

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.63332/joph.v5i5.1341>

Organizational Environment and Organizational Citizenship Behavior as Factors Influencing the Supervisory Performance Inspectorate of the Kolaka Regency

Adrian Tawai¹, La Ode Muh. Munadi², Khabiirun³, Edy Samiel⁴, La Ode Zumail⁵

Abstract

An organizational environment is essential to supporting individual and group performance. A supportive work environment can create a positive climate, increase work enthusiasm, and improve team member performance. In addition to the organizational climate, individual Behaviour or Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) also plays a vital role in improving supervisory performance. Based on the findings, it can be concluded that the organizational environment and organizational citizenship behaviour (OCB) both positively affect the supervisory performance of the Inspectorate of the Kolaka Regency. Variations in supervisory performance values can be explained mainly by the organizational environment and OCB variables. The better the organizational climate and OCB, the better the supervisory performance of the Inspectorate of the Kolaka Regency.

Keywords: Organizational Environment, Organization Citizenship Behavior, Supervisory Performance, Inspectorate.

Introduction

Supervisory performance is one of the crucial aspects of governance, especially in institutions with internal supervisory duties, such as the Inspectorate. Good supervisory performance depends not only on the system implemented but also on external and internal factors that influence it, such as the organizational environment and organizational Behaviour demonstrated by its employees. The Inspectorate of Kolaka Regency, adequate supervision can help improve accountability and transparency in managing finances and other resources. Therefore, it is essential to know what factors can support or hinder the performance of such supervision.

The organizational environment is essential in supporting individual and group performance in an organization. A supportive work environment can create a positive climate, increase enthusiasm, and improve team member performance. A healthy organizational environment will impact high job satisfaction, which, in turn, can improve the supervision performance of the Kolaka Regency Inspectorate. However, although important, many organizations have not been able to optimize this factor properly. In addition to the organizational environment, individual Behaviour or Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) also plays a vital role in improving

¹ Faculty of Social and Political Sciences, Halu Oleo University, Email: adriantawai@uho.ac.id, (Corresponding Author)

² Department of Socioeconomics, Faculty of Animal Science, Halu Oleo University

³ Faculty of Cultural Sciences, Halu Oleo University Jl. H.E.A Mokodompit, Campus Hijau Bumi Tridharma Anduonohu, Kendari City, Southeast Sulawesi, 93232 Indonesia.

⁴ Faculty of Cultural Sciences, Halu Oleo University Jl. H.E.A Mokodompit, Campus Hijau Bumi Tridharma Anduonohu, Kendari City, Southeast Sulawesi, 93232 Indonesia.

⁵ Faculty of Cultural Sciences, Halu Oleo University Jl. H.E.A Mokodompit, Campus Hijau Bumi Tridharma Anduonohu, Kendari City, Southeast Sulawesi, 93232 Indonesia.



supervisory performance. OCB refers to voluntary Behaviour carried out by members of the organization that is not covered by formal obligations but contributes to the organization's smooth operation. High OCB can help strengthen teamwork, increase efficiency in carrying out tasks, and create a more harmonious and productive work environment. At the Kolaka Regency Inspectorate, this Behavior has the potential to strengthen the effectiveness of supervision carried out.

The approach used in this study is a quantitative approach using a survey method to collect data from employees of the Inspectorate of the Kolaka Regency. The data will be analyzed to determine the relationship between organizational environment variables, OCB, and supervisory performance. This study will use statistical analysis techniques to test the proposed hypothesis and see how much influence each factor has on supervisory performance. This state-of-the-art study includes several previous studies that have examined the impact of organizational environment and OCB on performance in various sectors. However, these studies are often limited to other industries, such as private companies or non-governmental institutions. At the same time, few specifically discuss the context of supervision in local government agencies, especially the Inspectorate. Therefore, this study attempts to fill the gap in the literature by examining the influence of these factors in the context of local government. The novelty of this study lies in its deeper focus on the relationship between organizational environment, OCB, and supervisory performance in the Kolaka Regency Inspectorate, which has not been widely studied before. This study also attempts to contribute to organizational development efforts in the context of local government, particularly in improving the effectiveness of supervision through a better understanding of the factors that can affect team member performance in carrying out their duties. This study is expected to provide practical recommendations that are useful for policy development and improving the quality of performance of the Inspectorate at the Kolaka Regency.

Literature Review

Organizational Environment and Organizational Citizenship Behavior on Organizational Performance

The organizational environment has a significant influence on team member behaviour, which ultimately affects productivity and performance. Salleh et al., (2020) added that organizations can utilize Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) to reduce pressure from the environment, thereby improving organizational performance. A similar thing was also expressed by Boiral & Paillé (2012), who stated that several categories of OCB, such as helping coworkers, sportsmanship, loyalty to the organization, and individual initiative, can reduce and mitigate the impact of environmental problems on organizational performance. An empirical analysis conducted by Kadarningsih et al. (2020) confirmed that the organizational environment and OCB simultaneously influence team member performance. Based on the views of these experts, it can be concluded that the organizational climate and OCB can simultaneously affect organizational performance. Good and continuously developing organizational performance is usually the result of a positive organizational environment and good team member behaviour.

Environmental determinism theory states that external factors primarily influence the internal response of an organization to the environment. Jones (2012) argues that forces in the organizational climate influence the organization's ability to obtain scarce resources, ultimately affecting organizational performance. Riggio (2017) added that troops in the organizational environment can hinder or facilitate an organization's access to resources, meaning that the

environment can provide opportunities and pose threats. Structural contingency theory emphasizes the importance of the fit between the parameters of the organization's structure or design and the existing environment, leading to increased organizational effectiveness and performance. Abane & Brenya (2021) also stated that structural contingency theory emphasizes the importance of the fit between the structure and design of the organization and the environment in increasing organizational effectiveness and performance. This theory argues that organizational performance results from aligning environmental variables and organizational structure (Abane & Brenya, 2021).

Almanae (2007) argues that the characteristics of the organizational environment can be interpreted differently by employees, which in turn has different impacts on their Behavior, tendencies, and motives, ultimately affecting their performance. Sibindi & Samuel (2019) emphasize that how organizations adapt to the external environment through their transactions and exchanges can protect and strengthen their position, affecting performance. Based on the views of these scientists, it can be concluded that the organizational environment significantly influences organizational performance. Optimal organizational performance is usually the result of supportive organizational environmental characteristics.

Team member behaviour is the initial factor that determines organizational performance. New organizational performance can be achieved if employees display Behavior that supports organizational goals. Robbins & Judge (2014) stated that what individuals do in an organization and their Behaviour significantly influence organizational performance. Employees with good work behaviour tend to be more productive, work together better, and comply with safety regulations better, improving overall organizational performance. One form of organizational member behaviour that can have a significant impact on performance is Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB). Robbins & Judge (2014) revealed that organizations with employees who demonstrate OCB Behaviour perform better than organizations without implementation.

Ingrams (2018) stated that there are many reasons to believe that OCB has a vital role in public organizations. A similar thing was also conveyed by de Geus et al., (2020), who stated that currently, public organizations are increasingly utilizing empirical findings on OCB to improve performance. Rayner et al., (2012) explained that OCB contributes to organizational performance by forming social capital. This happens because employees are willing to go beyond their formal obligations, help each other, put the organization's interests above personal interests, and show a genuine interest in the organization's activities and mission. Therefore, OCB has commercial value and supports the effectiveness of organizational functions through behaviours desired by managers, although they cannot always be described in detail in formal job descriptions.

Organizational Environment Concept

The word "environment" comes from the French word *environner*, which means to surround or encircle Kumar, (2018). Etymologically, the environment is defined as the material and spiritual influences that affect living things' growth, development, and existence. That is, the environment is the conditions surrounding an organism or group of organisms, as well as the complex social or cultural conditions affecting individuals or communities. According to the dictionary, the environment can be defined as (1) the external conditions or environment in which people live and work, and (2) in the context of ecology, the environment is the external environment in which plants or animals live that affects their development and Behavior Kumar,

(2018). From a scientific perspective, the environment is everything outside the organism, including humans and organizations.

Organization comes from the Greek word *organon* and Latin *organum*, meaning tool, part, member, or body. This term applies to social or human systems (Ivancevich et al., 2011). An organization is a consciously coordinated social entity with identifiable boundaries working continuously to achieve a common goal. The closed system view generally guides the classical definition of organization. An organization is considered a consciously coordinated social unit consisting of two or more people, and it functions continuously to achieve a common goal. However, from an open system perspective, the organization is seen as a system of interdependent activities that link changing coalitions of participants and form a highly integrated system. Organizations exist within a more extensive system and are part of various interacting and interrelated subsystems (Scott, 2002). The main elements in an organization are not formal buildings or policies but people and the relationships between them. Organizations exist when individuals interact to perform essential functions that help achieve goals (Daft, 2010).

Organizations are all around us and affect our lives in various ways. Organizations bring together resources to achieve desired goals; produce goods and services efficiently; facilitate innovation; use modern technologies in manufacturing and information; adapt to environmental changes; create value for owners, customers, and employees; and address challenges related to team member diversity, ethics, and coordination (Daft, 2010). Based on this explanation, organizations are social entities with goals that interact with their environment. The term "social entity" indicates that organizations are made up of people, while "having goals" means that organizational activities are designed to achieve goals that have been set and are continuously reviewed. "Interacting with its environment" means that every organization exchanges inputs and outputs with its environment and even engages in co-production processes.

