*International Journal of Computational and Experimental Science and ENgineering (IJCESEN)*

*Vol. 11-No.3 (2025) pp. 4355-4363*
*http://www.ijcesen.com*

***ISSN: 2149-9144***



**Research Article**

# The Effect Of Ethical Leadership And Work Environment On Performance With Job Satisfaction As An Intervening Variable On Civil Servant Lecturers In North Sumatera

**Nirwana Br Bangun[1], Syaifuddin[2], Sofiyan Matondang[3]**

[1]Postgraduate School, University Prima Indonesia Medan, Indonesia
**Email:** bangu2n@gmail.com - **ORCID:** 0000-0002-5247-7851

[2]Postgraduate School, University Prima Indonesia Medan, Indonesia
* **Corresponding Author Email:** syaifuddin@unprimdn.ac.id- **ORCID:** 0000-0002-5247-7852

[3]Postgraduate School, University Prima Indonesia Medan, Indonesia
**Email:** sofiya2n@gmail.com - **ORCID:** 0000-0002-5247-7853

**Article Info:**

**DOI:** 10.22399/ijcesen.2751
**Received :** 02 April 2025
**Accepted :** 30 May 2025

**Keywords**

Ethical Leadership,
Lingkungan Kerja,
Kinerja,
Kepuasan Kerja Pegawai Negeri Sipil.

**Abstract:**

This study is to test whether there is an influence of ethical leadership and work environment on performance with job satisfaction as an intervening variable on Civil Servant lecturers. Data collection uses quantitative methods. This study was conducted on civil servant lecturers at DPK LLDikti Region I in Medan. In this study, the population was 448 people, so based on the provisions above, the author took a sample of 25% of the population, which was 112 people. The conclusion of the study is that Ethical leadership and Work environment do not affect the performance of civil servant lecturers at DPK LLDIKTI Region I Medan. However, it was found that Job satisfaction had a positive and significant effect on the performance of civil servant lecturers at DPK LLDIKTI Region I Medan. In contrast to Ethical leadership and Work environment which had a positive and significant effect on the job satisfaction of civil servant lecturers at DPK LLDIKTI Region I Medan. Furthermore, it was found that Ethical leadership and Work environment had a positive and significant effect on lecturer performance through job satisfaction on civil servant lecturers at DPK LLDIKTI Region I Medan.

## 1. Introduction

Lecturers are professional educators and scientists who develop and disseminate science and technology by transforming education, research, and community service. LLDIKTI is a work unit within the Ministry of Education, Culture, Research, and Technology that has duties and functions in the field of improving the quality of higher education in its work area led by a Head. Lecturer Dpk (Employed) LLDIKTI, namely a PNS (Civil Servant) at LLDIKTI who is then given the task or assigned to teach at one of the universities appointed by LLDIKTI to carry out the Tri Dharma of Higher Education.

Lecturers in carrying out their duties in implementing the Tridharma of higher education are some who are less than optimal, due to the lack of support and attention from the leadership towards the results of the work that has been done by the lecturer. Of course this will have an impact on the performance of the lecturer. Performance is the result of work in terms of quality and quantity achieved by a worker in this case a lecturer in carrying out his functions according to the responsibilities given to him. The performance of a lecturer is a very important and interesting part because it has proven to be very beneficial. An institution wants its employees to work hard according to their abilities to achieve good work results because without good performance from all employees, success in achieving goals will be difficult to achieve.

Other factors that influence the level of success of an organization include paying attention to the work environment. The work environment is everything around the worker that can affect job satisfaction in carrying out their duties so that

maximum results will be obtained where in the work environment there are work facilities that support workers in completing the responsibilities that have been entrusted to them. According to Afandi (2018) a pleasant work environment makes us feel more at home working so that it can increase work enthusiasm [1]. The condition of the work environment is good or appropriate if someone can carry out activities optimally, healthily, safely and comfortably. Therefore, a conducive work environment is needed to support performance in carrying out work, so that the work results obtained are achieved optimally.

