

## Analysis of the Impact of Work Interaction, OSH Culture, and Motivation on Employee Performance (A Case Study on a Mining Company)

Rudy Suprpto<sup>1</sup>, Isti Fadah<sup>2</sup>, Rini Yayuk Priyati<sup>3</sup>, Indrianawati Usman<sup>4</sup>

Universitas Terbuka<sup>1,2,3,4</sup>

Freeport Indonesia, Tembagapura, Mimika<sup>1</sup>

Jember University<sup>2</sup>

Airlangga University<sup>4</sup>

Correspondence Email: 530060048@ecampus.ut.ac.id

### ARTICLE INFORMATION

#### Publication information

#### Research article

#### HOW TO CITE

Suprpto, R., Fadah, I., Priyati, R. Y., Usman, I. (2022). Analysis Of the Impact of Work Interaction, Osh Culture, And Motivation on Employee Performance (A Case Study on A Mining Company) *Journal of International Conference Proceedings*, 5(14), 139-148.

#### DOI:

<https://doi.org/10.32535/ijcp.v5i1.1451>

Copyright@2022 owned by Author(s).  
Published by JICP



This is an open-access article.  
License: Attribution-Noncommercial-Share Alike (CC BY-NC-SA)

Received: 07 April 2022

Accepted: 23 April 2022

Published: 12 May 2022

#### ABSTRACT

Interactions between employees who have various backgrounds, employee motivation and safety culture are parts of a chain and integrated aspects to achieve a good employee performance. This study to analyze the effect of work interaction, safety culture and work motivation on employee performance at the Department of Underground Maintenance, PTFI, Papua, Indonesia. This research is explanatory research, that explains the causal relationship between the study variables and hypothesis testings. The study shows that there are significant and simultaneous effects of work interaction, OSH culture and work motivation on employee performance at the Department of Underground Maintenance. Moreover, work motivation variable gives dominant effect to performance within the department.

**Keywords:** Employee Performance, OSH/Safety Culture, Work Interaction, Work Motivation.

## **INTRODUCTION**

According to Indonesia.GO.ID (2019), development programs in Indonesia today are focused on the real sector (including infrastructure) as a continuation of the laying of the economic foundation and the government also prioritizes labor development (human resources/HR). Related to this employment, Iswanto and Yusuf (2020) argue that human resource management (HRM) occupies an important role in an organization or company because the problems faced by companies are not only related to raw materials, technology/equipment/work processes, production, and working capital. only, but also the problem of human resources that play a role in running and managing the company's production factors as well as being the goal of the production activity itself. This can be interpreted that the company's goals cannot be achieved without the role of employees and their effective management by each company.

Profit-oriented companies, such as mining companies that are laden with the use of advanced technology, of course require human resources/employees who have adequate knowledge, skills and expertise in order to be able to carry out company operations as expected by the company and can lead the company to achieve its goals. the goal. However, the availability of human resources with various backgrounds in mining companies also has the potential to cause internal conflicts due to poor work interactions such as unfair competition, poor communication, conflicts between employees, and so on. Employees of mining companies also cannot be separated from work risks that can threaten their health and safety. The risks that have negative implications in the economic review can be in the form of an accident in carrying out the work which results in the loss of work and income, either temporarily or permanently. Other problems that can arise with regard to employees of a company are employee demotivation or decreased employee motivation, work strikes, and so on. These problems can have an unfavorable impact on the performance of employees and the organization as a whole so that the achievement of company goals can also experience obstacles if not addressed quickly.

Based on the above background and as an employee of a mining company, I am interested in writing articles or conducting research to find out and analyze the impact of work interaction, safety culture, and work motivation on employee performance in the Underground Maintenance Department, PTFI. I hope this article can be useful for our department and all readers to be used as a reference in decision making and other relevant interests.