Every organization has an environment, which, according to Jones (2012), is a collection of forces around the organization that can affect how it operates and its access to scarce resources, such as raw materials, skilled employees, information, and support from external stakeholders. Forces in the environment that affect an organization's access to these resources include competition with competitors for customers and rapid technological change, which can reduce an organization's competitive advantage. An organization's environment can be divided into two categories: the specific environment and the general environment (Jones, 2013). The particular climate includes factors directly affecting an organization's ability to obtain resources, such as government, unions, customers, competitors, and social pressures (Vatsalaphone, 2024). Meanwhile, the general environment includes forces that shape the specific environment, including demographic, cultural, international, political, environmental, economic, and technological factors.

Buchanan & Huczynski (2017) explained that the organizational environment includes issues, trends, and events outside the boundaries of the organization that affect its internal decisions and behaviours. These external factors can alter the organization's internal structure, processes, and behaviours. Therefore, organizations must interact with their environment to remain effective and survive. An increasingly unstable and complex environment requires proper monitoring and understanding of these trends and developments and appropriate responses. The study of the organizational environment is essential to understanding these dynamics.

The characteristics of the organizational environment are often discussed in two main aspects, namely complexity and dynamics. From a complexity perspective, the organizational climate can be classified as "Simple or Complex" depending on the number of issues or factors to be considered. Meanwhile, environmental dynamics can be categorized as "Stable or Dynamic," which relates to how quickly or slowly these issues change (Buchanan & Huczynski, 2017). In the latest model of the relationship between organizations and the environment, external changes can stimulate organizational responses. The scale, dynamism, and complexity of environmental factors encourage organizations to adopt an adaptive and responsive paradigm to the environment, which is described as a post-modern organization. This type of organization is an information-rich, lean, boundaryless network and focuses on highly skilled and autonomous knowledge workers (Buchanan & Huczynski, 2017). The characteristics of the organizational environment that have received less attention in organizational theory are political support and stakeholder involvement. Som (2020) added that various stakeholders' political support and participation greatly influence public sector performance. Therefore, this study focuses on two important but less discussed variables in the organizational theory literature: political support and multi-stakeholder involvement.

Organizational Citizenship Behavior

Organizational citizenship behaviour was introduced about 35 years ago (de Geus et al., 2020). Therefore, Denis Organ is often considered the father of the OCB concept (Muzamil & Shah, 2015). Organizational members who engage in extra-role Behavior contribute significantly to organizational effectiveness (Muzamil & Shah, 2015). In contrast, organizations that rely solely on formally prescribed Behavior (task behaviour) can be very fragile social systems (Idris et al., 2021). Since its introduction by Organ, the concept of OCB has been studied in various disciplines, such as marketing, human resource management, economics, and health psychology (Muzamil & Shah, 2015). In the field of public administration, attention to OCB has only recently developed. Now, many public organizations are utilizing empirical findings in the field of OCB to improve their performance and effectiveness (de Geus et al., 2020).

According to Organ (1997), OCB is defined as discretionary Behaviour that is not directly or explicitly recognized by the formal reward system and promotes effective overall organizational functioning. OCB is a multidimensional concept with five dimensions: altruism, courtesy, civic virtue, sportsmanship, and conscientiousness. Altruism in the workplace refers to behaviours that help coworkers inside and outside the organization. Although there is not always a direct relationship between these helping behaviours and specific benefits to the organization, the collection of team members helping behaviours has been shown to benefit the organization (Organ, 1997). Courtesy is defined as behaviours that aim to prevent work-related conflicts with coworkers. This dimension includes helpful behaviours to avoid problems and showing concern for others (Organ, 1997).

Civic virtue is characterized by behaviours demonstrating employees' active concern and interest in the organization's life. This dimension also includes positive involvement in organizational activities, such as attending meetings and supporting organizational policies and practices when they are challenged by external sources (Paré & Tremblay, 2007). Sportsmanship is employees' willingness to accept less-than-ideal organizational circumstances without complaining or making a disproportionate issue (Waleriańczyk et al., 2020). Sportsmanship describes employees' ability to adapt to stress, even if they disagree with the changes taking place in the organization (Dobbs et al., 2019). Conscientiousness refers to adherence to organizational

standards, guidelines, and regulations (Panaccio et al., 2015). It includes adherence to organizational rules and norms and describes employees' reliability and dependability in their duties (Kark & Waismel-Manor, 2005).

The latest taxonomy classifies OCB into two types: (1) OCB directed at other individuals (OCB) and (2) OCB directed at the organization as a whole (OCB). Altruism and courtesy fall into the category of OCB, while conscientiousness, sportsmanship, and civic virtue fall into the category of OCB. This distinction does not change the essence of understanding OCB but provides implications in subsequent studies (Chuang & Liao, 2010; Detnakin & Rurkkhum, 2019; Yang et al., 2019). Many indicators have been used to assess the dimensions of OCB over time. However, the scale developed by Podsakoff in 1990 is the most widely cited in studies conducted in Western contexts and has been shown to have satisfactory psychometrics across contexts.

Concept of Organizational Performance

Performance, translated as performance, has various meanings, such as activities, appearance, final results, achievements, performance, and work results (Wholey, 1982). Ham (1987) mentions several definitions of the word performance, including: (1) doing, running, or implementing; (2) fulfilling or carrying out obligations; (3) depicting a character in a game; (4) carrying out or perfecting responsibilities; (5) carrying out activities in a game; (6) playing a show; and (7) doing something that someone expects. Performance is one of the main concepts in public sector management (Cartwright & Cooper, 1992). Public sector organizations currently require competitive advantages in terms of the reliability of human resources, which is reflected in their level of performance. The higher the level of performance, the more reliable the human resources are (DeVoge & Dyson, 1992).

Broadbent & Cullen (1993) stated that there are two ways to conceptualize performance in the literature, namely, the action perspective (Behavior) and the outcome perspective (outcomes). The behavioural aspect of performance refers to what individuals do or do not do in work situations. Performance in the action perspective includes behaviours relevant to organizational goals, especially those that can be measured on a scale or quantitatively and are considered performance makers. One definition of performance from the action perspective comes from Castellion (1993), who defines performance as what employees do or do not do. Proponents of the action perspective argue that performance is Behavior, and Behavior must be distinguished from its outcomes because other factors can influence the results of Behavior in the system. Moore's action theory (1993) falls into this category, which describes the performance process from a process and structure perspective. The process perspective focuses on the sequential (stage) aspects of action, while the structural perspective refers to the organizational hierarchy.

Meanwhile, the outcomes perspective states that performance should be defined as the result of work. These outcomes connect Behavior with the organization's strategic goals, client satisfaction, and economic contribution. The definition of performance from the outcomes perspective was put forward by Hultink (1994), who stated that performance is the result or level of success of a person in carrying out tasks during a specific period, compared to various work result standards, targets, or criteria that have been previously set. Combining these two perspectives, Darlington (1996) stated that Behavior and outcomes must be distinguished because other factors can influence outcomes in the system. A more comprehensive approach views performance as both Behavior and outcomes. Performance means Behavior that is transformed into actions that contribute to expected results.

The definition of performance from Garey (1996) includes this comprehensive perspective. Bacal states that performance is the level of achievement of predetermined goals and objectives, which includes (1) the ability to complete work on time, (2) demonstrate the required expertise and skills, (3) demonstrate creativity and initiative, and (4) meet or exceed predetermined work result targets. Bacal's definition of performance combines Behavior and outcomes using a quantitative perspective, as seen from the term "achievement level." Public sector performance can be analyzed at various levels: individual team member performance, workgroup or team performance, program performance, and organizational performance (Rosenau, 1996). However, much literature simplifies the division of performance into two primary levels, namely individual performance and organizational performance (Basuroy, 1997). Organizational performance is often referred to as the performance of institutions or institutions, which reflects the level of achievement of annual programs and activities assigned to each organizational unit by the division of authority, tasks, and responsibilities. On the other hand, individual performance refers to the results of individual activities or activities, namely tasks carried out by employees in realizing their authority, tasks, and responsibilities. Employee performance and organizational performance are closely related. Achieving organizational goals cannot be separated from the quality of human resources, who work to achieve those goals. If every individual in the organization works well, achieves, is enthusiastic, and makes the best contribution to organizational goals, then the organization's overall performance will be good. The higher the individual performance in an organization, the higher the organization's performance (McClure, 1997; Meyers, 1997).

Research Methods

Location and Time of Research

This research is located in the internal supervision work area of the Kolaka Regency Regional Inspectorate. The reason for choosing this location is because, based on the results of preliminary research, it was revealed that there were problems related to suboptimal performance and the organizational environment and organizational citizenship behaviour that were inadequate to create an effective supervision system. This has been described in the beginning. The implementation time of this research is four months, from April 2024 to August 2024.

Research Approach

This study uses a quantitative approach. This means this study starts from performance theories translated into statistically testable hypotheses based on empirical data successfully collected from the field. The research strategy applied is a survey in which researchers work with empirical data collected directly from employees using previously provided questionnaires to record empirical phenomena of supervisory performance as a dependent variable and independent variables that include the organizational environment and OCB.