Ethical Leadership is one of the moral standards and becomes a guideline for leaders in decision making. Ethics will also require leaders to think and act according to the norms of propriety in social relations. Ethical leaders have a positive influence on the people they lead. The role of leadership is very influential and important in an organization as one of the determinants of success in achieving the vision and mission of an organization. Leaders must be able to organize and create a conducive working atmosphere where the existing working atmosphere makes workers feel comfortable and fosters a sense of discipline to complete the work. The leadership needed is one that is able to direct and use available human resources optimally, so that they feel comfortable working and will affect the job satisfaction and performance of the person concerned.

Job satisfaction is influenced by many factors, including leadership ethics, work environment, and so on. Job satisfaction is a pleasant or unpleasant emotional state for workers to view their work. According to Handoko (2011) job satisfaction is basically very individualistic and is something that is very dependent on the personality of each worker [2]. If the factors that support job satisfaction are met, then workers will work well and vice versa. Job satisfaction is also one of the criteria that can determine the health of a company, Dissatisfaction is the starting point for problems in the company. Based on the description above, the author is interested in knowing the Influence of Ethical Leadership and Work Environment on Lecturer Performance with Job Satisfaction as an Intervening Variable on Civil Servant Lecturers Dpk. LLDikti Region 1 Medan.

## 2. Research Method

This study used quantitative descriptive analysis. Data were collected through research instruments and analyzed statistically, to test previously made hypotheses. This study uses a causal relationship, namely cause and effect seen from the relationship between independent variables and dependent variables. Processing research data using Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) is more appropriate to use because the interpretation of the results and the validity and reliability in the conclusions are more accurate. A simple method that is often used is to find the average indicator. This study was conducted on civil servant lecturers at DPK LLDikti Region I in Medan. In this context, the population is all civil servant lecturers at DPK LLDikti Region I Medan. The sampling technique used in this study is the Probability sampling technique. In this study, the population was 448 people, so based on the provisions above, the author took a sample of 25% of the population, which was 112 people.

Data collection techniques are the most strategic step in research, because the main purpose of research is to obtain data. Without knowing the data collection techniques, the research will not obtain data that meets the established data standards. According to Sugiyono, (2014), states that: "data collection techniques can be carried out by observation, interviews, questionnaires, documentation, and a combination of the four" [3]. The Likert scale is used to measure the opinions, attitudes, or perceptions of a person or group of people about phenomena that occur in a social. The measurement scale in this study will be divided into alternative answers from strongly agree to very bad with a scale number between 1-5 [4]. The data sources for this study are primary data and secondary data. This study uses the structural equation modeling-partial least squares (SEM-PLS) data analysis method using SmartPLS software.

The outer model or also called (outer relation or model measurement) defines how each indicator block relates to its latent variables. The measurement model (outer model) is used to assess the validity and reliability of the model. Testing in the outer model is as follows :

a.Convergent Validity

The convergent validity of the measurement model can be seen from the correlation between the indicator scores and the variable scores. To test convergent validity, the outer loading or loading factor value is used. Validity measurement includes testing how well the value of an instrument developed in measuring a study. The higher the value of the instrument, the better it is in representing the research question (Wijaya, 2019). To measure validity, it is necessary to test the relationship between variables, including: Discriminant Validity and Average Variance Extracted (AVE) with the expected AVE value> 0.5, (Wijaya, 2019). Validity testing with the SmartPLS program can be seen from the loading

factor value for each construct indicator. The requirement that is usually used to assess validity is that the loading factor value must be more than 0.70.

b. Discriminant Validity

Discriminant validity of the measurement model with reflective indicators is assessed based on the cross loading of the measurement with the construct. According to Ghozali and Latan (2015) the discriminant validity method is to test the discriminant validity with reflective indicators, namely by looking at the cross loading value for each variable must be > 0.07 [8]. In addition, another way that can be used to see a model that has discriminant validity is to compare the square root of Average Variance Extracted (AVE) value of each construct with the correlation between other constructs in the model.

c. Composite Reliability

Measuring the reliability of a construct with a reflective indicator can be done by measuring the Composite Reliability value. Composite Reliability measures the actual value of the reliability of a construct. A construct is said to be reliable if the composite reliability value must be > 0.07.

