

## Relationship Between Compensation, Motivation and Work Discipline Towards Employee Performance at RSD Dr. Soebandi Jember District

Marolop Bungaran Tua S<sup>1</sup>, Dwi Cahyono<sup>2</sup>, Diah Probowulan<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1,2,3</sup>Muhammadiyah University of Jember, Indonesia



DOI : <https://doi.org/10.61796/icossh.v2i1.201>



### Sections Info

#### Article history:

Submitted: January 31, 2025

Final Revised: February 28, 2025

Accepted: March 17, 2025

Published: March 30, 2025

#### Keywords:

Compensation

Work discipline

Work motivation

### ABSTRACT

**Objective:** This research was conducted at dr Soebandi Regional Hospital. This study consists of two variables, namely the independent variable (free), which consists of compensation (X1), work discipline (X2), and work motivation (X3), while the dependent variable (bound) is Employee Performance (y). This study aims to determine whether there is a significant influence between compensation, work discipline, and work motivation on employee performance with a sample of 162 respondents. **Method:** The data collection methods used in this study include interviews, observations, questionnaires, and literature studies. The data analysis technique in this study employs multiple linear analysis with data processing using Statistical Product and Service Solutions (SPSS) software 20. The data analysis methods include validity test, reliability test, multicollinearity test, heteroscedasticity test, partial t-test, F-test (simultaneous test), and coefficient of determination (R<sup>2</sup>). **Results:** The results of this study indicate that the variables of compensation, work discipline, and work motivation have a simultaneous influence on employee performance. Partially, the compensation and work motivation variables show an influence. Based on the results of the analysis of the coefficient of determination, the R-square value is 0.810 or 81%. **Novelty:** This study provides empirical evidence of the influence of compensation and work motivation on employee performance in a hospital setting, emphasizing the importance of these factors in workforce management.

## INTRODUCTION

An employee or employee is any person who works well for an institution, whether government or private institution and receives remuneration in accordance with regulations or agreements. (Department of Education and Culture, 1995) The amount of remuneration has been determined and known in advance, so that the employee or employee definitely know the remuneration/compensation he will receive. This compensation will be used by the employee and his family to meet their needs. If the remuneration received is good enough, then the needs that can be met by an employee will be better too. Thus, job satisfaction also improves. Having appropriate compensation for employees who work physically and mentally is very important because compensation is an expense and cost for the institution. The institution hopes that the compensation paid will receive greater work performance rewards from its employees. So, the value of employee work performance must be greater than the compensation paid by the institution, so that the institution gets the profits or credibility it desires. Based on the description above, it is clear the importance of this compensation issue for employees and institutions (Bakti, 2020).

Apart from compensation issues, workplaces or organizations must pay attention to employee work discipline issues. As Singomedjo in Agustin (2020) states that discipline is a person's willingness and readiness to fulfill and comply with applicable

regulatory norms, without good discipline it will be difficult for organizations or agencies to achieve optimal results.

High performance can be formed by the awareness of every leader of an organization or agency to provide direction regarding the work carried out by each employee so that employees can better understand the responsibilities of the work they do. If employee performance is good, organizational goals will be easily achieved. Conversely, if employee performance is poor, organizational goals will be difficult to achieve.

Results of a preliminary study with RSD personnel manager dr. Soebandi found that the level of employee discipline in the period 2020 to August 2023 showed a fluctuating trend, where in late 2020, alpha and absenteeism reached 32.6%. In 2021 there was a decrease to 26.2%, in 2022 there was an increase again to 28.1% and in the period from 2023 to August it was discovered that employees who were late, alpha and truant had decreased from the previous year, namely 16.6%. This happens because of the agency's policy where work discipline or absenteeism is used as a basis for calculating the compensation given to employees of RSD Dr. Soebandi, Jember Regency.

## RESEARCH METHOD

This research design uses analytical observational using a cross sectional approach. This research design uses analytical observational. The sample for this research is 60 people. The variables in this research are the independent variables, namely compensation, work motivation and work discipline, and the dependent variable in this research is employee performance. Bivariate analysis was carried out on two variables which were thought to have a relationship or correlation (Notoatmodjo, 2018). Bivariate analysis in this research aims to determine the relationship between compensation, work motivation and work discipline on employee performance. at RSD dr. Soebandi.

