International Journal of Engineering, Management and Humanities (IJEMH)
Volume 6, Issue 3, May-June, 2025 pp: 140-150 ISSN: 2584-2145 ww.ijemh.com

Linking Job Satisfaction, Motivation, Work Environment, and Compensation to Employee Performance: Insights from Managerial Accounting in Public Healthcare

Fitri Wahyuni[1]
[1]*Lecturer, Universitas Muhammadiyah Yogyakarta, Indonesia*
Corresponding Author

Date of Submission: 21-05-2025 Date of Acceptance: 01-06-2025

ABSTRACT: This research explores the impact of job satisfaction, work motivation, work environment, and compensation on employee performance, with a focus on public health workers at community Public Healthcare (Puskesmas) in the Special Region of Yogyakarta, Indonesia. Employing a quantitative approach, data were collected from 100 respondents using structured questionnaires and analysed through multiple linear regression techniques. The findings demonstrate that all four independent variables—job satisfaction, motivation, work environment, and compensation—significantly and positively affect employee performance. These results underscore the relevance of psychological and organizational factors in driving employee productivity within the public health sector. The study contributes to the literature by offering empirical support for organizational behaviour theories in a healthcare context and provides practical implications for managers and policymakers to strengthen workforce effectiveness through targeted human resource strategies.

KEYWORDS: Job Satisfaction, Work Motivation, Work Environment, Compensation, Employee Performance, Public Health Sector.

I. INTRODUCTION

In recent decades, the performance of public sector employees has gained considerable attention, particularly in the context of improving service quality and organizational effectiveness. Public organizations, especially in the healthcare sector, are central to meeting essential societal needs. Among these services, access to healthcare is a fundamental right and a major component of public accountability. In Indonesia, community Public Healthcare (Pusat Kesehatan Masyarakat or Puskesmas) function as the frontline institutions for healthcare delivery, especially in rural and semi-urban regions such as the Special Region of Yogyakarta, Indonesia. [22] These centres are tasked with ensuring equitable healthcare access, and their effectiveness depends heavily on the quality of their human resources.

[3] Employee performance is a vital determinant of organizational success, especially in labour-intensive sectors like public health. [12] Within this context, employee performance is not solely measured by the quantity of work produced but also by the quality of interactions, responsiveness, and adherence to public service standards. Several studies suggest that four critical factors influence employee performance: job satisfaction, work motivation, work environment, and compensation [32].

[20] Job satisfaction reflects the extent to which employees find fulfillment and meaning in their work. It encompasses emotional responses to job tasks and the overall workplace environment. Satisfied employees tend to demonstrate stronger loyalty, lower turnover intentions, and increased productivity. [6][27] In public health organizations, where emotional Labor and stress levels are high, job satisfaction is crucial for sustaining workforce morale and service quality. For instance, job satisfaction directly impacts individual performance and indirectly affects organizational efficiency through improved cooperation and reduced absenteeism.

Work motivation represents the internal and external forces that drive employees to exert effort in achieving organizational goals. [10] The self-determination theory posits that motivation increases when employees feel competent, autonomous, and connected. In healthcare, where workloads are often unpredictable and emotionally taxing, maintaining high motivation is vital. [38] Intrinsic motivation is particularly effective in the service sectors, where passion for patient care and professional growth play a significant role. Studies

International Journal of Engineering, Management and Humanities (IJEMH)
Volume 6, Issue 3, May-June, 2025 pp: 140-150 ISSN: 2584-2145 www.ijemh.com

in the Southeast Asian context also show that motivated healthcare workers exhibit stronger job involvement and resilience under pressure [2].

[5] [6] The work environment significantly shapes employee behaviour and performance. A conducive work environment includes physical safety, adequate resources, organizational culture, and positive interpersonal relationships. [21] Psychological safety and supportive leadership are necessary for employee engagement. In Puskesmas (Public Healthcare) settings, where teamwork and interdepartmental coordination are essential, a positive work environment fosters efficiency and reduces stress. [29] Poor environmental conditions, such as insufficient facilities or a lack of administrative support, can lead to decreased motivation and burnout.

Compensation serves as a tangible recognition of employee contributions and directly influences job satisfaction and retention. [15] A fair and transparent compensation system enhances motivation and fosters organizational citizenship behaviour. [46] In public health institutions where financial resources may be limited, compensation, both monetary and non-monetary, must be aligned with employee expectations to avoid dissatisfaction and high turnover. Studies by Ramli [34] and Sulaeman et al. [43] in Indonesia confirm that compensation packages significantly impact employee loyalty and performance outcomes.