1. Significance Test of Bootstrapping Effect (Inner Model)

The results of the outer model test show that it has met the validity and reliability requirements. Furthermore, the inner model test is carried out, which includes the direct effect significance test, and the indirect effect significance test/mediating and moderating influence (indirect effect). The inner model is a specification of the relationship between latent variables (structural model) that describes the relationship between latent variables based on the substantive theory of the study. The structural model is evaluated using R-square for the dependent construct, the Stone-Geisser Q-square test for predictive relevance and the t-test and significance of the structural path parameter coefficients.

2. Coefficient of Determination ($R^2$) and (Q2 )

The most commonly used measure to evaluate a structural model is the coefficient of determination ($R^2$ value). According to Hair et al. (2017), the coefficient of determination ($R^2$ value) is a measure of predictive power in a sample [5]. The higher the $R^2$ value, the greater the explanatory power of the PLS structural model and the better the prediction of endogenous variables. The range of $R^2$ values is from 0 to 1, with 0 indicating no relationship and 1 indicating a perfect relationship. An $R^2$ value of 0.75 can be concluded that the model is strong, 0.50 is moderate, and 0.25 is weak. According to Hair et al. (2017), problems often arise if we use the $R^2$ value to compare differently specified models, for example different exogenous variables predict the same endogenous variable [5].

The adjusted coefficient of determination ($R^2$adj) can be used to compare PLS-SEM results involving models with different numbers of exogenous latent variables and/or data sets with different sample sizes. While Q-Square predictive relevance for structural models, measures how well the observed values are generated by the model and also its parameter estimates. A Q2 value > 0 indicates evidence that the observed values have been well reconstructed so that the model has predictive relevance. While a Q2 value < 0 indicates no predictive relevance. The Q2 value is used to see the relative influence of the structural model on the measurement of observations for latent dependent variables (endogenous latent variables).

3. Path Coefficient

According to Hair et al. (2017), the path coefficient indicates the hypothesized relationship between variables [5]. The path coefficient has a standard value of approximately between -1 and +1. A path coefficient approaching +1 indicates a strong positive relationship. A path coefficient approaching -1 indicates a strong negative relationship. The closer the estimated coefficient is to 0, the weaker the relationship.

Uji Hipotesis

Hypothesis testing is done by looking at the significance value. According to Hair et al. (2017), the significance value is seen to determine the influence between variables through the bootstrapping procedure [5]. With bootstrapping, the t value (T-statistics) and p value (p-value) can be obtained. When the t value (T-statistics) is greater than the critical t value (t table), it can be concluded that the coefficient is statistically significant at a certain error probability, namely the significance level. The critical t value (critical t value) commonly used for two-sided testing is 1.65 (significance level = 10%), 1.96 (significance level = 5%), and 2.57 (significance level = 1%), while the critical t value (critical t value) commonly used for one-sided testing is 1.28 (significance level = 10%), 1.65 (significance level = 5%), and 2.33 (significance level = 1%).

Another method that is widely used is to look at the p value (p value). The coefficient can be said to be significant if the p value (p-value) is smaller than the significance level. In the field of Human Resource Management (HRM), researchers usually assume a significance level of 5%, although not all. In the application, it is usually assumed that the significance level is 5%. In this study, the significance level used is 0.05 (5%) and uses the p-value to see significance, so it can be said to be significant if the p-value is below 0.05 (<5%).

## 3. Results and Discussions

### Outer Model Evaluation

Evaluation of the Outer model consists of convergent validity, discriminant validity, and composite reliability.

**a. Convergent Validity Testing**

The purpose of conducting convergent validity testing is to determine the suitability of each instrument used in the study when measuring its construct variables. Convergent validity testing is carried out with loading factors and Average Variance Extracted. A loading value greater than 0.7 is a good loading factor value for an instrument to measure its construct variables. An Average Variance Extracted value greater than 0.5 is a good Average Variance Extracted value for its construct variables [6]. Furthermore, the results of Convergent validity of each variable are presented. The AVE limit value is 0.50 and the composite reliability is 0.7. The loading factor values in this study are shown in Table 1.

The Outer Loading Test aims to see the correlation between the item or indicator score and the variable score. An indicator is considered reliable if it has a correlation value above 0.7, but in the development stage a correlation of 0.50 is still acceptable [7]. Based on the outer loading validity test in Table 1, it is known that all outer loading values are > 0.5, which means that the data has met the validity requirements based on the outer loading value.