Population and Research Sample

The population of this study includes all units of regional apparatus organizations that are part of the internal supervision system of the Kolaka Regency government. The organizational units in question can be grouped into two: (1) functional examiner apparatus at the Regional Inspectorate and the head of the regional apparatus as the party being examined. The number of functional examiner apparatus Inspectorate at the Kolaka Regency Regional is 24, while the number of regional apparatuses as the party being examined is 32. The regional apparatus in question consists of the Regional Secretariat, the Secretariat of the Regional People's Representative

Council, Services, Agencies, and the Civil Service Police Unit. Thus, this research population's total number of members is 56 units.

The population size of this study is classified as a tiny population of 60 or less, including the small category. The entire population is needed for a tiny population to achieve accuracy. Based on this opinion, this study includes all members of the population, namely 56 units. Because the population size is classified as very small, this study does not draw samples but examines members of the population directly, which is called a census. Twenty-four functional examiners and 32 heads of regional apparatus became respondents in this study.

Research Variables

The variables in this research model are divided into independent and dependent variables. The independent variables in this study consist of the organizational environment (X1) and organizational citizenship behaviour (X2), while the dependent variable in this study is supervisory performance (Y). Both independent variables are predicted to partially and simultaneously affect the dependent variable.

Operational Definition of Variables

To direct and facilitate empirical measurement, the variables in the research model above are given operational definitions as follows: (1) The organizational environment is the entire force in the form of problems, trends, and events that are outside the boundaries of the organization but influence organizational decisions and Behavior. The organizational environment has two dimensions: political support and stakeholder participation, (2) Organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) is employee discretionary behavior that is not explicitly recognized by the formal reward system but encourages the organization to function effectively. OCB is measured by 5 (five) dimensions, namely altruism, politeness, civic virtue, sportsmanship, and awareness, and (3) Supervisory performance is Behavior and valuable behavioural results demonstrated by all regional apparatus institutions included in the internal supervision system to achieve internal supervision goals in the Kolaka Regency regional government organization.

Data Types and Sources

The data used in this study is quantitative. Quantitative data is measurement data expressed in numbers whose frequency can be calculated. The source of this research data is employees who are respondents to the study.

Data Collection Instruments

The data collection instrument used in this study is a questionnaire, an instrument and technique for collecting data from several people or respondents through a set of questions to be answered, and the answers obtained are then collected into data. The questionnaire in this study submitted a written statement that was closed in nature, and respondents were given alternative answers to choose one of the five answers provided. The measurement scale used in this study was the Likert scale, which ranged from 1 to 5 with scoring guidelines (1) Score 1 strongly disagree, (2) disagree, (3) Score 3 Neutral, (4) Score 4 agree, (5) Score 5 strongly agree.

Instrument Validity and Reliability Test

The questionnaire's validity and reliability test was conducted to obtain accurate and reliable data. The validity test shows the extent to which the instrument can be used to measure what should be measured. To perform the validity test, the questionnaire was tested on 10 respondents. The testing technique used was Pearson product-moment correlation on SPSS IBM-Statistics version 25.0. The validity measurement criteria in this study are declared valid if the correlation between items with a total score of more than 0.3 ($r = 0.3$) while the correlation between items with a total score of less than 0.3 ($r < 0.3$) indicates that the instrument is not valid.

Reliability testing ensures the extent to which measurements remain consistent after being repeated on the subject and under the same conditions. The questionnaire was tested on 10 employees at the research location for validity and reliability testing. Validity testing was conducted using product moment correlation, while instrument reliability testing in this study used *Alpha Cronbach* on SPSS IBM-Statistics 24.0. Interpret alpha stability where an instrument is declared reliable if the reliability coefficient value is greater than or equal to 0.40. In contrast, an instrument with a reliability coefficient value less than 0.40 is unreliable. The following summarises the research instrument reliability test results using SPSS 24.0 with *Alpha Cronbach's model*.

Hypothesis Test Design

Acceptance Criteria	Hypothesis 1
Ho: $\rho \leq 0$	The organizational environment and OCB simultaneously do not influence the supervisory performance of the Inspectorate of the Kolaka Regency Regional.
Ha: $\rho > 0$	The organizational environment and OCB simultaneously influence the supervisory performance of the Inspectorate of the Kolaka Regency Regional.
	Hypothesis 2
Ho: $\rho \leq 0$	The organizational environment does not affect the supervisory performance of the Inspectorate of the Kolaka District Regional.
Ha: $\rho > 0$	The organizational environment influences the supervisory performance of the Inspectorate of the Kolaka District Regional.
	Hypothesis 3
Ho: $\rho \leq 0$	OCB does not affect the supervision performance of the Inspectorate of the Kolaka District Regional.
Ha: $\rho > 0$	OCB influences the supervision performance of the Inspectorate of the Kolaka Regency Regional.

Table 1. Hypothesis Test Design

Data Analysis Techniques

The data obtained from the results of field measurements are processed and analyzed to produce information that supports the drawing of conclusions. The first stage is selecting questionnaire data based on clarity and completeness. The data is tabulated quantitatively as a statistical analysis material in the second stage. The third stage is to conduct a descriptive analysis to

determine the tendency of variables. The fourth stage is to test the research hypothesis using inferential statistical tests with multiple linear regression procedures on SPSS IBM-Statistics version 24.0. Descriptive analysis of the tendency of variables using Excel on SPSS IBM-Statistics version 24.0. The scores of the respondents' answers that have been tabulated according to each variable are calculated as the average score, then divided by the ideal score of 5 points. After that, the percentage of the average score to the perfect score is calculated, and the variables are classified. The classification of variables is divided into five classes, namely: (1) 20%-35% Very Bad, (2) 36%-51% Bad, (3) 52%-67% Moderate, (4) 68%-83% Good, (5) 84%-100% Very Good.

Hypothesis testing on the simultaneous influence of the three independent variables on the dependent variable is carried out using the F test. The simultaneous impact of the two variables is interpreted from the calculated F value. The magnitude of the joint influence of the three variables X on Y is analyzed from the Adjusted R Square coefficient of the regression results. The partial influence of each independent variable on the dependent variable is interpreted from the t value in the regression. In the final stage, the results of the statistical hypothesis testing are analyzed, then discussed with the theory and results of previous studies that have been previously presented in the literature review to position the results of this study in the literature well documented in public administration science. Correlation analysis measures the goodness of the regression line in predicting variable Y. The correlation coefficient (R) measures how well a regression line explains the relationship between sample data. The correlation coefficient is from -1 (minus) to +1 (plus 1). The way to interpret the R-value is as follows: R = 0.001 - 0.199 is a very weak correlation; R = 0.200 – 0.399 is a weak correlation; R = 0.400 – 0.599 is a moderate correlation; R = 0.600 – 0.799 is a strong correlation; and R = 0.800 – 1.00 is a robust correlation.

Research Result

Organizational Environment

The organizational environment in this study is examined from the level of political support and stakeholder participation. This variable is described into 13 items. Table 2 below summarises descriptive statistics from the average calculation and percentage of actual scores to ideal scores calculated using the Microsoft Excel application.

Dimensio n/ Item	Total Actual Score	Number of Samples	Actual Score Average	Skor Ideal	% Actual Score to Ideal Score	Cate gory
Political Support						
1	205	56	3,66	5	73,21	Goo d
2	210	56	3,75	5	75,00	Goo d
3	214	56	3,82	5	76,43	Goo d
4	230	56	4,11	5	82,14	Goo d
5	229	56	4,09	5	81,79	Goo d

6	206	56	3,68	5	73,57	Good
7	205	56	3,66	5	73,21	Good
Sub Total A	1499	392	3,82	5	76,48%	Good
Stakeholder Participation						
8	215	56	3,84	5	76,79	Good
9	192	56	3,43	5	68,57	Good
10	215	56	3,84	5	76,79	Good
11	228	56	4,07	5	81,43	Good
12	201	56	3,59	5	71,79	Good
13	195	56	3,48	5	69,64	Good
Sub Total B	1246	336	3,71	5	74,17%	Good
Total A+B	2745	728	3,77	5	75,41	Good

Table 2. Descriptive Statistics of the Organizational Environment

Source: Results of primary data processing 2024

Information: (1) The regional head provides full autonomy to the supervisory apparatus, (2) The authority of the supervisory apparatus is higher compared to other officials in the regional apparatus, (3) The regional head supports policy initiatives from the supervisory apparatus, (4) The DPRD trusts the supervisory apparatus, (5) The DPRD is critical of the results of supervision, (6) The need for resources for carrying out supervisory tasks is supported by the regional head, (7) The need for resources for implementing performance management is supported by the regional head, (8) The head of the regional apparatus participates in compiling internal supervision performance indicators, (9) The DPRD provides input in compiling internal supervision performance indicators, (10) The head of the regional apparatus provides input to the supervisory apparatus in order to evaluate internal supervision performance, (11) External stakeholders are aware of internal supervision performance, (12) External stakeholders trust the supervision management system in the Inspectorate, (13) Performance management in the Inspectorate facilitates effective communication with internal supervision stakeholders of the regional government.

