



JMK

P-ISSN 2477-3166
E-ISSN 2656 0771

(JURNAL MANAJEMEN DAN KEWIRAUSAHAAN)

[ANNOUNCEMENTS](#) [CURRENT](#) [ARCHIVES](#) [ABOUT ▾](#)

[HOME](#) / [ARCHIVES](#) / Vol 9 No 2 (2024): May

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.32503/jmk.v9i2>


PUBLISHED: 2024-05-31

ARTIKEL ILMIAH

The Influence of Islamic Leadership on Employee Performance with Intrinsic and Extrinsic Motivation as Intervening Variables : Study at PT. Bank Muamalat Indonesia, Tbk Malang Branch and Batu Sub-Branch

Ahmad Zaki Mubarok, Siswanto Siswanto

103-123




DOI: <https://doi.org/10.32503/jmk.v9i2.4895>

Social Entrepreneurial Intention: A Systematic Literature Review and Research Agenda

Bintang Eko Dwi Prayoga, Susilaningsih Susilaningsih, Mintasih Indriayu

124-142




DOI: <https://doi.org/10.32503/jmk.v9i2.5120>

Toxic Workplaces and Employee Performance: The Mediating Role of Organizational Support and Well-being in Java Island

Sherly Rosalina Tanoto, Tita Edenia

143-157



DOI: <https://doi.org/10.32503/jmk.v9i2.5179>





ADDITIONAL MENU

[ABOUT THE JOURNAL](#)

[AIMS AND SCOPE](#)

[PUBLICATION ETHICS](#)

[REVIEWER TEAM](#)

[AUTHOR GUIDELINES](#)

[PLAGIARISM POLICY](#)

[OPEN ACCES POLICY](#)

[JOURNAL INDEX](#)

[PEER REVIEW PROCESS](#)

[COPYRIGHT NOTICE](#)

[RETRACTION](#)

[ARCHIVING POLICY](#)

[REPOSITORY POLICY](#)

Editor JMK Silahkan submit dalam bahasa Inggris

Putri Permisi, apakah masih ada slot untuk bulan September?

Dona Pak apakah masih ada slot untuk Agustus akhir ?

Editor JMK Slot artikel untuk bulan september sudah full

Fendy maradita Apakah artikel yang saya submit bisa di publish September 2023 ini pak,saya submit dari bulan kemari

Ahmad Zaki Mubarak Sebelumnya mohon maaf izin bertanya, apakah slot artikel untuk bulan mei 2024 masih ada? 🙏

yuke12 SLMT MALAM

yuke12 Bagaimana saya dpat mendaftarkan jurnal untuk bulan jan 24 karena sepetember sudah fulpak, mohon pet

cindy permisi, apakah masih ada slot untuk januari 2024?

rizka apakah slot januari masih ada?

Rosiana Izin bertanya untuk slot Maret 2024 masih ada ?

widya izin bertanya admin apakah slot mei 2024 masih tersedia

admin Mei 2024 masih ada slot, silahkan submit

putrii apakah kuota untuk bulai mei 2024 masih ada? kalau boleh tau sinta 3 dengan biaya berapa?

Eka Selamat siang admin apakah masi ada slot untuk Mei 2024?

ila permisi, izin bertanya apakah untuk bulan mei 2024 masih ada slot? terimakasih

pristin ijin bertanya, apakah ada kontak wa editor? terimakasih

Bayu Izin bertanya, untuk publikasi bulan mei 2024 deadline pengumpulan tanggal berapa ? ,terimakasih

Cia Ada slot kah publikasi bulan mei atau juni



nama



pesan

- 12 bulan yang lalu
- 11 bulan yang lalu
- 10 bulan yang lalu
- 10 bulan yang lalu
- 9 bulan yang lalu
- 9 bulan yang lalu
- 8 bulan yang lalu
- 8 bulan yang lalu
- 7 bulan yang lalu
- 5 bulan yang lalu
- 4 bulan yang lalu
- 3 bulan yang lalu
- 3 bulan yang lalu
- 2 bulan yang lalu
- 2 bulan yang lalu
- 2 bulan yang lalu
- 2 bulan yang lalu
- 1 bulan yang lalu
- 2 minggu yang lalu

Upgrade



MAPS



KEYWORDS

Brand Image Compensation digital transformation Harga Keputusan Pembelian Kinerja Kualitas Pelayanan Motivation MSMEs Pandemi Covid-19 Performance Price Product Quality Produktivitas Kerja Promotion Strategy SWOT UMKM Work Discipline Work Productivity



Universitas Islam Kediri

Jln. Sersan Suharmaji Nomor. 38, Manisrenggo, Kecamatan, Kota Kediri, Kediri, Jawa Timur 64128.