**b. Average Variance Extracted (AVE), Reliability based on Composite Reliability (CR) and Cronbach's Alpha (CA)**

The recommended Average Variance Extracted (AVE) value is above 0.5 (Sholihin & Ratmono, 2021). If the AVE value is greater than 0.5, then the discriminant validity is considered good, the following is the average variance extracted (AVE) value in Table 2.The recommended AVE value is above 0.5. It is known that all AVE values are > 0.5, which means that they have met the validity requirements based on AVE. Furthermore, reliability testing is carried out based on the composite reliability (CR) value. The recommended CR value is above 0.7. It is known that all CR values are > 0.7, which means that they have met the reliability requirements based on CR. Furthermore, reliability testing is carried out based on the cronbach's alpha (CA) value. The recommended CA value is above 0.7. It is known that all CA values are > 0.7, which means that they have met the reliability requirements based on cronbach's alpha. Furthermore, discriminant validity testing is carried out using the Fornell-Larcker approach.

**c. Discriminant Validity**

Based on the validity test of outer loading in Table 3, it is known that all outer loading values are > 0.7, which means that they have met the validity requirements based on the outer loading value.

Based on the outer loading validity test in Table 3, it is known that all outer loading values are > 0.5, which means that they have met the validity requirements based on the outer loading value. Discriminant validity testing in research using the Fornell-Larckel approach is discriminant validity testing with the AVE square root value of a latent variable, compared to the correlation value between the latent variable and other latent variables. The following are the results of the discriminant validity test in Table 4.

In discriminant validity testing, the AVE square root value of a latent variable is compared with the correlation value between the latent variable and other latent variables. It is known that the AVE square root value for each latent variable is greater than the correlation value between the latent variable and other latent variables. So it is concluded that it has met the requirements of discriminant validity.

**d. Structural Model Evaluation (*Inner* Model)**

The inner model is a specification of the relationship between latent variables (structural model) that describes the relationship between latent variables based on the substantive theory of the study. The structural model is evaluated using R-square for the dependent construct, Stone-Geisser Q-square test for predictive relevance and t-test and significance of the structural path parameter coefficient. The results of the outer model test indicate that it has met the validity and reliability requirements. Furthermore, the inner model test is carried out, which includes the direct effect significance test, and the indirect effect significance test/mediating and moderating effects.

**1. Direct Effect between Research Variables**

The results of the significance test of the direct influence of this study are shown in Table 5.

**1. The Influence of Ethical Leadership on Lecturer Performance**

H1: Ethical leadership has a positive and significant effect on the performance of civil servant lecturers at Dpk LLDIKTI Region I Medan.

Based on table 5, the results of the O.S value are -0.035 and the T statistic value is 0.384 with a significance of 0.701> 0.05, thus it can be said that ethical leadership does not affect lecturer performance. Thus Ha (hypothesis) is rejected, and

Ho is accepted.

**2. The Influence of the Work Environment on Lecturer Performance**

H2: The work environment has a positive and significant effect on the performance of civil servant lecturers at Dpk LLDIKTI Region I Medan

Based on table 5, the results of the O.S value are -0.129 and the T statistic value is 1.457 with a significance of 0.146> 0.05, thus it can be said that the work environment does not affect the performance of lecturers. Thus Ha (hypothesis) is rejected, and Ho is accepted.

**3. The Influence of the Work Environment on Lecturer Performance**

H3: Job satisfaction has a positive and significant effect on the performance of civil servant lecturers at Dpk LLDIKTI Region I Medan

Based on table 5, the results of the O.S value are -0.548 and the T statistic value is 2.565 with a significance of 0.011 <0.05, thus it can be said that job satisfaction has a positive and significant effect on lecturer performance. Thus Ha (hypothesis) is accepted, and Ho is rejected.

**4. The Influence of Ethical Leadership on Job Satisfaction**

H4. Ethical leadership has a positive and significant effect on the job satisfaction of civil servant lecturers at Dpk LLDIKTI Region I Medan. Based on table 5, the results of the O.S value are 0.204 and the T statistic value is 4.146 with a significance of 0.000 <0.05, thus it can be said that Ethical leadership has a positive and significant effect on job satisfaction. Thus Ha (hypothesis) is accepted, and Ho is rejected.