The table above details the organizational environmental variables into two dimensions: political support and stakeholder participation. The data shows that the two dimensions of the organizational environmental variables have slightly different average scores. The political support dimension measured by seven items (items 1-7) has an average score of 3.82 or 76.48% of the ideal score, so it is in a suitable category. The stakeholder participation dimension measured by six items (items 8-13) has an average score of 3.71 or 74.17% of the ideal score,

so it is in a suitable category. The average score for the political support dimension is slightly higher than stakeholder participation, but both are in an appropriate category. In other words, the value of political support is empirically higher than stakeholder participation at this research location. Overall, the 13 items used to measure the organizational environmental variables in this research model have an average score of 75.41% of the ideal score and are in a suitable category. The average score of respondents' answers for the 13 items is 3.77, while the perfect score is 5 points. The advantages of this organizational environmental variable are in items 4, 5, and 11. Items 4 and 5 include the political support dimension, while item 11 includes the stakeholder participation dimension.

Item 4 has a high score, meaning that the DPRD's trust as a political partner of the regional government towards the internal supervisory apparatus is relatively high. Item 5 has a high score, meaning that the DPRD as a political partner of the regional government is critical of the results of supervision, and item 11 has a high score, meaning that external stakeholders know how the actual performance of internal supervision of the Kolaka Regency regional government is. Critical nature and knowledge can motivate the supervisory apparatus to supervise through existing regulations. The main weakness of this organizational environment variable is in items 9 and 13. Both of these items are in the stakeholder participation dimension. Item 9 has the lowest score, meaning that the DPRD provides input in the preparation of supervision performance indicators but not as expected by respondents. Item 13 has the lowest score, meaning that Performance management in the Inspectorate facilitates effective communication with internal supervision stakeholders of the regional government. This means that communication of supervision results has only been established between the Inspectorate and regional apparatus but has not been well established with the broader community.

Organization Citizenship Behavior

OCB in this study is examined from the dimensions of altruism, politeness, civic virtue, sportsmanship, and awareness of doing good deeds that are not specified in formal regulations but are believed to contribute to the success of the supervisory organization. This variable is described in 15 items.

Dimensio n/ Item	Total Actual Score	Number of Samples	Actual Score Average	Skor Ideal	%Actual Score to Ideal Score	Cate gory
Dimensions of Altruism						
1	227	56	4,05	5	81,07	Goo d
2	231	56	4,13	5	82,50	Goo d
3	227	56	4,05	5	81,00	Goo d
Sub Total A	685	168	4,08	5	81,55	Goo d
Dimensions of Politeness						
4	230	56	4,11	5	82,14	Goo d

5	229	56	4,09	5	81,79	Good
6	221	56	3,95	5	78,93	Good
Sub Total B	680	168	4,05	5	80,95	Good
Dimensions of Civic Virtue						
7	205	56	3,66	5	73,21	Good
8	183	56	3,27	5	65,36	Moderate
9	226	56	4,04	5	80,71	Good
Sub Total C	614	168	3,65	5	73,10	Good
Dimension of Sportsmanship						
10	215	56	3,84	5	76,79	Good
11	228	56	4,07	5	81,43	Good
12	223	56	3,98	5	79,64	Good
Sub Total D	666	168	3,96	5	79,29	Good
Dimensions of Consciousness						
13	185	56	3,30	5	66,07	Moderate
14	224	56	4,00	5	80,00	Good
15	227	56	4,05	5	81,07	Good
Sub Total E	636	168	3,79	5	75,71	Good
Total A s/d E	3281	840	3,91	5	78,12	Good

Table 3. Descriptive statistics Organization Citizenship Behavior

Source: Results of primary data processing 2024.

Information: (1) Behaviour that sincerely helps fellow professionals when they have work-related problems, (2) Behaviour that seniors sincerely help new employees to get oriented to work, (3) Willingness to help people in other units who are related to work, (4) Behaviour that avoids creating problems for co-workers, (5) Maintaining negative influences of Behaviour on other people's work, (6) Behaviour that does not abuse other people's rights, (7) Following developments/changes in the organization, (8) Always updating oneself according to the organization's needs, (9) Attending meetings that are not mandatory but still help the field/organization, (10) Not having to be continuously motivated to be able to complete work,

(11) Finding mistakes made by the organization, (12) Focusing on the positive side of the situation rather than what is wrong, (13) Complying with organizational rules even when no one is looking, (14) Not taking extra or long breaks while on duty, (15) Being present at work beyond standard provisions.

Table 3 contains the scores of the OCB variables in its five dimensions: altruism, politeness, civic virtue, sportsmanship, and conscientiousness. The data shows that the five dimensions of the OCB variables have slight differences in average scores. The altruism dimension measured by three items (items 1-3) has an average score of 4.08 or 81.55% of the ideal score, so it is in the Good category. The politeness dimension measured by three items (items 4-6) has an average score of 4.05 or 80.95% of the ideal score, so it is in the Good category. The civic virtue dimension measured by three items (items 7-9) has an average score of 3.65 or 73.10% of the ideal score, so it is in the Good category. The sportsmanship dimension measured by three items (items 10-12) has an average score of 3.96 or 79.29% of the ideal score, so it is in the Good category. As measured by three items (items 13-15), the awareness dimension has an average score of 3.79 or 75.71% of the ideal score, so it is in the Good category.

The average score of the altruism dimension is the largest among the five dimensions of the OCB variable, while the civic virtue dimension has the highest miniature score. Overall, the 15 items used to measure the OCB variable in this research model have an average score of 3.91 or 78.12% of the ideal score and are in the Good category. The items that are the advantages of this OCB variable are items 2, item 4, and item 5. Item 2 is included in the altruism dimension, while items 4 and 5 are included in the stakeholder participation dimension. Items 4 and 5 are included in the politeness dimension. A high score on item 2 indicates that senior Kolaka Regency regional apparatus employees sincerely help new employees orient themselves on their work. A high score on item 4 means that employees in the Kolaka Regency regional apparatus always try to avoid problems for coworkers that can hinder the supervision process. A high score on item 5 implies that employees in the Kolaka Regency regional apparatus always pay attention to their Behaviour's influence on others' work.

The weaknesses of the OCB variable are found in items 8 and 13, both of which have the lowest scores. Item 8 is included in the civic virtue dimension, while item 13 is included in the awareness dimension. A low score on item 8 means that most employees do not continuously try to update themselves in line with changes in policies in the field of supervision and other policies from the government. A low score on item 13 means that the daily discipline of the apparatus is relatively low when the leader is not supervising them directly. The lack of self-renewal related to policy knowledge and the lack of employee discipline can weaken the performance of supervision in local government because various instruments designed to carry out supervision are sourced from government policies.

Supervisory Performance

Supervisory performance in this study is examined from valuable Behavior and valuable outcomes in implementing internal supervision stages in the Kolaka Regency government. This supervisory performance variable is described into 14 items, as shown in Table 4.

Dimensi on/ Item	Total Actual Score	Number of Samples	Actual Score Average	Skor Ideal	% Actual Score to Ideal Score	Categ ory
---------------------	--------------------------	----------------------	----------------------------	---------------	----------------------------------	--------------

Dimensions Behavioral						
1	247	56	4,41	5	88,21	Very good
2	251	56	4,48	5	89,64	Very good
3	245	56	4,38	5	87,50	Very good
4	239	56	4,27	5	85,36	Very good
5	239	56	4,27	5	85,36	Very good
6	225	56	4,02	5	80,36	Good
7	227	56	4,05	5	81,07	Good
Total A	1673	392	4,27	5	85,36	Very good
Dimension Outcomes						
8	226	56	4,04	5	80,71	Good
9	226	56	4,04	5	80,71	Good
10	225	56	4,02	5	80,36	Good
11	187	56	3,34	5	66,79	Mode rate
12	223	56	3,98	5	79,64	Good
13	226	56	4,04	5	80,71	Good
14	185	56	3,30	5	66,07	Mode rate
Total B	1498	392	3,82	5	76,43	Good
Total A+B	3171	784	4,04	5	80,89	Good

Table 4. Descriptive Statistics of Supervisory Performance Variables

Source: Results of primary data processing 2024.

Information: (1) The apparatus carries out supervision on time, (2) Supervision by the apparatus is based on factual data, (3) Supervision by the apparatus is coordinated with the organizational work flow, (4) Supervision by the apparatus optimizes the application of skills, (5) The apparatus is flexible in responding to the audited, (6) The apparatus applies a supervision method that encourages the autonomy of the audited party, (7) The apparatus applies a supervision method that encourages the accountability of the audited, (8) The findings of the supervisory apparatus are not disputed by the audited, (9) The apparatus presents the results of supervision clearly, (10) The apparatus presents the results of supervision altogether, (11) The apparatus finds critical points that have the potential to result in failure to achieve program objectives, (12) The apparatus informs the results of supervision to the relevant agencies, (13) The apparatus presents a way to correct deviations from standards, (14) The audited party follows up on supervision recommendations.

Based on the data in Table 4 above, the two dimensions of the supervisory performance variable slightly differ in the average score. The valuable behaviour dimension measured by seven items (items 1-7) has an average score of 4.27 or 85.36% of the ideal score, which is in the Very Good category. The valuable outcomes dimension measured by seven items (items 8-14) has an average score of 3.82 or 76.43% of the ideal score, so it is in the Good category. The average score of the valuable behaviour dimension is greater than that of the beneficial outcomes dimension. In other words, the advantage of the supervisory performance variable is in the valuable behaviour dimension. Overall, the 14 items used to measure the supervisory performance variable in this study have an average score of 4.04 or 80.89% of the ideal score and are in the Good category.

