COMPENSATION AS A MODERATOR OF EMPLOYEE PERFORMANCE DETERMINANTS

Rika Anggraini
Sekolah Tinggi Ilmu Ekonomi KBP, Padang, Indonesia
E-mail: rikaanggraini@gmail.com

Sumiati
Sekolah Tinggi Ilmu Ekonomi KBP, Padang, Indonesia
E-mail: sumiati@akbpstie.ac.id

Abstract

This study examined the effects of work environment, motivation, and work discipline on employee performance and tested compensation as a moderating variable at the Pauh District Office, Padang City. The population comprised 58 employees, all of whom were included through total sampling. Data from a five-point Likert questionnaire were analyzed using hierarchical moderated regression analysis. Work environment, motivation, work discipline, and compensation had positive and significant direct effects on employee performance. Model 1 explained 48.8% of performance variance, increasing to 65.1% after compensation was added. However, the interaction terms for compensation with work environment, motivation, and work discipline were not significant; the full model explained 66.2%. Thus, compensation functioned as a direct predictor rather than a moderator in this bureaucratic setting. Performance improvement should prioritize supportive working conditions, recognition-based motivation, consistent discipline, and fair compensation while reconsidering assumptions about moderation in fixed public-sector pay systems.

Keywords: employee performance; work environment; motivation; work discipline; compensation; moderated regression
JEL Classification: M12; M52; H83

INTRODUCTION

Employee performance is a critical condition for effective public administration. District offices translate municipal policies into daily services, coordinate community activities, maintain administrative records, and interact directly with citizens. Their effectiveness therefore depends not only on formal organizational structures but also on whether employees can and are willing to perform with quality, timeliness, responsibility, and cooperation.

The Pauh District Office in Padang City showed fluctuating performance indicators between 2023 and 2025. The source manuscript reports that work quantity declined from high to moderate, effectiveness and timeliness fluctuated, work quality improved from low to high before returning to moderate, and responsibility and teamwork tended to decline to moderate in 2025. Attendance data also showed improvement from 2022 to 2023 but a slight decline in 2024. These patterns indicate that the organization had not achieved stable performance across multiple dimensions.

Work environment is one likely determinant. Employees perform within both a physical and psychosocial context. Adequate workspace, equipment, safety, communication, leadership support, and collegial relationships can reduce friction and facilitate task completion. Afianti (2025), Miftahudin (2024), Wolor (2023), and other studies listed in the source manuscript generally support the role of work environment in explaining employee outcomes.

Motivation is a second determinant. It describes the internal and external forces that direct effort toward organizational goals. Motivation influences intensity, persistence, and willingness to solve problems. The source manuscript cites evidence from Farisi (2020), Sembiring (2020), Oktiani (2024), and other studies showing that motivated employees tend to perform more effectively.

Work discipline is a third determinant and reflects compliance with organizational standards, schedules, procedures, and responsibilities. Discipline is particularly important in public service because citizen access often depends on predictable staff availability and timely administrative processing. The attendance data in the source manuscript make discipline a practical rather than purely theoretical concern.

Compensation may influence performance directly because employees perceive remuneration as recognition and economic return for their contribution. The original study went further by positioning compensation as a moderator: a factor that might strengthen or weaken the effects of work environment, motivation, and discipline on performance. This proposition is plausible in settings where compensation varies with performance or effort. However, public-sector compensation is often standardized and structured by administrative rules, raising the question of whether it has sufficient variability to operate as a true moderator.

The study therefore tested four direct effects—work environment, motivation, discipline, and compensation on employee performance—and three moderation effects involving the interaction of compensation with each principal predictor. It also evaluated whether the predictors jointly explained employee performance at the Pauh District Office.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Employee Performance

Employee performance is the level of work accomplishment achieved in relation to assigned responsibilities and organizational standards. Performance can be observed through quantity, quality, timeliness, effectiveness, responsibility, and teamwork. In public organizations, performance also has a service dimension because employee outputs affect citizens and institutional accountability. The source manuscript draws on human-resource literature that treats performance as a function of both individual and contextual factors.

Work Environment and Performance

The work environment consists of physical conditions and nonphysical social-psychological conditions surrounding employees. A conducive environment supports well-being and productivity, while poor conditions create distraction and stress. Research cited in the source manuscript, including Wolor (2023), Rozzaid (2018), Djuhartono (2021), Miftahudin (2024), and Afianti (2025), provides empirical reasons to expect a positive relationship. H1 states that work environment positively affects employee performance.

Motivation and Performance

Motivation determines the direction and persistence of work effort. Employees with stronger motivation are more likely to sustain attention, pursue targets, and respond constructively to obstacles. Studies by Farisi (2020), Sembiring (2020), and Oktiani (2024) support a positive relationship between motivation and performance. H2 states that motivation positively affects employee performance.

Work Discipline and Performance

Work discipline involves adherence to organizational rules, attendance requirements, procedures, and performance standards. Discipline supports reliable service because it reduces avoidable delays and inconsistency. Abdullah (2023), Nasution (2020), and Putra and Kurniawati (2024) are among the studies in the source manuscript reporting positive discipline-performance relationships. H3 states that work discipline positively affects employee performance.