These four variables are interconnected. For example, a well-compensated employee who works in a supportive environment is more likely to be motivated and satisfied with their job, resulting in higher performance [26]. Conversely, deficiencies in one area, such as inadequate compensation, can offset the benefits of strength in others. Hence, understanding the interaction between job satisfaction, motivation, environment, and compensation is essential for holistic human resource management.

Yogyakarta provides a rich context for this study due to its unique blend of cultural heritage, community engagement, and public service values. Despite being a hub of education and cultural development, [30] many Puskesmas(Public Healthcare) still face infrastructural limitations, increasing workloads, and budget constraints. These challenges make it imperative to investigate the factors influencing employee performance to propose evidence-based improvements.

Prior research reinforces the relevance of this topic. [32] Organizational performance improves significantly when job satisfaction and motivation levels are high. [20] A meta-analysis also concluded that job satisfaction is among the strongest predictors of employee performance. However, findings are not always consistent. For example, Rahmawati and Irwana [33] found no significant correlation between job satisfaction and performance in certain public institutions, suggesting contextual factors may moderate this relationship.

This research is underpinned by the theory of organizational behaviour, which posits that individual behaviour within an organization is shaped by internal motivations and external environmental stimuli [36]. The theory emphasizes that effective performance outcomes result from the alignment between individual attitudes and organizational systems. This framework is particularly useful for examining how structural factors like compensation and environmental quality interact with psychological variables like motivation and satisfaction to influence performance.

Therefore, this study seeks to empirically examine the effect of job satisfaction, motivation, work environment, and compensation on employee performance in Puskesmas(Public Healthcare) in Yogyakarta, Indonesia. The findings will provide insights for policy formulation and management practices aimed at enhancing the performance of healthcare personnel. These insights are especially important in the era of health system reforms, where efficiency and accountability are central to public sector governance.By focusing on a specific institutional setting and employing a comprehensive analytical model, this research contributes both theoretically and practically to the discourse on employee performance. It offers guidance for health administrators and policymakers seeking to optimize resource allocation, improve employee morale, and ultimately, enhance public trust in healthcare services.

II. THEORETICAL BACKGROUND AND HYPOTHESIS DEVELOPMENT

The grand theory that underpins this study is Organizational Behaviour (OB), a multidisciplinary framework that explores how individual and group behaviours within organizational contexts affect performance, productivity, and institutional effectiveness. [36] OB is the study of individual and group dynamics within an organizational setting, emphasizing the impact of behaviour on performance outcomes. OB incorporates concepts from psychology, sociology, management, and anthropology to analyse how employees interact, how decisions are made, and how systems and structures influence actions. In this

research, OB theory serves as the foundational framework to explain the relationships between job satisfaction, work motivation, work environment, compensation, and employee performance.

Historically, the roots of OB can be traced back to Max Weber's work in the late 19th century, where he introduced the concept of bureaucracy and formal authority as key components of organizational design. Over time, this concept evolved into a broader theory that investigates not only structures but also human behaviour within organizations. [36] OB assumes that individual behaviour is consistent and can be predicted and modified according to contextual factors and unique characteristics of individuals. This framework is commonly divided into three major components: inputs, processes, and outputs. Inputs refer to situational or personal factors such as needs, values, or organizational systems that shape initial behaviour. Processes include the cognitive, emotional, and behavioural actions taken by individuals and groups in response to inputs. Outputs represent the results, such as job performance, employee well-being, or organizational efficiency, which are influenced by the interaction of inputs and processes.

[19] OB examines how perceptions, values, and behaviours influence interpersonal dynamics within teams and organizations, and how external environmental forces affect these interactions. This dual internal–external orientation makes OB more comprehensive than closely related fields such as human resource management. The OB perspective does not isolate employees as mere instruments of productivity but emphasizes the psychological and emotional components that drive workplace engagement. Moreover, because organizations and their members are interdependent, OB insists on studying both the individual and the system, making it impossible to fully understand one without considering the other.

One essential element in OB is job satisfaction, which reflects how content individuals are with their roles and work conditions. [8] Social Exchange Theory (SET) helps to explain the relationship between satisfaction and behaviour. SET posits that individuals seek to reciprocate positive experiences; when employees receive support, fairness, or recognition from their organization, they are more likely to respond with commitment and proactive behaviour. [31] [36] Satisfied employees tend to speak positively about their organizations, help coworkers, and exceed expectations—phenomena closely related to organizational citizenship behaviour (OCB). Thus, job satisfaction becomes a predictor of desirable workplace behaviours that contribute to overall organizational performance.

