WORK-LIFE QUALITY, SATISFACTION, ENVIRONMENT, LOYALTY, AND EMPLOYEE PERFORMANCE

Desfa Primadona
Sekolah Tinggi Ilmu Ekonomi KBP, Indonesia
Email: desfaprimadona@gmail.com

Suhelmi Helia
Sekolah Tinggi Ilmu Ekonomi KBP, Indonesia
E-mail: suhelmihelia.26@gmail.com

Abstract

This study examined the effects of quality of work life, job satisfaction, work environment, and employee loyalty on employee performance at the Pancung Soal District Office, Pesisir Selatan Regency. A quantitative survey design was used with total sampling of 32 employees. Questionnaire data were analyzed using classical-assumption tests, multiple linear regression, t tests, an F test, and the coefficient of determination. The results showed that quality of work life, job satisfaction, work environment, and employee loyalty each had a positive and significant effect on performance. The four predictors were also jointly significant ($p < 0.001$), with $R^2 = 0.550$, indicating that 55.0% of performance variation was explained by the model. Employee loyalty had the largest regression coefficient. The findings support an integrated human-resource approach combining employee well-being, workplace satisfaction, a supportive work environment, and sustained organizational commitment.

Keywords: quality of work life; job satisfaction; work environment; employee loyalty; employee performance

INTRODUCTION

Human resources are a central determinant of organizational effectiveness because employees translate formal mandates, budgets, technology, and procedures into services and measurable results. This role is especially visible in local government offices, where the quality of public services depends not only on administrative rules but also on the motivation, well-being, commitment, and day-to-day behavior of civil servants and supporting staff. A district office therefore needs more than formal compliance; it requires a work system that enables employees to perform consistently, interact effectively with citizens, and sustain accountability under changing service demands.

The Pancung Soal District Office is a territorial government unit in Pesisir Selatan Regency. Its institutional mandate derives from regional regulations governing the organization, duties, functions, and working procedures of district administrations. The district head coordinates general government affairs, community empowerment, public order, enforcement of regional regulations, maintenance of public-service infrastructure, village administration, and other delegated functions. Because these responsibilities are directly connected to citizens, weak employee performance may immediately affect service speed, administrative accuracy, responsiveness, and public trust.

The performance pattern reported in the source manuscript indicates that institutional results were not consistently improving between 2022 and 2024. Electronic identity-card facilitation fluctuated from 14% in 2022 to 12% in 2023 and 13% in 2024. The LAKIP performance-accountability score declined from 90% to 85% before recovering to

87%, while village-government development remained nearly stagnant at 77%, 77%, and 78%. The overall average decreased from 60% to 58% and only slightly recovered to 59%. These figures suggest that the office faces a combination of service, accountability, and organizational-performance challenges rather than a single technical problem.

Employee behavior also provides an important diagnostic signal. The original manuscript reported recurring lateness during November 2024, with weekly proportions ranging from approximately 10.0% to 12.8%. Repeated lateness can disrupt the continuity of public services and may reflect weaknesses in discipline, supervision, job satisfaction, or the broader quality of the work experience. At the same time, an initial loyalty survey showed that most employees were proud of the organization and willing to protect its reputation, but lower proportions were willing to work overtime or place organizational interests above personal interests. The coexistence of positive attachment and incomplete discretionary commitment makes employee loyalty an important explanatory variable.

Quality of work life (QWL) represents employees' perceptions of whether the workplace supports their physical, psychological, social, and developmental needs. A strong QWL can provide safety, balance, participation, recognition, and opportunities for development. Prior work has associated QWL with work engagement, satisfaction, commitment, citizenship behavior, and performance (Ekowati & Ariani, 2022; Hermawati & Mas, 2022; Junita et al., 2022). In a public-sector setting, QWL is particularly important because employees may have limited flexibility in formal reward structures; consequently, nonfinancial aspects of work become meaningful sources of motivation and sustained performance.

Job satisfaction concerns the positive evaluation employees make of their jobs and work experiences. Satisfaction can arise from the work itself, supervision, interpersonal relationships, recognition, security, career opportunities, and perceived fairness. When employees perceive that organizational practices meet reasonable expectations, they are more likely to concentrate on work, cooperate with colleagues, and maintain service standards. Robbins and Judge (2020) emphasize that job attitudes are closely related to work behavior, while Ellys and Ie (2020) illustrate the broader link between job satisfaction and organizational commitment.