The advantages of this supervisory performance variable are items 1, item 2, item 3, item 4, and item 5, all of which are in the valued behaviour dimension. A high score for item 1 indicates that the apparatus supervises on time. A high score for item 2 indicates that the supervisory apparatus in conducting inspections is always based on factual data. A high score for item 3 means that the inspection activities carried out by the supervisory apparatus on the examinee are always coordinated with the organizational workflow. A high score for item 4 means that the inspection activities carried out by the supervisory apparatus require the expenditure of high skills by the examinee. A high score for item 5 implies that the apparatus in conducting inspections is always flexible in responding to the examinee.

The weaknesses of the supervisory performance variables, according to the results of this study, are in items 11 and 14. Both of these items have lower scores compared to all other items. A low score for item 11 means that the supervisory apparatus does not always find critical points that have the potential to fail to achieve program objectives in the audited agency. Meanwhile, a low score for item 14 means that the head of the audited agency does not always follow up on recommendations given by the supervisory apparatus. The lack of ability to detect strategic points of failure and the lack of commitment to follow up on supervisory recommendations both weaken the performance of internal supervision in local governments.

Hypothesis Testing

According to the research design proposed in Chapter II, the study has three hypotheses. The first hypothesis predicts the simultaneous influence of the organizational environment (X1) and OCB (X2) on the supervisory performance of the Kolaka Regency Inspectorate (Y). The second hypothesis predicts the partial influence of the organizational environment (X1) on the supervisory performance of the Kolaka Regency Inspectorate (Y). The third hypothesis predicts the partial influence of OCB (X2) on the supervisory performance of the Kolaka Regency Inspectorate (Y). The first hypothesis test was conducted using the F-test procedure. In contrast, the second and third hypothesis tests used the t-test procedure in multiple linear regression analysis with SPSS Statistics version 24. Table 5 below summarises the results of the hypothesis tests as referred to.

<i>Coefficients^a</i>					
Model		<i>Unstandardized Coefficients</i>		<i>Standardized Coefficients</i>	Sig.
		<i>B</i>	<i>Std. Error</i>	<i>Beta</i>	
1	(Constant)	13,443	4,205		,002

Organizational Environment	,529	,107	,627	4,960	,000
Citizenship Behavior Organization	1,173	,118	1,250	9,896	,000
F = 61,407					
Sig. = ,000 ^b					
R = ,836 ^a					
Adjusted R ² = ,687					
a. <i>Dependent Variable: Inspectorate Supervision Performance</i>					

Table 5. Summary of the Results of Hypothesis Testing on the Influence of Organizational Environment and OCB on the Supervisory Performance Inspectorate of the Kolaka District

Source: Results of multiple linear regression analysis with SPSS version 24.

The number of research data is 56 units (N=56). This is done using the sample design in Chapter III, and all data taken from the 56 respondents were entered into SPSS using the enter method. The simultaneous influence of the two independent variables, namely the organizational environment (X_1) and OCB (X_2), on the dependent variable, namely the Inspectorate's supervisory performance (Y), was tested using the F Test procedure known as the Simultaneous Test or Model Test/Anova Test. This test is used to see how all independent variables influence the dependent variable together.

Based on the test results, the influence of both independent variables simultaneously on the dependent variable, as seen from its probability, is 0.000. The probability value is smaller than $\alpha = 0.05$, which indicates that the independent variables, namely the organizational environment and OCB, positively affect the supervisory performance of the Kolaka Regency Inspectorate. The first research hypothesis is proven or accepted based on the statistical results above. The first hypothesis states that the organizational environment and OCB simultaneously affect the supervisory performance of the Kolaka Regency Inspectorate. The test results using data taken from 56 respondents from within the supervisory system support the theoretical prediction. The positive influence is that the better the organizational environment and OCB, the better the supervisory performance of the Inspectorate of the Kolaka Regency.

The implication of accepting the first hypothesis is that if the leadership of the Kolaka Regency government and the leadership of all regional apparatuses included in the regional government's internal supervision system want better supervision performance in the future, then providing a better organizational environment and better OCB is an absolute must be done systematically. The results of descriptive statistics show that the current organizational climate and OCB are both in the Good category but not yet optimal. It is said to be not yet optimal because the respondents' assessment scores for both variables have not reached the ideal score of 5 points. The organizational environment variable score is 3.77 out of 5 points or has only reached 75.41%, while the OCB variable score is 3.91 out of 5 points or 78.12%. This means there is still room to increase the availability of a better organizational environment and OCB to drive organizational performance to a higher level. Furthermore, with a positive simultaneous influence, efforts to improve the two variables above require an integrated approach in which the organizational environment and OCB are simultaneously enhanced to provide optimal results.

The simultaneous ability of organizational environment variables and OCB to explain the variation in the supervisory performance of the Kolaka Regency Inspectorate is interpreted from the Adjusted R^2 value of 0.687 or 68.7%. This statistical value shows that 68.7% of the variation in the supervisory performance of the Kolaka Regency Inspectorate is determined by the joint influence of the organizational environment and OCB at the location. The epsilon factor determines the remaining 31.3%, other variables not included in this research model. This means that to optimize the supervisory performance of the Kolaka Regency Inspectorate, other variables that have been explained in various theoretical and empirical literature still need to receive serious attention from local government leaders.

The magnitude of the simultaneous influence of the organizational environment variables and OCB on the supervision performance of the Kolaka Regency Inspectorate of 68.7% is a reasonably prominent figure. This means that improvements in the organizational environment variables and OCB are relevant to achieving supervision goals and more optimal supervision performance in the Kolaka Regency. In other words, improvements to the organizational environment variables and OCB are essential and urgent to be adopted as key programs by all regional apparatuses to improve supervision performance in Kolaka Regency, not only in the Inspectorate but also in all other regional apparatuses within the scope of the Kolaka Regency Government as the inspected agency.

The correlation coefficient (R) value of 0.836 indicates a strong positive correlation between the organizational environment and OCB with supervisory performance in Kolaka Regency. This figure suggests a good fit, so the regression model obtained in this study is suitable for estimating the supervisory performance of the Kolaka Regency Inspectorate. The results of testing the partial influence of the organizational environment and OCB variables on the supervisory performance of the Kolaka Regency Inspectorate, as indicated by the t value in Table 4.6 above, can be explained as follows:

- 1) The t-value of the organizational environment variable (X_1) is 4.960 with a significance level of 0.000 ($p < 0.05$). The statistical results indicate that the organizational environment variable (X_1) significantly affects the supervisory performance variable of the Kolaka Regency Inspectorate. The consequence is that the hypothesis proposed in the second point is accepted. The second hypothesis states, "The organizational environment affects the supervisory performance of the Kolaka Regency Inspectorate." The t-value of 4.960 indicates that each point increase in the Organizational Environment variable will be positively associated with an increase of 4.960 points in the supervisory performance Inspectorate of the Kolaka Regency.
- 2) The t-value of the OCB variable (X_2) is 9.896 with a significance level of 0.000 ($p < 0.05$). The statistical results indicate that the OCB variable (X_2) significantly affects the supervisory performance variable of the Kolaka Regency Inspectorate. The consequence is that the hypothesis proposed in the third point is accepted. The third hypothesis states that "OCB affects the supervisory performance of the Kolaka Regency Inspectorate." The t-value of 9.896 indicates that each point increase in the OCB variable will be positively associated with a rise of 9.8960 points in the supervisory performance Inspectorate of the Kolaka Regency.

The statistical results in Table 5, which have been described above, show the difference in t-test values between the organizational environment variables (X_1) and OCB (X_2). The t-test value of the organizational environment variable (X_1) is 4.960, while the t-test value of the OCB variable (X_2) is 9.896. The t-test value of the OCB variable (X_2) is greater than the t-test value of the organizational environment variable (X_1). This means that although both variables positively

influence the supervisory performance variable of the Kolaka Regency Inspectorate, OCB is more important than the influence of the organizational environment variable. These statistical results imply that the strategy to improve the supervisory performance of the Kolaka Regency Inspectorate will produce more optimal results if the improvement intervention prioritizes improvements to OCB. Based on the statistical results described above, a multiple linear regression equation can be created as follows:

$$Y' = 13,443 + 4,960X_1 + 9,896X_2 + \epsilon$$

Where: Y' is the regression value of the Kolaka District Inspectorate's supervisory performance; X_1 is the organizational environment variable; X_2 is the OCB variable; ϵ is epsilon or a factor outside this research model.

Discussion

This study investigates the influence of organizational environment and OCB on supervisory performance in local government. This study's main idea is that local government organizations in many countries face limitations in achieving high performance, as stated by Waldman & Atwater (1998) and (Burke et al., 2000). Supervision is still one of the management challenges in public administration, including in local government (Day, 2000). Modern public administration experts recognize how vital the supervisory function is (Evans et al., 2003). Claims about these supervisory constraints are also seen in the Kolaka Regency government. The facts include those found regarding the level of APIP capability, which is in the Sufficient category (65% to <85%), the level of maturity of SPIP implementation in the "defined" category, namely point three on a scale of 0-5 and a score of B on SAKIP for the last three years (2017, 2018, and 2019).