**5. The Influence of the Work Environment on Job Satisfaction**

H5: The work environment has a positive and significant effect on the job satisfaction of civil servant lecturers at Dpk LLDIKTI Region I Medan

Based on table 5, the results of the O.S value are 0.136 and the T statistic value is 3.082 with a significance of 0.002 <0.05, thus it can be said that the work environment has a positive and significant effect on job satisfaction. Thus Ha (hypothesis) is accepted, and Ho is rejected.

**2. Indirect Influence**

The indirect influence in this study is the influence that is intervened by other variables. The results of the indirect influence research in this study are presented in the table 6.

**a. The Influence of Ethical Leadership on Lecturer Performance Through Job Satisfaction**

H6: Ethical leadership has a positive and significant effect on lecturer performance through job satisfaction on PNS lecturers Dpk LLDIKTI Region I Medan

Based on table 6, the results of the O.S value are -0.112 and the T statistic value is 2.292 with a significance of 0.002 <0.05, thus it can be said that Ethical leadership has a negative and significant effect on lecturer performance through job satisfaction. Thus Ha (hypothesis) is accepted, and Ho is rejected.

**b. The Influence of the Work Environment on Lecturer Performance Through Job Satisfaction**

H7: The work environment has a positive and significant effect on lecturer performance through job satisfaction on PNS lecturers Dpk LLDIKTI Region I Medan.

Based on table 6, the results of the O.S value are -0.075 and the T statistic value is 1.864 with a significance of 0.063> 0.05, thus it can be said that the work environment does not affect lecturer performance through job satisfaction. Thus Ha (hypothesis) is rejected, and Ho is accepted.

**Coefficient of Determination (R2)**

The value of the coefficient of determination (R2) is said to be strong, if the value of R2 > 50%. The following is an analysis of the value of the coefficient of determination (R2) in Table 23.
Known :

1. The R-Square value of job satisfaction is 0.949, which means that the independent variables of ethical leadership and work environment are able to explain the dependent variable of job satisfaction by 94.9% (strong), the remaining 6.1% is explained by other independent variables.
2. 2. The R-Square value of Performance is 0.878, which means that the independent variables of ethical leadership, work environment, and job satisfaction are able to explain the performance variable by 88.8% (Strong), the remaining 12.2% is explained by other independent variables.

**Goodness of Fit Model Testing**

It is known that based on the results of the SRMR goodness of fit test, the SRMR value = 0.080 < 0.1, so it is concluded that the model is FIT.

***Table 1.*** *Validity Testing Based on Outer Loading (First Order)*

| Indicator | Ethical Leadership | Job satisfaction | Performance | Work environment |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **X1.1** | **0.698** | | | |
| **X1.10** | **0.872** | | | |
| **X1.2** | **0.770** | | | |
| **X1.3** | **0.803** | | | |
| **X1.4** | **0.610** | | | |
| **X1.5** | **0.805** | | | |
| **X1.6** | **0.848** | | | |
| **X1.7** | **0.775** | | | |
| **X1.8** | **0.837** | | | |
| **X1.9** | **0.803** | | | |
| **X2.1** | | | | **0.726** |
| **X2.10** | | | | **0.800** |
| **X2.2** | | | | **0.802** |
| **X2.3** | | | | **0.817** |
| **X2.4** | | | | **0.851** |
| **X2.5** | | | | **0.773** |
| **X2.6** | | | | **0.777** |
| **X2.7** | | | | **0.724** |
| **X2.8** | | | | **0.702** |
| **X2.9** | | | | **0.742** |
| **Y1** | | | **0.721** | |
| **Y10** | | | **0.734** | |
| **Y2** | | | **0.707** | |
| **Y3** | | | **0.713** | |
| **Y4** | | | **0.697** | |
| **Y5** | | | **0.698** | |
| **Y6** | | | **0.723** | |
| **Y7** | | | **0.727** | |
| **Y8** | | | **0.711** | |
| **Y9** | | | **0.698** | |
| **Z1** | | **0.705** | | |
| **Z10** | | **0.799** | | |
| **Z2** | | **0.703** | | |
| **Z3** | | **0.801** | | |
| **Z4** | | **0.810** | | |
| **Z5** | | **0.812** | | |
| **Z6** | | **0.811** | | |
| **Z7** | | **0.837** | | |
| **Z8** | | **0.805** | | |
| **Z9** | | **0.774** | | |