Telepon : (0354) 683243

Email : redaksijmk@uniska-kediri.ac.id

Support : Taufik Akbar



JMK

P-ISSN 2477-3166
E-ISSN 2656 0771

(JURNAL MANAJEMEN DAN KEWIRAUSAHAAN)

[ANNOUNCEMENTS](#) [CURRENT](#) [ARCHIVES](#) [ABOUT ▾](#)

[HOME](#) / [Editorial Team](#)

Chief in Editor

Suseno Hendratmoko, Program Studi Manajemen Fakultas Ekonomi Universitas Islam Kadiri

Associate Editors

Taufik Akbar, Program Studi Manajemen Fakultas Ekonomi Universitas Islam Kadiri

Wiwiek Kusumaning Asmoro, Politeknik Negeri Malang

Beny Mahyudi Saputra, Program Studi Manajemen Fakultas Ekonomi Universitas Islam Kadiri

Section Editors

Novie Astuti Setianingsih, Politeknik Negeri Malang


Copy Editors

Sinollah, Universitas Islam Raden Rahmat Malang

Production Editor

Ririn Wahyu Arida, Program Studi Manajemen Fakultas Ekonomi Universitas Islam Kadiri

ACCREDITATION CERTIFICATE



ADDITIONAL MENU

Toxic Workplaces and Employee Performance: The Mediating Role of Organizational Support and Well-being in Java Island

Sherly Rosalina Tanoto

School of Business and Management, Petra Christian University
sherlytanoto@petra.ac.id

Tita Edenia

School of Business and Management, Petra Christian University
d11180419@john.petra.ac.id

Abstract

This study examines the influence of a toxic workplace environment on employee performance, organizational support perception, and employee well-being among workers in Java Island, Indonesia. Utilizing a quantitative research approach, data were collected from 321 permanent employees. Structural Equation Modeling with Partial Least Square (PLS) was employed for analysis. Findings indicate that a toxic workplace environment does not directly impact employee performance, organizational support perception, or employee well-being. However, organizational support perception significantly affects employee performance, and employee well-being also significantly impacts employee performance. Moreover, a toxic workplace environment does not indirectly influence employee performance through organizational support perception or employee well-being as mediating factors. Despite the lack of direct impact, this research contributes novelty by utilizing perception of organizational support and employee well-being as mediating variables for the relationship between toxic workplace environment and employee performance. Practically, the study underscores the importance of addressing organizational support and employee well-being to enhance employee performance in organizations. Managers and organizational leaders must prioritize creating conducive work environments and providing adequate support to foster employee well-being, ultimately leading to improved organizational performance.

Keywords: employee performance, employee well-being, perceived organizational support, toxic workplace environment

DOI : <http://dx.doi.org/10.32503/jmk.v9i2.5179>

Article History : Article received (7 Apr 2024); revised (8 May 2024);
accepted (15 May 2024)

Email Co-Author : sherlytanoto@petra.ac.id



This work is licensed under a Creative Commons
Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License

Introduction

The era of globalization presents myriad challenges and intense competition. Organizations operating in this global context must secure a solid competitive advantage, which can often be achieved through effective human resource management. Human resources are a critical component in creating a competitive advantage; without them, a company cannot excel against its competitors. A key indicator of a competitive organization is its overall performance, which in turn is reflected in the performance of its human resources or individual employees.

The quality of Indonesian workers declined due to the pandemic, impacting their performance. In Java, a province significantly influenced by the globalization crisis, dynamic job mobility and workforce movements are common. Despite these challenges, East Java is expected to see improved performance in 2024, although ongoing global crises threatening the region's stability (Kompas, 2023b). This situation provides a poignant example of how employee performance is crucial for organizations aiming to fulfill their future visions.

One significant driver of performance levels is the work environment, which encompasses the conditions and interactions among employees as they undertake their tasks. The nature of this environment can significantly influence employee performance, productivity, and creativity, either positively or negatively. A supportive and healthy work environment boosts efficiency and productivity, while a poorly managed one can adversely affect employee morale (Pickering et al., 2017).

Over the past few decades, Indonesia has experienced considerable industrialization, urbanization, and economic growth, ranking high among G20 countries in terms of economic expansion (Kontan, 2023). However, this growth has not necessarily translated into improved public welfare, with many Indonesians still enduring substandard living conditions and toxic work environments.

In today's fiercely competitive job market, individuals strive to outperform one another. However, not all work environments support such aspirations. The social environment is a significant factor affecting employee performance (Rasool et al., 2019). A quarter of employees globally, and a third in Asia, experience burnout, with toxic work behaviors being a leading cause (McKinsey & Company, 2021). In Indonesia, the dilemma for many employees is whether to endure a toxic work environment or resign. A toxic workplace culture is a significant reason for resignation, far outweighing low pay (Fachri, 2023). An alarming 70.93 percent of Indonesian workers report experiencing an unhealthy work environment (Kompas, 2023a).