Compensation as Direct Predictor and Moderator

Compensation includes financial and nonfinancial returns received in exchange for work. Fair and appropriate compensation can directly increase performance by signaling recognition and meeting economic expectations. The moderation proposition assumes a stronger mechanism: compensation changes the strength of another predictor's relationship with performance. For example, a supportive work environment or strong motivation might translate more strongly into performance when compensation is perceived as attractive and contingent. The source manuscript cites mixed evidence, making moderation an empirical question rather than an assumption. H4 states that compensation positively affects performance; H5–H7 propose that compensation moderates the effects of work environment, motivation, and discipline, respectively.

RESEARCH METHODS

This quantitative study was conducted at the Pauh District Office, Padang City. The population consisted of 58 employees, and all were included through total sampling. Data were collected using a five-point Likert questionnaire measuring employee performance (Y), work environment (X1), motivation (X2), work discipline (X3), and compensation (M).

Instrument testing in the source manuscript included corrected item-total correlations and Cronbach's alpha. The reported reliability coefficients were 0.893 for employee performance, 0.905 for work environment, 0.889 for motivation, and 0.845 for work discipline, all above the study's 0.60 threshold. Classical-assumption diagnostics indicated tolerance values above 0.10, VIF values below 10, and a normality significance of 0.063. Heteroskedasticity test probabilities were also above 0.05 for the predictors, supporting further regression analysis.

Moderated Regression Analysis (MRA) was implemented hierarchically. Model 1 entered work environment, motivation, and discipline. Model 2 added compensation as a direct predictor. Model 3 added interaction terms: work environment × compensation, motivation × compensation, and discipline × compensation. A statistically significant interaction coefficient was required to conclude moderation. This approach separates direct compensation effects from genuine moderation effects.

Table 1. Employee Performance Indicators, 2023–2025

Performance indicator	2023	2024	2025	Pattern
Work quantity	High	Moderate	Moderate	Declining
Effectiveness	Moderate	High	Moderate	Fluctuating
Timeliness	Moderate	High	Moderate	Fluctuating
Work quality	Low	High	Moderate	Fluctuating
Responsibility	High	High	Moderate	Tending to decline
Teamwork	High	High	Moderate	Tending to decline

Source: Secondary data from the Pauh District Office, 2026.

Table 2. Attendance Data, 2022–2024

Attendance category	2022	2023	2024
Present	40 (68.97%)	51 (87.93%)	50 (86.21%)
Absent	10 (17.24%)	3 (5.17%)	4 (6.90%)
Late	8 (13.79%)	4 (6.90%)	4 (6.90%)
Total employees	58 (100%)	58 (100%)	58 (100%)

Source: Pauh District Office attendance data, as reported in the source manuscript.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Direct Effects

Table 3. Direct Regression Effects

Predictor	B	t	p-value	Interpretation
Work environment	0.454	2.237	0.029	Positive, significant
Motivation	0.360	2.390	0.020	Positive, significant
Work discipline	0.359	2.685	0.010	Positive, significant
Compensation	0.495	4.965	<0.001	Positive, significant

Source: MRA coefficient tables in the source manuscript.

The direct-effect results support the first four hypotheses. Work environment, motivation, and discipline were positive predictors in Model 1, and compensation was a positive predictor when entered in Model 2. The compensation coefficient was statistically strong, indicating that compensation matters for performance in its own right. However, a significant direct effect does not establish a moderating effect, which requires significant interaction terms.

Model Fit and Incremental Explanatory Power

Table 4. Hierarchical Model Summary

Model	Predictors	R	R^2	Adjusted R^2	ΔR^2	Sig. ΔF
1	Environment, motivation, discipline	0.699	0.488	0.459	0.488	<0.001
2	Model 1 + compensation	0.807	0.651	0.624	0.163	<0.001
3	Model 2 + three interaction terms	0.813	0.662	0.614	0.011	0.651

Source: Source manuscript Model Summary output.

Model 1 explained 48.8% of employee-performance variance. Adding compensation increased R^2 to 65.1%, an incremental gain of 16.3 percentage points, and the change was significant. By contrast, adding all three interaction terms increased R^2 by only 1.1 percentage points to 66.2%, and the R^2 change was not statistically significant ($p = 0.651$). This pattern provides a clear statistical distinction: compensation adds substantial direct explanatory power but does not improve the model through moderation.

Moderation Tests

Table 5. Compensation Moderation Tests

Interaction term	B	t	p-value	Moderation conclusion
Work environment × compensation	-0.033	-0.937	0.353	Not significant
Motivation × compensation	0.016	0.552	0.583	Not significant
Work discipline × compensation	0.024	0.914	0.365	Not significant

Source: Source manuscript MRA output.

None of the three interaction terms was significant. Compensation therefore did not moderate the relationship between work environment and performance, motivation and performance, or discipline and performance. This is the central substantive finding of the study. It shows why moderation must be tested explicitly: a variable can be an important direct predictor while failing to change the slope of another predictor.