*Source: Data processed with Smart PLS (V.3.2.9), 2024*

***Table 2.*** *Validity Testing based on Average Variance Extracted (AVE); Reliability based on Composite Reliability (CR) and Cronbach's Alpha (CA) (First Order)*

| Variables | Cronbach's Alpha | rho_A | Composite Reliability | Average Variance Extracted (AVE) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Ethical Leadership | **0.930** | **0.937** | **0.941** | **0.617** |
| Job Satisfaction | **0.931** | **0.935** | **0.942** | **0.619** |
| Performance | **0.893** | **0.893** | **0.912** | **0.509** |
| Work Environment | **0.925** | **0.928** | **0.937** | **0.597** |

*Source: Data processed with Smart PLS (V.3.2.9), 2024*

***Table 3.*** *Validity Test Based on Outer Loading (Second Order)*

| Indicator | Sample Mean (M) |
|---|---|

| | |
|---|---|
| X1.1 <- Ethical Leadership | 0.692 |
| X1.10 <- Ethical Leadership | 0.869 |
| X1.2 <- Ethical Leadership | 0.765 |
| X1.3 <- Ethical Leadership | 0.797 |
| X1.4 <- Ethical Leadership | 0.615 |
| X1.5 <- Ethical Leadership | 0.806 |
| X1.6 <- Ethical Leadership | 0.843 |
| X1.7 <- Ethical Leadership | 0.772 |
| X1.8 <- Ethical Leadership | 0.836 |
| X1.9 <- Ethical Leadership | 0.801 |
| X2.1 <- Work Environment | 0.726 |
| X2.10 <- Work Environment | 0.798 |
| X2.2 <- Work Environment | 0.800 |
| X2.3 <- Work Environment | 0.816 |
| X2.4 <- Work Environment | 0.848 |
| X2.5 <- Work Environment | 0.767 |
| X2.6 <- Work Environment | 0.774 |
| X2.7 <- Work Environment | 0.725 |
| X2.8 <- Work Environment | 0.701 |
| X2.9 <- Work Environment | 0.740 |
| Y1 <- Performance | 0.717 |
| Y10 <- Performance | 0.733 |
| Y2 <- Performance | 0.708 |
| Y3 <- Performance | 0.705 |
| Y4 <- Performance | 0.683 |
| Y5 <- Performance | 0.692 |
| Y6 <- Performance | 0.710 |
| Y7 <- Performance | 0.720 |
| Y8 <- Performance | 0.713 |
| Y9 <- Performance | 0.706 |
| Z1 <- Job Satisfaction | 0.694 |
| Z10 <- Job Satisfaction | 0.799 |
| Z2 <- Job Satisfaction | 0.702 |
| Z3 <- Job Satisfaction | 0.801 |
| Z4 <- Job Satisfaction | 0.805 |
| Z5 <- Job Satisfaction | 0.808 |
| Z6 <- Job Satisfaction Work | 0.807 |
| Z7 <- Job Satisfaction | 0.836 |
| Z8 <- Job Satisfaction | 0.805 |
| Z9 <- Job Satisfaction | 0.768 |

*Source: Data processed with Smart PLS (V.3.2.9), 2024*

***Table 4.*** *Discriminant Validity Testing: Fornell & Larcker (First)*

| | **Ethical Leadership** | **Kepuasan Kerja** | **Kinerja** | **Lingkungan Kerja** |
|---|---|---|---|---|

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Ethical Leadership** | 0.796 | | | |
| Job Satisfaction | 0.785 | 0.841 | | |
| Performance | 0.621 | 0.782 | 0.853 | |
| Work Environment | 0.739 | 0.773 | 0.664 | 0.787 |