## **LITERATURE REVIEW**

### **Work Interaction**

The definition of interaction according to Ali and Asrori (2010), namely: " an event " where activities/ sentiments carried out by one individual against another individual are punished or rewarded by using an activity/ sentiment by another individual who is their partner. The concept refers to an action taken by a person in an interaction which is a stimulus for the actions of another individual who is his partner. This can be interpreted that interaction is a process of reciprocal influence between two or more employees where each employee is actively involved in playing their respective roles in a company.

According to Soekanto (2012) social interaction is a visible form when individuals/groups interact with other individuals/groups within a company. Social interaction has the following forms:

1. Cooperation, which is a joint effort that is oriented to achieve predetermined goals.
2. Competition, which is an attempt by the opponent/other party to bring down the opponent/rival without using threats or violence or peacefully to achieve its goals.
3. Conflict (contradictory), namely the interaction events that occur do not cause harmony between the parties involved in the interaction because there is a different interpretation of meaning between those who take the action (the first party) and the other party so that it is done by dropping the opponent/other party if deemed obstruct.
4. Accommodation, which is an effort to reduce conflicts or conflicts that occur without destroying/dropping the other party/opponent so that no one is harmed because it leads to a state of balance (equilibrium).

Susanto (2011); Mustofa (2012); Satrio (2013); Febrianti (2014) conclude their research results that social interaction has a positive influence (> 65%) on employee performance. Related to the management of social skills that can support achievement/performance and productivity, there is a concept of a social interaction learning model such as the research conducted by Bali (2017). The emphasis of this model is on the formation of a superior and realistic personal concept in presenting productive interactions with other employees and their work environment.

### **Occupational Safety and Health (K3) Culture**

According to the Decree of the Minister of Manpower of the Republic of Indonesia No. 245/Men/1990 dated May 12, 1990, stated that "1) OSH culture is performance behavior, the pattern of assumptions that underlies a person's perceptions, thoughts and feelings related to OSH; 2) Empowering is an effort to develop independence which is done by growing awareness, willingness and ability to act and understand a problem, and 3) Cultivation is an effort/process to empower workers so that they know, understand, act according to norms and rules and become role models or reference for other workers. Thus, the importance of this OSH culture, it is necessary to manage culture as well as possible to be effective. Tofte and Schumacher (2010) offer 6 elements of an effective safety process, namely: "1) Written Safety Policies, 2) Safety Training, 3) A job description includes safety/OSH, 4) Claims Management (Management of Rights/Demands), 5) Benchmarking (Comparing and Selecting Best Practices), and 6) Self-Evaluation (Self-Evaluation for improvements)".

Furthermore, Tofte and Schumacher (2010) stated: "Your company's current form of safety culture always starts at the top and works its way down the chain of command, like a switch that starts an engine. Management and employees shape culture by what they value and believe, by the assumptions each group makes about other groups within the company, or by the attitudes in which interactions take place throughout the work day".

The form of OSH culture that is currently owned by every organization cannot be separated from the strategy taken by the top leadership of the organization where the strategy is described from the vision and mission of the organization concerned. Sobirin (2009) states "strategy is culture and culture is strategy". This means that the OSH culture is part of the organization's overall strategies in achieving its goals, including in improving its performance. Singgih (2011) and Wahjoe (2012) reveal that the safety culture variable has an influence on employee performance > 55%. In terms of the implementation of the OHS management system, Fitriana & Wahyuningsi (2017)

conclude their research results that the implementation of the OHS management system (part of the OHS culture) of a company with the achievement of 60.9% implementation is included in the level of good implementation.

### **Motivation**

Talking about motivation cannot be separated from the theory of needs put forward by Maslow, McClelland, McGregor, Herzberg, and so on. Hasibuan (2007) states that motivation is the provision of a driving force that creates enthusiasm for one's work, so that they are willing to work together effectively and are integrated with all their efforts to achieve satisfaction. Robbins and Coulter (2010) argue that there are 3 key elements in motivation, namely: energy, persistence, and purpose. So that motivation leads to a process or effort to collect energy (steps) of an employee, then directs it to achieve a desired goal.