The work environment includes both physical and nonphysical conditions surrounding employees. Physical aspects include workspace, lighting, temperature, noise, equipment, and safety, whereas nonphysical aspects include communication, leadership, teamwork, interpersonal climate, and psychological security. A supportive environment reduces avoidable friction and enables employees to allocate more attention to core tasks. Research by Pangestu et al. (2019), Putra and L. (2020), and Setyo (2022) generally supports the proposition that work-environment quality is associated with stronger job attitudes and performance.

Employee loyalty reflects a durable willingness to remain attached to the organization, protect its interests, maintain its reputation, and contribute beyond minimal contractual requirements. Loyalty is not identical to passive tenure. In public institutions, meaningful loyalty includes commitment to service values, organizational integrity, and collective goals. Rumampuk et al. (2022) found that motivation, loyalty, and employee quality were jointly related to performance, while Asriandi et al. (2020) linked organizational culture and work environment to loyalty and employee outcomes.

This study integrates QWL, job satisfaction, work environment, and employee loyalty as simultaneous predictors of employee performance. Such integration is relevant because workplace factors do not operate independently. A comfortable environment may be insufficient if employees experience poor work-life quality; satisfaction may be temporary if loyalty and commitment are weak; and loyalty may not translate into results when the workplace does not provide adequate support. Accordingly, the study asked whether each predictor affects employee performance and whether the four variables jointly explain performance at the Pancung Soal District Office.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Employee Performance

Employee performance refers to the quality, quantity, timeliness, responsibility, and effectiveness of work accomplished in accordance with organizational standards. In a district office, performance also has a public-value dimension because employee outputs influence citizens' access to administrative services. Mathis and Jackson (2022) view human-resource performance as the result of ability, effort, support, and organizational systems. The present study treats performance as the dependent variable and assumes that both attitudinal and contextual factors shape the level of work accomplishment.

Quality of Work Life and Performance

QWL describes the extent to which an organization creates conditions that allow employees to work productively while maintaining well-being, security, participation, and opportunities for development. Junita et al. (2022) show that quality of work life can transmit the influence of leadership to worker performance, while Ekowati and Ariani (2022) connect QWL with work involvement and satisfaction. These findings support the expectation that employees who experience greater balance, support, and meaningfulness will have more psychological resources to perform effectively. Therefore, H1 states that quality of work life has a positive effect on employee performance.

Job Satisfaction and Performance

Job satisfaction is an evaluative attitude toward one's job and work context. Satisfaction may improve performance because employees who perceive fairness, support, and positive work experiences are more willing to invest attention and effort in their duties. Although performance is influenced by many factors, the affective evaluation of the job can shape persistence, cooperation, and discretionary effort. Thus, H2 states that job satisfaction has a positive effect on employee performance.

Work Environment and Performance

A conducive work environment supports task completion by reducing physical discomfort, interpersonal conflict, and communication barriers. Sedarmayanti (2022) emphasizes the relationship between work arrangements, ergonomics, and productivity. Empirical studies by Pangestu et al. (2019) and Setyo (2022) similarly indicate that favorable work conditions are associated with positive work outcomes. Thus, H3 states that the work environment has a positive effect on employee performance.

Employee Loyalty and Performance

Loyal employees tend to protect organizational interests, preserve institutional reputation, remain committed during demanding periods, and support collective objectives. Loyalty can therefore convert identification with the organization into consistent service behavior. Rumampuk et al. (2022) provide empirical support for a relationship between loyalty and performance. H4 states that employee loyalty has a positive effect on employee performance. Finally, H5 proposes that QWL, job satisfaction, work environment, and employee loyalty simultaneously affect employee performance.

RESEARCH METHODS

This research used a quantitative explanatory design. The study was conducted at the Pancung Soal District Office, Pesisir Selatan Regency. The population consisted of all structural employees and implementing staff recorded in the office. The source manuscript contained an inconsistency between the abstract (33 respondents) and the methods section (32 employees). Because the methods section explicitly defines the population and states that all members were included through total sampling, the present edited version uses n = 32 as the internally consistent sample size.