Multivariate analysis is an analysis using statistical methods that allows researchers or writers to conduct research on 2 variables simultaneously. The function of this analysis is to find out the relationship between the independent variables, namely compensation, work motivation and work discipline, and the dependent variable, namely employee performance at the same time. The analysis used in this research is logistic regression using SPSS 25 software

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

**Table 1.** Distribution of Respondent Characteristics Based on Age, Gender, Position, education and Length of service.

| Variabel           | Frekuensi<br>(n) | (%)   |
|--------------------|------------------|-------|
| <b>Age</b>         |                  |       |
| 18 - 25 years      | 26               | 16.04 |
| 26 - 45 years      | 127              | 78.39 |
| More than 45 years | 9                | 5.57  |

| <b>Gender</b>                 |     |       |
|-------------------------------|-----|-------|
| Male                          | 52  | 32.09 |
| Female                        | 110 | 67.91 |
| <b>Education</b>              |     |       |
| Elementary School             | 2   | 1.23  |
| Junior High School            | 0   | 0.00  |
| Senior High School            | 17  | 10.49 |
| Diploma                       | 49  | 30.25 |
| Bachelor                      | 94  | 58.03 |
| <b>Position of Job</b>        |     |       |
| Medical Personnel             | 77  | 47.53 |
| Nursing                       | 22  | 13.58 |
| Midwife                       | 30  | 18.52 |
| Pharmaceutical staf           | 5   | 3.08  |
| Nutrsionist                   | 2   | 1.24  |
| Medical Laboratory technology | 4   | 2.47  |
| Management Support            | 22  | 13.58 |
| <b>Length of Work</b>         |     |       |
| < 1 years                     | 24  | 14.81 |
| 1 - 5 years                   | 56  | 34.57 |
| 5 - 10 years                  | 50  | 30.86 |
| More than 10 years            | 32  | 19.76 |

Source : Data is processed (2025)

Based on table 4.1 above, it can be seen that of the 162 respondents, the majority of respondents were aged between 26 - 45 years, namely 127 people (78.39%), as many as 110 people (67.91%) were female, the majority had a recent educational history, namely a bachelor's degree. / masters as many as 94 people (58.03%), most of them have positions as medical personnel as many as 77 people (47.53%) and most respondents have worked for 1 - 5 years at RSD dr. Soebandi, namely 56 people (34.57%).

### Compensation

**Table 2.** Frequency distribution and percentage of compensation.

| No             | Indikator           | F<br>Score | Skor       |           |          |          | Amount      | Average |
|----------------|---------------------|------------|------------|-----------|----------|----------|-------------|---------|
|                |                     |            | STS<br>(1) | TS<br>(2) | N<br>(3) | S<br>(4) |             |         |
| 1.             | Incentive<br>(X1.1) | F          |            | 18        | 54       | 72       | 18          | 3,44    |
|                |                     | Fx s       |            | 36        | 162      | 288      | 90          |         |
| 2.             | Salary (X1.2)       | F          |            |           | 85       | 68       | 9           | 3,33    |
|                |                     | Fx s       |            |           | 255      | 240      | 45          |         |
| 3.             | Bonuses<br>(X1.3)   | F          |            | 9         | 45       | 104      | 4           | 3,63    |
|                |                     | Fx s       |            | 18        | 135      | 416      | 20          |         |
| 4.             | Benefits<br>(X1.4)  | F          |            | 4         | 90       | 54       | 14          | 3,48    |
|                |                     | Fx s       |            | 8         | 270      | 216      | 70          |         |
| <b>Avarage</b> |                     |            |            |           |          |          | <b>3,47</b> |         |

Source : Data is processed (2025)

From the table above, it can be seen that the respondents' answers to the compensation variable are 3.47 and in the high or good category, meaning that the compensation variable is influenced by the four indicators, namely incentives, salaries, bonuses, wages and allowances which are considered good. by respondents. Of the four indicators, the bonus indicator has the highest value so that the best compensation is the bonus.

**Table 3.** Frequency distribution and percentage of work motivation.

| No             | Indikator                    | F Score | Score   |        |       |       |        | Amount      | Average |
|----------------|------------------------------|---------|---------|--------|-------|-------|--------|-------------|---------|
|                |                              |         | STS (1) | TS (2) | N (3) | S (4) | SS (5) |             |         |
| 1.             | Physiologis needs (X2.1)     | F       |         | 13     | 54    | 81    | 14     | 162         | 3,59    |
|                |                              | Fx s    |         | 26     | 162   | 324   | 70     | 582         |         |
| 2.             | Safety needs (X2.2)          | F       |         | 4      | 86    | 40    | 11     | 162         | 3,02    |
|                |                              | Fx s    |         | 8      | 258   | 160   | 55     | 481         |         |
| 3.             | Kebutuhan Social (X2.3)      | F       |         | 4      | 72    | 68    | 18     | 162         | 3,61    |
|                |                              | Fx s    |         | 8      | 216   | 272   | 90     | 586         |         |
| 4.             | Need for appreciation (X2.4) | F       |         | 9      | 45    | 90    | 18     | 162         | 3,72    |
|                |                              | Fx s    |         | 18     | 135   | 360   | 90     | 603         |         |
| 5.             | Self actualization (X2.5)    | F       |         |        | 81    | 63    | 18     | 162         | 3,61    |
|                |                              | Fx s    |         |        | 243   | 252   | 90     | 585         |         |
| <b>Average</b> |                              |         |         |        |       |       |        | <b>3,51</b> |         |

