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ABSTRACT

Employee performance is an important variable for a company because employees determine the growth and development of the company. Employee performance can be improved through coaching and mentoring and fostering high work motivation. Using 80 employees as a sample, this research examines the way that job motivation is mediated by coaching and mentoring and how that influences employee performance. The findings using SmartPLS showed that: (1) Coaching significantly improved performance. (2) Motivation is significantly improved by coaching. (3) Performance is negatively and negligibly impacted by mentoring. (4) Mentoring significantly boosts motivation in a favorable way. (5) Performance is significantly improved by motivation. This demonstrates how raising employee motivation will affect raising worker productivity. (6) The impact of coaching on performance is mediated by motivation. (7) The impact of mentorship on performance is mediated by motivation.
INTRODUCTION

A company's overall success is greatly influenced by its human resources (HR) department. Companies that have efficient and skilled HR teams can increase company productivity and efficiency. A productive workforce can complete tasks well, optimize working time, and increase output. Meanwhile, trained and empowered human resources will stimulate innovation. Meanwhile, employees who feel appreciated and supported will be more likely to contribute creative ideas that can increase the company's competitiveness. Overall, human resources are not just an operational element of a company, but also the key to achieving competitive advantage and long-term sustainability. By focusing on HR management and development, companies can create a productive, innovative, and sustainable work environment, and can improve company performance.

A key element in the company's strategy for success and the achievement of its objectives is employee performance. Many facets of the workplace are improved when employees perform at their best. Excellent work output from employees is directly correlated with organizational productivity. Employees who carry out tasks effectively and efficiently can improve their performance, so they can produce more products or services, and ultimately increase the organization's competitiveness in the market.

Good employee performance is often related to high degrees of originality and inventiveness. Workers are more likely to be willing to offer fresh perspectives and innovative solutions when they feel appreciated and encouraged, which can help businesses remain competitive and relevant in a market that is constantly evolving. Employee performance that is consistent aids in an organization's sustainability. Workers are more likely to remain with an organization for a longer period of time if they feel engaged and committed to its vision and goal. This lowers employee turnover rates and minimizing training and recruiting costs.

Increasing employee performance Any corporation that hopes to thrive in the rapidly changing business environment must prioritize performance. Coaching and mentoring are two methods that are becoming more and more popular since they each have special benefits for human resource development. In addition to offering work guidance, coaching encompasses leadership development, interpersonal skill enhancement, and maximization of human potential. When self-improvement is prioritized at work, an environment that fosters employee development is created.

On the other hand, mentoring is the process by which a person with relevant experience, skill, or area of expertise offers counsel, information, or support to another person in order to further their professional and personal growth. A mentor is a knowledgeable and reliable counselor. To put it simply, a mentor is someone who can assist others in learning something they are unable to learn themselves.
Meanwhile, work motivation also has an impact on employee performance. Motivation at work, in this context, includes intrinsic and extrinsic drives that encourage employees to achieve personal and organizational goals. Work motivation is considered an important mediator that can provide a better understanding of how coaching and mentoring influence employee performance.

Formulation of the problem

In the face of increasingly fierce business competition, organizations are looking for ways to improve employee performance. Coaching and mentoring, two different but complementary variables, are the focus of this research. This research aims to explore this further, with work motivation considered as a mediator that might clarify how the influence of coaching and mentoring can create a positive impact on employee performance. So the research question is phrased as follows:

1. Does coaching impact workers' motivation at work?
2. How does mentoring impact workers' motivation at work?
3. How does employee performance relate to coaching?
4. How does employee performance relate to mentoring?
5. Does employee performance become influenced by work motivation?
6. Does the impact of coaching on employee performance depend on motivation at work?
7. Does the impact of mentoring on employee performance depend on work motivation?

LITERATURE REVIEW

Coaching

Coaching is a coaching process for individuals, groups, or organizations in order to attain peak performance, which is executed in a planned, regular, and directed manner, to improve knowledge, attitudes, and skills in handling assigned responsibilities and overcoming obstacles as a means of personal and professional development. Coaching is defined as a mentoring and guidance process designed to improve an individual's skills, performance, and achievement of goals. In a business context, coaching aims to help employees reach their maximum potential, identify areas for development, and improve performance.

