Employee performance (Y1)	**0.646**
Organizational performance (Y2)	**0.612**

Source: PLS Processed Results, 2021

The test results in table 6 above show that each latent variable has good discriminant validity. Because all correlations between variables are smaller than the AVE value of each latent variable. This means that the variable constructs of motivation, training, employee performance, and organizational performance have good discriminant validity. Thus, it can be concluded that the overall latent construct in this study is stated to be able to explain the phenomenon being measured.

Reliability Test

The reliability test is the next stage carried out by researchers to test the instrument. PLS also uses a reliability test to measure the internal consistency of the measuring instrument. Reliability shows the accuracy, consistency, and accuracy of a measuring instrument in making measurements.

The reliability test in PLS can use two methods, namely Cronbach's alpha and Composite reliability. Composite reliability results are said to be good if the value is above 0.70. The results of reliability testing can be seen in table 7.

Table 7. Cronbach's alpha and Composite reliability test results

Latent Variable	*Cronbach's alpha*	*Composite Reliability*
Motivation (X1)	**0.869**	**0.922**
Training (X2)	**0.829**	**0.879**
Employee performance (Y1)	**0.931**	**0.942**
Organizational performance (Y2)	**0.841**	**0.977**

Source: PLS Processed Results, 2021

The test results in the table above show the value of Cronbach's alpha and composite reliability of the four latent variables studied, namely motivation, training, employee performance and organizational performance have good reliability because having a value greater than 0.70 means it is acceptable. Thus, all the instruments used in this study have met the requirements or are feasible to be used in measuring all latent variables.

Structural Model Testing (*Inner Model*)

The coefficient of determination or R-Square is done through testing the structural model (inner model). The coefficient of determination is used to measure the ability of all independent variables to explain the variance of the dependent variable. The results of the R-square estimation are presented in the following table:

Table 8. R-Square Test Results

Research Variable	*R Square*
Employee Performance (Y1)	0.723
Organizational Performance (Y2)	0.777

Source: Processed PLS Results, 2021

Table 8 above shows that the R-Square value of the employee performance variable is 0.723, which means that the ability of the motivation and training variables to explain employee performance variables is only 72.3%, and the remaining 27.7% is explained by other variables not included in the model. this research. Furthermore, the R-Square value of the organizational performance variable is 0.777 which means that the ability of the motivation and training variables to explain the variance of the organizational performance

variable is 77.7% and the remaining 22.3% is explained by other variables not included in this research model.

Based on the value of the coefficient of determination R² presented in table 8, it can be seen the predictive relevance of Q² with the following calculations:

$Q^2 = 1-\{(1-R1^2)(1-R2^2)\}$

$Q^2 = 1-\{(1-0.723^2)(1-0.777^2)\}$

$Q^2 = 1-\{(1-0,522729)(1-0.603729)\}$

$Q^2 = 1-\{(0.477271)(0.396271)\}$

$Q^2 = 1-0.1891$

$Q^2 = 0.811$

Based on the results of the calculation above, the predictive-relevance value is obtained by $Q^2 = 0.811$ or 81.1%. This means that the accuracy or accuracy of this research model can explain the diversity of motivational variables, training, employee performance, and organizational performance by 81.1%. The remaining 18.9% is explained by other variables not included in this research model.

Hypothesis test

The hypothesis in this study can be known through the calculation of the model using the PLS bootstrapping technique. Through the results of the bootstrapping calculation, p-values will be obtained for each relationship or path. If p-values <0.05 then the hypothesis is supported, on the contrary, if p-values> 0.05 then the hypothesis is rejected.

Table 9. *Path Coefficients*

Latent Variable Relationship	Original Sample	T-Statistics	P-Values
Motivation (X1) on Employee Performance (Y1)	0.356	2.634	0.009
Training (X2) on Employee Performance (Y1)	0.552	3.768	0.000
Motivation (X1) on Organizational Performance (Y2)	0,805	4.829	0.000
Training (X2) on Organizational Performance (Y2)	-0,331	1.981	0.048
Employee Performance (Y1) on Organizational Performance (Y2)	0.385	2.571	0.010

Source: Processed PLS Results, 2021

Based on the test results described in the table above, the direct effect testing and research hypotheses can be described as follows:

1) Hypothesis 1 states:
   The results of the Smart PLS calculation show that motivation has a significant positive effect on employee performance with the original sample value of 0.356 and p-values of 0.009 smaller than 0.05 (0.009 < 0.05). Thus, H0 is rejected and Ha accepts, meaning that there is an influence of motivation on employee performance.
2) Hypothesis 2 states:
   The results of Smart PLS calculations show that training has a significant positive effect on employee performance with the original sample value of 0.552 and p-values of 0.000 less than 0.05 (0.000 < 0.05). Thus, H0 is rejected and Ha accepts, meaning that there is an effect of training on employee performance.
3) Hypothesis 3 states:
   The results of the Smart PLS calculation show that motivation has a significant positive effect on organizational performance with the original sample value of 0.805 and p-values of 0.000 which is smaller than 0.05 (0.000 < 0.05). Thus, H0 is rejected and Ha accepts, meaning that there is an influence of motivation on organizational performance.

4) Hypothesis 4 states:
The results of Smart PLS calculations show that training has a significant negative effect on organizational performance with the original sample value of -0.331 and p-values of 0.048 which is smaller than 0.05 (0.048 < 0.05). Thus, H0 is accepted and Ha is rejected, meaning that there is a negative effect of training on organizational performance.

5) Hypothesis 5 states:
The results of Smart PLS calculations show that employee performance has a significant positive effect on organizational performance with the original sample value of 0.385 and p-values of 0.007 smaller than 0.05 (0.007 < 0.05). Thus, H0 is rejected and Ha accepts, meaning that there is an influence of employee performance on organizational performance.

Furthermore, to see the significance of the indirect relationship (mediation test) it can be seen on the specific indirect effect.

Table 10. Specific Index Effect

Latent Variable Relationship	Original Sample	T-Statistics	P-Values
Motivation (X1) on Employee Performance (Y1) and Organizational Performance (Y2)	0.137	1.972	0.049
Training (X2) on Employee Performance (Y1) and Organizational Performance (Y2)	0.212	1.991	0.047

Source: Processed PLS Results, 2021

Based on the original sample values and p-values, the test results for each hypothesis for an indirect relationship (mediation test) are as follows:

6) Hypothesis 6 states:
The results of the Smart PLS calculation show that motivation has a significant positive effect on organizational performance through employee performance with the original sample value of 0.137 and p-values of 0.049, smaller than 0.05 (0.049 < 0.05). Thus, H0 is rejected and Ha is accepted, meaning that there is an influence of motivation on organizational performance with employee performance as an intervening variable.

7) Hypothesis 7 states:
The results of Smart PLS calculations show that training has a significant positive effect on organizational performance through employee performance with the original sample value of 0.212 and p-values of 0.034 which is smaller than 0.05 (0.034 < 0.05). Thus, H0 is rejected and Ha accepts, meaning that there is an effect of training on organizational performance with employee performance as an intervening variable.

Discussion

The Effect of Motivation on Employee Performance

Motivation has a significant positive effect on employee performance, this can be seen with the *original sample* of 0.356 and *p-values* of 0.009 which is smaller than 0.05 (0.009 < 0.05. This means that the better the motivation given to employees, the better the motivation given to employees). both perceived employee performance on the need for achievement, the need for affiliation, and the need for power can improve employee performance which is implemented on quality, quantity, time, cost, service orientation, commitment, work initiative, cooperation, and leadership

The Effect of Training on Employee Performance

Training has a significant positive effect on employee performance. This can be seen by the *original sample* of 0.552 and *p-values* of 0.000 which is smaller than 0.05 (0.000 < 0.05). This means that the better the training provided to employees, the better the employee's performance perceived on the indicators of instructors, materials, methods, equipment, and certificates. can improve employee performance which is implemented on quality, quantity, time, cost, service orientation, commitment, work initiative, cooperation, and

leadership.

The Effect of Motivation on Organizational Performance

Motivation has a significant positive effect on organizational performance. This can be seen through the *original sample* of 0.805 and *p-values* of 0.000 which is smaller than 0.05 (0.000 < 0.05). This means that the better the motivation given to employees, the better the organizational performance perceived on the indicators of achievement needs, affiliation needs, and the need for power can improve organizational performance which is implemented in productivity, service quality, responsiveness, responsibility, and accountability.

