Vol. 4 No. 1 Edisi November – Januari 2027 E. ISSN. 3032-2472
Multidisciplinary Indonesian Center Journal (MICJO)
Journal page is available to
https://e-jurnal.jurnalcenter.com/index.php/micjo
Email: admin@jurnalcenter.com

# TEACHER PERFORMANCE AND ORGANIZATIONAL CONDITIONS: A MULTIPLE REGRESSION STUDY AT SDN NAGASARI 03, BEKASI

# KINERJA GURU DAN KONDISI ORGANISASI: STUDI REGRESI GANDA DI SDN NAGASARI 03, BEKASI

**Nur'asiah[1*], Zulkifli Rangkuti[2], Dudun Junaedi[3]**

[1*]Universitas Mitra Bangsa, Email: nurasiahspd83@gmail.com
[2]Universitas Mitra Bangsa, Email: zrangkuti@gmail.com
[3]Kencana Academy of Secretarial and Management Bandung (ASMKB),
Email: dudunjunaedi@asmkencana.ac.id

*email koresponden: nurasiahspd83@gmail.com

DOI: https://doi.org/10.62567/micjo.v4i1.3426

**Abstract**

This study examines the associations of work environment and organizational culture with teacher performance at SDN Nagasari 03, Bekasi Regency. It distinguishes the resources and working relationships available to teachers from the shared norms and practices that coordinate school work. Questionnaire responses from 33 teachers were analysed using descriptive statistics and multiple linear regression. The work environment received an overall mean score of 3.80. Workspace arrangement and supervisory support and communication each scored 4.24, whereas work facilities scored 3.21. In the regression model, work environment was positively associated with teacher performance ($B = 0.473$, $t = 3.535$, $p = .001$), as was organizational culture ($B = 0.568$, $t = 4.856$, $p < .001$). The predictors were jointly significant ($F = 54.898$, $p < .001$), and the model accounted for 78.5% of the observed variation in the performance measure ($R^2 = .785$). By examining material and relational working conditions alongside shared organizational practices in one elementary school, the study provides a focused basis for school-level diagnosis. The comparatively low facilities score warrants a review of teachers' specific resource needs, while communication and coordinated work routines should be maintained. Because the analysis draws on one school and the available questionnaire summary, its findings describe associations rather than causal effects.

**Keywords :** Teacher Performance, Work Environment, Organizational Culture, Elementary School, Bekasi Regency.

Multidisciplinary Indonesian Center Journal (MICJO)
Journal page is available to
https://e-jurnal.jurnalcenter.com/index.php/micjo
Email: admin@jurnalcenter.com

**Abstrak**

Penelitian ini menganalisis hubungan lingkungan kerja dan budaya organisasi dengan kinerja guru di SDN Nagasari 03, Kabupaten Bekasi. Lingkungan kerja dipahami melalui sumber daya dan hubungan kerja yang mendukung pelaksanaan tugas, sedangkan budaya organisasi mencakup norma serta praktik bersama yang mengoordinasikan pekerjaan di sekolah. Jawaban kuesioner dari 33 guru dianalisis menggunakan statistik deskriptif dan regresi linear berganda. Lingkungan kerja memperoleh skor rata-rata 3,80. Penataan ruang kerja serta dukungan dan komunikasi atasan masing-masing memperoleh skor 4,24, sedangkan fasilitas kerja memperoleh skor 3,21. Dalam model regresi, lingkungan kerja berhubungan positif dengan kinerja guru ($B = 0,473$; $t = 3,535$; $p = 0,001$), demikian pula budaya organisasi ($B = 0,568$; $t = 4,856$; $p < 0,001$). Kedua variabel signifikan secara bersama-sama ($F = 54,898$; $p < 0,001$), dan model menjelaskan 78,5% variasi teramati pada ukuran kinerja guru ($R^2 = 0,785$). Dengan menelaah kondisi kerja dan praktik organisasi secara bersamaan pada satu sekolah dasar, penelitian ini memberi dasar yang terarah untuk mengidentifikasi prioritas pengelolaan sekolah. Skor fasilitas yang relatif rendah perlu ditelusuri hingga kebutuhan sumber daya yang spesifik, sementara komunikasi dan koordinasi kerja perlu dipertahankan. Temuan ini menunjukkan hubungan antarvariabel pada sekolah yang diteliti, bukan bukti pengaruh sebab-akibat.