Wulansari and Fauzi (2023) state that coaching is an interactive process where managers and supervisors try to provide solutions to performance problems or develop employee abilities. Coaching is a technique that can be used by anyone. Coaching is a process that can help close the gaps that individuals and groups present. The desire to hold, in this instance, a position inside the company (Shukla, 2014).

Closeness and one-on-one interaction between the parties involved are necessary for coaching in order for the coach to be able to assist clients in realizing their full potential. They possess the ability to view things from the outside in, which helps them become more self-conscious and aware of how their actions affect other people. Whitmore, however, said in Passmore (2013) that coaching is
the secret to maximizing a person's performance and realizing their full potential. Instead than instructing someone, coaching focuses more on supporting their learning.

**Mentoring**

Mentoring is a relationship that involves a mentor (mentor) sharing knowledge, experience, and insight with someone more junior or less experienced (mentee). Mentors provide guidance, insight, and support to assist mentees in career development and personal growth.

Mentoring relationships are often long-term, with the mentor guiding the mentee not only in terms of assignments or work but also in career development and personal life. Mentoring can include developing technical and behavioral skills, as well as providing perspective on the mindset and culture of the organization. Mentoring tends to be more informal and personal. Mentor-mentee relationships can form naturally or be regulated by the organization.

Crawford (2010) states that mentoring is a caring and supportive interpersonal relationship between a competent and experienced person and a less knowledgeable or experienced person. Hilali et al (2020) say that mentoring is also a professional learning process related to the transfer of knowledge and professionalism of employees who are more experienced and have better knowledge about work with newer or inexperienced employees.

**Work Motivation**

Motivation at work is frequently sparked by personal demands and preferences. These can include social requirements like relationships with coworkers, recognition and praise, and physiological needs like pay and job stability, as well as demands for personal and professional growth and achievement. Establishing attainable goals helps increase motivation at work. Those with specific objectives are typically more driven to work toward achieving those goals. Recognition of achievements and constructive feedback can increase work motivation. Someone who feels appreciated and gets positive feedback tends to be more motivated to continue or improve their performance. Jufrizen (2018) asserts that worker performance indicates whether an individual or group is successful or unsuccessful in completing actual work that has been assigned by an organization. However, according to Bahri and Nisa (2017), an employee's performance is the outcome of their work during a given time period in comparison to a range of options, such as predetermined and mutually agreed-upon goals, targets, or criteria.

According to Hasibuan (2017), on the other hand, performance is the outcome of work that an individual or group of individuals within an organization can accomplish by virtue of their respective authority and responsibilities in order to legally, morally, and financially accomplish the goals of the organization in question. In the meanwhile, Susanty et al. (2012) claimed that performance is a metric that can be used to compare the outcomes of activities completed and the duties assigned by the company within a specific time frame. It can also be used to measure an organization's or an individual's performance at work.
Employee Performance

Individual performance, according to Adhan and Prayogi (2021), is the capacity of an individual to carry out specific tasks. Employee performance is crucial since it indicates how well an employee can do the responsibilities that have been given to him. According to Afandi (2016), performance, on the other hand, is the act of doing and completing the assigned assignment. It is a collection of outcomes attained.

According to Mangkunegara (2010), employee performance is a comparison of the outcomes attained with the workforce's participation per unit of time. Performance encompasses more than simply the output of labor; it also refers to the manner in which the task is carried out (Wibowo, 2007).

According to Nasution (2020), performance is the outcome of the work and work behavior that have been attained in finishing the obligations and duties assigned within a specific time frame. Performance is the outcome of an employee's ability to complete tasks in both quantity and quality while adhering to the assigned obligations (Mangkunegara, 2010).

As for performance, it is defined by Rivai and Basri (in Laitef. et al., 2016) as an individual's or group's willingness to complete a task and perfect it through their responsibilities with the desired outcomes. Moreover, performance is described by Fatah (in Sugiyatmi et al., 2016) as a manifestation of advancement predicated on information, attitudes, and drive for generating work.