Motivation is another critical aspect addressed by OB. It refers to the internal drive that initiates, directs, and sustains goal-oriented behaviour. Self-Determination Theory [10] and Herzberg's Two-Factor Theory [17] are two of the most widely applied frameworks in OB to explain motivation. Herzberg identifies motivators (such as achievement, recognition, and responsibility) that foster job satisfaction, and hygiene factors (such as salary and work conditions) that prevent dissatisfaction. [10] [18]In contemporary applications, research continues to show that motivated employees are more likely to exhibit persistence, creativity, and dedication in their roles, particularly in emotionally demanding environments like healthcare.

The work environment is another contextual factor central to OB. According to the Job Demands-Resources (JD-R) model by Bakker and Demerouti [5], the work environment consists of demands (e.g., workload, emotional stressors) and resources (e.g., managerial support, autonomy). A balanced environment, where job resources adequately meet job demands, is likely to enhance engagement and reduce burnout. [14] Supportive environments promote feelings of safety and psychological comfort, allowing employees to perform optimally. In healthcare institutions like Puskesmas (Public Healthcare), where human interaction and responsiveness are essential, a conducive work environment can directly influence the quality and consistency of service delivery.

Compensation, both monetary and non-monetary, plays a dual role within the OB framework: it serves as a basic need satisfier and a strategic tool for behaviour reinforcement. According to Equity Theory [1], employees continuously evaluate the fairness of their compensation in comparison to peers. [15] When they perceive inequity, motivation and performance can decline. Conversely, equitable and performance-based compensation schemes have been shown to promote organizational citizenship behaviours and reduce turnover intentions. Compensation policies are thus not merely financial instruments but behavioural levers capable of driving the desired organizational outcomes.

Ultimately, employee performance represents the output component in the OB framework, serving as a tangible indicator of how well an organization is functioning internally. [26] Performance results from the complex interaction

International Journal of Engineering, Management and Humanities (IJEMH)
Volume 6, Issue 3, May-June, 2025 pp: 140-150 ISSN: 2584-2145 www.ijemh.com

between individual characteristics, organizational inputs, motivational processes, and environmental conditions. In this study's context—public health institutions in Indonesia—performance is understood as not only the completion of tasks but also the demonstration of responsibility, responsiveness, and service excellence. By integrating all these variables—motivation, satisfaction, environment, and compensation—Organizational Behavior Theory provides a comprehensive explanation of the antecedents and mechanisms that drive employee performance.

[25][27] Job satisfaction is defined as a positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one's job or job experiences. It reflects how employees feel about their work environment, job responsibilities, relationships with colleagues, and compensation. [20] Prior studies have consistently shown that job satisfaction is positively correlated with employee performance. Employees who are satisfied with their jobs are more likely to show greater enthusiasm, stay longer with the organization, and deliver higher-quality outputs.

[6] In public health institutions, job satisfaction can significantly influence responsiveness, empathy, and the quality of patient care. Therefore, employees who perceive their roles as meaningful and fulfilling are likely to demonstrate improved performance outcomes.

H1: Job satisfaction has a positive and significant effect on employee performance.

Motivation refers to internal or external forces that stimulate enthusiasm and persistence in pursuing goals. [10] According to Self-Determination Theory (SDT), individuals are more motivated when they experience autonomy, competence, and relatedness in their workplace. In public healthcare settings, motivated employees are essential to ensuring consistent service delivery and responding effectively to patient needs.[13] Motivation influences not only the intensity of effort but also the direction and sustainability of that effort. [12][32]Numerous studies have confirmed the positive association between work motivation and employee performance. In Indonesia, motivated Puskesmas(Public Healthcare) employees have been shown to exhibit greater adaptability, persistence, and job satisfaction, all of which contribute to higher performance levels.

H2: Work motivation has a positive and significant effect on employee performance.

[9] The work environment encompasses all physical, psychological, and organizational conditions that influence employees' capacity to perform. According to the Job Demands-Resources (JD-R) Model, a supportive and well-resourced environment can mitigate job demands and prevent burnout, thus enhancing performance. Elements such as clean facilities, functional equipment, proper lighting, and harmonious workplace relationships are all crucial in supporting employee performance.

[5] In the healthcare sector, poor work environments can lead to errors, inefficiencies, and job dissatisfaction. Conversely, a conducive work environment enhances safety, collaboration, and service quality. [11][29] Empirical research in Indonesia supports this view, with studies showing a direct link between work environment quality and employee productivity in Puskesmas (Public Healthcare) and other public health institutions.

H3: Work environment has a positive and significant effect on employee performance.

Compensation includes all forms of financial and non-financial rewards provided to employees in return for their contributions. According to equity theory [1], employees assess fairness by comparing their inputs and rewards to those of others. [15] When compensation is perceived as fair, it can enhance motivation, reduce turnover, and increase performance. Inadequate compensation, on the other hand, can result in demotivation and disengagement.