Sudarmo et al. (2008), states that the motivation process includes the following stages: 1) the unfulfilled need leads to an imbalance in the individual/person so that he tries to overcome it by performing certain behaviors; 2) the person/individual is looking for steps to fulfill this desire; 3) then he directs his behavior towards achieving achievements or goals with the steps he has designed by utilizing his experience, skills, and abilities; and 4) performance evaluation is based on self-assessment or other employees regarding their success in achieving goals.

Febrianti (2014); Satrio (2013); Ma'rifah (2014) reported the results of their research that motivation has an impact on employee performance > 60%. Marjaya and Pasaribu (2019) reported their research results that motivation had a positive impact on performance but was not significant. Nugroho et al. (2017) stated that organizational motivation and human resources in the implementation of K3 as well as the facilities of the organization play a very important role in cultivating K3 in the organization.

### **Performance**

There are many opinions regarding the definition of performance, I can put forward several definitions of performance. According to Irbansyah (2011), the performance is "Firm's Performance refers to the real & perceived accomplishments that result from the manufacturer-distributor relationship. Improved Firm's Performance is a function of a competitive advantage" (company performance refers to tangible and perceived achievements as a result of the manufacturer's relationship with distributors. Improved company performance is a function of a competitive advantage). Furthermore, Riniwati (2011) defines performance as the extent to which employees contribute in carrying out the company's strategy to achieve organizational goals by demonstrating their competencies which are considered to meet company standards or meet company needs. Performance is a multi-dimensional concept and includes: attitude, accomplishment, and ability.

McCormick and Tiffin (1995) in Suharto & Cahyono (2005) explain that there are two variables that affect performance, including:

#### 1. Individual variables

Individual variables consist of experience, education, gender, age, motivation, physical condition, personality.

#### 2. Situational variables

Situational variables involve two factors, namely:

- a. Social and organizational factors, including: policies, types of training and experience, wage system and social environment.

- b. Physical and occupational factors, including: work methods, settings and conditions, work equipment, work space arrangements, noise, lighting and temperature.

Based on several references from previous research as presented above, social interaction, safety culture, and motivation have an impact on employee performance.

### RESEARCH METHOD

Based on the formulation of the problem and the research objectives that have been determined, the type of research used is explanatory. According to Zulganef (2018), explanatory research is research that explains the relationship between research variables (cause-effect relationship) and testing tentative conclusions/hypotheses, namely research that analyzes or proves the relationship between the variables formulated. This research uses a quantitative approach. According to Sugiyono (2019), a quantitative approach can be defined as a research method based on the philosophy of positivism, used to examine certain populations or samples, data collection using research instruments, quantitative/statistical data analysis, with the aim of testing predetermined hypotheses. In this study, the population is employees in the Underground Maintenance Department, Underground Maintenance Division, PTFI, Papua, which amounted to 645 people.

### RESULTS

There are some research results tables that can support our understanding deeper as follow:

**Table 1.** Multiple Lenear Regression Results

Model	Coefficients <sup>a</sup>		Sig
	Standar Koefisien		
	B	Std.Error	
Constant	14,117	4,223	0,001
Work Interaction X <sub>1</sub>	-0,597	0,153	0,000
OSH Culture X <sub>2</sub>	0,342	0,124	0,007
Motivation X <sub>3</sub>	0,367	0,124	0,004
R Square = 0,956			

**Table 2.** Regresssion Determination Coefficient Results of Independent Variables on Dependent Variable

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Durbin-Watson
1	.753 <sup>a</sup>	.628	.584	2.73646	1.682

a. Predictors: (Constant), X<sub>3</sub>, X<sub>1</sub>, X<sub>2</sub>

**Table 3. t-Test**

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	14.117	4.223		3.343	.001
	X1	-.597	.153	-.580	-3.909	.000
	X2	.342	.124	.412	2.759	.007
	X3	.367	.124	.508	2.966	.004