Conceptual Framework and Hypothesis Development

The conceptual framework of this research can be depicted in diagram 2.1. below this.

![Conceptual Framework](image)

Figure 1. Conceptual Framework

Hypothesis Development

Organizational support through coaching and mentoring can be an effective strategy for increasing employee work motivation. Coaching and mentoring are two different but complementary approaches to providing guidance, direction, and coaching to employees, so that employees are motivated at work.
Coaching and mentoring can provide recognition for achievements and provide positive reinforcement, which can increase employee motivation. Employees who feel appreciated tend to be more motivated to work to contribute optimally.

**H1: Coaching has a positive effect on employee work motivation**

**H2: Mentoring has a positive influence on employee work motivation**

Coaching is not just a skills development tool, but also an approach that can shape employees' intrinsic and extrinsic motivation, which in turn improves their performance. Careful integration between coaching, work motivation, and employee performance can form a dynamic and productive work environment. Stimulate or move someone to carry out a mandated work task.

Mentoring is a process in which a mentor provides guidance, advice, and support to a more junior or less experienced employee (mentee) to assist them in career development and performance improvement. Some of the positive influences of mentoring on employee performance are the transfer of knowledge and experience, skill development, increasing leadership abilities, increasing involvement and motivation, and helping develop networks and career opportunities.

**H3: Coaching has a positive effect on employee performance**

**H4: Mentoring has a positive effect on employee performance**

**H5: Work motivation has a positive effect on employee performance**

Employees who receive mentoring and coaching will be more confident in their work, thereby increasing their work motivation. This high work motivation will in turn have an impact on improving employee performance.

Employee performance reflects the extent to which individuals can achieve their goals and responsibilities at work. Coaching and mentoring have an effect on worker performance directly as well as indirectly through worker motivation. In order to attain the best possible employee performance, the work motivation variable of the employee is thought to act as a bridge (mediation) between coaching and mentoring.

**H6: Work motivation mediates the effect of coaching on employee performance.**

**H7: Work motivation mediates the effect of mentoring on employee performance.**
METHODOLOGY

Population and Sample

The entire number of participants in the study is referred to as the population (Sugiyono, 2015). There were eighty employees of PT Maybank Finance Pekanbaru that made up the study’s population. Sekaran and Bougie (2016) offer a number of recommendations for figuring out sample size, including:

1. For the majority of investigations, sample sizes between thirty and five hundred are suitable.
2. A minimum sample size of 30 people is suitable for each category if the sample is divided into subsamples (men and women).
3. The sample size for multivariate research, which includes multiple regression analysis, should be ten times more than the total number of variables under investigation.

According to Hair et al. (2017), the sample size was five to ten times the indication. In this investigation, the sample size is $16 \times 5$, or 80, because there are 16 indicators.

Data Analysis Technique

This study employs Partial Least Square (PLS) data analysis using SmartPLS version 3 software. PLS is an equation model for structural equation modeling (SEM) that uses a component-based or variance-based approach. Researchers frequently utilize SEM because of its increased flexibility in bridging theory and data and its ability to do route analysis with latent variables.

PLS-SEM seeks to construct a theory or create one, according to Ghozali and Latan (2015) (prediction orientation). To determine if there is a relationship between latent variables (prediction), PLS is utilized. In addition, PLS is utilized to validate hypotheses, making data analysis more appropriate in studies based on PLS predictions. Least Squares in Partial (PLS) is able to evaluate constructions created using formative and reflective indicators at the same time. Covariance-based SEM is unable to accomplish this since it would require an unknown model.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Measurement Model Analysis – Outer Model Analysis

The Smart PLS tool was used to analyze the data. First, the measurement model, often referred to as the outer model analysis, is tested. The purpose of outer model analysis is to evaluate an indicator or instrument's validity and dependability.