**Kata Kunci :** Kinerja Guru, Lingkungan Kerja, Budaya Organisasi, Sekolah Dasar, Kabupaten Bekasi.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Teacher performance depends partly on what teachers can do within the conditions of their school. Adequate facilities, workable spaces, communication, and shared routines can support daily teaching, but these features describe different aspects of organizational life. The work environment concerns the resources and relationships surrounding a task; school culture concerns the meanings and recurring practices through which staff coordinate their work. School-climate reviews likewise warn that related constructs need clear measurement boundaries (Thapa et al., 2013; Wang & Degol, 2016). Treating them as generic signs of a "good school" obscures what a school leader could actually change (Cucchiara et al., 2025; Merrill, 2021; Schoen & Teddlie, 2008).

At SDN Nagasari 03 in Bekasi Regency, the thesis underlying this article reports uneven familiarity with work standards and procedures, incomplete programme targets, and concerns about task execution and evaluation. Its approximate figure of 70% programme attainment is an unverified background assertion, not a measured outcome in the dataset presented here. These local concerns motivate an examination of the association between teachers' perceptions of working conditions, organizational culture, and performance. They do not, by themselves, demonstrate that the two predictors caused the reported problems.

Prior research gives both a reason to expect a relationship and a reason to examine its scope. Arifin & Mardikaningsih, (2021) found positive associations for work environment and organizational culture in a teacher sample. In elementary settings, (Haryanto et al., (2020) reported a positive association between work environment and performance, while Ideswal et al., (2020) linked school climate with teacher performance. Studies with other covariates likewise connect physical working conditions Priyono et al., (2018), leadership and school culture (Handayani & Rasyid, 2015), and school-level organizational context Kraft et al., (2016) to outcomes relevant to teachers. These studies do not use identical definitions or outcomes: school climate, organizational culture, satisfaction, retention, and performance should not be collapsed into one measure.

The findings are also less uniform than a simple positive-effect narrative suggests. Indajang et al., (2020) found no statistically significant direct association between organizational culture and teacher performance in a foundation-run school, and Pangesa et al., (2025) likewise reported a nonsignificant culture coefficient alongside a significant nonphysical work-environment coefficient in

Multidisciplinary Indonesian Center Journal (MICJO)
Journal page is available to
https://e-jurnal.jurnalcenter.com/index.php/micjo
Email: admin@jurnalcenter.com

a Jakarta school. Recent models include job satisfaction, leadership, or self-development (Putra et al., 2025; Naufal et al., 2026); elementary-school evidence from Merauke also links leadership, morale, and satisfaction with performance (Werang, 2014). A two-predictor specification captures only part of a wider organizational explanation. Differences in school governance, measures, and model specification may help account for these contrasting results; the present data cannot determine which explanation is correct.

Conceptually, supportive physical and social conditions may provide resources for accomplishing teaching tasks (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007; Demerouti et al., 2001). Culture refers more specifically to shared expectations and enacted practices, including coordination and the handling of standards (Cucchiara et al., 2025; Schoen & Teddlie, 2008). These perspectives orient the interpretation of the two survey predictors; they do not turn the regression into a test of a mediated mechanism. The research question is: How are perceived work environment and organizational culture, separately and jointly, associated with teacher performance at SDN Nagasari 03? The article offers a context-specific estimate and compares its direction with relevant studies, including contrary findings, to inform school-level priorities.

## 2. RESEARCH METHOD

The study used a quantitative, observational questionnaire design at SDN Nagasari 03, Bekasi Regency. The supplied statistical summary reports 33 observations. The source describes simple random sampling but provides neither the population size nor a sampling frame or selection procedure; accordingly, the method of selecting the 33 teachers remains. The cross-sectional interpretation is plausible from the single questionnaire analysis but also needs confirmation in the thesis. The unit analysed in the regression is the individual teacher, although the school itself is the single institutional setting.