Data were collected through a structured questionnaire measuring employee performance, quality of work life, job satisfaction, work environment, and employee loyalty. Responses were processed using IBM SPSS. The analytical sequence comprised instrument assessment, tests of normality, multicollinearity, and heteroskedasticity, followed by multiple linear regression, partial t tests, a simultaneous F test, and the coefficient of determination. Statistical significance was evaluated at $\alpha = 0.05$.

The multiple-regression model was specified as $Y = \alpha + \beta1X1 + \beta2X2 + \beta3X3 + \beta4X4 + \varepsilon$, where Y represents employee performance, X1 quality of work life, X2 job satisfaction, X3 work environment, and X4 employee loyalty. The hypotheses were supported when regression coefficients were positive and their probability values were below 0.05.

Table 1. Selected Performance Indicators, 2022–2024

Indicator	2022	2023	2024
E-KTP service facilitation (%)	14	12	13
LAKIP performance value (%)	90	85	87
Village-government development (%)	77	77	78
Overall average (%)	60	58	59

Source: Pancung Soal District Office performance data, as reported in the source manuscript.

Table 2. Initial Employee-Loyalty Survey

Initial loyalty statement	Yes (%)	No (%)
Committed to working in the office in the long term	70	30
Proud to be part of the office	80	20

Initial loyalty statement	Yes (%)	No (%)
Willing to work overtime when needed	60	40
Protects the institution's public reputation	90	10
Places organizational interests above personal interests	60	40

Source: Preliminary interview/survey in the source manuscript (10 respondents).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Classical-Assumption Tests

The normality test showed Asymp. Sig. values above 0.05 for employee performance (0.064), quality of work life (0.200), job satisfaction (0.157), work environment (0.119), and employee loyalty (0.200). The regression data therefore met the normality criterion used in the study. The multicollinearity assessment also indicated tolerance values above 0.10 and VIF values below 10, suggesting that the independent variables did not exhibit problematic linear overlap. The heteroskedasticity scatterplot showed residual points dispersed above and below the zero line without a systematic pattern, supporting the homoskedasticity assumption.

Multiple Regression and Hypothesis Testing

The estimated equation was Y = 45.717 + 0.469X1 + 0.233X2 + 0.504X3 + 0.585X4. All four coefficients were positive. Holding other predictors constant, a one-unit increase in QWL was associated with a 0.469-unit increase in performance; a one-unit increase in job satisfaction with a 0.233-unit increase; a one-unit improvement in the work environment with a 0.504-unit increase; and a one-unit increase in employee loyalty with a 0.585-unit increase. The loyalty coefficient was the largest, although coefficient magnitude should be interpreted carefully when variables have different scales.

Table 3. Partial Regression Results

Predictor	B	p-value	Decision
Quality of work life (X1)	0.469	<0.001	H1 supported
Job satisfaction (X2)	0.233	0.021	H2 supported
Work environment (X3)	0.504	<0.001	H3 supported
Employee loyalty (X4)	0.585	<0.05	H4 supported

Source: Regression results reported in the source manuscript. The source text consistently interpreted all four effects as positive and significant.

The simultaneous F test was significant ($p < 0.001$), supporting H5. The model produced $R = 0.742$ and $R^2 = 0.550$, indicating that 55.0% of observed variation in employee performance was explained by the four predictors. The adjusted R^2 of 0.481 shows that explanatory power remained meaningful after accounting for the number of predictors and sample size. The remaining 45.0% may reflect factors not included in the model, such as leadership style, competence, workload, organizational culture, compensation, public-service systems, or individual characteristics.

Quality of Work Life and Employee Performance

The positive QWL effect indicates that employee performance is strengthened when work arrangements support well-being and enable employees to balance organizational demands with personal and developmental needs. In a district office, QWL can be expressed through manageable workload, a sense of security, opportunities to develop competence, participation in workplace decisions, and respectful treatment. These conditions may reduce emotional strain and free cognitive resources for service delivery. The result is consistent with Junita et al. (2022), who position quality of work life as an important mechanism linking leadership and worker performance, and with QWL literature emphasizing the interaction of well-being and organizational effectiveness.