Convergent Validity Test

The purpose of the validity test is to determine whether an instrument or indicator is a reliable means of measuring the construct variable. If an indicator's loading factor is more than 0.7, it is deemed legitimate. A loading factor of 0.4 to 0.7 is still reasonable, though. As for the indicator, if the loading factor is less than 0.4, is not a good measuring tool for the construct variable. (Hair et al, 2017). The model to be tested is shown in the picture below with latent variables and indicators presented as follows.
Figure 2. Loading Factor Indicator
Source: SmartPLS (2024)

From the picture above, the latent coaching variable will be assessed through the use of five indicators, which are Co-1, Co-2, Co-3, Co-4, and Co-5. Men-1, Men-2, Men-3, and Men-4 are the indicators used to measure the mentoring variable. In the meantime, the indicators Mot-1, Mot-2, Mot-3, and Mot-4 are used to measure the Motivation variable. Meanwhile, the indicators Kin-1, Kin-2, and Kin-3 are used to measure the performance variable.

The table below displays the loading factor values for the indicators in the latent variables.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Coaching</th>
<th>Mentoring</th>
<th>Motivation</th>
<th>Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Co-1</td>
<td>0.529</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-2</td>
<td>0.744</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-3</td>
<td>0.758</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-4</td>
<td>0.769</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-5</td>
<td>0.605</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men-1</td>
<td>0.662</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men-2</td>
<td>0.589</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men-3</td>
<td>0.851</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men-4</td>
<td>0.798</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mot-1</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.646</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mot-2</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.697</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mot-3</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.775</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mot-4</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.657</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kin-1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.852</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kin-2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.807</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kin-3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.579</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: SmartPLS Output (2024)
For an indicator to be deemed genuine in this study, its loading factor measurement has to be more than 0.5. It is clear from the above table that all of the indicators in the latent variables of this study have satisfied the requirements of convergent validity because each indicator's loading factor score is more than 0.5.

Table 2. Discriminant Validity
Cross Loading Value Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Coaching</th>
<th>Mentoring</th>
<th>Motivation</th>
<th>Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Co-1</td>
<td>0.529</td>
<td>0.314</td>
<td>0.306</td>
<td>0.209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-2</td>
<td>0.744</td>
<td>0.362</td>
<td>0.324</td>
<td>0.386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-3</td>
<td>0.758</td>
<td>0.288</td>
<td>0.312</td>
<td>0.346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-4</td>
<td>0.769</td>
<td>0.391</td>
<td>0.396</td>
<td>0.276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-5</td>
<td>0.605</td>
<td>0.255</td>
<td>0.334</td>
<td>0.220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men-1</td>
<td>0.210</td>
<td>0.662</td>
<td>0.354</td>
<td>0.104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men-2</td>
<td>0.211</td>
<td>0.589</td>
<td>0.259</td>
<td>0.225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men-3</td>
<td>0.325</td>
<td>0.851</td>
<td>0.299</td>
<td>0.299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men-4</td>
<td>0.532</td>
<td>0.798</td>
<td>0.427</td>
<td>0.427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mot-1</td>
<td>0.440</td>
<td>0.558</td>
<td>0.046</td>
<td>0.184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mot-2</td>
<td>0.307</td>
<td>0.416</td>
<td>0.697</td>
<td>0.613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mot-3</td>
<td>0.495</td>
<td>0.557</td>
<td>0.775</td>
<td>0.232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mot-4</td>
<td>0.253</td>
<td>0.369</td>
<td>0.657</td>
<td>0.487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kin-1</td>
<td>0.460</td>
<td>0.403</td>
<td>0.549</td>
<td>0.852</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kin-2</td>
<td>0.276</td>
<td>0.192</td>
<td>0.417</td>
<td>0.807</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kin-3</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>0.312</td>
<td>0.186</td>
<td>0.579</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Processed Smart PLS Output (2024)

From the indicator factor loadings on the latent variables are larger than the values in the above table. Factor loadings on other latent variables. For example, the Co-1 indicator, which is an indicator measuring the coaching latent variable, has a loading factor of 0.529 on the latent variable, namely Coaching. The loading factor of 0.529 is greater when compared to the loading on the Mentoring variable of 0.314 greater when compared to the latent variable Motivation of 0.306 and also greater when compared to the performance variable of 0209. The same thing can also be seen in all indicators measuring the hidden variable. In comparison to other latent variables, the loading factor is higher. Therefore, the research indicators' discriminant validity is unaffected.