Within that setting, primary data came from questionnaires on the perceived work environment ($X_1$), perceived organizational culture ($X_2$), and teacher performance (Y). The source describes the work environment through physical conditions, facilities, and working relationships, and culture through norms, communication, coordination, and leadership example. It supplies a five-point-style mean for the work environment but does not provide the item wording, response anchors, dimension scores, performance indicators, or scoring rules The article uses published research and the thesis narrative as secondary contextual material; the supplied regression does not establish that administrative records or independent classroom observations were analysed as secondary empirical data. The 70% programme figure must be checked against an identified school record before it can be treated as evidence.

To examine the two associations in the same model, the reported analysis used SPSS version 25. Descriptive means summarize the available work-environment scores. Multiple linear regression estimates the conditional association of each predictor with Y, while t tests assess the individual coefficients and the F test assesses the joint model. The reported specification is

$$Y_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X_{1i} + \beta_2 X_{2i} + \varepsilon_i.$$

## 3. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

The analysis begins with the work-environment ratings because their component scores can identify an operational issue that the overall score alone might hide. Table 1 presents the reported composite and selected indicators; no other indicator means are available in the supplied manuscript.

**Table 1. Selected descriptive results for the work environment**

| Measure | Reported mean | Reading within the source |
|---|---|---|
| Work environment, overall | 3.80 | Labelled “good” in the source; cut-offs unavailable |
| Workspace arrangement | 4.24 | Joint-highest reported indicator |

Multidisciplinary Indonesian Center Journal (MICJO)
Journal page is available to
https://e-jurnal.jurnalcenter.com/index.php/micjo
Email: admin@jurnalcenter.com

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Supervisory support and communication | 4.24 | Joint-highest reported indicator |
| Work facilities | 3.21 | Lowest of the indicators supplied |

Source: Author's compilation 2026.

Table 1 shows an overall mean of 3.80, labelled "good" in the source although its category cut-offs remain. Workspace arrangement and supervisory support and communication each scored 4.24; facilities scored 3.21. The 1.03-point contrast is descriptive and does not test whether indicator means differ statistically. It points to a practical question: which facilities are least adequate for teachers' daily tasks? Work resources can affect whether teachers have the conditions to perform a task, but these ratings neither identify the missing resources nor establish their effect on instruction (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007; Merrill, 2021). Comparing item responses with an equipment inventory and accounts of work interruptions would make the next management decision more precise.

Having identified the lower-rated aspect of the work setting, the analysis turns to whether the two composite predictors are associated with the performance measure when entered together. Table 2 reports the available unstandardized slopes and their individual tests.

**Table 2. Reported multiple-regression coefficients for teacher performance**

| Term | Unstandardized *B* | *t* | Reported *p* | Interpretation |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Intercept | 0.954 | Not supplied | Not supplied | Fitted constant |
| Work environment ($X_1$) | 0.473 | 3.535 | .001 | Positive conditional association |
| Organizational culture ($X_2$) | 0.568 | 4.856 | < .001 | Positive conditional association |

Source: Author's compilation 2026.

Table 2 shows positive conditional coefficients for work environment ($B = 0.473$, $t = 3.535$, $p = .001$) and organizational culture ($B = 0.568$, $t = 4.856$, $p < .001$). The fitted equation is $\hat{Y} = 0.954 + 0.473X_1 + 0.568X_2$. Holding the other reported predictor constant, a one-unit difference in each score corresponds to its respective difference in fitted performance. The slopes cannot be ranked as measures of relative importance without comparable scale construction or standardized estimates. The intercept's practical meaning also depends on unavailable scale ranges; confidence intervals and standard errors are not supplied.

For work environment, the direction is consistent with (Arifin & Mardikaningsih, 2021; Haryanto et al., 2020; Priyono et al., 2018). A resource perspective suggests that space, facilities, and support may make planning and delivering lessons easier. Yet this composite blends physical resources with social relations. Its coefficient cannot reveal whether facilities, supervision, collegial relations, or a general tendency toward favourable survey ratings accounts for the association. Johnson et al., (2012) show why organizational conditions deserve attention, but their broader outcomes and setting are not a direct replication of this school's performance measure.