Investigating the influence of organizational environment and OCB on supervisory performance, the author uses relevant public administration theories such as environmental determinism theory (Holbeche, 2005a; Holbeche, 2005b; Holbeche, 2006), and theories that combine environmental factors and OCB (Porter et al., 2006). This study does not test the propositions of these theories but uses them as a lens in constructing a research model. According to the theory, the organizational environment variables covered in this study are political support and stakeholder participation (Tyson, 2006). According to the OCB theory, OCB includes altruism, politeness, civic virtue, sportsmanship, and conscientiousness (Cornelius, 2011). Supervisory performance in this study is seen as organizational performance that provides for Behavior and behavioural outcomes that are valuable according to the theory (Colombo et al., 2012). In addition to testing the influence of organizational environmental variables and OCB simultaneously on supervisory performance, this study also tested the partial influences of the two independent variables.

The first objective of this study is to analyze the simultaneous influence of organizational environment variables and OCB on the supervisory performance of the Kolaka Regency Inspectorate. The theory of Ericsson & Moxley (2012) and Agostino (2015) is the basis for making a hypothesis about the simultaneous influence of the two variables. The null hypothesis proposed in this study states, "There is no simultaneous influence of organizational environment and OCB on the supervisory performance of the Kolaka Regency Inspectorate." The researcher has tested the hypothesis using multiple linear regression procedures on SPSS version 24.0 where the probability of $F_{\text{count}} = 0.000$ or less than $\alpha = 0.05$ is obtained. The probability that is less than α indicates that the two independent variables (organizational environment and OCB)

simultaneously have a positive and significant effect on the supervisory performance of the Kolaka Regency Inspectorate. Statistically, the simultaneous ability of the two independent variables above to explain the variation in supervisory performance (dependent variable) is 68.7%, while the correlation coefficient is 0.836 or is classified as a strong correlation.

The statistical results above indicate that the organizational environment and OCB simultaneously have a positive effect on the supervisory performance of the Kolaka Regency Inspectorate. This positive effect means that the better the organizational climate and OCB, the better the supervisory performance of the Kolaka Regency Inspectorate. The implication is that improving the organizational environment and OCB is an integral part of efforts to optimize the supervisory performance of the Kolaka Regency Inspectorate. Furthermore, strategies to enhance supervisory performance like this must concern all regional apparatuses included in the regional government's internal supervisory system, not only in the Inspectorate. However, the results of descriptive statistics show that the organizational environment and OCB in the Kolaka Regency government are currently not optimal, and there are still dimensions of the organizational climate and OCB that are not conducive to achieving more optimal supervisory performance. This supports Conley's claim (2015) that many regional government organizations do not pay serious attention to developing an organizational/institutional environment that allows for the achievement of high and sustainable performance, as well as Cabric's claim (2017) that OCB has not been widely activated in public organizations.

The above findings mean that the Kolaka Regency local government, if it wants to optimize its internal supervision performance, needs to seriously pay attention to these two variables, namely the organizational environment and OCB. Improving supervisory performance cannot solely rely on the competence of supervisory officers or the availability of facilities and infrastructure as often recommended in traditional public administration literature, including previous research from Wang & Zhao, (2020), but needs to pay more attention to environmental factors and discretionary behavior that are beneficial to the organization in the long term. The second objective of this study is to analyze the partial influence of organizational environmental variables on the supervisory performance of the Kolaka Regency Inspectorate. The theory of environmental determinism (Pahkin, 2021; Ponnaluri & Alluri, 2021) is the basis for developing hypotheses regarding this. Previous research from Maguire et al., (2022) supports this claim. The null hypothesis proposed in this study is that "there is no influence of the organizational environment on the supervisory performance of the Kolaka Regency Inspectorate".

The results of the statistical test seen from the t-test indicate that the organizational environment variable has a significant effect on the supervisory performance variable of the Kolaka Regency Inspectorate. The t-value of 4.960 indicates that each point increase in the organizational environment variable will be positively associated with an increase of 4.960 points in the supervisory performance of the Kolaka Regency Inspectorate. This finding supports the theory of environmental determinism (Baldini et al., 2023; Basadur et al., 2023) and is in line with previous research from Camargo et al., (2023) mentioned above. This is also in accordance with the theory of De Lanerolle et al., (2023) regarding the existence of strengths and opportunities that arise from the environment surrounding an organization.

The existence of this influence of the organizational environment can be easily understood because organizations must interact with their environment, and that the characteristics of the organizational environment influence the functional behavior of individuals, their trends and motives (Dekker et al., 2023; posthumanism.co.uk

2024; François-Philip de Saint Julien & Courie-Lemur, 2023) and Hunter et al., (2023) emphasizes the political environment, that political support has a positive relationship with the effectiveness of organizational performance. The findings of this study support these theories where a good political environment motivates internal supervisory apparatus and influences the allocation of resources and funds to support supervisory activities in the regions. Meanwhile, Hunter et al., (2023) emphasize stakeholder participation. Kumar & Kumar, (2023) found that stakeholder participation influences the formulation and adoption of performance measurement results. The findings of this study support this theory where stakeholder participation that is already classified as good affects the effectiveness of the performance system and the formulation and implementation of policies.

The third objective of this study is to analyze the effect of OCB on supervisory performance. The theories about OCB were proposed by Luiselli, (2023) and have been widely used in public administration. This theory, together with previous studies by Kumburu, (2023), became the basis for developing hypotheses about the effect of OCB on supervisory performance. The null hypothesis tested stated that "OCB has no effect on supervisory performance". The test results indicated by the t-value of the OCB variable show that this OCB variable has a significant and positive effect on the supervisory performance variable of the Kolaka Regency Inspectorate. A significant and positive effect means that an increase in the OCB variable will be positively associated with an increase in the regional supervisory performance variable. In fact, the results of the t-test show that the effect of OCB on performance is more important than the effect of the organizational environment described above. This means that both variables have a positive effect on the supervisory performance variable of the Kolaka Regency Inspectorate, but if the local government has to give certain priorities, then that priority should be given to increasing the OCB variable.

The implication of the importance of the influence of OCB on performance is that the leaders of the Kolaka Regency local government need to pay serious attention to further encourage the emergence of OCB. This is important, as stated by Manoharan et al., (2023) that OCB promotes effective organizational function through behavior that managers want but cannot be specified in formal job descriptions. Encouraging this OCB can overcome the weaknesses of employee work orientation that have existed so far, such as only working seriously if there are formal incentives and direct supervision from superiors. Increasing OCB can be included in the local government bureaucratic reform agenda as recommended (Mears, 2023). Based on the empirical analysis above, the thesis that the author puts forward as the most important finding of this study is that if the Kolaka Regency local government wants more optimal internal supervision performance in the future, improving the quality of the organizational environment and OCB needs to be prioritized. Increasing these two variables needs to be an integral part of the overall strategic plan of the regional apparatus which is consolidated in the local government's medium-term development plan, or specifically become an explicit part of the change management and quick wins program for the Kolaka Regency local government bureaucratic reform.

Conclusion

Based on the findings, it can be concluded that the organizational environment and organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) both simultaneously have a positive effect on the supervisory performance of the Kolaka Regency Inspectorate. Variations in supervisory performance values can explained mostly by the organizational environment and OCB variable

The better the organizational environment and OCB, the better the supervisory performance of the Kolaka Regency Inspectorate. The simultaneous positive influence means that efforts to improve the two variables above require an integrated approach in which the organizational environment and OCB are improved simultaneously in order to provide the most optimal results. Furthermore, the correlation coefficient value which is in the strong category indicates a good level of fit so that the regression model obtained in this study is good for estimating the supervisory performance of the Kolaka Regency Inspectorate, (2) The organizational environment variable has a positive effect on the supervisory performance of the Kolaka Regency Inspectorate. The significance of the t-value of the organizational environment variable is 0.000 ($p < 0.05$) which indicates that each point increase in the organizational environment variable will be positively associated with a certain increase in the supervisory performance of the Kolaka Regency Inspectorate. However, the environmental variables of the Kolaka Regency Inspectorate's supervisory organization are not yet in the best condition so that they have not provided the most optimal influence on the Kolaka Regency Inspectorate's supervisory performance, and (3) the OCB variable has a significant influence on the Kolaka Regency Inspectorate's supervisory performance variable. The influence of this variable has a significance level of 0.000 ($p < 0.05$) and is interpreted that each point increase in the OCB variable will be positively associated with a certain increase in the Kolaka Regency Inspectorate's supervisory performance.