**Table 4. F-Test**

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	841.292	3	280.431	12.500	.000 <sup>a</sup>
	Residual	2153.668	96	22.434		
	Total	2994.960	99			

a. Predictors: (Constant), X3, X1, X2

### **Effect of Work Interaction (X1) on Employee Performance (Y)**

Based on the data obtained and processed as well as the results of statistical analysis and hypothesis testing, it was found that:

1. The coefficient of B regression of Work Interaction (X1) is -0.597 (b<sub>1</sub>), indicating that the magnitude of the effect of work interaction (X1) on employee performance at the company (Y) is negative (-0.597). This means that the worse or worse the work interaction in the company, the worse it will have on the performance of the workforce.
2. The  $t_{count}$  value for the Work Interaction (X1) variable is -3.909 >  $t_{table}$  (-2.025) so that work interactions have a negative impact on performance (Y), meaning that if there is a bad work interaction, it will also have a bad impact on performance. This negative (-) work interaction value needs attention because it is alleged that there is a poor work interaction between employees in the company.

### **The Influence of K3/OSH Culture (X<sub>2</sub>) on Employee Performance (Y)**

Based on the data that has been obtained and processed as well as the results of statistical analysis and hypothesis testing, it is found that:

1. The coefficient B regression of OSH Culture (X<sub>2</sub>) is 0.342 (b<sub>2</sub>), indicating the magnitude of the influence of OSH culture (X<sub>2</sub>) on employee performance in the company. The value of the B coefficient for the OSH culture is positive (0.342). This means that the better the employee's OSH culture in working at in the company, it will have an impact on the better employee performance.
2. The  $t_{count}$  value OSH Culture variable (X2) is 2.759 >  $t_{table}$  (2.025) so that OSH culture has a positive impact on performance (Y), meaning that there is a good OSH culture influence in the company as evidenced by a positive work culture value (+), so that a good work culture needs to be maintained.

### **The Influence of Motivation (X3) on Employee Performance (Y)**

Based on the data that has been obtained and processed as well as the results of statistical analysis and hypothesis testing, it is found that:

1. The coefficient of B regression of motivation (X3) is 0.367 (b<sub>3</sub>), indicating the magnitude of the influence of motivation (X2) on employee performance in the

company. The value of the B coefficient for motivation is positive (0.367). This means that the better the motivation of employees to work within the company, the better the impact on employee performance .

2. The  $t_{count}$  value for the Motivation variable (X3) is  $2,966 > t_{table}$  (2,025) so that motivation has a positive impact on performance (Y), meaning that there is a good motivational impact in the company as evidenced by a positive value (+), so that good work motivation both need to be maintained.

### **The Impact of Work Interaction, K3/OSH Culture (X2), Motivation (X3) on Employee Performance (Y)**

Based on the data that has been obtained and processed as well as the results of statistical analysis and hypothesis testing, it is found that:

1. The results of the F test, namely the simultaneous influence of Work Interaction variables (X1), OSH Culture (X2), Motivation (X3) on Performance (Y) at PT FI obtained a  $F_{count}$  value of 12,500. The value of  $F_{table}$  for 100 respondents in df 3 Residual 96 is 2.048. This test gets the  $F_{count}$  value  $> F_{table}$  ( $12,500 > 2,048$ ) meaning that there is a simultaneous significant impact on Work Interaction (X1), OSH Culture (X2), Motivation (X3) on Performance/Performance (Y) at PT FI .
2. Multiple correlation value (R) of 0.753 indicates that there is a strong and direct relationship between Work Interaction (X1), OSH Culture (X2), Motivation (X3) and Employee Performance (Y) at PT. Freeport Indonesia. The results of this study prove that the value for the coefficient of determination (R square) is 0.628. This figure shows that there is a fairly strong influence on the variables of Work Interaction (X1), OSH Culture (X2), Motivation (X3) and Performance (Y) at PT FI, which is 62.8%, so the remaining 37.2% is performance. employees in the company is caused or influenced by the variables i outside the variables in this research .
3. The Work Interaction Variable (X1) has a  $t_{count}$  Value of -3.909 and a Beta value of Standardized Coefficients of -0.580 ; for the OSH Culture variable (X2) it has a  $t_{count}$  value of 2.759 and a Beta value of Standardized Coefficients of 0.412 ; and the Motivation variable (X3) has a  $t_{count}$  value of 2.966 and the Beta value of the Standardized Coefficients of 0.508 (dominant effect).