The Effect of Training on Organizational Performance

Training has a significant negative effect on organizational performance. It can be seen through the results of the PLS test with the *original sample* of -0.331 and *p-values* of 0.048 which is smaller than 0.05 (0.048 < 0.05). This means that the better the training provided to employees, the lower the perceived organizational performance on the indicators of instructors, materials, methods, equipment, and certificates can improve organizational performance which is implemented on productivity, service quality, responsiveness, responsibility, and accountability. Conversely, the lower the training provided to employees, the organizational performance will increase.

The influence of employee performance on organizational

Employee performance has a significant positive effect on organizational performance. This can be seen through the results of the *original sample* of 0.385 and *p-values* of 0.010 which is smaller than 0.05 (0.010 < 0.05). This means that the better the employee's performance, the better the perceived organizational performance on indicators of quality, quantity, time, cost, service orientation, commitment, work initiative, cooperation, and leadership can improve organizational performance which is implemented in productivity, service quality, responsiveness, responsibility, and accountability.

The Role of Employee Performance in Mediating Motivation on Organizational Performance

Employee performance mediates the effect of motivation on organizational performance. This can be seen through the table of PLS test results on the results of the *Specific Indirect Effect* with the *original sample* of 0.137 and *p-values* of 0.049 which is smaller than 0.05 (0.049 < 0.05). This means that employee performance can be used as a mediating variable in bridging the influence of motivation on organizational performance. In addition, motivation indirectly has a significant effect on organizational performance. This is because the employee's performance has been well perceived by the respondents when viewed from the indicators of quality, quantity, time, cost, service orientation, commitment, work initiative, cooperation, and leadership.

The Role of Employee Performance in Mediating the Effect of Training on Organizational Performance

Employee performance mediates the effect of training on organizational performance. this can be seen through the results of the *Specific Indect Effect* on the PLS test with the *original sample* of 0.212 and *p-values* of 0.034 which is smaller than 0.05 (0.034 < 0.05). This means that employee performance can be used as a mediating variable in bridging the effect of training on employee performance. In addition, training indirectly has a significant effect on employee performance. This is because the employee's performance has been well perceived by the respondents when viewed from the indicators of quality, quantity, time, cost, service orientation, commitment, work initiative, cooperation, and leadership.

Research Limitations

In this study, it has been explained that the employee performance variable influences 72.3%, this value is quite low when compared to the organizational performance variable with an influence of 77.7%. Therefore, it is recommended for further researchers to add variables that can increase the influence of employee performance variables at the Tourism and Culture Office of West Muna Regency.

Conclusions and suggestions
Conclusion
Based on the results of data analysis and discussion, it can be concluded several things as follows:

1. Motivation has a significant positive effect on employee performance. This means that the better the perceived motivation on the indicators of the need for achievement, the need for affiliation and the need for power, the better the performance of employees who are implemented in terms of quality, quantity, time, cost, service orientation, commitment, work initiative, cooperation, and leadership.

2. Training has a positive and significant effect on employee performance. This means that the better the perceived training on the indicators of instructors, materials, methods, equipment, and certificates can improve employee performance which is implemented on quality, quantity, time, cost, service orientation, commitment, work initiative, cooperation, and leadership.

3. Motivation has a positive and significant effect on organizational performance. This means that the better the perceived motivation on the indicators of the need for achievement, the need for affiliation and the need for power, the higher the organizational performance which is implemented in terms of productivity, service quality, responsiveness, responsibility, and accountability.

4. training has a significant negative effect on organizational performance. This means that the better the perceived training on the indicators of instructors, materials, methods, equipment, and certificates cannot improve organizational performance which is implemented on productivity, service quality, responsiveness, responsibility, and accountability, if training is reduced, organizational performance will increase.

5. Employee performance has a positive and significant effect on organizational performance. This means that the better employee performance perceived on the indicators of quality, quantity, time, cost, service orientation, commitment, work initiative, cooperation, and leadership can improve organizational performance which is implemented on productivity, service quality, responsiveness, responsibility, and accountability.

6. Employee performance mediates the effect of motivation on organizational performance at the Department of Tourism and Culture of West Muna Regency. This means that employee performance can be used as a mediating variable in bridging the influence of motivation on organizational performance at the Tourism and Culture Office of West Muna Regency.

7. Employee performance mediates the effect of training on organizational performance at the Department of Tourism and Culture of West Muna Regency. This means that employee performance can be used as a mediating variable in bridging the influence of training on organizational performance at the Tourism and Culture Office of West Muna Regency.