In public institutions like Puskesmas (Public Healthcare), where wages may be limited, the role of compensation becomes even more critical. [34][43] Studies have found that adequate compensation leads to greater job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and performance.

H4: Compensation has a positive and significant effect on employee performance.

III RESEARCH METHOD

This study adopts a quantitative research methodology to examine the influence of job satisfaction, work motivation, work environment, and compensation on employee performance in community Public Healthcare (Puskesmas) in Yogyakarta, Indonesia. A quantitative approach enables the researcher to collect numerical data, analyse relationships between variables, and test predetermined hypotheses using statistical methods [7]. [39] The nature of the study is explanatory and causal, as it seeks to understand the cause-and-effect relationships between multiple independent variables—namely, job satisfaction, motivation, work environment, and compensation—and the dependent variable, employee performance. This design is well-suited to revealing the magnitude and direction of influence among variables.

International Journal of Engineering, Management and Humanities (IJEMH)
Volume 6, Issue 3, May-June, 2025 pp: 140-150 ISSN: 2584-2145 www.ijemh.com

The population of the study consists of employees working at various Puskesmas(Public Healthcare) across Yogyakarta, Indonesia. Respondents were selected using purposive sampling, a technique in which individuals are chosen based on specific criteria relevant to the study—in this case, a minimum of one year of work experience. This ensures that the respondents possess adequate familiarity with the institutional context and organizational climate. The sample size was determined using the Slovin formula, which ensures that the findings can be generalized with a specified margin of error and confidence level.

Primary data were gathered through structured questionnaires designed to measure each research variable. The questionnaire items were adapted from validated instruments used in previous studies and presented using a five-point Likert scale, ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). The questionnaire was distributed both physically and electronically to increase accessibility and response rates. [20][25] Each construct was measured using specific indicators: job satisfaction was assessed through items related to supervision, work content, pay, promotion, and coworker relations; motivation was measured based on intrinsic and extrinsic drivers by Self-Determination Theory [37]; [1] [9] [15]the work environment was evaluated through its physical, psychological, and social aspects; compensation was measured in terms of fairness, adequacy, and motivational effect; and employee performance was gauged through indicators such as task quality, timeliness, initiative, and teamwork [3].

To test the proposed hypotheses, the data were analysed using multiple linear regression. This statistical technique helps identify the strength and significance of the relationship between each independent variable and the dependent variable. Before performing the regression analysis, classical assumption tests were conducted to ensure the validity of the model. These included tests for normality, multicollinearity, heteroscedasticity, and linearity. The analysis was conducted using SPSS software, which provides robust tools for statistical testing and model interpretation.

Equation for the analysis:

$$\text{Employee Performance} = \alpha + \beta_1 \text{Job Satisfaction} + \beta_2 \text{Motivation} + \beta_3 \text{Work Environtment} + \beta_4 \text{Compensation} + \varepsilon$$

[16] Instrument validity and reliability were carefully tested to ensure the quality of the measurement tools. Validity testing was conducted through factor analysis to confirm that each questionnaire item loaded appropriately onto its respective construct. Reliability was assessed using Cronbach's alpha, where a threshold value of 0.7 or above was considered acceptable for internal consistency. These tests ensure that the measurement instruments accurately and consistently reflect the constructs under investigation.

By adopting this methodological approach, the study provides empirical evidence on how key organizational factors influence employee performance in the public health sector. The findings are expected to inform both academic inquiry and managerial practice, particularly in efforts to improve service quality and human resource effectiveness in healthcare institutions.

IV RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Table 1 shows the characteristics of the respondents, wherefrom a total of 125 questionnaires distributed to respondents, 104 were successfully returned, resulting in a high response rate of 83.2%, which indicates strong participant engagement and interest in the research. However, 4 of the returned questionnaires (3.2%) contained incomplete answers and were therefore excluded from the analysis. This left a total of 100 valid questionnaires (80%) that could be processed and analysed further.In terms of age distribution, most respondents (57%) were in the 21–30 years age group, followed by 21% in the 31–40 years range, 12% under the age of 20, and only 10% above the age of 41. These results suggest that the respondent profile is predominantly composed of younger individuals, most of whom are likely to be in the early to mid-stages of their careers. This demographic profile may also reflect generational differences in work motivation, adaptability, and technological competence.