The finding is plausible in a district-office bureaucracy. If compensation is largely standardized by grade, status, tenure, or government regulations, employees may perceive it as a normative entitlement rather than as a contingent incentive. Under those conditions, compensation can influence overall satisfaction and effort but may not meaningfully alter how workplace conditions, motivation, or discipline translate into performance. In statistical terms, insufficient variability or contingency reduces the likelihood of a strong interaction effect.

The positive work-environment effect indicates that performance benefits from conditions that enable employees to complete tasks efficiently. Improvements should address physical facilities as well as communication, supervisory support, coordination, and interpersonal climate. Because the performance indicators showed fluctuation and

some decline, management should identify specific workflow bottlenecks and service points where environmental constraints are most visible.

The positive motivation effect indicates that employees' willingness to invest effort remains a meaningful performance determinant. Recognition, developmental opportunities, meaningful assignments, leadership feedback, and transparent career information may strengthen motivation without relying solely on additional pay. This is especially relevant when formal compensation structures are relatively fixed.

The positive discipline effect underscores the importance of attendance, punctuality, procedural compliance, and responsibility. The attendance data improved substantially after 2022, but performance indicators remained unstable, suggesting that attendance alone is not sufficient. Discipline needs to include the quality and timeliness of task execution, not merely physical presence.

The strong direct compensation effect should not be ignored simply because moderation was absent. Fair and clear compensation can still influence performance by improving perceived organizational justice and the willingness to maintain effort. The managerial implication is therefore nuanced: compensation is important, but it should be designed and evaluated as a direct human-resource policy rather than assumed to amplify every other performance mechanism.

The overall model also supports an integrated perspective. Work environment, motivation, discipline, and compensation jointly explain a large share of performance variance. Yet the nonsignificant interactions warn against overly complex causal claims. In public organizations, structural characteristics such as civil-service rules, leadership authority, and standardized remuneration may constrain the operation of mechanisms commonly observed in private-sector incentive systems.

Extended Interpretation of the Moderation Model

The hierarchical results provide a particularly useful lesson for applied management research: direct effects and moderation effects answer different questions. Compensation had a strong positive direct coefficient and increased R^2 from 0.488 to 0.651, meaning that it explained substantial additional variation in performance. Yet the interaction block added only 0.011 to R^2 and was not significant. Therefore, compensation matters, but it does not change how strongly work environment, motivation, or discipline are related to performance in this sample.

This distinction prevents an interpretive error common in moderation studies. A researcher may assume that because compensation is important for employees, it must strengthen the effect of other predictors. Statistically, however, moderation requires the relationship between a predictor and outcome to vary across levels of the moderator. The nonsignificant interaction coefficients indicate that the slopes were not detectably different.

Employees with different compensation perceptions showed broadly similar relationships between environment, motivation, discipline, and performance.

The bureaucratic context provides a plausible explanation. Public-sector compensation is frequently determined by employment status, grade, tenure, allowances, and regulations. When employees have limited influence over these structures and pay changes are not tightly contingent on individual performance, compensation may be experienced as a relatively stable background condition. Stable conditions can affect overall attitudes and effort while producing little interaction with day-to-day motivational or environmental factors.

The result does not imply that compensation policy is irrelevant. The significant direct effect and large increase in R^2 after compensation entered the model indicate the opposite. Fairness, adequacy, clarity, and reliability of compensation can shape employees' willingness to maintain effort. The managerial implication is that compensation should be designed well for its direct motivational and justice effects, but leaders should not expect it to substitute for workplace improvement or discipline management.

The work-environment effect suggests that task conditions matter independently of pay. Employees need appropriate facilities, effective coordination, predictable procedures, supportive supervision, and constructive relationships. If these conditions are weak, higher compensation may not eliminate the resulting operational friction. This helps explain the absence of moderation: a poor process remains a poor process even when employees perceive compensation positively.

The motivation finding similarly points to nonfinancial drivers. Recognition, meaningful public-service goals, developmental opportunities, feedback, involvement in problem solving, and confidence in leadership can influence effort. In a structured pay system, these factors may have greater day-to-day variability than compensation. Managers can therefore strengthen motivation through leadership practices that are feasible even when formal pay scales cannot be changed.

Discipline should be understood as more than attendance. The source data show that attendance improved strongly after 2022, yet performance indicators still fluctuated and several dimensions were moderate in 2025. This pattern indicates that physical presence is necessary but not sufficient. Effective discipline includes punctual task completion, procedural accuracy, responsibility for outcomes, responsiveness to citizens, and consistency in teamwork.

The performance-indicator trends also suggest the value of combining survey data with administrative metrics. Perception-based measures can identify employee experiences, while operational indicators show whether service output actually improves. Future performance management should link the two. For example, an improvement in work-environment scores should be examined alongside service completion times, error rates, citizen complaints, or backlog levels.

The decline in responsibility and teamwork to moderate levels in 2025 deserves particular attention because these dimensions are highly relevant to district-office coordination. Management could use team-based service targets, regular case-review meetings, and clearer responsibility matrices to reduce ambiguity. Such interventions may influence performance more directly than additional compensation if the main constraint is coordination rather than effort.

The moderation failure also raises measurement questions. Moderation tests require adequate statistical power because interaction effects are typically smaller and noisier than main effects. With only 58 respondents, the study may have limited power to detect modest interactions. In addition, if compensation responses are clustered within a narrow range due to standardized pay, restricted variance further reduces the possibility of detecting moderation. Future studies should assess the distribution and reliability of the compensation scale explicitly.