References

- Abane, J. A., & Brenya, E. (2021). The relationship between organizational environment antecedents and performance management in local government: Evidence from Ghana. *Future Business Journal*, 7(1), 1–17.
- Agostino, D. (2015). Performance Control for Organizational Units. In M. Arnaboldi, G. Azzone, & M. Giorgino (Eds.), *Performance Measurement and Management for Engineers* (pp. 117–141). Academic Press. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-801902-3.00008-6>
- Almanae, M. (2007). Organizational environment and its effects on performance—Applied study in Insurance Companies in Libya
[Prostředí organizace a jeho dopad na výkon—Applikovaná studie v libyjských pojišťovnách]. *Acta Universitatis Agriculturae et Silviculturae Mendelianae Brunensis*, 55(3), 9–22.
- Baldini, D., Cobuzzi, I., & Baldini, G. M. (2023). Setting up an ART unit: Planning, design, and organization. In A. S. Laganà & A. Guglielmino (Eds.), *Management of Infertility* (pp. 11–24). Academic Press. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-323-89907-9.00035-1>
- Basadur, M., Basadur, T., & Calic, G. (2023). Organizational development. In R. Reiter-Palmon & S. Hunter (Eds.), *Handbook of Organizational Creativity* (Second Edition) (pp. 239–255). Academic Press. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-323-91841-1.00015-4>
- Basuroy, S. (1997). Winning: Continuous improvement theory in high-performance organizations. *Journal of Product Innovation Management*, 14(2), 150–151. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0737-6782\(97\)83958-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0737-6782(97)83958-6)
- Boiral, O., & Paillé, P. (2012). Organizational Citizenship Behaviour for the Environment: Measurement and Validation. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 109(4), 431–445. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-011-1138-9>
- Broadbent, M., & Cullen, J. (1993). Performance measurement and transfer pricing in divisionalized organizations. In M. Broadbent & J. Cullen (Eds.), *Managing Financial Resources* (pp. 267–307). Butterworth-Heinemann. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-7506-0669-1.50015-8>
- Buchanan, D. A., & Huczynski, A. (2017). *Organizational Behaviour* (Ninth edition). Pearson.

- <https://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&scope=site&db=nlebk&db=nlabk&AN=1419854>
- Burke, W. W., Trahan, W., & Koonce, R. (2000). Chapter 2—Identifying the Drivers of Organizational Performance In Your Company. In W. W. Burke, W. Trahan, & R. Koonce (Eds.), *Business Climate Shifts* (pp. 23–33). Butterworth-Heinemann. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-7506-7186-6.50007-1>
- Cabric, M. (2017). Influencing Performance: Running an Efficient Security Organization. In M. Cabric (Ed.), *From Corporate Security to Commercial Force* (pp. 87–99). Butterworth-Heinemann. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-805149-8.00007-8>
- Camargo, A., Ross, W., & Glăveanu, V. (2023). Cross-cultural creativity in organizations. In R. Reiter-Palmon & S. Hunter (Eds.), *Handbook of Organizational Creativity* (Second Edition) (pp. 121–131). Academic Press. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-323-91841-1.00016-6>
- Cartwright, S., & Cooper, C. L. (1992). The impact of mergers and acquisitions on organizational performance. In S. Cartwright & C. L. Cooper (Eds.), *Mergers and Acquisitions* (pp. 21–29). Butterworth-Heinemann. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-7506-0144-3.50005-6>
- Castellion, G. (1993). The wisdom of teams: Creating the high-performance organization. *Journal of Product Innovation Management*, 10(3), 268–270. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0737-6782\(93\)90046-S](https://doi.org/10.1016/0737-6782(93)90046-S)
- Chuang, C.-H., & Liao, H. (2010). Strategic Human Resource Management in Service Context: Taking Care of Business by Taking Care of Employees and Customers. *Personnel Psychology*, 63(1), 153–196. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.2009.01165.x>
- Colombo, S., Nazir, S., & Manca, D. (2012). Towards Holistic Decision Support Systems: Including Human and Organizational Performances in the Loop. In I. A. Karimi & R. Srinivasan (Eds.), *Computer Aided Chemical Engineering* (Vol. 31, pp. 295–299). Elsevier. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-444-59507-2.50051-2>
- Conley, T. M. (2015). Improving Organizational Performance by Employing Total Quality Management. In S. J. Davies, C. A. Hertig, & B. P. Gilbride (Eds.), *Security Supervision and Management* (Fourth Edition) (pp. 289–300). Butterworth-Heinemann. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-800113-4.00024-9>
- Cornelius, P. (2011). Organization, value creation, and performance. In P. Cornelius (Ed.), *International Investments in Private Equity* (pp. 15–47). Academic Press. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-375082-2.10002-3>
- Daft, R. L. (2010). *Organization Theory and Design*. South-Western Cengage Learning.
- Darlington, G. (1996). Improving organizational performance—A handbook for managers. *Long Range Planning*, 29(1), 125. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0024-6301\(96\)90013-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0024-6301(96)90013-8)
- Day, M. T. (2000). Performance-Driven Organizational Change: The Organizational Portfolio. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 26(2), 143. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0099-1333\(00\)00090-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0099-1333(00)00090-2)
- de Geus, C. J. C., Ingrams, A., Tummers, L., & Pandey, S. K. (2020). Organizational Citizenship Behavior in the Public Sector: A Systematic Literature Review and Future Research Agenda. *Public Administration Review*, 80(2), 259–270. <https://doi.org/10.1111/puar.13141>
- De Lanerolle, G., Phiri, P., & Haroon, A. (2023). Organizational structure and research readiness. In G. De Lanerolle, P. Phiri, & A. Haroon (Eds.), *Clinical Trials and Tribulations* (pp. 153–163). Academic Press. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-821787-0.00001-5>
- Dekker, S., Zimmermann, V., & Woods, D. D. (2023). High-reliability organizations invest in resilience. In J. R. Keebler, E. H. Lazzara, K. A. Wilson, & E. L. Blickensderfer (Eds.), *Human Factors in Aviation and Aerospace* (Third Edition) (pp. 41–57). Academic Press. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-420139-2.00006-X>
- Detnakin, S., & Rurkkhum, S. (2019). Moderating Effect of Perceived Organizational Support on

- Human Resource Development Practices and Organizational Citizenship Behavior. *Journal of Asia-Pacific Business*, 20(3), 215–234. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10599231.2019.1647078>
- DeVoge, S., & Dyson, C. (1992). Improving Organizational Performance: Aligning Corporate Strategy and the Management of People. In N. Boulter, M. Dalziel, & J. Hill (Eds.), *Achieving the Perfect Fit* (pp. 13–26). Gulf Professional Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-88415-625-3.50006-7>
- Dobbs, J. M., Jackson, R. Jeffrey, & Lindsay, D. R. (2019). The Impact of Perceived Leader and Organizational Integrity on Extra-Role Behaviors in a Military Context. *Military Behavioral Health*, 7(2), 135–141. <https://doi.org/10.1080/21635781.2018.1515132>
- Ericsson, K. A., & Moxley, J. H. (2012). The Expert Performance Approach and Deliberate Practice: Some Potential Implications for Studying Creative Performance in Organizations. In M. D. Mumford (Ed.), *Handbook of Organizational Creativity* (pp. 141–167). Academic Press. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-374714-3.00007-0>
- Evans, N., Campbell, D., & Stonehouse, G. (2003). The travel and tourism organization—Financial analysis and performance indicators. In N. Evans, D. Campbell, & G. Stonehouse (Eds.), *Strategic Management for Travel and Tourism* (pp. 90–118). Butterworth-Heinemann. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-7506-4854-7.50010-X>
- François-Philip de Saint Julien, D., & Courie-Lemur, A. (2023). A collective of resilient organizations together to build a resilient city: Issues and perspectives. In Z. Allam, D. Chabaud, C. Gall, F. Pratlong, & C. Moreno (Eds.), *Resilient and Sustainable Cities* (pp. 417–425). Elsevier. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-323-91718-6.00013-X>
- Garey, L. J. (1996). Cortex Cerebri. Performance, Structural and Functional Organization of the Cortex. *Trends in Neurosciences*, 19(7), 300–301. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0166-2236\(96\)60018-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0166-2236(96)60018-6)
- Ham, R. (1987). Performance organization. In R. Ham (Ed.), *Theatres* (pp. 145–148). Architectural Press. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-442-20497-6.50022-0>
- Holbeche, L. (2005a). Designing the high performance organization. In L. Holbeche (Ed.), *The High Performance Organization* (pp. 93–120). Butterworth-Heinemann. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-7506-5620-7.50007-3>
- Holbeche, L. (2005b). Towards the high performance organization. In L. Holbeche (Ed.), *The High Performance Organization* (pp. 5–26). Butterworth-Heinemann. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-7506-5620-7.50003-6>
- Holbeche, L. (Ed.). (2006). What is a high performance organization? In *Understanding Change* (pp. 119–150). Butterworth-Heinemann. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-7506-6341-0.50009-7>
- Hultink, E. J. (1994). 4 Product development performance: Strategy, organization and management in the world auto industry. *Design Studies*, 15(2), 234–235. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0142-694X\(94\)90031-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/0142-694X(94)90031-0)
- Hunter, S., d'Amato, A. L., Linnell, A. E., & Reiter-Palmon, R. (2023). Creativity in organizations macro perspectives: Leadership, interventions, and applications. In R. Reiter-Palmon & S. Hunter (Eds.), *Handbook of Organizational Creativity (Second Edition)* (pp. 3–6). Academic Press. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-323-91841-1.00028-2>
- Hunter, S., Reiter-Palmon, R., d'Amato, A. L., & Linnell, A. E. (2023). Creativity in organizations micro and mezzo perspectives: Individual and team-level determinants. In R. Reiter-Palmon & S. Hunter (Eds.), *Handbook of Organizational Creativity (Second Edition)* (pp. 3–6). Academic Press. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-323-91840-4.00026-8>
- Idris, I., As, N., Soetjipto, B. E., & Supriyanto, A. S. (2021). Predicting factors of organizational citizenship behavior in Indonesian nurses. *Heliyon*, 7(12), e08652. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2021.e08652>
- Ingrams, A. (2018). Organizational Citizenship Behavior in the Public and Private Sectors: A Multilevel Test of Public Service Motivation and Traditional Antecedents. *Review of Public Personnel*