Regarding gender, 62% of the respondents were male while 38% were female, indicating a notable gender imbalance in the sample. This might be due to the nature of the organization or sector where the study was conducted, which could be male dominated in terms of staffing.In terms of educational background, most respondents had attained at least a vocational or undergraduate degree, with 42% holding a bachelor's degree, 37% having completed vocational education, 12% graduating from high school, and 9% holding a master's degree. This distribution demonstrates that most of the workforce is relatively well-educated, which is an important factor in understanding employee performance, decision-making

International Journal of Engineering, Management and Humanities (IJEMH)
Volume 6, Issue 3, May-June, 2025 pp: 140-150 ISSN: 2584-2145 www.ijemh.com

Table 1. Characteristics Respondent

No	Characteristics Respondent	Sub Characteristics	Frequency	Percentage
1	Questionnaires	Distributed	125	100%
		Returned	104	83,2%
		Questionnaires returned with incomplete answers	4	3,2%
		Total number of questionnaires that can be analysed	100	80%
2	Age	< 20 Year Old	12	12%
		21 – 30 Year Old	57	57%
		31 – 40 Year Old	21	21%
		> 41 Year old	10	10%
3	Gender	Male	62	62%
		Female	38	38%
4	Educational Background	High School	12	12%
		Vocational	37	37%
		Bachelor	42	42%
		Master	9	9%
5	Length of Work	< 5 Year	24	24%
		6 – 10 Year	64	64%
		>11 Year	12	12%

capabilities, and the implementation of organizational policies.

As for work experience, the highest proportion of respondents (64%) had worked for 6–10 years, indicating a moderately experienced workforce. Meanwhile, 24% had been employed for less than 5 years, and 12% for more than 11 years. This suggests that most participants were neither new to their roles nor nearing the end of their careers, but were instead at a stage where they had gained sufficient familiarity with their work environment to

provide informed and relevant insights.Overall, the respondent profile reflects a young, male-dominated, and well-educated workforce with moderate levels of work experience. These characteristics are essential in contextualizing the findings of the study, particularly in relation to how demographic and professional backgrounds may influence employee behaviour, performance, and perceptions within the organization.

Table 2 presents the descriptive statistics of five variables: job satisfaction, motivation, work environment, compensation, and employee performance, based on 100 valid responses. Each variable is compared against its theoretical and practical range, along with its mean and standard deviation, to assess data distribution and variation.Job satisfaction has a theoretical range of 20 to 80, with a midpoint of 50. The practical data range is from 42 to 80, and the mean value is 58.76, indicating that on average, respondents report a relatively high level of job satisfaction. The standard deviation is 8.716, suggesting moderate variability in respondents' perceptions.

Motivation also has a theoretical range of 20 to 80, with the same midpoint of 50. The practical range is slightly wider than job satisfaction, from 35 to 80, and the mean score is 56.46. This shows that employees are generally well-motivated, although slightly below the average of job satisfaction. The standard deviation of 9.785 reflects a moderate to high dispersion in motivation levels among employees.The work environment has a narrower theoretical range of 11 to 44 (midpoint 27.5), with actual responses ranging from 23 to 44 and an average of 33.33. This indicates a favorable perception of the work environment among employees, with relatively low variability (standard deviation = 5.029), suggesting consistency in their responses.

For compensation, the theoretical score ranges from 6 to 24 (midpoint 15). The observed data ranges from 13 to 24, and the mean is 18.50,

International Journal of Engineering, Management and Humanities (IJEMH)
Volume 6, Issue 3, May-June, 2025 pp: 140-150 ISSN: 2584-2145 ww.ijemh.com

indicating that compensation is perceived positively and exceeds the midpoint. The low standard deviation (3.023) implies that respondents had similar opinions about the compensation they received.

Lastly, employee performance has a theoretical range of 12 to 48, with a midpoint of 30. The practical data range is from 26 to 48, with a mean of 39.09, reflecting a strong performance level among employees. The standard deviation of 5.347 suggests moderate variation in perceived performance across respondents.Overall, the results show that respondents generally report above-average levels across all variables, especially in job satisfaction, motivation, and performance. The relatively low to moderate standard deviations suggest that the responses are consistently distributed, enhancing the reliability of the data for further statistical analysis.

The instrument and data quality tests conducted in this study include validity, reliability, and classical assumption testing. The validity test was performed to determine whether the questionnaire items accurately measure the intended constructs. A questionnaire item is considered valid if it has a significance value below 0.05. Based on the results, all items across the variables of job satisfaction, work motivation, work environment, compensation, and employee performance showed significance values less than 0.05. Therefore, all items were declared valid and appropriate for use in this research.