*Source: Data processed with Smart PLS (V.3.2.9), 2024*

***Table 5.*** *Direct Effect between Research Variables*

| | **Original Sample (O)** | **Sample Mean (M)** | **Standard Deviation (STDEV)** | **T Statistics (\|O/STDEV\|)** | **P Values** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Ethical Leadership -> Job Satisfaction | 0.204 | 0.209 | 0.049 | 4.146 | **0.000** |
| Ethical Leadership -> Performance | -0.035 | -0.033 | 0.090 | 0.384 | **0.701** |
| Job Satisfaction -> Performance | -0.548 | -0.537 | 0.214 | 2.565 | **0.011** |
| Work Environment -> Job Satisfaction | 0.136 | 0.138 | 0.044 | 3.082 | **0.002** |
| Work Environment -> Performance | -0.129 | -0.134 | 0.088 | 1.457 | **0.146** |

*Source: Data processed with Smart PLS (V.3.2.9), 2024*

***Table 6.*** *Results of the Indirect Influence Test*

| | **Original Sample (O)** | **Sample Mean (M)** | **Standard Deviation (STDEV)** | **T Statistics (\|O/STDEV\|)** | **P Values** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Ethical Leadership -> Job Satisfaction -> Performance | -0.112 | -0.111 | 0.049 | 2.292 | **0.022** |
| Work Environment -> Job Satisfaction -> Performance | -0.075 | -0.074 | 0.040 | 1.864 | **0.063** |

*Source: Processed data, 2024*

***Table 7.*** *Coefficient of Determination (R2)*

| | **R Square** |
|---|---|
| Job Satisfaction | 0.949 |
| Performance | 0.878 |

*Source: Data processed with Smart PLS (V.3.2.9), 2024*

***Table 8.*** *Goodness of Fit Model Testing*

| | **Estimated Model** |
|---|---|
| **SRMR** | 0.080 |

*Source: Data processed with Smart PLS (V.3.2.9), 2024*

## 4. Conclusions

Based on the results of the variable test, several research conclusions were found, namely Ethical leadership and Work environment do not affect the performance of PNS lecturers at Dpk LLDIKTI Region I Medan. However, it was found that Job satisfaction has a positive and significant effect on the performance of PNS lecturers at Dpk LLDIKTI Region I Medan. This is different from Ethical leadership and Work environment which have a positive and significant effect on the job satisfaction of PNS lecturers at Dpk LLDIKTI Region I Medan. Furthermore, it was found that Ethical leadership and Work environment have a positive and significant effect on lecturer performance through job satisfaction in PNS lecturers at Dpk LLDIKTI Region I Medan.

## Author Statements:

- **Ethical approval:** The conducted research is not related to either human or animal use.
- **Conflict of interest:** The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper
- **Acknowledgement:** The authors declare that they have nobody or no-company to acknowledge.
- **Author contributions:** The authors declare that they have equal right on this paper.
- **Funding information:** The authors declare that there is no funding to be acknowledged.
- **Data availability statement:** The data that support the findings of this study are available on request from the corresponding author. The data are not publicly available due to privacy or ethical restrictions.

## References

[1]Afandi, Pandi. 2018. *Manajemen Sumberdaya Manusia Teori Konsep dan. Indikator*. Pekanbaru: Zanafa Publishing.

[2]Handoko, Hani. (2011) .*Manajemen Personalia dan Sumber Daya Manusia* .Yogyakarta : Penerbit BPFE Anggota IKAPI.

[3]Sugiyono. 2014. Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif dan Kualitatif .Bandung: Alfabeta.

[4]Sugiyono. 2015. Metodologi Penelitian Bisnis. Bandung: Penerbit Alfabeta.

[5]Hair, J. F., Hult, G. T. M., Ringle, C. M., Sarstedt, M., & Thiele, K. O. (2017). Mirror, mirror on the wall: a comparative evaluation of composite-based structural equation modeling methods. *Journal of the academy of marketing science*, *45*, 616-632.

[6]Wong, K. K. K. (2019). *Mastering partial least squares structural equation modeling (PLS-Sem) with Smartpls in 38 Hours*. IUniverse.

[7]Ghozali, Imam. 2006. *Aplikasi Analisis Multivariate dengan Program SPSS*. (Edisi Ke 4). Semarang:Badan Penerbit Universitas Diponegoro.

[8]Ghozali, I., & Latan, H. (2014). Partial Least Squares konsep, metode dan Aplikasi menggunakan program WarpPLS 4.0. *Semarang: Badan Penerbit Universitas Diponegoro*, *57*.

.