- Administration. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0734371X18800372>
- Ivancevich, J. M., Gibson, J. L., & Konopaske, R. (2011). *Organizations: Behavior, Structure, Processes*. McGraw-Hill Education.
- Jones, G. (2012). *Organizational Theory, Design, and Change* (7th edition). Pearson.
- Jones, G. R. (2013). *Organizational theory, design, and change* (7th ed). Pearson.
- Kadarningsih, A., Oktavia, V., & Ali, A. (2020). The Role of OCB as a Mediator in Improving Employees Performance. *Benefit: Jurnal Manajemen Dan Bisnis*, 5(2), 123–134. <https://doi.org/10.23917/benefit.v5i2.11087>
- Kark, R., & Waismel-Manor, R. (2005). Organizational Citizenship Behavior: What's Gender Got To Do With It? *Organization*, 12(6), 889–917. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1350508405057478>
- Kumar, A. (2018). Brief Introduction Of Environment, Ecology And Environmental Pollution. *Inspira-Journal of Modern Management & Entrepreneurship (JMME)*, 08(01), 314–322.
- Kumar, D., & Kumar, D. (2023). Mine organization. In D. Kumar & D. Kumar (Eds.), *Phosphate Rock* (pp. 201–223). Elsevier. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-323-95984-1.00002-0>
- Kumburu, N. P. (2023). Ontology-based knowledge management framework in business organizations and water users networks in Tanzania. In S. Eslamian & F. Eslamian (Eds.), *Handbook of Hydroinformatics* (pp. 333–348). Elsevier. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-821285-1.00014-2>
- Luiselli, J. K. (2023). Chapter 15—Organizational behavior management in human services. In J. K. Luiselli (Ed.), *Applied Behavior Analysis Advanced Guidebook (Second Edition)* (pp. 369–392). Academic Press. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-323-99594-8.00015-5>
- Maguire, H., Gardner, R. M., Bird, F. L., & Luiselli, J. K. (2022). Overview of organizational behavior management within human services organizations. In H. Maguire, R. M. Gardner, F. L. Bird, & J. K. Luiselli (Eds.), *Training, Supervision, and Professional Development in Human Services Organizations* (pp. 1–30). Academic Press. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-323-85564-8.00002-8>
- Manoharan, G., Durai, S., Rajesh, G. A., Razak, A., Rao, C. B. S., & Ashtikar, S. P. (2023). A study on the perceptions of officials on their duties and responsibilities at various levels of the organizational structure in order to accomplish artificial intelligence-based smart city implementation. In V. Basetti, C. K. Shiva, M. R. Ungarala, & S. S. Rangarajan (Eds.), *Artificial Intelligence and Machine Learning in Smart City Planning* (pp. 1–10). Elsevier. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-323-99503-0.00007-7>
- McClure, C. R. (1997). Measuring and managing performance in organizations. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 23(1), 58. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0099-1333\(97\)90085-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0099-1333(97)90085-9)
- Mears, S. (2023). Lessons in leadership from third sector organizations. In D. Baker, L. Ellis, C. Williams, & C. Wragg (Eds.), *Benchmarking Library, Information and Education Services* (pp. 185–200). Chandos Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-323-95662-8.00013-8>
- Meyers, P. W. (1997). Organizational change and redesign: Ideas and insights for improving performance. *Journal of Product Innovation Management*, 14(2), 144–145. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0737-6782\(97\)83953-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0737-6782(97)83953-7)
- Moore, W. M. (1993). The wisdom of teams: Creating the high performance organization. *The Columbia Journal of World Business*, 28(3), 104. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-5428\(93\)90024-J](https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-5428(93)90024-J)
- Muzamil, M. K., & Shah, S. (2015). Psychometric Properties of Podsakoff's Organizational Citizenship Behaviour Scale in the Asian Context. *The International Journal of Indian Psychology*, 3(1), 51–60. <https://doi.org/10.25215/0301.152>
- Organ, D. W. (1997). Organizational Citizenship Behavior: It's Construct Clean-Up Time. *Human Performance*. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327043hup1002_2
- Pahkin, K. (2021). Improving organizational practices. In A.-M. Teperi & N. Gotcheva (Eds.), *Human Factors in the Nuclear Industry* (pp. 191–205). Woodhead Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0->

08-102845-2.00010-7

- Panaccio, A., Henderson, D. J., Liden, R. C., Wayne, S. J., & Cao, X. (2015). Toward an Understanding of When and Why Servant Leadership Accounts for Employee Extra-Role Behaviors. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 30(4), 657–675. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10869-014-9388-z>
- Paré, G., & Tremblay, M. (2007). The Influence of High-Involvement Human Resources Practices, Procedural Justice, Organizational Commitment, and Citizenship Behaviors on Information Technology Professionals' Turnover Intentions. *Group & Organization Management*, 32(3), 326–357. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1059601106286875>
- Ponnaluri, R., & Alluri, P. (2021). Organizational framework for mainstreaming CAV. In R. Ponnaluri & P. Alluri (Eds.), *Connected and Automated Vehicles* (pp. 79–95). Elsevier. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-820567-9.00005-9>
- Porter, K., Smith, P., & Fagg, R. (2006). High performance organizations. In K. Porter, P. Smith, & R. Fagg (Eds.), *Leadership and Management* (pp. 5–36). Butterworth-Heinemann. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-7506-6794-4.50008-9>
- Rayner, J., Lawton, A., & Williams, H. M. (2012). Organizational Citizenship Behavior and the Public Service Ethos: Whither the Organization? *Journal of Business Ethics*, 106(2), 117–130. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-011-0991-x>
- Riggio, R. E. (2017). *Introduction to Industrial/Organizational Psychology* (7th ed.). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315620589>
- Robbins, S. P., & Judge, T. A. (2014). *Organizational Behavior* (16th edition). Pearson.
- Rosenau, M. D. (1996). Improving performance: How to manage the white space in the organization chart (2nd edition). *Journal of Product Innovation Management*, 13(1), 86. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0737-6782\(96\)90201-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0737-6782(96)90201-5)
- Salleh, S., Razali, M., Ibrahim, I., Zain, R., & Mansor, Z. (2020). Human Resources Management and Employees' Practices at the Workplace: Enhancing Organizational Citizenship Behavior for Environment. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 10(8), 305–317. <https://doi.org/10.6007/IJARBS/v10-i8/7540>
- Scott, W. R. (2002). *Organizations: Rational, Natural, and Open Systems* (5th edition). Taylor & Francis.
- Sibindi, N., & Samuel, O. M. (2019). Structure and an unstable business operating environment: Revisiting Burns and Stalker's organization-environment theory in Zimbabwe's manufacturing sector. *South African Journal of Economic and Management Sciences*, 22(1), Article 1. <https://doi.org/10.4102/sajems.v22i1.2113>
- Som, P. (2020). Determinants of Good Governance for Public Management in Cambodia. *Journal of Service Science and Management*, 13(01), 168–177. <https://doi.org/10.4236/jssm.2020.131011>
- Tyson, S. (2006). The contribution of HRM to organizational performance. In S. Tyson (Ed.), *Essentials of Human Resource Management* (Fifth Edition) (pp. 447–450). Butterworth-Heinemann. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-7506-6795-1.50032-7>
- Vatsalaphone, S. (2024). Research on Public Political Trust in Public Crisis Management in Laos. *Open Journal of Social Sciences*, 12(03), 66–75. <https://doi.org/10.4236/jss.2024.123006>
- Waldman, D. A., & Atwater, L. E. (1998). Does 360° Feedback Impact Organizational Performance? In D. A. Waldman & L. E. Atwater (Eds.), *The Power of 360° Feedback* (pp. 116–127). Gulf Professional Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-88415-412-9.50011-8>
- Waleriańczyk, W., Pruszcak, Dominika, & and Stolarski, M. (2020). Testing the role of midpoint sleep and social jetlag in the context of work psychology: An exploratory study. *Biological Rhythm Research*, 51(7), 1026–1043. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09291016.2019.1571707>
- Wang, G., & Zhao, W. (2020). The organization and architecture of the avionics system. In G. Wang & W.

- Zhao (Eds.), *The Principles of Integrated Technology in Avionics Systems* (pp. 41–101). Academic Press. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-816651-2.00002-2>
- Wholey, J. S. (1982). Results Oriented Management: Integrating Evaluation And Organizational Performance Incentives. In G. J. Stahler & W. R. Tash (Eds.), *Innovative Approaches to Mental Health Evaluation* (pp. 255–275). Academic Press. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-663020-6.50014-0>
- Yang, L., Jiang, Y., Zhang, W., Zhang, Q., & Gong, H. (2019). An empirical examination of individual green policy perception and green behaviors. *International Journal of Manpower*, 41(7), 1021–1040. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJM-09-2019-0455>.