Reliability Test

Reliability tests are utilized to assess the degree of dependability or consistency of research indicators. Composite reliability and Cronbach's alpha are used in reliability testing. As seen in the table below.
When doing tests with Cronbach's alpha values, results greater than 0.6 are still acceptable, but values greater than 0.70 are considered reliable. According to the test results, every latent variable satisfies the reliability requirements with a Cronbach's alpha value > 0.6.

Cronbach's alpha and composite reliability scores are more than 0.70, according to the reliability test findings, which indicates that they are deemed reliable.

Composited reliability is used in instrument reliability testing, where instruments with composite reliability values > 0.7 are considered dependable. It is evident from the above table that all composite reliability values are more than 0.7, indicating that the reliability criteria for this study have been met.

### Structural Model Analysis - Inner Model

The R square value measurement, which illustrates the link between constructs (variables) as shown in the table below, is used to examine inner models or structural models.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Composite Reliability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coaching</td>
<td>0.815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring</td>
<td>0.796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td>0.819</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>performance</td>
<td>0.789</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is evident from the preceding table that the R Square values for Performance and Motivation indicate how suitable the structural model is: 0.347 and 0.503, respectively. This means what follows:

1) The performance R Square value of 0.347 indicates that 34.7% of the variance in coaching, mentoring, and motivating variables may be used to explain the variance in performance variables; the remaining 65.3% can be attributed to variables not included in this study.
2) The coaching and mentoring factors account for 50.3% of the variance in the Motivation variable, according to the R Square value of 0.503. Other variables not included in this study account for the remaining 49.7% of the variance.

**Hypothesis Testing**

Hypothesis testing is completed by employing the bootstrapping approach. Using the output results of the bootstrapping, coefficient values, t statistics, and p values will be produced as presented in the table below.

Table 5. Direct Influence Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Influence between variables</th>
<th>Original Sample (O)</th>
<th>T Statistics (O/STDEV)</th>
<th>P Values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coaching → performance</td>
<td>0.195</td>
<td>1.748</td>
<td>0.080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coaching → Motivation</td>
<td>0.233</td>
<td>2.211</td>
<td>0.027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring → performance</td>
<td>-0.030</td>
<td>0.136</td>
<td>0.892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring → motivation</td>
<td>0.569</td>
<td>5.187</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation → performance</td>
<td>0.488</td>
<td>2.849</td>
<td>0.004</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Smartpls Output Processed (2024)

A hypothesis is considered accepted if it meets the following conditions: the t statistical value > 1.64, the p value < 0.10, and the hypothesis testing is performed using these criteria at a significance level of 10%. If the requirements are not fulfilled, the hypothesis is rejected.

**Direct Effect Test**

**Hypothesis Testing 1**

- Coaching Has a Significant Positive Effect on Performance

  The coaching effect on performance has a magnitude of 0.195, indicating a favorable influence. In the meantime, a substantial influence is shown by the statistical t value of 1.748 > 1.64 and the p-value of 0.080 < 0.10. As a result, there is enough data to conclude that coaching significantly improves performance. In this investigation, hypothesis 1 is accepted.

**Hypothesis Testing 2**

- Coaching Has a Significant Positive Effect on Motivation

  The coaching effect's magnitude on motivation is 0.233, indicating a favorable influence. In the meantime, a substantial influence is shown by the statistical t-value of 2.211 > 1.64 and the p-value of 0.027 < 0.10. As a result, there is enough data to conclude that coaching significantly improves motivation. In this investigation, hypothesis 2 is accepted.