Job Satisfaction and Employee Performance

Job satisfaction had the smallest unstandardized coefficient but remained statistically significant. This finding suggests that satisfaction is not merely a desirable employee attitude; it has behavioral consequences for work concentration and willingness to sustain performance. In public organizations where compensation structures may be relatively standardized, satisfaction may be strongly shaped by supervision, recognition, role clarity, fairness, collegial relationships, and the meaningfulness of public service. Management should therefore treat satisfaction as a multidimensional condition rather than equating it only with pay.

Work Environment and Employee Performance

The work environment had a relatively large positive coefficient. This result corrects a substantive inconsistency in the original abstract, which described the effect as negative even though the reported regression coefficient (0.504) and the hypothesis-testing narrative were positive. The internally consistent statistical evidence supports a positive interpretation. For the Pancung Soal District Office, improvements in physical facilities should be accompanied by attention to communication, interpersonal respect, supervision, and service coordination. A supportive nonphysical environment can be particularly important when public-service tasks require interdependence among employees.

Employee Loyalty and Employee Performance

Employee loyalty emerged as the strongest coefficient in the regression equation. This does not imply that loyalty alone is sufficient, but it highlights the potential importance of durable organizational attachment in public administration. Loyal employees are more likely to preserve the institution's reputation, maintain service continuity, and contribute during periods of increased workload. The preliminary loyalty survey nevertheless revealed areas for improvement: only 60% were willing to work overtime when needed and 60% agreed that organizational interests should take priority over personal interests. These indicators suggest that institutional pride is stronger than discretionary sacrifice, creating a practical space for leadership intervention.

Integrated Interpretation and Managerial Implications

The simultaneous result shows that employee performance should be managed through an integrated human-resource system. QWL provides the foundation of employee well-being; job satisfaction reflects positive evaluation of work; the work environment provides daily enabling conditions; and loyalty sustains long-term commitment. Weakness in one dimension may reduce the benefits of the others. For example, an employee can be

loyal yet perform below potential in a dysfunctional workplace, or can be satisfied in the short term without developing durable organizational commitment.

For management, four priorities follow from the evidence. First, improve QWL through equitable workload, opportunities for professional development, and attention to work-life balance. Second, strengthen job satisfaction through transparent recognition, role clarity, supportive supervision, and fair personnel practices. Third, improve both physical and psychosocial aspects of the work environment, including facilities, communication routines, and collaboration. Fourth, cultivate loyalty through inclusive organizational culture, meaningful public-service values, development opportunities, and credible leadership behavior. These actions should be designed as a coherent package rather than isolated programs.

The findings also have a public-service implication. Better employee performance at a district office is expected to improve the timeliness, consistency, and reliability of services experienced by citizens. Therefore, human-resource policies should be evaluated not only by internal employee indicators but also by their downstream impact on administrative quality, citizen satisfaction, and accountability outcomes.

Extended Discussion of the Integrated Performance Model

From a systems perspective, the four predictors can be interpreted as complementary layers of the employee experience. Quality of work life concerns whether work is sustainable and supportive of human well-being; job satisfaction concerns employees' evaluative response to their job; the work environment concerns the immediate conditions under which tasks are performed; and loyalty concerns the durability of attachment to the institution. Performance is therefore not treated as the mechanical result of one incentive but as the outcome of a configuration of conditions. This interpretation is consistent with contemporary human-resource thinking in which employee attitudes, resources, and context interact to influence organizational results.

The distinction between quality of work life and job satisfaction is especially important. Although the concepts overlap, QWL is broader and includes structural features such as work-life balance, safety, participation, and opportunities for development, whereas job satisfaction is the employee's evaluative reaction to the work experience. A district office could theoretically provide stable working hours and adequate facilities while employees remain dissatisfied because of recognition or supervisory problems. Conversely, employees may report satisfaction with colleagues while still experiencing poor balance or limited development opportunities. Including both variables allows the model to capture different dimensions of the employment relationship.