Organizational support perception and employee well-being are also vital for enhancing performance. When employees feel supported by their organization, they are more motivated and likely to be engaged in their roles (Alshaabani et al., 2021). Employee well-being, which encompasses happiness, security, and satisfaction (Avey et al., 2010), is crucial for fostering a safe and supportive workplace atmosphere.

This study aims to analyze the impact of toxic work environments on employee performance, perceptions of organizational support, and employee well-being in Java. By examining these interrelated factors, the research seeks to offer insights into how they collectively influence employee outcomes in the region. This study responds to calls for more international research and varied organizational

outcomes, focusing specifically on employee performance (Haeruddin et al., 2022; Kurniawan et al., 2023; Rasool et al., 2021).

Concerning the relationship between a toxic workplace environment and employee performance, Haeruddin et al. (2022) demonstrated that the degree of employee performance is influenced by the work environment, with a toxic workplace having a detrimental impact on employee performance. A toxic work environment can reduce employee motivation to complete tasks optimally so that contributions to the company will decrease. A toxic workplace environment will affect work efficiency and worsen the level of fatigue in employees. Kurniawan et al. (2023) showed results that the toxic workplace environment did not have a significant effect on employee performance directly. Although it does not have a direct effect, there is still a negative influence given by the toxic work environment, which causes a decrease in employee performance levels. Therefore, this study hypothesizes:

H₁: Toxic workplace environment affects employee performance.

Toxic work environments harm employee performance outcomes, such as stress and burnout. Wang et al. (2020) discovered that perceived support from the organization positively influences employee commitment and performance in the workplace, leading to enhanced outcomes. When employees feel support from the organization, their cognitive and emotional evaluations of the organization will be stronger. According to Rasool et al. (2021), a high level of organizational support will allow employees to produce high performance, even if that performance decreases due to unfavorable work environment characteristics. Based on the explanation above, the hypothesis is obtained:

H₂: Toxic workplace environment affects perceived organizational support.

Mental health is closely related to work environment conditions. An unpleasant work environment can disrupt a person's sense of security and negatively impact well-being. Toxic workplace environments have consequences that are closely related to employees' mental health, such as increased stress, anxiety, fear, and insecurity (Alsomaidae et al., 2023). The repercussions of toxic workplace environments on employee health pose challenges in attaining employee well-being (Alsomaidae, 2023). Salin et al. (2023) supplemented this by indicating that such environments lead to reduced employee performance and productivity. The prolonged cycle of negative influences from the toxic workplace environment will ultimately impact employee well-being and performance. Based on the explanation above, the hypothesis is obtained:

H₃: Toxic workplace environment affects employee well-being.

Employee perceptions of organizational support can increase employee motivation and increase productivity (Kurtessis et al., 2017). Research by Ridwan et al. (2020) states that perceptions of organizational support affect employee performance. Employees with high perceptions of organizational support feel that the organization is willing to provide this assistance in the situation most in need of job support. Employees will feel valued, cared for, and recognized, and the interchange provided can increase work diligence and respect for one another. This situation can improve employee performance. The perception of organizational support has a positive impact on employee performance and can increase commitment and productivity to the organization so that company values can be

maintained (Afsar et al., 2015; Fry et al., 2017; Wang et al., 2020). Based on the explanation above, the hypothesis is obtained:

H₄: Perceived organizational support affects employee performance.

It is the productivity and viability of employees that determine the efficiency and viability of an organization. Employee performance plays a vital role in productivity and is critical to understanding organizational performance (Inuwa, 2016). Nowadays, employee well-being is an issue in the business environment. Employee well-being, in general, is to improve employee health in terms of work safety. Yan et al. (2020) explain performance as a record of the results obtained for a certain period, where when employees feel that their welfare is guaranteed and cared for, the interchange that can be given to the organization is an active contribution so that the results of employee performance also increase. Based on the explanation above, the hypothesis is obtained:

H₅: Employee well-being affects employee performance.

Fry et al. (2017) show that perceived organizational support significantly influences performance outcomes, employee work commitment, and employee performance. Perceived organizational support has a positive impact on dynamic behavior in the workplace. When employees feel support from the organization, work motivation leads to high productivity. So, it can be assumed that high organizational support will allow employees to produce high performance, even if that performance decreases due to unfavorable work environment characteristics (Rasool et al., 2021). Based on the explanation above, the hypothesis is obtained:

H₆: Toxic workplace environment affects employee performance through perceived organizational support as mediation.

The work environment is designed to organize its workforce according to the social nature of individuals to produce better performance. According to Haeruddin et al. (2022), the workplace environment significantly influences employee performance, with a toxic work environment having a detrimental effect. Employee well-being serves as a motivator for all levels of staff, from executives to administrative personnel (Arenas et al., 2015). This suggests that organizational commitment contributes to employee well-being. Additionally, Fotiadis et al. (2019) concluded that the quality of work life is intertwined with employee performance due to the reciprocal nature of organizational behavior. An employee will perform nicely and optimally if concern for the organization arises, even if the performance decreases due to unfavorable work environment characteristics (Rasool et al., 2021). Based on the explanation above, the hypothesis is obtained:

H₇: Toxic workplace environment affects employee performance through employee well-being as mediation.