**Hypothesis Testing 3**

- Mentoring Has a Significant Positive Effect on Performance

  The mentoring effect on performance has a magnitude of -0.030, indicating a negative influence. On the other hand, the p-value is 0.892 > 0.10 and the statistical t value is 0.136 < 1.64, suggesting that the effect is not significant. Therefore, there is insufficient data to conclude that mentoring significantly improves performance. In this investigation, hypothesis 3 was disproved.
Hypothesis Testing 4
- Mentoring has a Significant Positive Effect on Motivation

The mentoring effect on motivation has a 0.569 magnitude, indicating a favorable influence. In the meantime, a substantial influence is shown by the statistical t value of 5.187 > 1.64 and the p-value of 0.000 < 0.10. As a result, there is enough data to conclude that mentoring significantly boosts motivation. As a result, the study's fourth hypothesis is accepted.

Hypothesis Testing 5
- Motivation has a Significant Positive Effect on Performance

The correlation coefficient between motivation and performance is 0.488, suggesting a positive relationship. In the meantime, a significant influence is shown by the statistical t value of 2.849 > 1.64 and the p value of 0.004 < 0.10. Therefore, there is enough data to conclude that motivation significantly improves performance. In this study, the fifth hypothesis is accepted.

- Indirect Effect Test

Testing the mediating variable's capacity to mediate the exogenous (independent) variable against the endogenous (dependent) variable is the goal of the indirect impact test. The specific indirect effect results on the smartPLS output, as shown in the table below, were examined in order to conduct testing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source: Smartpls Output (2024)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Table 6. Indirect Effect Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coaching ➔ motivation ➔ performance</th>
<th>Original Sample (O)</th>
<th>T Statistics (O/STDEV)</th>
<th>P Values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coaching ➔ motivation ➔ performance</td>
<td>0.114</td>
<td>1.660</td>
<td>0.097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring ➔ motivation ➔ performance</td>
<td>0.279</td>
<td>2.720</td>
<td>0.007</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hypothesis Testing 6
- Motivation mediates the effect of coaching on performance

The coaching effect on performance has a motivation mediation coefficient of 0.114, which is a significant value. In the meantime, a substantial influence is shown by the statistical t value of 1.660 > 1.64 and the p value of 0.097 < 0.10. Therefore, there is enough data to conclude that coaching has a mediating influence on performance through motivation. Given the strong and positive correlation between coaching and performance, motivational mediation is only partially effective. This study's sixth hypothesis is accepted.

Hypothesis Testing 7
- Motivation mediates the effect of mentoring on performance

The impact of mentorship on performance is mediated by motivation, and the size of this mediation coefficient is 0.279. In the meantime, a significant influence is shown by the statistical t value of 2.720 > 1.64 and the p value of 0.007 < 0.10. Therefore, there is enough data to conclude that motivation influences how mentoring affects performance. Since the impact of mentoring on prior performance is negligible, hypothesis 7's motivation mediation is full mediation. The strong impact of mentorship on performance is caused by the mediation of motivational variables. In this study, the seventh hypothesis is accepted.
CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The following are the findings that may be made from this research, based on the description given above:

1. Coaching significantly improves performance. This implies that coaching will affect raising employee performance if it is executed properly.
2. Coaching significantly boosts motivation in a favorable way. This implies that coaching will affect raising employee job motivation if it is executed properly.
3. The performance impact of mentoring is negligible and unfavorable. This demonstrates that employee performance is not directly impacted by mentorship.
4. Mentoring significantly boosts motivation in a favorable way. This demonstrates that effective and appropriate mentoring will have an effect on raising employee motivation at work.
5. The drive has a notable improvement in performance. This demonstrates how raising employee motivation will affect raising worker productivity.
6. The impact of coaching on performance is mediated by motivation. Motivation is able to raise the size of the influence that coaching has on employee performance, meaning that the existence of motivation variables on the influence of coaching on performance is partially mediating.
7. The impact of mentorship on performance is mediated by motivation. The influence of mentoring on employee performance is entirely mediating when the motivation variable is present; that is, motivation can convert the negative and small influence of mentoring on performance to a positive and large influence on performance. Employee performance can be enhanced by mentoring by raising employee motivation.

FURTHER STUDY

This research still has limitations, so it is necessary to carry out further research related to the topic of The Influence of Coaching and Mentoring on Employee Performance Mediated by Work Motivation in order to improve this research and add insight to readers.
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