The positive culture coefficient is consistent with Arifin & Mardikaningsih, (2021) and with research associating school culture with teacher outcomes (Handayani & Rasyid, 2015). It differs from the nonsignificant direct associations reported by (Indajang et al., 2020; Pangesa et al., 2025). These contrasting results prevent a universal claim that a favourable culture will always correspond to higher teacher performance. In the present school, shared norms and communication may coincide with clearer task expectations, but the data neither measure that process directly nor distinguish culture from overlapping items about communication and supervisory relations. The distinction between formal meanings and enacted practices developed by Cucchiara et al., (2025) is useful for the next measurement round: asking whether teachers know a standard is different from observing whether they *use* it in planning, teaching, and evaluation.

Multidisciplinary Indonesian Center Journal (MICJO)
Journal page is available to
https://e-jurnal.jurnalcenter.com/index.php/micjo
Email: admin@jurnalcenter.com

The performance outcome itself needs tighter definition. Teacher performance might include preparation, instructional delivery, assessment, and follow-up, but the provided source does not show which dimensions were measured. More elaborate Indonesian studies have incorporated competence, motivation, satisfaction, or leadership (Indajang et al., 2020; Putra et al., 2025; Ratnasari et al., 2021). Collie et al., (2012) connect perceived school climate to teachers' stress, satisfaction, and efficacy, while Van Beurden et al., (2017) examine school climate and perceived career opportunities; these are related teacher outcomes, not interchangeable performance measures. Their models help identify plausible omitted variables, although they do not prove that any particular omitted factor biases the present coefficients in a given direction. School-culture theory and work-resource theory guide interpretation here; neither was independently measured as a mechanism.

Individual coefficients answer only part of the research question. To assess how the two predictors perform jointly within the reported sample, Table 3 brings together the model-fit and omnibus-test statistics.

**Table 3. Reported joint-model statistics**

| Statistic | Reported value | What it establishes |
|---|---|---|
| *R* | .886 | Multiple correlation in the fitted sample |
| $R^2$ | .785 | *Share of observed Y variance fitted by $X_1$ and $X_2$* |
| *Adjusted* $R^2$ | .771 | *Sample-size- and predictor-adjusted fit estimate* |
| *F* | 54.898 | *Omnibus test of the reported model* |
| *p for F* | < .001 | *Evidence against a zero-slope model under test assumptions* |

*Source:* Reporting SPSS 25 model summary and ANOVA 2026.

Table 3 shows a significant joint test ($F = 54.898$, $p < .001$), with $R = .886$, $R^2 = .785$, and adjusted $R^2 = .771$. The two predictors therefore account for 78.5% of the observed variation in the reported performance measure within this sample. The remaining 21.5% is unexplained by this specification, rather than attributable to one particular omitted factor. If all 33 observations were complete cases, the residual degrees of freedom for two predictors would be 30; the original output should confirm the count and rounding. Strong in-sample fit does not establish causal attribution or predictive performance in other schools.

That distinction matters particularly for a single-school survey. The analysis cannot separate individual perceptions from school-wide conditions through between-school variation. If teachers rated their own performance and the predictors, a shared measurement context could strengthen correlations (Podsakoff et al., 2003). The unverified selection frame also limits transferability. Independent performance records, classroom observations, or repeated observations could strengthen later analysis if they measure compatible outcomes; none is part of the reported model.

The immediate implication is a staged school-management response. First, specify which facilities teachers rated poorly and verify their availability, condition, and use. Second, maintain the reported strengths in supervisory communication and workspace arrangement while checking whether school standards are understood and enacted consistently. Third, monitor any changes against defined teaching practices rather than relying only on the same perception survey. This sequence is feasible at the school level and follows the descriptive contrast and conceptual distinction in the data. The regression cannot rank the expected returns of these actions. Broader work on teacher working conditions and collaborative professional practice makes the priorities credible as questions for local improvement, not guaranteed effects (Kraft et al., 2016; Merrill, 2021; OECD, 2020).