Centering predictor and moderator variables before creating interaction terms can also improve interpretability and reduce nonessential multicollinearity in moderation analysis. The source manuscript does not clearly report whether centering was performed. Future research should document this procedure and provide conditional-effect plots, simple-slope tests, and confidence intervals so that any significant moderation can be interpreted substantively rather than only through a p-value.

Comparison across organizational contexts would be valuable. The moderation role of compensation may differ in private firms with performance-based bonuses, state-owned enterprises with mixed remuneration systems, or public agencies where allowances are tied to measurable outputs. A multi-organization study could test whether compensation-system flexibility is itself a higher-level moderator of the compensation interaction effects.

Qualitative inquiry could further explain how employees understand compensation. Some may view it as entitlement, others as recognition, and others as inadequate relative to workload. Interviews could explore which component—salary, allowance, nonfinancial benefits, recognition, or perceived fairness—is most salient. This would help distinguish whether the absence of moderation reflects statistical limitations or genuine employee perceptions.

From a managerial standpoint, the most defensible strategy is balanced. Maintain fair and reliable compensation, but allocate improvement effort to variables with demonstrated direct pathways: improve the work environment, strengthen meaningful motivation, and enforce discipline consistently. Because the four direct predictors jointly explain a large proportion of performance variance, coordinated management of these factors is likely to be more effective than relying on incentive escalation alone.

Practical Framework for Performance Improvement

The statistical findings can be translated into a four-part performance framework. The first component is workplace enablement: ensure that employees have the physical resources, information, coordination, and supervisory support needed to complete tasks. The second is motivation: connect daily duties with public-service purpose, recognition, and opportunities for growth. The third is discipline: define and enforce expectations for attendance, punctuality, procedural accuracy, and responsibility. The fourth is compensation: maintain fairness, clarity, and reliability while recognizing that compensation alone will not transform the effects of the other components.

Implementation should begin with baseline indicators. For work environment, management can monitor facility adequacy, internal communication, coordination delays, and employee climate. For motivation, indicators can include recognition frequency, development participation, perceived meaning, and engagement. For discipline, management can use attendance, lateness, missed deadlines, and procedural compliance. Compensation can be evaluated through perceived fairness and clarity. Performance outcomes should include both supervisor assessments and objective service indicators where available.

Because Model 2 produced the largest meaningful increase in explanatory power, compensation policy deserves attention even though moderation was absent. Managers should distinguish between questions of adequacy and contingency. Employees may respond positively to compensation that is fair and reliable, yet if the amount does not vary with effort, it cannot be expected to strengthen the motivation-performance slope. This distinction is important when designing future incentive experiments or performance allowances.

Leadership should communicate this nuance clearly. If employees are told that better performance will be rewarded when formal rules do not allow meaningful differentiation, credibility may decline. Conversely, when compensation is standardized, leaders can emphasize nonfinancial recognition and transparent career development. Consistency between promises and actual policy is likely to be more motivating than vague incentive rhetoric.

The office can also use team-level improvement projects. Because several performance indicators involve coordination, small teams can be assigned specific service problems, given time to analyze causes, and asked to test process improvements. Recognition can be attached to demonstrated improvement, while formal compensation remains within regulations. This approach strengthens motivation and work environment without depending on individual pay differences.

Finally, the study suggests that public-sector performance research should test institutional conditions directly. Variables such as pay-system rigidity, leadership discretion, civil-service status, and performance-allowance rules may explain why

moderation findings differ across organizations. Including these structural characteristics would improve theoretical precision and help managers understand when compensation is likely to function as a direct predictor, a moderator, or both.

One final implication is the need to distinguish compensation amount from compensation fairness. Even when pay levels are administratively fixed, employees may differ in whether they understand the system, perceive deductions and allowances as transparent, or believe comparable employees are treated fairly. Future studies should separate adequacy, distributive justice, procedural justice, and pay-for-performance perceptions. One of these dimensions may moderate performance relationships even if an overall compensation score does not.

The study also supports regular review of interaction hypotheses before they are embedded in policy. Managers should not assume that increasing one resource will automatically strengthen every other performance driver. Testing specific mechanisms and monitoring whether performance actually changes can prevent costly interventions based on intuitive but unsupported assumptions.

Performance review meetings should therefore focus on evidence rather than assumptions. Managers can compare survey results, attendance, service indicators, and team feedback to determine whether a problem reflects resources, motivation, discipline, compensation, or process design. This diagnostic approach is more likely to produce effective action than automatically responding to every performance problem with additional incentives.

In the longer term, the office could collaborate with the municipal government to examine whether parts of the compensation system can be linked transparently to team or service outcomes without undermining fairness. Such reform would provide a stronger empirical setting for retesting moderation, because compensation would then have greater contingency and variability than in the current structure.

The broader lesson is that performance policy should preserve conceptual clarity. A factor can be important without serving every statistical role proposed for it. In this study, compensation is clearly important as a direct predictor, but the evidence does not support its use as an interaction mechanism. Recognizing that distinction produces more accurate theory and more realistic managerial expectations.