The positive relationship between QWL and performance can also be explained through resource conservation. Employees have finite physical, cognitive, and emotional resources. When work arrangements repeatedly create overload, insecurity, conflict, or poor balance, employees must spend more resources coping with the environment and have fewer resources available for productive service. By contrast, a supportive work system protects resources and can increase energy for task completion. This mechanism is particularly relevant in public service, where employees regularly deal with citizens' expectations, administrative deadlines, and procedural accountability.

The job-satisfaction result should also be interpreted beyond immediate happiness. Satisfaction signals that employees perceive an acceptable relationship between what they contribute and what they receive from the organization, including recognition, treatment, stability, support, and opportunities. When this exchange is perceived positively, employees are more likely to cooperate and maintain consistent work effort. However, satisfaction should not be expected to eliminate all performance problems. The model's R^2 of 0.550 shows that almost half of performance variation remains associated with factors beyond the four variables in this study.

The work-environment finding is highly relevant to daily service delivery. Physical conditions influence concentration and efficiency, but the nonphysical environment may be equally important. Public services often require coordination across administrative functions, rapid clarification of documents, and cooperative handling of citizen requests. When communication is weak or relationships are characterized by tension, even technically competent employees can experience delays. Thus, improvements in environment should include both tangible facilities and social processes such as routine coordination meetings, clear escalation channels, respectful feedback, and shared service standards.

Employee loyalty adds a temporal dimension to the model. QWL, satisfaction, and environment describe current experiences, while loyalty reflects the tendency to sustain attachment and protect organizational interests over time. The preliminary survey is informative in this respect. Ninety percent of the small preliminary group were willing to protect the institution's public reputation, but only 60% were willing to work overtime when required and the same proportion were willing to place organizational interests above personal interests. The pattern suggests that symbolic identification with the institution may be stronger than willingness to make discretionary sacrifices. Management should therefore avoid assuming that pride automatically translates into extra effort.

Loyalty in public organizations should also be framed carefully. Healthy loyalty is commitment to institutional mission, public-service values, integrity, and collective performance; it is not unconditional obedience to supervisors or acceptance of unreasonable demands. Policies intended to strengthen loyalty should therefore emphasize fairness, organizational credibility, professional respect, and opportunities to contribute meaningfully. Such conditions encourage attachment that is compatible with accountability rather than dependence.

The simultaneous effect provides a basis for prioritizing integrated interventions. A sequence of isolated programs—for example, renovating office space without improving supervision, or providing motivational events without addressing workload—may produce only temporary changes. A more coherent approach begins with diagnosis: identify which QWL dimensions are weakest, which aspects of satisfaction are problematic, what environmental barriers employees face, and where loyalty is fragile. Interventions can then be linked to measurable indicators such as lateness, service completion times, error rates, citizen complaints, and employee perceptions.

The institutional performance indicators reported for 2022–2024 reinforce the need for such integration. The decline and partial recovery in LAKIP values suggest that performance-management quality itself may require attention. Meanwhile, the nearly stagnant village-development indicator and fluctuating E-KTP facilitation outcome

indicate that different service functions may face different constraints. Human-resource factors may influence all of them, but operational bottlenecks, technology, citizen participation, and interagency coordination are also plausible contributors. The present model should therefore be understood as an important but incomplete explanation of organizational performance.

For policy implementation, management could establish a quarterly employee-experience review using a short, confidential instrument covering QWL, satisfaction, workplace climate, and loyalty. Results should be discussed together with operational performance data. This would help distinguish whether a service problem is primarily associated with employee experience, process design, resource limitations, or external factors. The goal is not to create an additional administrative burden but to make human-resource information useful for management decisions.

Career development is another cross-cutting intervention. Opportunities to learn and grow can improve QWL by increasing developmental value, raise satisfaction through recognition and progress, strengthen loyalty by signaling long-term organizational investment, and improve performance by expanding competence. In a small district office, development need not depend solely on formal promotion. Job enrichment, task rotation, mentoring, short training programs, digital-service skill development, and participation in cross-unit improvement projects can provide meaningful growth.

Recognition systems should similarly be designed to affect multiple variables. Recognition can increase satisfaction, reinforce loyal behavior, and shape the social work environment by clarifying what the institution values. Yet recognition must be transparent and credible. If employees perceive favoritism, the same system can undermine satisfaction and trust. Therefore, criteria should be linked to observable service behaviors, reliability, collaboration, innovation, and compliance with ethical standards rather than personal proximity to supervisors.