## 4. CONCLUSION

This study examined the associations of work environment and organizational culture with teacher performance at SDN Nagasari 03, Bekasi Regency. The results confirm that both variables were positively and significantly associated with teacher performance. Work environment produced a coefficient of 0.473, whereas organizational culture produced a coefficient of 0.568. The research

Multidisciplinary Indonesian Center Journal (MICJO)
Journal page is available to
https://e-jurnal.jurnalcenter.com/index.php/micjo
Email: admin@jurnalcenter.com

objective was therefore achieved through evidence of partial and joint associations between the two organizational factors and teacher performance.

The joint regression model was significant and explained 78.5% of the observed variation in teacher performance. The work environment obtained an overall mean of 3.80, indicating generally favourable perceived working conditions. Workspace arrangement, supervisory support, and communication received higher ratings than work facilities. The lower facilities score of 3.21 identifies a practical aspect requiring closer attention within the school's performance-management process.

This study contributes by examining material, relational, and cultural conditions together within an elementary-school setting. The findings show that teacher performance is associated with both supportive work conditions and shared organizational practices. School leaders should assess the adequacy, condition, and use of teaching facilities while maintaining effective communication and coordinated routines. These actions can strengthen the conditions through which teachers prepare, implement, and evaluate their professional responsibilities.

The findings are limited to 33 teachers from one school and reflect the conditions reported by respondents at SDN Nagasari 03. The cross-sectional questionnaire design identifies statistical associations but cannot establish causal relationships between the variables. The interpretation also depends on the quality of the measurement instrument, sampling procedure, and regression assumptions applied in the original study. Accordingly, the conclusions should be applied within the institutional context and empirical scope of this research.

## 5. REFERENCES

Arifin, S., & Mardikaningsih, R. (2021). Pengembangan kinerja guru ditinjau dari variabel lingkungan kerja dan budaya organisasi. *Jurnal Simki Pedagogia*, *4*(1), 24–32. https://doi.org/10.29407/jsp.v4i1.14

Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2007). The job demands-resources model: State of the art. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, *22*(3), 309–328. https://doi.org/10.1108/02683940710733115

Collie, R. J., Shapka, J. D., & Perry, N. E. (2012). School climate and social-emotional learning: Predicting teacher stress, job satisfaction, and teaching efficacy. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *104*(4), 1189–1204. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0029356

Cucchiara, M., Golann, J. W., & Diehl, D. (2025). What is school culture? Proposing a new, integrative model. *Theory and Research in Education*, *23*(2), 163–187. https://doi.org/10.1177/14778785251351272

Demerouti, E., Bakker, A. B., Nachreiner, F., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2001). The job demands-resources model of burnout. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *86*(3), 499–512. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.86.3.499

Handayani, T., & Rasyid, A. A. (2015). Pengaruh kepemimpinan kepala sekolah, motivasi guru, dan budaya organisasi terhadap kinerja guru SMA Negeri Wonosobo. *Jurnal Akuntabilitas Manajemen Pendidikan*, *3*(2), 264–277. https://doi.org/10.21831/amp.v3i2.6342

Haryanto, A. T., Dewi, S. N., & Fatonah, S. (2020). Kepuasan kerja intrinsik memediasi pengaruh kompetensi kerja dan lingkungan kerja pada kinerja di sekolah dasar. *Jurnal Basicedu*, *4*(3), 754–764. https://doi.org/10.31004/basicedu.v4i3.426

Ideswal, I., Yahya, Y., & Alkadri, H. (2020). Kontribusi iklim sekolah dan kepemimpinan kepala sekolah terhadap kinerja guru sekolah dasar. *Jurnal Basicedu*, *4*(2), 460–466. https://doi.org/10.31004/basicedu.v4i2.381

Indajang, K., Jufrizen, J., & Juliandi, A. (2020). Pengaruh budaya organisasi dan kepemimpinan kepala sekolah terhadap kompetensi dan kinerja guru pada Yayasan Perguruan Sultan Agung Pematangsiantar. *JUPIIS: Jurnal Pendidikan Ilmu-Ilmu Sosial*, *12*(2), 393–406. https://doi.org/10.24114/jupiis.v12i2.17881