Figure 1 illustrates the research framework utilized in this study. Straight arrows indicate direct relationships between variables, while dashed arrows indicate indirect relationships with mediation among the variables used in this study, and the hypotheses being tested are already stated.




Figure 1. Research Model

Methodology

The type of research used in this study is quantitative research. Quantitative research involves using numbers through structured questions in data collection. The population taken for this study consists of permanent employees working on the island of Java. This research uses a non-probability sampling technique. Non-probability sampling is a sample selected based on the availability of respondents or researcher considerations based on criteria. The criteria for respondents in this study are permanent employees located on the island of Java, with a minimum tenure of 1 (one) year. This criterion is used in this study assuming that permanent employees who have worked for one year or more have understood the situation or conditions of the environment and the behavior of their superiors or coworkers in the workplace. Determination of sample size by Hair et al. (2014) suggests that the minimum sample size is 100 or more. The research sample amounted to 321 employees.

This study will utilize questionnaire items adapted from the research of Rasool et al. (2021), Wang et al. (2020), Ahmed et al. (2020), and Tastan et al. (2015). Adaptation of the questionnaire was conducted by carefully translating and modifying it to ensure that the meanings of the items between the original language and the designated language remain consistent. The translation was performed

using back translation, a process where the research questionnaire items are translated from the original language to the designated language and then back to the original language to ensure the congruence of meanings.

The survey on toxic work environments was adopted from the studies conducted by Anjum et al. (2018) and Rasool et al. (2019), as utilized in Rasool et al.'s (2021) research, boasting a reliability level of 0.935 and comprising seven items. Meanwhile, the questionnaire assessing employees' perception of support was sourced from Wang et al. (2020), also featured in Rasool et al.'s (2021) investigation, demonstrating a reliability level of 0.784 and consisting of 4 items. The questionnaire gauging employee well-being was adapted from Ahmed et al. (2020) and incorporated into Rasool et al.'s (2021) research, showcasing a reliability level of 0.843 and comprising six items. Lastly, the survey concerning employee performance was drawn from William and Anderson (1991, in Taştan & Davoudi, 2015), boasting a reliability level of 0.797 and 7 items. Each of these surveys employs a Likert scale with a 5-point range, spanning from strongly disagree to agree strongly.

Data were analyzed using Structural Equation Modeling with Partial Least Square (PLS) method using SmartPLS 4. Partial Least Square (PLS) is a variant-based structural equation analysis (SEM) that tests measurement and structural models simultaneously. There are two measurement models in SmartPLS, namely the outer model and the inner model. The outer model is used to test validity and reliability, while the inner model is used to test the research model's feasibility and the proposed hypothesis.

Result and Discussion

Validity and reliability tests were used to evaluate the outcomes of examining the measurement model. First, a validity test is employed to examine a questionnaire's list of questions to identify the research variables. The preliminary step included identifying variables with a factor loading value exceeding 0.7 and discarding those with a factor loading beneath this threshold (Hair et al., 2014). The validity test results for the variables toxic workplace environment, perceived organizational support, employee well-being, and employee performance indicate that the count value on each question for each variable is more significant than 0.7, indicating that the data in this study are valid (Table 1). Only one indicator was invalid, exhibiting an outer loading value below 0.5. This indicator pertains to the first item of the toxic workplace variable. Hence, it had to be deleted. The test for convergent validity is based not only on the outer loading values but also on the Average Variance Extracted (AVE) values. A variable is considered valid if its AVE value is more significant than 0.5 (Hair et al., 2014).

Table 1. Loading Factor and AVE

Variable	Indicators	Outer Loading	AVE
Toxic Workplace (TW)	TW2	0.854	0.655
	TW3	0.794	
	TW4	0.806	
	TW5	0.730	
	TW6	0.867	
	TW7	0.796	
	Perceived Organizational Support (POS)	POS1	
POS2		0.808	
POS3		0.815	
POS4		0.805	
Employee Well-being (EW)	EW1	0.820	0.698
	EW2	0.815	
	EW3	0.849	
	EW4	0.872	
	EW5	0.870	
	EW6	0.786	
Employee Performance	EP1	0.876	0.806
	EP2	0.932	
	EP3	0.915	
	EP4	0.937	
	EP5	0.794	
	EP6	0.908	
	EP7	0.914	

Source: primary data processing

The reliability test is conducted to determine the accuracy of the constructed structural model, ensuring that the data can be considered reliable or consistent (Hair et al., 2014). Reliability testing can be assessed by examining Cronbach's alpha and composite reliability values. A variable in a study is deemed reliable if Cronbach's alpha value reaches or exceeds 0.7 and the composite reliability value is between 0.6 and 0.7, which is considered good (Hair et al., 2014). As seen in Table 2, all the variables in this study have Cronbach's alpha and composite reliability values above 7, indicating they are reliable.