## **CONCLUSION**

Research Analysis of the Effect of Work Interaction, OSH Culture, and Work Motivation on Performance (Case Study at the UG Maintenance Department, Mine Maintenance Division, PTFI, Papua), concluded that:

1. Multiple correlation value (R) of 0.753 indicates that there is a strong and direct relationship between Work Interaction (X1), OSH Culture (X2), Motivation (X3) and Employee Performance (Y) at PT FI. The results of this study prove that the value for the coefficient of determination (R square) is 0.628. This figure shows that there is a fairly strong influence on the variables of Work Interaction (X1), OSH Culture (X2), and Motivation (X3) on employee performance (Y) at PTFI, so that the remaining 37.2% of employee performance in the company is caused or influenced by variables outside the variables in this research.
2. The results of the F test are the simultaneous influence of Work Interaction variables (X1), OSH Culture (X2), Motivation (X3) on Performance (Y) at PT. Freeport Indonesia obtained a  $F_{count}$  value of 12,500. The value of  $F_{table}$  for 100 respondents in df 3 Residual 96 is 2.048. This test gets the  $F_{count}$  value  $> F_{table}$  ( $12,500 > 2,048$ ) meaning that there is a simultaneous significant effect on Work Interaction (X1), OSH Culture (X2), Motivation (X3) on Performance (Y) at PTFI.

3. The Work Interaction Variable (X1) has a t value for this variable of  $-3.909 > t_{table}$  ( $-2.025$ ) so that work interactions have a negative effect on performance (Y), meaning that if there is a bad work interaction, it will also have a bad impact on performance. This negative (-) work interaction value needs attention because it is alleged that there is a poor work interaction between employees in the company. The OSH Culture variable (X2) has a t value for this variable of  $2.759 > t_{table}$  ( $2.025$ ) so that OSH culture has a positive impact on performance (Y), meaning that there is a good OSH culture impact in the company as evidenced by the positive work culture value (+), so that a good work culture needs to be maintained. The work motivation variable (X3) has a t value for this variable of  $2.966 > t_{table}$  ( $2.025$ ) so that work motivation has a positive impact on performance (Y), meaning that there is a good work motivation effect in the company as evidenced by a positive value (+), so that good work motivation needs to be maintained.
4. The Work Interaction Variable (X1) has a  $t_{count}$  value of  $-3.909$  and the Beta value of the Standardized Coefficients of  $-0.580$ . The OSH Culture variable (X2) has a  $t_{count}$  value of  $2.759$  and the Beta value of the Standardized Coefficients of  $0.412$ . The work motivation variable (X3) has a  $t_{count}$  value of  $2.966$  and the Beta value of the Standardized Coefficients of  $0.508$ , thus the work motivation variable (X3) has a dominant effect on performance (Y) at PTFI.

### **Suggestions**

1. Work interaction in the Underground Maintenance Department, PTFI, needs to be improved and improved, especially in the current digital era so that every employee can communicate and work well together in completing each task/job so that departmental targets can be achieved on time and safely.
2. The existing and good K3 culture must be maintained. Discipline enforcement in implementing a dynamic OHS culture needs to be continuously carried out by the company's management because employees are always faced with OHS risks at the work site so that employees always feel protected. In addition, the existence of social security for employees while working and in retirement can also motivate employees to give their best contribution by improving their performance.
3. Employee motivation that is already quite good needs to be maintained and improved. Efforts that can be made to improve employee performance is to pay attention to the internal motivation and external motivation of employees. Employees will show high performance and work loyalty if there is social protection including K3 and continuity of work in the company because employees will have a high awareness, sense of security, confidence, and guarantee for a better future by continuing to work at the company where they work. at the moment.