For public-sector managers, this distinction supports disciplined experimentation: improve one management mechanism, specify the expected pathway to performance, and evaluate whether the evidence supports that pathway before scaling the intervention. Such practice can make limited resources more effective and strengthen accountability for human-resource policy decisions.

CONCLUSION

Work environment, motivation, work discipline, and compensation each have positive and significant direct effects on employee performance at the Pauh District Office, Padang City. The first model explains 48.8% of performance variance, while adding compensation increases explanatory power to 65.1%. The full model explains 66.2%. However, compensation does not significantly moderate any of the three principal predictor-performance relationships because all interaction terms are nonsignificant and the incremental R^2 of the interaction block is also nonsignificant.

The findings imply that compensation should be treated primarily as a direct performance determinant in this setting, while improvements in work environment, motivation, and discipline should be pursued through their own management mechanisms. The study is limited by a small single-office sample, cross-sectional self-report data, and the relatively fixed nature of public-sector compensation. Future research should compare offices with different compensation systems, test alternative moderators such as transformational leadership or organizational climate, and use mixed methods to investigate how employees interpret pay, recognition, and performance expectations.

REFERENCES

Abdullah, R. (2023). Pengaruh Disiplin Kerja Terhadap Kinerja Karyawan pada PT. Harapan Gina Pratama Makassar. Paradoks: Jurnal Ilmu Ekonomi, 6(2), 85-92.

Afianti, F. (2025). Analisis Pengaruh Lingkungan Kerja Terhadap Kinerja Karyawan Di Indonesia. Economics and Digital Business Review, 6(1), 237-244.

Agustiyanto, K. (2019). Pengaruh Lingkungan Kerja dan Motivasi Terhadap Kepuasan Kerja dan Dampaknya Terhadap Kinerja Pegawai pada Kantor Pertanahan Kabupaten Merangin Provinsi Jambi. J-MAS (Jurnal Manajemen Dan Sains), 4(1), 142. https://doi.org/10.33087/jmas.v4i1.82

Akhiryan, M. T., & Ahmadi, M. A. (2024). Pengaruh Kompensasi dan Motivasi Kerja terhadap Kinerja. Culture education and technology research (Cetera), 1(3), 56-67.

Apriyanti, D., & Setyaningsih, I. (2025). Pengaruh Kompensasi dan Disiplin Kerja Terhadap Kinerja Karyawan. Indonesian Journal of Management Science, 4(2), 189-195.

Arifin, A., Magito, M., Perkasa, D. H., & Febrian, W. D. (2023). Pengaruh Kompensasi, Kompetensi dan Konflik Kerja terhadap Kinerja Karyawan. Global: Jurnal Lentera Bitep, 1(01), 24-33.

Armantari, N. L. I., Sugianingrat, I. A. P. W., & Mashyuni, I. A. (2021). Pengaruh Kompensasi Terhadap Kinerja Karyawan Melalui Motivasi Kerja Pada CV. Duta Niaga Bali Denpasar. WidyaAmrita: Jurnal Manajemen, Kewirausahaan dan Pariwisata, 1(1), 275-289.

Arviyanti, D., & Widyaningsih, M. (2025). Pengaruh Kompensasi, Lingkungan Kerja dan Motivasi Kerja terhadap Kinerja Karyawan PT BPRS Sukowati Sragen. Jurnal Maps (Manajemen Perbankan Syariah), 8(2), 124-135.

Aulia Pilda, R., Efendi, A., & Damingun, D. (2025). Pengaruh Disiplin Kerja dan Lingkungan Kerja terhadap Kinerja Pegawai pada Inspektorat Daerah Provinsi Kalimantan Timur. Jurnal Riset Manajemen Dan Akuntansi , 5 (2), 01–15.

Budiasa. (2021). Beban Kerja dan Kinerja Sumber Daya Manusia. Penerbit CV. Pena Persada.

Darhan, & Rahayu, S. (2022). Lingkungan Kerja dan Gaji berpengaruh terhadap Kepuasan Kerja Karyawan PT. Yamaha Mataram Sakti Cabang Muara Bungo. Jurnal Manajemen Sains, Vo. 2(No.2), Hal.105-144.

Daspar. (2020). Pengaruh Lingkungan, Motivasi dan Disiplin Kerja Terhadap Kinerja Karyawan. EKOMABIS: Jurnal Ekonomi Manajemen Bisnis, Volume 01(Issue 02), Hal.159-166.

Dasril. (2021). Pengaruh Motivasi dan Disiplin Terhadap Kinerja Pegawai Dinas Pekerjaan Umum, Tata Ruang dan Pertanahan Kabupaten Solok Selatan. Jurnal Ilmiah Pendidikan Scholastic, Vol.5 No.

Enny, M. (2019). Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia. Cetakan Pertama. Ubhara Manajemen Pers. Surabaya.

Fachrezi, F. R., & Prasetiyo, B. (2024). Pengaruh Kompensasi dan Motivasi terhadap Kinerja Pegawai. Reviu Akuntansi, Manajemen, dan Bisnis, 4(1), 107-115.

Farida. (2016). Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia II. Ponorogo: Umpo Ponorogo Press.