Table 2. Results of Reliability Tests

Variable	Cronbach's Alpha	Composite Reliability
Toxic Workplace (TW)	0.897	0.930
Perceived Organizational Support (POS)	0.839	0.844
Employee Well-being (EW)	0.914	0.931
Employee Performance (EP)	0.959	0.961

Source: primary data processing

In hypothesis testing, the value to be observed is the t-statistic value, which ideally should exceed 1.96 for a hypothesis to be accepted or to have a significant influence. Similarly, the p-value needs to be considered; if the value is less than 0.05, then the hypothesis in the study can be accepted, and the opposite applies as well. Table 3 presents the results of hypothesis testing within a study investigating the effects of various factors on employee performance, perceived organizational support, and employee well-being. The interpretation of the table is based on the t-statistic and p-value for each hypothesis.

Table 3. Results of Hypothesis Tests

Hypothesis	t-statistic	p-value	Information
H ₁ Toxic Workplace Environment -> Employee Performance	0.614	0.539	Rejected
H ₂ Toxic Workplace Environment -> Perceived Organizational Support	1.310	0.190	Rejected
H ₃ Toxic Workplace Environment -> Employee Well-being	1.339	0.181	Rejected
H ₄ Perceived Organizational Support -> Employee Performance	4.111	0000	Supported
H ₅ Employee Well-being -> Employee Performance	2.648	0.008	Supported
H ₆ Toxic Workplace Environment -> Perceived Organizational Support -> Employee Performance	1.172	0.241	Rejected
H ₇ Toxic Workplace Environment -> Employee Well-being -> Employee Performance	1.310	0.259	Rejected

Source: primary data processing

In summary, the study supports the hypotheses that perceived organizational support and employee well-being directly contribute to improved employee performance. However, it rejects the hypotheses concerning the direct and indirect

negative impacts of a toxic workplace environment on employee performance, perceived organizational support, and employee well-being. The results of the inner model testing can be seen in Figure 2.




Figure 2. Inner Model Results
Source: primary data processing

This study addresses discrepancies in previous research findings. According to Haeruddin et al. (2022), it is known that employee performance is influenced by the workplace environment, where a toxic work environment can negatively impact employee performance. A toxic work environment can decrease employees' motivation to complete tasks effectively, reducing their contributions to the company. Specifically, a toxic work environment fundamentally affects work efficiency and exacerbates levels of work fatigue among employees. On the other hand, Kurniawan et al. (2023) found results indicating that a toxic work environment does not significantly affect employee performance. Despite the lack of a direct effect, there is still a negative influence exerted by a toxic work environment, resulting in decreased employee performance. Therefore, the findings of this study confirm the research by Kurniawan et al. (2023), stating that a toxic work environment does not significantly affect employee performance. This discrepancy may occur because individuals have a high sense of responsibility as employees, allowing them to complete tasks effectively even in a toxic work environment.

The findings of this study also contradict the research conducted by Wang et al. (2020), which suggests that a toxic work environment influences employees' perceptions of organizational support. In Wang et al.'s study, employees were reported to feel less motivated to complete tasks and could overlook organizational support due to the toxicity of the work environment. However, in this research, the negative behavior experienced did not significantly alter employees' perceptions of organizational support in Java Island, as employees often feel supported by their organization or workplace, even in challenging situations.

The study by Rasool et al. (2021) suggests that when an organization pays attention to the well-being of its employees, the impact of a toxic work environment can be reduced, leading to sustainable organizational performance. However, this research found that a toxic work environment does not affect the well-being of employees in Java Island. Although a toxic work environment can negatively impact employees, arguments suggest this may not directly affect their well-being. Some employees may be able to cope with a toxic work environment by employing effective coping mechanisms or having social support outside of work to help them manage stress (Anjum & Ming, 2018). Personal coping strategies and perceptions of control over the situation in the workplace can also help employees maintain their well-being. However, it is essential to remember that a toxic work environment still has significant adverse effects and can affect various aspects of employees' lives if not adequately addressed.

Employees' perception of organizational support can enhance their motivation and increase productivity. The study by Ridwan et al. (2020) states that organizational support perception influences employee performance. Employees with a high perception of organizational support feel that the organization is willing to provide it in situations where they most need job support. Employees feel valued, cared for, and recognized, and the reciprocation provided can increase their perseverance and mutual respect (Eisenberger et al., 2020). The findings of this research align with the study by Chen et al. (2020) regarding the influence of organizational support perception on employee performance. That study highlights the importance of organizational support in providing a new perspective for critical organizational stakeholders and authorities to develop performance-related management strategies. Effective performance management will result in continuous learning, collaboration, problem-solving, and work initiatives.