Source : Data is processed (2025)

From the table above, the results of the questionnaire answers from respondents show that the work motivation variable at RSD Dr. Soebandi Jember Regency is running well. This is proven by the average score which shows 3.51. This shows that on average the respondents' answers stated that the existing work motivation would be able to improve the performance of employees at RSD Dr. Soebandi with the highest indicator is the need for awards on average scores 3,72.

### Work Discipline

**Table 4.** Frequency distribution and percentage of work discipline.

| No | Indikator          | F Score | Score   |        |       |       |        | Amount | Average |
|----|--------------------|---------|---------|--------|-------|-------|--------|--------|---------|
|    |                    |         | STS (1) | TS (2) | N (3) | S (4) | SS (5) |        |         |
| 1. | Punctuality (X3.1) | F       |         | 4      | 95    | 40    | 23     | 162    | 3,5     |
|    |                    | Fx s    |         | 8      | 285   | 160   | 115    | 568    |         |
| 2. | Infrastructure     | F       |         | 9      | 45    | 90    | 18     | 162    | 3,72    |

|                |                                      |      |    |     |     |     |     |             |
|----------------|--------------------------------------|------|----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-------------|
|                |                                      | Fx s | 18 | 135 | 360 | 90  | 603 |             |
| 3.             | Have high responsibility (X3.3)      | F    |    | 81  | 58  | 23  | 162 |             |
|                |                                      | Fx s |    | 243 | 232 | 115 | 590 | 3,64        |
| 4.             | Compliance with company rules (X3.4) | F    | 18 | 49  | 68  | 27  | 162 |             |
|                |                                      | Fx s | 36 | 147 | 272 | 135 | 590 | 3,64        |
| <b>Average</b> |                                      |      |    |     |     |     |     | <b>3,62</b> |

Source : Data is processed (2025)

Based on the table above, it can be seen that the respondents' answers to the work discipline variable are 3.62 and are in the high or good category, meaning that the work discipline variable is influenced by the four indicators, namely punctuality, being good, having a high level of responsibility. , and compliance with workplace rules. Of the four indicators, the indicator of using infrastructure well has the highest value, namely 3.72. This shows work discipline.

### Employee performance

**Table 5.** Frequency distribution and percentage of employee performance.

| No             | Indikator          | F Score | Score   |        |        |       |        | Amount      | Ave rage |
|----------------|--------------------|---------|---------|--------|--------|-------|--------|-------------|----------|
|                |                    |         | STS (1) | TS (2) | N (3 ) | S (4) | SS (5) |             |          |
| 1              | Quality(Y1) (Y1)   | F       |         |        | 81     | 58    | 23     | 162         |          |
|                |                    | Fx s    |         |        | 243    | 232   | 115    | 590         | 3,64     |
| 2.             | Quantity (Y2)      | F       |         | 18     | 49     | 68    | 27     | 162         |          |
|                |                    | Fx s    |         | 36     | 147    | 272   | 135    | 590         | 3,64     |
| 3.             | Punctuali ty(Y3)   | F       |         | 4      | 76     | 64    | 18     | 162         |          |
|                |                    | Fx s    |         | 8      | 228    | 256   | 90     | 582         | 3,63     |
| 4.             | Effectiveness (Y4) | F       |         | 4      | 94     | 22    | 23     | 162         |          |
|                |                    | Fx s    |         | 8      | 282    | 88    | 115    | 493         | 3,04     |
| 5.             | Independence (Y5)  | F       | 4       | 9      | 54     | 81    | 14     | 162         |          |
|                |                    | Fx s    | 4       | 18     | 162    | 324   | 70     | 578         | 3,56     |
| <b>Average</b> |                    |         |         |        |        |       |        | <b>3,51</b> |          |

Source : Data is processed (2025)

Based on the table above, it is known that the respondents' answers to employee performance variables, with an average of 3.51, are in the high or good category, meaning that employee performance variables are influenced by four indicators, namely work quality, quantity, timeliness, effectiveness and independence. Of the four indicators, the work quality and quantity indicators have the highest value.