Faturrahman, H., Supriyadi, L., & Yaman, B. (2025). Pengaruh Pelatihan Dan Kompensasi Terhadap Kinerja Pegawai Ditjen Binapenta Dan PKK KEMNAKER RI Melalui Komitmen Organisasi Sebagai Variabel Intervening. Journal of Social Science and Multidisciplinary Analysis, 2(1), 1-19.

Fau, F. T. (2021). Pengaruh Disiplin Kerja Terhadap Kinerja Pegawai di Kantor Camat SOMAMBAWA KABUPATEN NIAS SELATAN. Jurnal Ilmiah Mahasiswa Nias Selatan, Vo. 4(No.2), 203-212.

Fitrah, I. N., & Prasetyo, W. B. (2024). Pengaruh Work Life Balance, Motivasi Kerja, Dan Lingkungan Kerja Terhadap Kinerja Karyawan Dimoderasi Oleh Kompensasi pada Pt. Xyz Konstruksi. Jurnal Bisnis Dan Manajemen, 4(1), 1-18.

Ghozali, I. (2016). "Aplikasi Analisis Multivariate Dengan Program SPSS." Semarang: Badan Penerbit Universitas Diponegoro.

Gunawan, P. D. P. A., Sabudi, I. N. S., & Sihombing, I. H. H. (2024). Pengaruh lingkungan kerja terhadap kinerja karyawan Hotel Fairfield By Marriott Bali South Kuta. Jurnal Sosial Teknologi, 4(10), 816-825.

Handoko, N. T. P., & Susbiyani, A. (2022). Pengaruh kompensasi dan lingkungan kerja terhadap kinerja pegawai dengan motivasi kerja sebagai variabel intervening. Jurnal Manajemen, 14(1), 181-190.

Hartatik, P. I. (2014). Buku Praktis Mengembangkan SDM. Jogjakarta: Suka Buku.

Hasibuan, M. S. (2016). Manajemen sumber daya manusia, edisi revisi, Jakarta: PT. Bumi aksara.

Hasibuan, M. S. . (2016). Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia (EdisiRevis).

Hendri Sembiring. (2020). Pengaruh Motivasi dan Lingkungan Kerja terhadap Kinerja Karyawan Pada Bank Sinarmas Medan. Jurakunman, Jurakunman(No.1), Hal.10-23.

Hosnawati. (2016). Pengaruh Motivasi kerja dan komitmen organisasi terhadap kinerja karyawan dengan etos kerja sebagai variabel Moderasi. Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta.

Kurniati, K. J., & Heryanda, K. K. (2023). Pengaruh Motivasi Kerja Terhadap Kinerja Karyawan Dengan Kompensasi Sebagai Variabel Moderasi (Studi Pada PT. Japfa Comfeed Indonesia Tbk Unit Pupuan). Bisma: Jurnal Manajemen, 9(2), 155-163.

Liman, I., & Yoyo, T. (2025). Pengaruh Self Efficacy, Employee Engagement, dan Kompensasi Terhadap Kinerja Karyawan Dengan Motivasi Sebagai Pemoderasi. eCo-Buss, 7(3), 1969-1983.

Lova, A. N., Budaya, I., & Liantifa, M. (2026). The Green Marketing Mix as a Determinant of Green Purchase Decisions for Sustainability Based SME Products in Kerinci Regency. Journal of Innovative and Creativity, 6(1), 7618–7634

Ludin, I., Mukti, S., & Rohman, I. S. (2023). Pengaruh kompensasi dan disiplin kerja terhadap kinerja pegawai (Studi kasus pada pegawai desa di Kecamatan Plered). Value: Journal of Management and Business, 8(1), 11-26.

Lukman Nasution. (2020). Pengaruh Disiplin Kerja Terhadap Kinerja Pegawai Negeri Sipil (PNS) di Lingkungan Ajudan Jenderal Daerah Militer (AJENDAM) – I BUKIT BARISAN MEDAN. JURNAL DARMA AGUNG, Vo. 28(No.2), 187-210.

Mahatani, C., Noch, M. Y., Mansur, M., & Pongtiku, A. (2025). Pengaruh Lingkungan Kerja Terhadap Kinerja Pegawai Melalui Motivasi Kerja Sebagai Variabel Mediasi. Advances in Management & Financial Reporting, 3(3), 820-830.

Manaf, F. R., Saputra, F. E., & Candra, A. (2026). Pengaruh Disiplin Kerja Terhadap Kinerja Karyawan Dengan Kompensasi Sebagai Variabel Moderasi Pada Hotel Marcopolo Bandar Lampung. Jurnal Manajemen Motivasi, 22(1), 157-165.

Maulana, N. F. A., Rahmawati, E. D., & Hadi, N. (2024). Pengaruh Motivasi Terhadap Kinerja Pegawai Dengan Kepuasan Sebagai Variabel Intervening Pada Dinas Penanaman Modal dan Pelayanan Terpadu Satu Pintu Kabupaten Sukoharjo. Manajemen Kreatif Jurnal, 2(3), 99-110.