Yan et al. (2020) define performance as the recorded outcomes obtained over a specific period, wherein when employees feel their well-being is assured and attended to, the reciprocal contribution they can provide to the organization is active participation, thereby enhancing employee performance outcomes. The findings of this research support Yan et al.'s (2020) statement that employee well-being influences employee performance. This study found that the sense of security felt by employees in the workplace would drive work motivation to effectively fulfill job responsibilities according to each individual's job description. When job responsibilities are satisfactorily fulfilled, completing tasks encourages employees to be more diligent.

So far, no research has been found regarding the influence of a toxic work environment on employee performance mediated by organizational support perception. However, a study by Kurniawan et al. (2023) used other mediating variables in the relationship between a toxic work environment and employee performance, namely employee engagement and work stress, and the results showed that both variables could act as mediators. However, in this study, organizational support perception could not mediate the relationship between a toxic work environment and employee performance. This is suspected to occur due to two reasons. First, the presence of alternative mediating factors that more directly affect employee performance than organizational support perception. Second, the respondents in this study come from diverse organizations, resulting in unique dynamics in their work culture and organizational structure, which makes

organizational support perception unable to mediate the relationship between a toxic work environment and employee performance.

Su and Swanson (2019) posit employee well-being as a commendable achievement for individuals exhibiting innovative work behavior, wherein the outcomes of such thinking can lead to enhanced employee performance. To date, no prior research has examined the influence of a toxic work environment on employee performance mediated by organizational support perception. However, a study by Kurniawan et al. (2023) was identified, which utilized other mediating variables, such as employee engagement and work stress, to investigate the impact of a toxic work environment on employee performance, yielding results indicating that both mediator variables mediated the relationship between a toxic work environment and employee performance. Nevertheless, the findings of this research indicate that employee well-being cannot mediate the relationship between a toxic work environment and employee performance. Employee well-being is influenced by multifaceted factors extending beyond the workplace, including personal life, health, and relationships (Pagán-Castaño et al., 2020). Therefore, even if employees experience a sense of well-being, it may not directly translate into improved performance if other factors related to the toxic work environment persist. Well-being encompasses various dimensions, such as physical health, emotional stability, and social connections, which may not directly impact organizational efforts to address workplace toxicity. As a result, the complexity and diverse nature of well-being makes it less suitable as a mediator for the relationship between a toxic work environment and employee performance.

Employee engagement and work stress, as identified in the study by Kurniawan et al. (2023), may play more direct roles in mediating the relationship between a toxic work environment and employee performance than overall well-being. Employee engagement reflects the extent to which employees are invested in their work, while work stress captures the negative psychological and emotional experiences resulting from workplace toxicity. Compared to overall well-being, these variables may offer more direct pathways through which the toxic work environment affects employee performance, a broader and potentially less specific construct. Therefore, the failure to find employee well-being as a mediator could be attributed to the more direct and specific role played by employee engagement and work stress in mediating the relationship between a toxic work environment and employee performance.

This study makes significant contributions to the scientific understanding of the relationship between toxic work environments, organizational support perception, employee well-being, and employee performance. By examining these dynamics in the context of Java Island, our findings offer valuable insights that extend and refine existing knowledge in several key ways. Firstly, our research provides valuable insights into the impact of toxic work environments on employee performance. While previous studies have yielded mixed results regarding this relationship, our findings align with the assertion by Kurniawan et al. (2023) that a toxic work environment may not directly impact employee performance. However, our study goes further by clarifying how organizational support perception and employee engagement play critical mediating roles in this relationship, shedding light on the underlying mechanisms that influence employee outcomes. Secondly, the identification of organizational support perception as a key mediator highlights

its pivotal role in mitigating the negative effects of toxic work environments. Contrary to the findings of Wang et al. (2020), our study reveals that despite facing workplace toxicity, employees in Java Island maintain positive perceptions of organizational support, which in turn bolster their motivation and performance. This finding underscores the importance of organizational support interventions in fostering a supportive work culture that promotes employee well-being and productivity.

Lastly, our research underscores the complex interplay between employee well-being, workplace dynamics, and performance outcomes. While we did not find direct mediation of employee well-being in the toxic work environment-performance relationship, our study contributes to the broader understanding of well-being as a multifaceted construct influenced by diverse factors beyond the workplace. By explaining these relationships, our findings enrich theoretical frameworks and provide practical implications for organizations striving to optimize employee performance amidst challenging work environments. In summary, our study advances scientific knowledge by clarifying the complex interrelationships between toxic work environments, organizational support perception, employee well-being, and performance outcomes. These insights contribute to the development of evidence-based strategies for promoting healthier and more productive work environments, ultimately fostering organizational sustainability and employee satisfaction.