Johnson, S. M., Kraft, M. A., & Papay, J. P. (2012). How context matters in high-need schools: The effects of teachers' working conditions on their professional satisfaction and their students'

Multidisciplinary Indonesian Center Journal (MICJO)
Journal page is available to
https://e-jurnal.jurnalcenter.com/index.php/micjo
Email: admin@jurnalcenter.com

achievement. *Teachers College Record*, *114*(10), 1–39. https://doi.org/10.1177/016146811211401004

Kraft, M. A., Marinell, W. H., & Yee, D. S.-W. (2016). School organizational contexts, teacher turnover, and student achievement: Evidence from panel data. *American Educational Research Journal*, *53*(5), 1411–1449. https://doi.org/10.3102/0002831216667478

Merrill, B. C. (2021). Configuring a construct definition of teacher working conditions in the United States: A systematic narrative review of researcher concepts. *Review of Educational Research*, *91*(2), 163–203. https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654320985611

OECD. (2020). *TALIS 2018 results (Volume II): Teachers and school leaders as valued professionals*. OECD Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1787/19cf08df-en

Pangesa, M., Pradiani, T., & Fathorrahman, F. (2025). Analisis pengaruh beban kerja, budaya organisasi, dan lingkungan kerja non fisik terhadap kinerja guru di Ichthus School West Jakarta Barat. *Jurnal Pendidikan Indonesia*, *6*(3), 1459–1472. https://doi.org/10.59141/japendi.v6i3.7385

Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Lee, J.-Y., & Podsakoff, N. P. (2003). Common method biases in behavioral research: A critical review of the literature and recommended remedies. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *88*(5), 879–903. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.88.5.879

Priyono, B. H., Qomariah, N., & Winahyu, P. (2018). Pengaruh gaya kepemimpinan, motivasi guru dan lingkungan kerja fisik terhadap kinerja guru SMAN 1 Tanggul Jember. *Jurnal Manajemen Dan Bisnis Indonesia*, *4*(2), 144–160. https://doi.org/10.32528/jmbi.v4i2.1758

Putra, R., Akmaruddin, T., Miran, I., Rivai, Y., & Al Sukri, S. (2025). Teacher satisfaction and performance reviewed from the perspective of leadership style, work environment, and organizational culture. *Procuratio: Jurnal Ilmiah Manajemen*, *13*(2), 174–186. https://doi.org/10.35145/procuratio.v13i2.5094

Ratnasari, S. L., Sutjahjo, G., Susanti, E. N., Tanjung, R., & Ismanto, W. (2021). Pengaruh kompetensi, motivasi, dan kreatifitas terhadap kinerja guru melalui kepuasan kerja. *Manajemen Pendidikan*, *16*(1), 1–12. https://doi.org/10.23917/jmp.v16i1.11149

Schoen, L. T., & Teddlie, C. (2008). A new model of school culture: A response to a call for conceptual clarity. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, *19*(2), 129–153. https://doi.org/10.1080/09243450802095278

Thapa, A., Cohen, J., Guffey, S., & Higgins-D'Alessandro, A. (2013). A review of school climate research. *Review of Educational Research*, *83*(3), 357–385. https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654313483907

Van Beurden, J., Van Veldhoven, M., Nijendijk, K., & Van De Voorde, K. (2017). Teachers' remaining career opportunities: The role of value fit and school climate. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *68*, 143–150. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2017.09.002

Wang, M.-T., & Degol, J. L. (2016). School climate: A review of the construct, measurement, and impact on student outcomes. *Educational Psychology Review*, *28*(2), 315–352. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-015-9319-1

Werang, B. R. (2014). Pengaruh kepemimpinan transformasional kepala sekolah, moral kerja guru, dan kepuasan kerja terhadap kinerja guru SDN di Kota Merauke. *Jurnal Cakrawala Pendidikan*, *33*(1), 128–137. https://doi.org/10.21831/cp.v1i1.1869