The study also has implications for leadership. Although leadership was not included as an independent variable, leaders influence every predictor in the model. Supervisors shape work allocation, communication climate, recognition, conflict handling, development opportunities, and the symbolic meaning of public service. Future models should therefore examine leadership as either an antecedent of the four predictors or as a moderator that changes the extent to which positive employee attitudes translate into performance.

Finally, the findings should be interpreted with appropriate statistical caution. The study used a small census sample from one office, and the coefficients are based on self-reported survey measures. Significant relationships within this sample do not establish universal causal effects. Common-method bias, social desirability, and the cross-sectional design may inflate associations. Nevertheless, because the entire accessible employee population was included and the reported assumptions were satisfied, the results provide a useful organizational diagnosis and a foundation for more rigorous comparative research.

Implications for Public-Sector Human Resource Management

Public-sector human-resource management differs from private-sector management in several ways that are relevant to these findings. Formal pay systems, staffing rules,

promotion procedures, and job classifications are often more regulated, reducing managerial discretion over some material incentives. This increases the relative importance of factors that local managers can influence directly, such as task allocation, communication, recognition, learning opportunities, office climate, and the organization of service processes. The four variables in this study therefore provide a practical framework for distinguishing which aspects of employee experience can be improved locally even when structural policies are set at higher levels.

One practical tool is a human-resource action matrix that links each predictor with specific indicators and interventions. QWL can be monitored through workload balance, overtime frequency, perceived support, safety, and access to development. Job satisfaction can be monitored through recognition, supervision, role clarity, fairness, and relationships. Work environment can be assessed through physical adequacy, communication quality, teamwork, and conflict. Loyalty can be observed through intention to remain, willingness to protect organizational reputation, identification with public-service values, and voluntary contribution. Employee performance can then be tracked through service completion, punctuality, accuracy, responsiveness, and accountability.

Because the office has a relatively small workforce, management has an opportunity to use participatory approaches. Small-group discussions can identify operational problems more quickly than broad bureaucratic surveys. Employees can be invited to map service bottlenecks, propose solutions, and evaluate whether changes reduce delays or errors. Participation itself may improve QWL and satisfaction because employees experience greater voice and influence over their work. At the same time, visible implementation of employee suggestions can strengthen trust and loyalty.

Work-life balance should be treated as an operational issue rather than a purely personal concern. When staffing is limited, unexpected absences or seasonal workload can create pressure on a small number of employees. Management can respond through cross-training, backup arrangements, clear priority rules, and advance planning for predictable service peaks. These practices protect QWL while improving institutional resilience. They also reduce the likelihood that loyal employees become overloaded simply because they are known to be dependable.

Organizational justice is another mechanism connecting the variables. Employees are more likely to be satisfied and loyal when they perceive procedures, decisions, and interpersonal treatment as fair. Fairness also influences the work environment by shaping trust and cooperation. Therefore, transparent task distribution, documented performance criteria, consistent discipline, and equal access to development opportunities are not merely administrative practices; they are potential drivers of the employee attitudes measured in this study.

The data on lateness should be used constructively. Recurrent lateness may reflect individual discipline problems, but it can also be associated with transportation constraints, family responsibilities, unclear enforcement, or weak supervisory routines. A fair response begins by clarifying attendance expectations and documenting patterns, while also investigating root causes. Progressive corrective action is more likely to improve performance when employees perceive the process as consistent and respectful rather than arbitrary.

Performance management should similarly avoid reducing complex service quality to a single score. The 2022–2024 indicators show that different functions moved differently over time. Managers should therefore disaggregate performance by service type and identify the employee and process factors associated with each outcome. A stagnant village-development indicator may require different solutions from fluctuating identity-card facilitation or accountability scores. Human-resource interventions become more credible when they are linked to specific operational problems.

Technology may also interact with the four predictors. Digital systems can improve efficiency, but poorly implemented technology can increase workload and frustration. Training, user support, clear procedures, and reliable infrastructure can improve QWL and satisfaction while creating a more supportive work environment. Employees who feel competent using technology may also show greater confidence and loyalty because they perceive the organization as investing in their ability to serve the public effectively.