Conclusion

In conclusion, this study yields significant theoretical contributions regarding the influence of a toxic workplace environment on employee performance, organizational support perception, and employee well-being among workers in Java Island, Indonesia. Firstly, it was observed that a toxic workplace environment does not influence employee performance, organizational support perception, or employee well-being. Additionally, the perception of organizational support was found to significantly impact employee performance, while employee well-being also significantly affects employee performance. Furthermore, the study revealed that a toxic workplace environment does not indirectly influence employee performance through organizational support perception or employee well-being as mediating factors among workers in Java Island. Despite the lack of impact, this research contributes novelty by using the perception of organizational support and employee well-being as mediating variables for the relationship between toxic workplace environment and employee performance. These findings provide valuable insights into the dynamics of workplace environments and their effects on employee outcomes, underscoring the importance of addressing organizational support and well-being for enhancing employee performance.

This study offers practical implications for managers or individuals within organizations tasked with monitoring employee performance. In efforts to enhance organizational performance reflected through employee performance, a growing body of research highlights the workplace environment as a significant factor influencing employee performance. The workplace is where everything can impact employees' physical and mental well-being in fulfilling job tasks, both directly and indirectly. Managers or individuals in authority within organizations must pay attention to the workplace environment to foster good employee performance.

Organizations or companies, as controllers of the situations and conditions within the workplace, can contribute to improving employee performance. One crucial aspect to consider is ensuring the availability of support that employees can receive. Therefore, companies need to actively enhance employee performance through various means, such as setting individual goals to encourage employees to continually develop new approaches to achieve them continually, thus feeling appreciated for their goals and values. Being a flexible organization is an action that significantly attracts employee contributions. Another implication is to pay close attention to employee well-being. The well-being experienced by employees during work serves as a turning point for the performance they will provide to the company. Employee well-being can be seen from the positive attitudes exhibited by workers, which may arise from the positive intentions they experience while working. Managers can be more empathetic and show their concern for employee relations to create a balance in employees' lives, both in their work and personal lives, for each individual working as office staff in companies on Java Island.

References

- Afsar, B., Badir, Y., & Khan, M. M. (2015). Person–job fit, person–organization fit and innovative work behavior: The mediating role of innovation trust. *The Journal of High Technology Management Research*, 26(2), 105–116.
- Ahmed, M., Zehou, S., Raza, S. A., Qureshi, M. A., & Yousufi, S. Q. (2020). Impact of CSR and environmental triggers on employee green behavior: The mediating effect of employee well-being. *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management*, 27(5), 2225–2239.
- Alshaabani, A., Naz, F., Magda, R., & Rudnák, I. (2021). Impact of perceived organizational support on OCB in the time of COVID-19 pandemic in Hungary: employee engagement and affective commitment as mediators. *Sustainability*, 13(14), 7800.
- Alsomaidae, M. M. (2023). The effect of workplace stress on employee engagement, the mediation role of leadership style. *American Journal of Economics and Business Innovation*, 2(2), 74–85.
- Alsomaidae, M. M., Joumaa, B. A., & Khalid, K. W. (2023). Toxic Workplace, Mental Health and Employee Well-being, the Moderator Role of Paternalistic Leadership, an Empirical Study. *Journal of Applied Business and Technology*, 4(2), 114–129.
- Anjum, A., & Ming, X. (2018). Combating toxic workplace environment: An empirical study in the context of Pakistan. *Journal of Modelling in Management*, 13(3), 675–697.
- Arenas, A., Giorgi, G., Montani, F., Mancuso, S., Perez, J. F., Mucci, N., & Arcangeli, G. (2015). Workplace bullying in a sample of Italian and Spanish employees and its relationship with job satisfaction, and psychological well-being. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 6, 157073.
- Avey, J. B., Luthans, F., Smith, R. M., & Palmer, N. F. (2010). Impact of positive psychological capital on employee well-being over time. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 15(1), 17.
- Chen, T., Hao, S., Ding, K., Feng, X., Li, G., & Liang, X. (2020). The impact of organizational support on employee performance. *Employee Relations: The International Journal*, 42(1), 166–179.
- Eisenberger, R., Rhoades Shanock, L., & Wen, X. (2020). Perceived organizational support: Why caring about employees counts. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 7, 101–124.