### **Research Limitations**

In this study, it is realized that there are limitations that are owned by researchers from various points of view, namely:

1. Limitations of indicators and dimensions of research variables, this has an impact on the existence of indicators that cannot be studied, for example relating to the company's external motivation on employee performance, even though it does not rule out that these indicators have values that are no less important than the values that have been achieved from the results of this study.
2. The limitations of the unit of analysis, with a broader unit of analysis involving other departments will provide more optimal and representative results in analyzing data in a study at PTFI.



## REFERENCES

- Agus, S. (2013). *Interaksi Sosial Dalam Perusahaan*. Bandung: Rosdakarya Remaja.
- Ali, M. & Asrori, M. (2010). *Psikologi Remaja: Perkembangan Peserta Didik*. Jakarta: PT. Bumi Aksara.
- Anthony, T. & Hastuti, T. (2003). *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia*. Jakarta: Universitas Indonesia Press.
- Asrori, B. (2012). *Interaksi Sosial dan Retorika Dalam Perusahaan*. Yogyakarta: Liberty.
- Chairul, M. (2012). *Pengaruh Interaksi Sosial dan Konflik Kerja terhadap Kinerja Karyawan PT. Astra International Indonesia, Tbk Jakarta*. Semarang: Jurnal Tesis Universitas Diponegoro.
- Bali, M. M. E. (2017). Model Interaksi Sosial Dalam Mengelaborasi Keterampilan Sosial. *Jurnal Pedagogik*, 04 (02), 211-227. ISSN : 2354-7960, E-ISSN : 2528-5793.
- Firiana, L. & Wahyuningsih, A. S. (2017). Penerapan Sistem Manajemen Kesehatan dan Keselamatan Kerja (SMK3) di PT. Ahmadaris. *HIGEIA: Journal of Public Health Research and Development Universitas Negeri Semarang*, 1 (1), 29-35. p ISSN 1475-362846, e ISSN 1475-222656. <http://journal.unnes.ac.id/sju/index.php/higeia>
- Febrianti, K. (2014). *Pengaruh Interaksi Sosial dan Motivasi Kerja Terhadap Produktifitas Kerja Karyawan PT. Good Year, Tbk Jakarta Indonesia*. Semarang: Tesis Universitas Diponegoro.
- Hasibuan, S.P. (2007). *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia: Dasar dan Kunci Keberhasilan*. Cetakan Pertama. Jakarta : CV. Haji Mas Agung.
- Iswanto, Y. & Yusuf, A. (2020). *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia*. Tangerang Selatan: Universitas Terbuka.
- Kaswan. (2019). *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia Strategis*. Yogyakarta: CV. Andi Offset.
- Malik, R., Said, S., Kamase, J., Ramlawati, Padhi, A. (2019). Integrasi Total Quality Manajemen dan Supply Chain Management Terhadap Keunggulan Bersaing dan Kinerja Perusahaan. *Journal of Industrial Engineering Management*, 4(1), 55-65. DOI : <http://dx.doi.org/10.33536/jiem.v4i1.304>
- Marjaya, I., & Pasaribu, F. (2019). Pengaruh Kepemimpinan, Motivasi, dan Pelatihan Terhadap Kinerja Pegawai. *Jurnal Ilmiah Magister Manajemen*, 2 (1), Maret 2019, 129-147. ISSN 2623-2634 (online). DOI: <https://doi.org/10.30596/maneggio.v2i1.3650>
- Mustofa, C. (2012). *Pengaruh Interaksi Sosial dan Konflik Kerja terhadap Kinerja Karyawan PT. Astra International Indonesia, Tbk Jakarta*. Semarang: Universitas Diponegoro.
- Nugroho, A., Trisnowati, H., Puspitawati, T., Pratiwi, R., Landis, M. V., Bu'u, N. M., dan Saputra, J. A. (2017). Implementation of Safety and Occupational Health Culture of The Companies at Sleman, Yogyakarta. *Jurnal Formil (Forum Ilmiah) KesMas Respati*, 2 (2), October 2017, 63-75. p-ISSN 2502-5570, e-ISSN 2550-0864.
- Pangestoeti (2012). *Keselamatan dan Kesehatan Kerja serta Pengaruhnya Terhadap Kinerja Karyawan Pada Karyawan Bagian Produksi PT. Indomarine Malang*. Tesis Program Magister Manajemen Fakultas Ekonomi dan Bisnis. Malang: Universitas Brawijaya.
- Priono. (2011). *Keselamatan dan Kesehatan Kerja serta Pengaruhnya Terhadap Kinerja Karyawan pada PT. Indofood Sukses Makmur Kabupaten Tanah Laut*. Tesis Program Magister Manajemen Fakultas Ekonomi dan Bisnis. Banjarmasin: Universitas Lambang Mangkurat.