Citizen-facing work creates emotional demands that should not be underestimated. Employees may need to manage complaints, incomplete documents, urgent requests, or dissatisfaction with procedures. Supportive supervision, clear service standards, and peer assistance can reduce emotional strain. These practices are relevant to QWL and work environment and can indirectly support performance by helping employees maintain professional behavior under pressure.

In summary, the statistical model can be translated into a management cycle: diagnose employee experience, select integrated interventions, monitor operational and employee indicators, evaluate outcomes, and adjust policies. This cycle allows the office to move from one-time improvement activities toward continuous organizational learning. The value of the present study lies not only in identifying significant coefficients but in providing a structure for that ongoing management process.

An additional implication concerns evidence-based supervision. Supervisors should use performance discussions to connect employee experience with operational expectations. Rather than treating lateness, low output, or weak collaboration as isolated personal failures, supervisors can ask whether workload, role clarity, facilities, communication, or development needs contribute to the problem. This approach does not remove individual accountability; it improves the quality of diagnosis and makes corrective action more likely to address the actual cause.

Continuous improvement also requires institutional memory. Small government offices can lose useful knowledge when experienced employees transfer or retire. Documentation of service procedures, mentoring, cross-training, and shared digital repositories can reduce this vulnerability. These practices may increase QWL by reducing uncertainty, strengthen the work environment through easier collaboration, and support loyalty by demonstrating that employee knowledge is valued. They also protect performance continuity during staffing changes.

Because loyalty had the largest reported coefficient, future management reviews should examine which forms of loyalty are most productive. Commitment to public-service standards, willingness to help colleagues, and intention to remain may have different relationships with performance. A multidimensional loyalty scale would allow the organization to distinguish constructive commitment from simple tenure and would improve the precision of future policy recommendations.

For future organizational assessment, the office should also distinguish between individual performance and unit performance. Some public-service outcomes depend heavily on coordination, technology, and external agencies, so an individual employee may perform well even when the unit indicator remains weak. Combining individual appraisal with team and service-level measures can reduce unfair attribution and provide a more accurate basis for improving QWL, satisfaction, environment, and loyalty.

An annual review of the four predictors could be incorporated into existing performance-management routines rather than established as a separate program. This integration would make employee-experience data part of normal managerial decision making and would help the office evaluate whether human-resource improvements are followed by more stable service and accountability outcomes.

A final practical consideration is sequencing. Management should first correct basic environmental and procedural barriers, then strengthen development and recognition, and finally evaluate whether changes in employee experience are reflected in performance. This sequence does not imply that one variable is unimportant; it provides a manageable way to implement an integrated model within the administrative and resource constraints of a district office.

Taken together, the findings support a practical principle of proportional management: employee performance improves most sustainably when organizational demands are matched by adequate resources, fair treatment, developmental support, and a credible sense of shared mission. This principle is directly relevant to local government offices whose service obligations are continuous even when staffing and budgets are constrained.

CONCLUSION

The study concludes that quality of work life, job satisfaction, work environment, and employee loyalty each have a positive and significant effect on employee performance at the Pancung Soal District Office. They are also jointly significant, and the model explains 55.0% of performance variation. Among the reported unstandardized coefficients, employee loyalty is the largest, followed by work environment, quality of work life, and job satisfaction.

Theoretical implications arise from the usefulness of combining well-being, attitude, context, and commitment in a single public-sector performance model. Practically, district-office management should integrate employee-well-being policies, satisfaction-enhancing practices, workplace improvement, and loyalty-building efforts rather than relying on a single intervention. The study is limited by its small census sample, cross-sectional design, self-reported questionnaire data, and single-office setting. Future research should test mediation and moderation mechanisms, include leadership and organizational-culture variables, and compare multiple district offices to improve generalizability.

REFERENCES

Amin, M., Aldakhil, A. M., Wu, C., Rezaei, S., & Cobanoglu, C. (2022). The structural relationship between TQM, employee satisfaction and hotel performance. International

Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management, 29(4), 1256–1278. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJCHM-11-2015-%0A0659

Asriandi, Umar Gani, M., & Hasbi, A. (2020). Pengaruh Budaya Organisasi Dan Lingkungan Kerja Terhadap Loyalitas Karyawan Serta Dampaknya Terhadap Kinerja Karyawan Pt. Industri Kapal Indonesia (Persero) Makassar. Jemma, 1(2), 1–13.