Table 2. Descriptive Statistics

Variabel	N	Theoretical Range			Practical Range			Std. Deviation
		Min	Max	Mean	Min	Max	Mean	
Job Satisfaction	100	20	80	50	42	80	58,76	8,716
Motivation	100	20	80	50	35	80	56,46	9,785
Work Environment	100	11	44	27,5	23	44	33,33	5,029
Compensation	100	6	24	15	13	24	18,50	3,023
Employee Performance	100	12	48	30	26	48	39,09	5,347

The reliability test was conducted using Cronbach's Alpha, where a value greater than 0.60 indicates that the instrument is reliable. The results show that the Cronbach's Alpha values for job satisfaction (0.915), work motivation (0.909), work environment (0.864), compensation (0.802), and employee performance (0.851) all exceeded the required threshold. These findings confirm that the research instrument is highly reliable and consistently measures each variable.Furthermore, classical assumption tests were performed to ensure the appropriateness of the regression model. The normality test, using the One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov method, produced an asymptotic

significance value of 0.200, which is greater than 0.05. This indicates that the data are normally distributed. The heteroscedasticity test was conducted using the Glejser method, and all independent variables had significance values above 0.05, meaning there is no indication of heteroscedasticity in the model. Lastly, the multicollinearity test showed that all tolerance

Tabel 3: Partial Test or Hypothesis Test

Variabel	***Standardized Coefficients***	**t**	**P-Value**
	Beta		
Job Satisfaction	0,196	1,995	0,049
Motivation	0,224	2,808	0,006
Work Environment	0,384	3,928	0,000
Compensation	0,166	2,164	0,033
Dependent Variable: Employee Performance			

International Journal of Engineering, Management and Humanities (IJEMH)
Volume 6, Issue 3, May-June, 2025 pp: 140-150 ISSN: 2584-2145 www.ijemh.com

values were greater than 0.10 and all VIF values were below 10, indicating that there is no multicollinearity among the independent variables.In conclusion, the research instrument used in this study has been validated as both valid and reliable, while the data also meet the classical assumptions of normality, homoscedasticity, and absence of multicollinearity. These results confirm the adequacy of the instrument and support the validity of the regression analysis conducted in the next stage of the study.

The results of the partial hypothesis test (t-test) in Table 3, aim to evaluate whether each independent variable—job satisfaction, work motivation, work environment, and compensation—has a significant effect on the dependent variable, employee performance.The standardized coefficient (β) for job satisfaction is 0.196, with a t-value of 1.995 and a p-value of 0.049, which is slightly below the 0.05 threshold. This indicates that job satisfaction has a positive and significant effect on employee performance (H1 Supported). These findings support the notion that when employees feel content with their roles, work conditions, and organizational support, they tend to perform better. As stated in the document, job satisfaction is closely related to emotional responses toward one's job and working conditions [28] (Wahyudi, 2018. [47] Satisfiedemployees are more likely to show commitment and enthusiasm in carrying out their duties.This finding aligns with previous studies such as Susanti & Fahmy [45] and Suardi[41] confirm the significant role of job satisfaction in enhancing employee performance. However, some contradictory findings, such as those by Rahmawati &Irwana[33], suggest that job satisfaction may not always significantly influence performance, highlighting the contextual nature of this relationship.

Work motivation recorded a standardized beta of 0.224, a t-value of 2.808, and a p-value of 0.006, which is well below 0.01. This result confirms that motivation significantly and positively affects employee performance (H2 Supported). [35] Motivation stems from internal desires and expectations about achieving personal goals through work. Motivated employees are more driven, resilient, and focused, which translates into higher productivity.This result is consistent with the findings of Sudiardhita et al. [42] and Sembiring et al. [40], who argue that motivation is a critical driver of employee performance. This study confirms the relevance of motivation in the healthcare sector, where emotional and professional dedication is crucial.

Among the variables, work environment showed the highest impact, with a standardized beta of 0.384, a t-value of 3.928, and a p-value of 0.000. These values indicate a strong and highly significant influence of the work environment on employee performance (H3 Supported). [11][44] A well-structured and comfortable work environment fosters a sense of security and satisfaction, which enhances efficiency and reduces absenteeism.[29] The work environment includes factors such as lighting, ventilation, noise, temperature, and relationships among colleagues—all of which influence performance. [14] The strong positive effect observed here supports the theory of organizational behaviour, which posits that a conducive work environment enhances individual performance outcomes.

Compensation shows a standardized beta of 0.166, a t-value of 2.164, and a p-value of 0.033, indicating that compensation has a statistically significant positive effect on employee performance. This finding suggests that employees who perceive their compensation as fair and adequate are more motivated to contribute positively to the organization. [23][24] In the theoretical framework, compensation is viewed not only as financial reward but also as a form of recognition and appreciation. Prior research by Ramli [34] and Sudiardhita et al [42] also supports this finding, confirming that well-managed compensation policies contribute to enhanced performance, especially when they are perceived as just and competitive.