- Riniwati, H. (2011). Mendongkrak Motivasi dan Kinerja: Pendekatan Pemberdayaan SDM. Malang: UB Press.
- Santoso, B. (2014). Interaksi Sosial Dalam Perusahaan. Jurnal Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia. Retrived from [www.google.com/Interaksi-sosial.html](http://www.google.com/Interaksi-sosial.html) on July 10<sup>th</sup> 2015.
- Sinambela, L. P. (2012). Kinerja Pegawai. Cetakan Pertama. Yogyakarta: Graha Ilmu.
- Sobirin, A. (2009). Budaya Organisasi. Yogyakarta: UPP STIM YKPN.
- Soekanto, S. (2012). Sosiologi (Suatu Pengantar). Jakarta: PT Raja Grafindo Persada.
- Stangrecka, B. H. (2016). The Impact of Information and Communication Technologies on E-Culture. *Global Management Journal*, 8, 14-20  
ISSN 2080-2951  
[http://www.nauka.gov.pl/g2/oryginal/2016\\_12/c5c2fcb0c283a9eb3d1081020fd3178c.pdf](http://www.nauka.gov.pl/g2/oryginal/2016_12/c5c2fcb0c283a9eb3d1081020fd3178c.pdf)
- Sudarmo, Gito, dan Indriyo. (2008). Perilaku Organisasi. Yogyakarta: BPFE.
- Suharto & Cahyo, B. (2005). Pengaruh Budaya Organisasi, Kepemimpinan dan Motivasi Kerja Terhadap Kinerja Sumber Daya Manusia, di sekretariat DPRD Propinsi Jawa Tengah. *JRBI*, 1 (1), Januari 2005, 13-30.
- Sugiyono. (2019). Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif, Kualitatif, dan R & D. Bandung: Alfabeta.
- Susanto, H. (2011). Analisis Interaksi Sosial dan Disiplin Kerja terhadap Kinerja Karyawan PT. Gudang Garam Indonesia, Tbk Kediri. Malang: Tesis Fakultas Ekonomi Universitas Brawijaya.
- Tofte, D. & Schumacher, J.E. (2010). Safety Culture and an Effective Safety Process. *WasteAdvantage Magazine*, July 2010, 27-30.
- Trisya, N. & Sutiadiningsih, A. (2013). Pengaruh Motivasi Kerja Terhadap Kinerja Karyawan Bagian Produksi Pada Perusahaan Citra Bakery Gresik. *E-journal Boga*, 2(3), 59-68.
- Zulganef. (2018). Metode Penelitian Bisnis dan Manajemen. Bandung: PT Refika Aditama.
- <https://www.indonesia.go.id/narasi/indonesia-dalam-angka/politik/fokus-utama-periode-kedua>, accessed on Januari 23rd 2022, 10:14AM.