- Fachri. (2023, January 18). *Apakah Banyak Karyawan Resign Karena Lingkungan Kerja yang Toxic?* <https://www.liputan6.com/lifestyle/read/5183553/apakah-banyak-karyawan-resign-karena-lingkungan-kerja-yang-toxic?page=3>.
- Fotiadis, A., Abdulrahman, K., & Spyridou, A. (2019). The mediating roles of psychological autonomy, competence and relatedness on work-life balance and well-being. *Frontiers in Psychology, 10*, 460630.
- Fry, L. W., Latham, J. R., Clinebell, S. K., & Krahnke, K. (2017). Spiritual leadership as a model for performance excellence: a study of Baldrige award recipients. *Journal of Management, Spirituality & Religion, 14*(1), 22–47.
- Haeruddin, M. I. M., Akbar, A., Dipatmodjo, T. S. P., Kurniawan, A. W., & Abadi, R. R. (2022). The toxicity of our city: The effect of toxic workplace environment on employee's performance. *International Journal of Social Science and Business, 6*(2), 183–190.
- Hair Joseph F, Babin, B. J., & Anderson, R. E. (2014). *Multivariate Data Analysis* (7th ed.). Pearson Education Limited.
- Inuwa, M. (2016). Job satisfaction and employee performance: An empirical approach. *The Millennium University Journal, 1*(1), 90–103.
- Kompas. (2023a, July 17). *dari 5 Orang Merasa Tempat Kerjanya Toxic, Ada Apa?* <https://lifestyle.kompas.com/read/2023/07/17/201538020/1-dari-5-orang-merasa-tempat-kerjanya-toxic-ada-apa?page=all> Kontan. (2023, May 8). *Pertumbuhan Ekonomi Indonesia*.
- Kompas. (2023b, November 20). *Menakar Resiliensi Ekonomi Jatim di Tengah Resesi Global dan Tahun Politik*. https://www.kompas.id/baca/nusantara/2023/11/19/menakar-resiliensi-ekonomijatim-ditengah-resesi-global-dan-tahunpolitik?status=sukses_login%3Fstatus_login%3Dlogin&status_login=login.
- Kontan. (2023, May 8). *Pertumbuhan Ekonomi Indonesia Kuartal 1 2023 Tertinggi Kedua Dunia, Cek Datanya*. <https://nasional.kontan.co.id/news/pertumbuhan-ekonomi-indonesia-kuartal-1-2023-tertinggi-kedua-dunia-cek-datanya>.
- Kurniawan, S., Bamumin, F. A., & Kusnandar, K. N. (2023). The Effect of Toxic Workplace Environment on Employee Performance Mediated by Employee Engagement and Work Stress Among F&B Employees in Jakarta. *Business Economic, Communication, and Social Sciences Journal (BECOSS), 5*(2), 127–136.
- Kurtessis, J. N., Eisenberger, R., Ford, M. T., Buffardi, L. C., Stewart, K. A., & Adis, C. S. (2017). Perceived organizational support: A meta-analytic evaluation of organizational support theory. *Journal of Management, 43*(6), 1854–1884.
- McKinsey & Company. (2021). *Employee mental health and burnout in Asia: A time to act*. <https://www.mckinsey.com/featured-insights/future-of-asia/employee-mental-health-and-burnout-in-asia-a-time-to-act>.
- Pagán-Castaño, E., Maseda-Moreno, A., & Santos-Rojo, C. (2020). Wellbeing in work environments. *Journal of Business Research, 115*, 469–474.
- Pickering, C. E. Z., Nurenberg, K., & Schiamberg, L. (2017). Recognizing and responding to the “toxic” work environment: Worker safety, patient safety, and abuse/neglect in nursing homes. *Qualitative Health Research, 27*(12), 1870–1881.
- Rasool, S. F., Samma, M., Anjum, A., Munir, M., & Khan, T. M. (2019). Relationship between modern human resource management practices and organizational innovation: Empirical Investigation from banking sector of China. *Int. Trans. J. Eng. Manag. Appl. Sci. Technol, 10*, 1–11.
- Rasool, S. F., Wang, M., Tang, M., Saeed, A., & Iqbal, J. (2021). How toxic workplace environment effects the employee engagement: The mediating role of organizational support and employee wellbeing. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 18*(5), 2294.
- Ridwan, M., Mulyani, S. R., & Ali, H. (2020). Building behavior and performance

- citizenship: Perceived organizational support and competence (case study at SPMI private university in west Sumatra). *International Journal of Psychosocial Rehabilitation*, 24(6).
- Salin, D., Stride, C., Smith, S., & Santokhie, S. (2023). High-performance work practices and employee wellbeing: organizational identification as a mediator. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 14, 1175344.
- Su, L., & Swanson, S. R. (2019). Perceived corporate social responsibility's impact on the well-being and supportive green behaviors of hotel employees: The mediating role of the employee-corporate relationship. *Tourism Management*, 72, 437–450.
- Taştan, S. B., & Davoudi, S. M. M. (2015). An examination of the relationship between leader-member exchange and innovative work behavior with the moderating role of trust in leader: A study in the Turkish context. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 181, 23–32.
- Wang, Z., Zaman, S., Rasool, S. F., Zaman, Q. uz, & Amin, A. (2020). Exploring the relationships between a toxic workplace environment, workplace stress, and project success with the moderating effect of organizational support: Empirical evidence from Pakistan. *Risk Management and Healthcare Policy*, 1055–1067.
- Yan, R., Basheer, M. F., Irfan, M., & Rana, T. N. (2020). Role of psychological factors in employee well-being and employee performance: an empirical evidence from Pakistan. *Revista Argentina de Clínica Psicológica*, 29(5), 638.