Meliza, J. (2024). Pengaruh Lingkungan, Motivasi Serta Disiplin Kerja Terhadap Kinerja Pegawai Kantor Camat Rumbai Barat Kota Pekanbaru. UNIVERSITAS LANCANG KUNING PEKANBARU.

Miftahudin, M. (2024). Pengaruh Lingkungan Kerja Terhadap Kinerja Karyawan Pada PT. PLN Distribusi Jakarta Raya. Jurnal Minfo Polgan, 13(1), 505-511.

Mudji Kuswinarno. (2024). Peran Lingkungan Kerja dalam Meningkatkan Kepuasan Kerja Karyawan Pabrik Rokok. Jurnal Manajemen Kewirausahaan Dan Teknologi (JUMAKET), 1(No.2), 88-97.

Nurvi Oktiani. (2024). Pengaruh Motivasi dan Disiplin Kerja Terhadap Kinerja Karyawan di PT Samugara Artajaya. JIBEMA : Jurnal Ilmu Bisnis, Ekonomi, Manajemen Dan Akuntasi, 1(3).

Oktikasari, F. Y., & Suyanto, S. (2023). Analisis Kompetensi Dan Motivasi Terhadap Kinerja Pegawai Melalui Kompensasi Sebagai Variabel Moderasi. Journal of Economics and Business UBS, 12(5), 3224-3241.

Pamungkas, B., & Nursyamsi, I. (2024). Pengaruh motivasi dan disiplin kerja terhadap kinerja pegawai. Jurnal Penelitian Ekonomi Manajemen dan Bisnis, 3(4), 222-232.

Pamungkas, DC, Rauf, M., Bhisma, M., Chalim, N., & Jakaria, RB (2024). Pengaruh Pemberian Kompensasi Terhadap Kinerja Karyawan Pada Pt. Purnama Jaya Teknik. Neraca: Jurnal Ekonomi, Manajemen Dan Akuntansi , 2 (9), 598–603.

Permana, D., & Rachmawati, S. (2024). Pengaruh disiplin kerja dan motivasi kerja terhadap kinerja pegawai. Jurnal Ekonomi Bisnis Antartika, 2(1), 20-27.

Permatasari, I. (2024). Pengaruh Disiplin Kerja, Motivasi dan Tunjangan terhadap Kinerja Pegawai. Jurnal Ilmiah Edunomika , 8 (1).

Prasastono, N. (2012). Pengaruh Gaya Kepemimpinan dan Kompensasi Terhadap Motivasi Kerja Karyawan Hotel Muria Semarang. Jurnal Ilmiah Dinamika Kepariwisataan, 11(2), 32-39.

Priyono. (2016). Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif. Surabaya: Zifatama Publishing.

Putra, F. I., & Kurniawati, D. T. (2024). Pengaruh disiplin kerja dan kompensasi terhadap kinerja pegawai. Jurnal Kewirausahaan dan Inovasi, 3(4), 1060-1068.

Putri, L. D., & Endratno, H. (2023). Pengaruh Beban Kerja, Kompensasi dan Pengalaman Kerja Terhadap Kinerja Karyawan Bank Jawa Tengah Cabang Purwokerto. Jurnal Ilmiah Mahasiswa Manajemen, Bisnis Dan Akuntansi (JIMMBA), 5(4), 375-386.

Rafli Praditya Ardhana. (2024). Pengaruh Lingkungan Kerja Dan Beban Kerja Terhadap Kinerja Karyawan PT. Gunung Mutiara Nedindo. Jurnal Kewirausahaan Dan Multi Talenta (JKMT), 2(1), 22-30.

Rian, A., Randika, F., & Lita, P. S. (2024). Pengaruh Budaya Organisasi Dan Motivasi Terhadap Kinerja Pegawai Itwasda Polda Provinsi Papua Dengan Moderasi Variabel Kompensasi. Jurnal Mahasiswa Entrepreneur (JME) FEB UNARS, 9(3), 1784-1794.

Rianda, S., & Winarno, A. (2022). Pengaruh Kompensasi Dan Lingkungan Kerja Fisik Terhadap Kinerja Pegawai Pada Pt Rajasaland Bandung. Publik: Jurnal Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia, Administrasi Dan Pelayanan Publik, 9(2), 192-203.

Rosadi, A., Amir, J. F., Widyastuti, T., & Suyanto, S. (2024). Analisis Lingkungan Kerja Dalam Memoderasi Pengaruh Kemampuan Kerja Dan Kompensasi Terhadap Kinerja Pegawai Sekretariat Daerah Kabupaten Bogor. Innovative: Journal Of Social Science Research, 4(5), 1129-1138.

Safitry, W., & Andri, S. (2025). Pengaruh Kepemimpin Pemberdayaan Terhadap Loyalitas Perawat Dengan Keterlibatan Kerja Sebagai Variabel Intervening Pada RSIA Zainab Pekanbaru. eCo-Fin, 7(1), 273-284.

Salman Farisi. (2020). Pengaruh Motivasi dan Disiplin Kerja Terhadap Kinerja Karyawan PT. Perkebunan Nusantara V (Persero) Kebun Tanah Putih Provinsi Riau. Jurnal Humaniora (Jurnal Ilmu Sosial, Ekonomi Dan Hukum), Vol.4(No.1), 15-33.