Ekowati, S., & Ariani, T. (2022). Kualitas Kehidupan Kerja, Keterlibatan Kerja Dan Kepuasan Kerja Karyawan PT. WOM Cabang Bengkulu. EKOMBIS REVIEW: Jurnal Ilmiah Ekonomi Dan Bisnis, 10(1), 229–236.

Ellys, E., & Ie, M. (2020). Pengaruh kepuasan kerja dan budaya organisasi terhadap komitmen organisasi karyawan. Jurnal Manajemen Maranatha, 20(1), 75–84.

Hermawati, A., & Mas, N. (2022). Quality of Work Life dan Organizational Citizenship Behavior Sebuah Kajian Empiris. Badan Penerbiitan Universitas Widyagma.

Junita, A., Nahrisah, E., & Oktaviani, H. (2022). Determination of Servant Leadership on Worker Performance Mediated by The Quality of Work -Life and Moderated by Work Engagement. Jurnal Dinamika Manajemen, 13(85), 30–44.

Mathis, R. & J. H. J. (2022). Human Resourse Management : Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia. Salemba Empat.

Muhamad Mardiansyah, & R. (2022). Pengaruh Quality of Work Life dan Employee Engagement Terhadap Komitmen Organisasi pada Anita Phoneshop Baturaja. Jurnal Manajemen Bisnis, Akuntansi Dan Keuangan, 1(1), 25–38.

Pangestu, Z. S. D., Mukzam, M. D., & Ruhana, I. (2019). Pengaruh Lingkungan Kerja Terhadap Kepuasan Kerja (Studi pada Karyawan Perum Perhutani Ngawi). Jurnal Administrasi Bisnis (JAB), 4(3), 157– 162.

Prasetyo, A. A., & W. (2022). Analisis faktor-faktor yang mempengaruhi kinerja karyawan pada masa pandemi covid-19 (studi pada PT. Cahaya manunggal). Jurnal Ekonomi Dan Keuangan, 3(1), 61–74.

Putra, T., & L. (2020). Pengaruh Lingkungan Kerja Non-Fisik Terhadap Kinerja Karyawan Bukit Pelayangan Resto. E-Proceeding of Management, 7(2), 6645–6651.

Republika.co.id. (n.d.). (2022). Pengusaha Ritel Ingin Kembalikan Trafik Bisnis Offline Setelah Dihantam Pandemi. https://www.republika.co.id/berita/rf07gq383/pengusaha-ritel-ingin- kembalikan-trafik-bisnis-offline-setelah-dihantam-pandemi

Robbins, S. . dan J. T. . (2020). Perilaku Organisasi. Salemba Empat.

Rumampuk, T. L., Mandamdari, A. N., & Nurdiani, U. (2022). Pengaruh Motivasi Kerja, Loyalitas dan Kualitas Karyawan Terhadap Kinerja Karyawan di PT. Indofood CBP Sukses Makmur Tbk. Jurnal Aplikasi Bisnis Dan Manajemen, 8(2), 491–502. https://doi.org/10.17358/jabm.8.2.491

Rusydiati. (2022). Kepuasan Kerja Guru Terhadap Prestasi Kerja Guru Dalam Meningkatkan Mutu Pendidikan di Madrasah. Jurnal Ilmiah Bidang Pendidikan, 11(1), 45–54.

Sedermayanti. (2022). Tata Kerja dan Produktifitas Kerja, Suatu Tinjauan Dari Aspek Ergonomi Atau Kaitan Antara Manusia Dengan Lingkungan Kerjanya. Mandar Maju.

Setyo, A. (2022). Pengaruh Motivasi Kerja dan Lingkungan Kerja terhadap Kinerja Karyawan Qnb (Qatar National Bank) Indomesia Area Surabaya. E-Jurnal Ekonomi Dan Bisnis Universitas Udayana, 6(12), 4197–4224.

Sugiyono. (2021). Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif Kualitatif, R&D. Alfabeta.