Suggestion

Based on these conclusions, the following are suggested:

1. To optimize the indicators of achievement needs, namely improving the abilities and skills of employees so that they always excel in the organization, employees take part in the training provided by the organization in order to improve performance at work, at work employees always expect corrections from other people and employees convey satisfaction from completing difficult tasks.

2. To optimize the certificate indicators, organizations should improve training by increasing the provision of training certificates when participating in training, giving certificates according to their competencies, and motivating employees to be proud of the certificates that employees get during training.

3. To optimize service orientation indicators, it is expected that the leadership will provide direction on the importance of service orientation. By prioritizing service, employees will have their own satisfaction, the people served will feel happy with the services provided by the organization.

4. To optimize the responsiveness indicator, the organization must better respond to complaints and increase the use of the complaint as a reference for future improvements, the organization should further improve the best actions to provide satisfaction to service users and the organization must better understand the needs of the community so that the programs carried out by the organization are appropriate according to what society expects.

5. For further researchers, it is better to use research objects from more than one government agency in West Muna Regency by involving other variables. Thus the research results will have a higher level of generalization.

References

[1] Dubagus, Wolde shiferaw.dkk. 2020. *Effects Of Employee Motivation On Organizational Performance At Ethiopian Telecom South West*. Penerbit :prizren social science journal, Jimma University.

[2] Julianry, Anriza. Dkk. 2017. Pengaruh Pelatihan Dan Motivasi Terhadap Kinerja Pegawai Serta Kinerja Organisasi Kementrian Komunikasi Dan Informatika. Penerbit: Departemen Ilmu Dan Teknologi Pangan, Fakultas Teknologi Pertanian. Institut Pertanian Bogor.

[3] Tarmidi, Deden dan Regine Jansen Arsah. 2019. *Employee and Organizational Performance: Impact of Employee Internal and External Factors, Moderated by Online Application*. Penerbit: Journal Of Resources Development And Managenent, Fakultas Ekonomi dan Bisnis, Universitas Trisakti.

[4] Herawati, Efi. Dkk. 2021. The role of *employee performance mediation on organizational performance*. Penerbit: jurnal prespektif dan pembangunan daerah Doctoral Program in Economics, Postgraduate, Universitas Jambi, Indonesia.

[5] Daniel, Cross Ogihi. 2018. Effects of training on organizational performance. Penerbit: Asian Of Business And Management, Departement Of Business Admistration , Nile University Of Nigeria.

[6] Winardi, 2007 , Manajemen Kinerja, Jakarta, PT. RajaGrafindo Persada.

[7] Handoko, Hani. 2008. *Manajemen Personalia dan Sumber Daya Manusia*. BPFE : Yogyakarta.

[8] Kadarisman. 2012. "Manajemen Pengembangan Sumber Daya Manusia". Jakarta: Raja Grafindo Persada.

[9] Afandi, Pandi. (2018). *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia:Teori, Konsep dan Indikator*.Tampan Pekan Baru Riau: Nusa Media Yogyakarta.

[10] Hasibuan, Malayu S.P. 2016. *Manajemen Suber Daya Manusia*.Cetakan ke-17.Jakarta: PT. Bumi Aksara.

[11] Rivai, Veithzal dan Sagala, Ella Jauvani. 2011. Manajemen Sumber Daya. Manusia untuk Perusahaan dari Teori ke Praktik. Jakarta: PT Raja. Grafindo.

[12] Simamora Henry, 2009. *Manajemen Sumberdaya Manusia*, STIE., YKPN, Yogyakarta.

[13] Steers, R.M. and Porter, L. W. (2003). Motivation and Work Behavior. New York: Mc Graw-Hill Book Company.

[14] Mahsun, Mohamad. 2006. Pengukuran Kinerja Sektor Publik : Cetakan Pertama. Yogyakarta : Penerbit BPFE-Yogyakarta.

[15] Dwiyanto, Agus. 2006. Reformasi Birokrasi Publik Indonesia : Yogyakarta : Pusat Studi Kependudukan dan Kebijakan Universitas Gajah Mada

[16] Hasibuan, Malayu S.P. 2014. *Manajemen Suber Daya Manusia*. Jakarta:PT Bumi Aksara.

[17] Sugiyono. (2013). Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif, Kualitatif dan R&D. Bandung: Alfabeta.CV. Yusuf

[18] Ghozali, Imam. 2013. Aplikasi Analisis Multivariat dengan Program IBM SPSS. Edisi 7. Semarang: Penerbit Universitas Diponegoro.