Saputri, FA, & Febriana, A. (2024). Penilaian Kinerja, Kompensasi, Lingkungan Kerja dan Pengaruhnya pada Kinerja Pegawai Balai Besar Pemali Juana. Jurnal Ekonomi Dan Bisnis , 3 (4), 242–253.

Sari, A., Zamzam, F., & Syamsudin, H. (2020). Pengaruh kepemimpinan, kompensasi, dan motivasi terhadap kinerja karyawan. Jurnal Nasional Manajemen Pemasaran & SDM, 1(2), 1-18.

Sari, G. P., Rozikin, I., & Nababan, J. C. E. (2023). Konsep Dan Terapan Sistem Penggajian/Kompensasi Dalam Peningkatan Kinerja Pegawai Sektor Publik. EKOBIS: Jurnal Ilmu Manajemen dan Akuntansi, 11(1), 108-118.

Simatupang, RKL, & Moeljono, M. (2023). Pengaruh Kepuasan Kerja, Lingkungan Kerja dan Kompensasi Terhadap Kinerja Karyawan dengan Motivasi Sebagai Variabel Moderating. IJMA (Jurnal Manajemen dan Akuntansi Indonesia) , 4 (2), 152-161.

Sitepu, L. E. B., Akbar, A., & Gultom, P. (2024). Pengaruh Kompensasi dan Disiplin Kerja terhadap Kinerja Karyawan dengan Motivasi Sebagai Variabel Moderasi. ASSET: Jurnal Manajemen dan Bisnis, 7(1).

Sumiati, S., & Sumitra, I. A. (2023). Pengaruh Gaya Kepemimpinan Dan Disiplin Kerja Terhadap Kinerja Pegawai Pada Dinas Pangan Dan Perikanan Kabupaten Dharmasraya. Jurnal Economina, 2(5), 1117-1134

Sugiyono. (2015). Metode Penelitian Kombinasi (Mix Methods). Bandung: Alfabeta.

Suswati, E., & Nasir, J. A. (2025). Pengaruh Kompensasi Dan Disiplin Kerja Terhadap Kepuasan Kerja Serta Dampaknya Terhadap Kinerja Pegawai (Studi Pada Pegawai Bps Di Jawa Timur). Jurnal Pendidikan Indonesia, 6(4).

Syuchriah, N., & Suwandi, S. (2025). Pengaruh Kompensasi Terhadap Kinerja Karyawan dengan Remunerasi sebagai Variabel Moderasi. Jurnal Riset Manajemen Dan Ekonomi (JRIME), 3(3), 66-76.

Tahir, S., & Ramli, M. (2025). Efektifitas Motivasi dan Kecerdasan Emosional dalam Meningkatkan Kinerja Pegawai. Jurnal Penelitian Manajemen dan Akuntansi , 5 (1), 64-74.

Teja, P., Agussalim, A., & Hadya, R. (2025). Pengaruh Komunikasi dan Kompensasi terhadap Kepuasan Kerja Aparatur Sipil Negara (ASN) Departemen Dalam Negeri Kota Padang. Jurnal Riset Manajemen, 2(1), 80-90.

Tjiong, F. L. (2018). Pengaruh Kepuasan Kerja terhadap Kinerja Karyawan melalui Motivasi Kerja pada CV. Union Event Planner. Surabaya. AGORA, Vol.6(No.1). https://publication.petra.ac.id/index.php/manajemen-bisnis/article/view/6483

Tjipto Djuhartono. (2021). Pengaruh Lingkungan Kerja Terhadap Kinerja Karyawan Pada PT National Finance. Jurnal ARASTIRMA Fakultas Ekonomi Program Studi Manajemen UNPAM, 1(2), 336-346.

Widayati, C. (2017). Pengaruh Gaya Kepemimpinan Transformasional, Motivasi Dan Kompensasi Terhadap Kinerja Karyawan PT Hanken Indonesia. Jurnal Ekonomi, 22(3), 466–485. https://doi.org/10.24912/je.v22i3.286

Wolor, C. W. (2023). Pengaruh Lingkungan Kerja, Budaya Kerja, dan Beban Kerja Terhadap Kinerja Karyawan. Jurnal Manuhara: Pusat Penelitian Ilmu Manajemen Dan Bisnis, Vol.2(Vo.1), 01-10.

Yonathan, H., & Barusman, M. Y. S. (2025). Pengaruh Motivasi Kerja, Disiplin Kerja, dan Kompensasi Terhadap Kinerja Karyawan (Studi Kasus Pada Karyawan PT. Florindo Makmur (SB7). eCo-Fin, 7(1), 261-272.

Yudiningtyas, L. A., & Winarko, R. (2024). Kinerja Pegawai: Peran Motivasi dalam Pengaruh Komitmen Dan Lingkungan Kerja. Jurnal Inspirasi Ilmu Manajemen, 3(1), 46-53.

Yusron Rozzaid. (2018). Pengaruh Lingkungan Kerja, Etos Kerja dan Disiplin Kerja Terhadap Kinerja Karyawan (Studi Kasus Pada Pemkab Bondowoso). Jurnal Manajemen Dan Bisnis Indonesia, 4(2), 174-188.