. *Operations Management*. 2nd Edn., Publiiser Salemba Empat, Jakarta, Indonesia.
- Ricky, W.G. and M. Gregory, 2014. *Organizational Behavior-Managing People and Organizations*. 11th Edn., Cengage Learning, Boston, Massachusetts, ISBN:9781305258334, Pages: 598.
- Ringle, C.M., S. Wende and J.M. Becker, 2014. *Smartpls 3*. SmartPLS, Hamburg, Germany.,.
- Robbins, S.P., 2008. *Organizational Behavior*. 12th Edn., Erlangga Publisher, Jakarta, Indonesia.,.
- Robbins, S.P., 2010. *Essentials of Organizational Behavior*. 16th Edn., Salemba Empat, Jakarta, Indonesia.,.
- Rose, R.C., N. Kumar and O.G. Pak, 2011. The effect of organizational learning on organizational commitment, job satisfaction and work performance. *J. Appl. Bus. Res.*, 25: 55-66.
- Rumasukun, S.F.A., Y. Rante, O. Wambrauw and B.E. Bharanti, 2015. The influence of human resource management strategy and competence on employee performance with the mediation of work motivation, organizational commitment and work culture. *Intl. J. Bus. Manage. Invention*, 4: 15-27.

- Salarian, M., K. Baharmpour and S. Habibi, 2015. Organizational commitment and its relationship with organizational learning (case study: General directorate of ports and maritime of Mazandaran province). *Intl. J. Rev. Life Sci.*, 5: 67-73.
- Sedarmayanti, 2010. Human Resource Management. Refika Aditama Publisher, Bandung, Indonesia,.
- Senge, P.M., 2006. *The Fifth Discipline: The Art and Practice of the Learning*. Doubleday, New York.
- Siagian, S.P., 2008. Human Resource Management. Bumi Aksara Publisher, Jakarta, Indonesia,.
- Silalahi, B., 2004. Corporate Culture and Performance. Alhambra Educational Foundation, Alhambra, California, USA,.
- Sofyandi, H., 2008. Human Resource Management. Graha Ilmu Publisher, Yogyakarta, Indonesia, .
- Solimun, M.D., 2010. Structural equations modeling PLS approach equipped with discussion of moderator variables statistics program FMIPA. Ph.D Thesis, Universitas Brawijaya, Malang, Indonesia.
- Srieati, L., 2016. Influences of leadership, discipline, work environment and work culture on employee performance via motivation and organizational commitment (Study in dinas kehutanan of blora regency). Master Thesis, STIE-AUB, Surakarta, Indonesia.
- Stephen, P.R. and A.J. Timothy, 2015. *Organizational Behavior*. Salemba Empat Publisher, Jakarta, Indonesia,.
- Suroso, M., 2016. The influence of leadership and work environment to performance through organizational commitment and employee motivation in religious courts karanganyar district. Master Thesis, STIE-AUB, Surakarta, Indonesia.
- Suwondo, D.I. and E.M. Sutanto, 2015. Workplace environment, work discipline and employee performance. *JMK.*, 17: 135-144.
- Thompson, J.D., 1967. *Organizations in Action*. McGraw-Hill, New York.
- Triandis, H., 1971. *Attitudes and Attitudes Change*. Jhon Waley & Sons, New York, USA,.
- Uma, S., 2006. *Research Methods for Business: A Skill Building Approach*. 4th Edn., John Willey & Sons, New York, USA., ISBN:9788126509287, Pages: 464.
- Usefi, S., R. Nazari and T. Zargar, 2013. The relationship between organizational learning and organizational commitment in sport organizations. *Manage. Administrative Sci. Rev.*, 2: 682-688.
- Vanaki, Z. and S.A. Vagharseyyedin, 2009. Organizational commitment, work environment conditions and life satisfaction among Iranian nurses. *Nurs. Health Sci.*, 11: 404-409.
- Watkins, K.E. and V.J. Marsick, 1993. Sculpting the learning organization: Consulting using action technologies. *N. Directions Adult Continuing Educ.*, 1993: 81-90.
- Winarno, E., A.T. Armanu and A. Solimun, 2012. The influence of human capital and organizational learning moderated organizational competencies and innovation culture (Studies at Private Colleges in Kopertis V Yogyakarta). *J. Aplikasi Manajemen*, 10: 239-251.