V CONCLUSION

Based on the results of the study, it can be concluded that job satisfaction, work motivation, work environment, and compensation all have a positive and significant influence on employee performance at Puskesmas(Public Healthcare) in the Special Region of Yogyakarta, Indonesia. Among these variables, the work environment was found to be the most influential factor, followed by motivation, job satisfaction, and compensation. These findings indicate that a supportive and comfortable work environment, along with motivated and satisfied employees who feel compensated, can significantly enhance individual performance. This supports the framework of Organizational Behaviour as proposed by Robbins and Judge [36], which emphasizes that organizational outcomes are closely linked to the attitudes and behaviours of employees shaped by internal and external workplace conditions.

However, this study has several limitations. First, the use of a cross-sectional design limits the

ability to assess changes in employee behaviour and performance over time or to infer causal relationships. Second, the research sample was limited to 100 respondents from selected Public Healthcare in Yogyakarta, Indonesia, which may not fully represent the diversity of public healthcare workers in other regions. Third, the use of self-reported questionnaires may lead to biases such as overestimation or social desirability effects. Lastly, the study only examined four independent variables, leaving out other potential influences such as leadership, organizational culture, or job stress.

Therefore, it is recommended that future research adopt a longitudinal approach to explore the dynamics between workplace factors and performance over time. Expanding the sample to include various institutions and regions would enhance the generalizability of the findings. Practically, Public Healthcare should pay greater attention to creating a conducive work environment, providing competitive and fair compensation, and fostering both motivation and job satisfaction to improve employee performance. Moreover, future studies should consider including additional variables such as leadership style, employee engagement, or work-life balance to provide a more comprehensive understanding of what drives employee effectiveness in public health services.

REFERENCES

[1]. Adams, J. S. (1965). Inequity in social exchange. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), Advances in Experimental Social Psychology (Vol. 2, pp. 267–299). Academic Press.

[2]. Ali, M., & Anwar, M. (2021). Job satisfaction and employee performance: Empirical evidence from Pakistan. International Journal of Business and Management, 16(5), 112–123.

[3]. Armstrong, M., & Taylor, S. (2020). Armstrong's handbook of human resource management practice (15th ed.). Kogan Page.

[4]. Arifin, Z., Suhariadi, F., &Prasetya, A. (2018). The effect of job satisfaction on employee performance. JurnalPsikologi Industri dan Organisasi, 4(1), 1–10.

[5]. Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2007). The Job Demands–Resources model: State of the art. Journal of Managerial Psychology, 22(3), 309–328. https://doi.org/10.1108/02683940710733115

[6]. Chen, M., Su, C., & Wang, M. (2020). Job satisfaction and turnover intention among primary care providers in China: The mediating role of work stress. BMC Public Health, 20(1), 1–9.https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-020-8421-y

[7]. Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches (5th ed.). Sage Publications.

[8]. Cropanzano, R., & Mitchell, M. S. (2005). Social exchange theory: An interdisciplinary review. Journal of Management, 31(6), 874–900. https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206305279602

[9]. Demerouti, E., Bakker, A. B., Nachreiner, F., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2001). The Job Demands–Resources model of burnout. Journal of Applied Psychology, 86(3), 499–512.

[10]. Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1985). Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behavior. Plenum Press.

[11]. Ferawati, E. (2017). The impact of work environment on employee performance. JurnalManajemen dan Bisnis, 14(2), 113–120.

[12]. Gagné, M., & Deci, E. L. (2005). Self-determination theory and work motivation. Journal of Organizational Behavior, 26(4), 331–362.

[13]. Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2000). The "what" and "why" of goal pursuits: Human needs and the self-determination of behavior. Psychological Inquiry, 11(4), 227–268.

[14]. Gibson, J. L., Ivancevich, J. M., Donnelly, J. H., & Konopaske, R. (2012). Organizations: Behavior, structure, processes (14th ed.). McGraw-Hill Education.

[15]. Gupta, N., & Shaw, J. D. (2014). Employee compensation: The neglected area of HRM research. Human Resource Management Review, 24(1), 1–4.

[16]. Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., & Anderson, R. E. (2019). Multivariate data analysis (8th ed.). Cengage Learning.

[17]. Herzberg, F. (1959). The motivation to work. John Wiley & Sons.

[18]. Herzberg, F., Mausner, B., & Snyderman, B. B. (1987). The motivation to work (2nd ed.). Transaction Publishers.

[19]. Ivancevich, J. M., Konopaske, R., & Matteson, M. T. (2011). Organizational behavior and management (9th ed.). McGraw-Hill.

[20]. Judge, T. A., Thoresen, C. J., Bono, J. E., & Patton, G. K. (2001). The job satisfaction–job

performance relationship: A qualitative and quantitative review. Psychological Bulletin, 127(3), 376–407.

[21]. Kahn, W. A. (1990). Psychological conditions of personal engagement and disengagement at work. Academy of Management Journal, 33(4), 692–724.

[22]. Kurniawan, H., Wibowo, A., & Rahmawati, R. (2021). Human resource management in Puskesmas: Challenges and strategic solutions. JurnalManajemenPelayanan Kesehatan, 24(1), 45–53.

[23]. Handoko, T. H. (2010). Manajemen personalia dan sumberdayamanusia. BPFE.

[24]. Imron, A. (2021). Compensation system and employee performance in public organizations. JurnalIlmuAdministrasi, 10(1), 22–31.

[25]. Locke, E. A. (1976). The nature and causes of job satisfaction. In M. D. Dunnette (Ed.), Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology (pp. 1297–1349). Rand McNally.

[26]. Luthans, F. (2011). Organizational behavior: An evidence-based approach (12th ed.). McGraw-Hill Education.

[27]. Mahmood, R., He, W., & Ahmad, N. (2019). The effects of job satisfaction on employee performance: Evidence from higher education institutions in Pakistan. Asian Business Research Journal, 4(2), 1–12.

[28]. Mahmood Aziz, M., Ahmad, A., & Rahman, R. (2021). Job satisfaction and its impact on employee performance in the public sector. Journal of Public Administration Studies, 9(1), 45–56.

[29]. Noviyanto, H., &Yuniati, Y. (2015). Influence of work environment on employee performance in public services. JurnalAdministrasi Publik, 3(2), 112–121.

[30]. Nurhidayati, T., Syafrudin, D., & Sari, D. P. (2022). The role of employee engagement and job satisfaction in improving performance: A study at health service centers in Yogyakarta. Health Policy and Management Journal, 7(1), 18–29.

[31]. Organ, D. W. (1988). Organizational citizenship behavior: The good soldier syndrome. Lexington Books.

[32]. Pancasila, I., Sudiro, A., & Dharma, P. S. (2020). The effect of job satisfaction and organizational commitment on employee performance. International Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting Research, 4(3), 256–267.

[33]. Rahmawati, R., &Irwana, I. (2020). The relationship between job satisfaction and employee performance in the public sector: Evidence from Indonesia. JurnalIlmiahAdministrasi Publik, 6(2), 210–220.

[34]. Ramli, Y. (2018). The effect of compensation on employee performance. International Journal of Management Science and Business Administration, 4(4), 45–52.

[35]. Rizqi, F. (2019). The role of motivation in enhancing work productivity. JurnalPsikologiTerapan, 6(2), 101–110.

[36]. Robbins, S. P., & Judge, T. A. (2022). Organizational behavior (19th ed.). Pearson Education.

[37]. Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000). Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development, and well-being. American Psychologist, 55(1), 68–78. https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.55.1.68

[38]. Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000). Intrinsic and extrinsic motivations: Classic definitions and new directions. Contemporary Educational Psychology, 25(1), 54–67.

[39]. Sekaran, U., & Bougie, R. (2019). Research methods for business: A skill-building approach (8th ed.). Wiley.

[40]. Sembiring, R., Prasetyo, H., & Wibowo, A. (2021). Motivation and employee performance: A case study in healthcare services. Journal of Human Resource Development, 3(2), 134–143.

[41]. Suardi, S. (2019). Pengaruhkepuasankerjaterhadapkinerjakaryawan. JurnalIlmiah Ekonomi dan Bisnis, 15(1), 89–96.

[42]. Sudiardhita, K., Mukzam, M. D., & Rahayu, M. (2018). The impact of compensation, motivation, and job satisfaction on employee performance. JurnalAplikasiManajemen, 16(1), 150–157.

[43]. Sulaeman, M., Halim, R. E., & Rani, A. (2021). The effect of compensation and motivation on employee performance. Journal of Applied Economics and Business, 9(2), 15–25.

[44]. Sunarsi, D., Hidayat, D., &Priyono, A. (2020). Influence of work environment on employee productivity in health services. International Journal of Management Science, 5(1), 40–47.

[45]. Susanti, E., & Fahmy, M. (2020). Job satisfaction and employee performance: An

empirical study at government Public Healthcare. JurnalAdministrasi Publik, 7(2), 23–31.

[46]. World Health Organization. (2016). Working for health and growth: Investing in the health workforce. WHO Press.

[47]. Wulandari, S., Santoso, H., &Kusumaningrum, D. (2020). The relationship between job satisfaction and performance among public sector employees. JurnalAkuntansi dan Bisnis, 20(1), 34–42.