**Table 6.** Calculated t value.

| Variabel        | T table | T count | sig.t |
|-----------------|---------|---------|-------|
| Compensation    | 1,694   | -1.538  | 0,123 |
| Work Motivation | 1,694   | 10.330  | 0,000 |
| Work discipline | 1,694   | 4.386   | 0,000 |

In the table above it can be seen that the calculated t value (-1.538) < t table (1.694) and sig (0.123) > 0.05. This shows that H0 is accepted and Ha is rejected. Which means that the compensation variable has no effect on employee performance. Thus the first hypothesis is rejected. This is because the compensation indicator, namely allowances, is given to employees based on the length of time the employee has worked at RSD dr. Soebandi, then the incentives given to employees are not in accordance with the work carried out by employees, so the incentives given do not provide a sense of enthusiasm to employees and are still unable to improve employee performance, therefore compensation has no effect on employee performance at RSD dr. Soebandi.

## CONCLUSION

**Fundamental Findings :** the conclusion of this research is that compensation, work motivation and work discipline have an influence on employee performance at RSD dr. Soebandi, Jember district. **Implication :** Improving compensation, motivation, and discipline can significantly enhance employee performance and operational efficiency in hospital work environments. **Limitation :** the limitation of this research is that the research was only carried out in one work unit without distinguishing the workload of the staff. **Future Research :** future research can carry out further research regarding factors that influence employee performance in terms of the workload of each employee.

## REFERENCES

- Adamy, M(2016). Manajemen Sumber daya Manusia. Ljokseumawe:Unimal press
- Adhari, I. Z. (2020). Optimalisasi Kinerja Karyawan Menggunakan Pendekatan Knowledge Management & Motivasi Kerja. Pasuruan: Qiara Media.
- Agustin, D. 2020. Pengaruh Kompetensi, Motivasi dan Disiplin Kerja Terhadap Kinerja Karyawan Studi Kasus Pada Karyawan Konveksi Kalary Sukoharjo. Skripsi. Universitas Muhammadiyah. Surakarta.
- Alfian Amidhan Akbar (2015). Pengaruh kompensasi, motivasi, disiplin kerja terhadap kinerja Karyawan. CV. Cemara Production. Sitohang Sekolah Tinggi.
- Arianto, Nurmin. 2020. Pengaruh Motivasi dan Lingkungan Kerja Terhadap Kinerja Karyawan. Jurnal Ilmiah, Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia, JENIUS. Vol. 3, No. 3
- Arif Muhammad, Maulana Taufik dan Lesmana Taufik Muhammad. Pengaruh Disiplin kerja dan kemampuan kerja terhadap prestasi kerja karyawan. Sumatera utara:Meda, 2020. Ilmu Ekonomi Indonesia (STIESIA) Surabaya
- Bagong Suyanto & Sutinah, Metode Penelitian Sosial: Berbagai Alternatif Pendekatan, (Jakarta: Kencana, 2007)

- Bakti, U., & Hairudin, H. (2020). Pengaruh disiplin terhadap prestasi kerja karyawan pada pt. semen baturaja (persero),tbk. panjang plant. *GEMA : Jurnal gentiaras manajemen dan akuntansi*,12(2), 115-124. <https://doi.org/10.47768/gema.v12i2.193>
- Carvalho Cruz Da Adelina and Riana Gede I (2020). Motivation on Job Satisfaction and Employee Performance. 7,13-23
- Darsono dan Tjatjunc Suswandoko, 2011, *Manajemen Sumber DayaManusia*, Jakarta: Nusantara Consulting.
- Departemen Agama RI, 2004, *Al-Quran Terjemahan*, Jakarta:KaryaInsan Indonesia.
- Departemen Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan, 1995, *Kamus Besar bahasa Indonesia*, Jakarta: Balai Pustaka.
- Fairing, Resiren Watmanlussy. 2020. Overview of Nurse Performance in Service Quality in the Inpatient Room RSUD dr. D. Anatototi Larat. Thesis. Universitas Hasanuddin.
- Hasibuan Malayu, 2001, *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia*, Jakarta: Bumi Aksara. Hikmawati Fenti, 2018, *Metologi Penelitian*, Depok: Rajawali Pers.
- Indrawati, 2018, *Metode Penelitian Kualitatif*, Bandung: RafikaAditama.
- Kadarisman, Muhammad 2018, *Manajemen Aparatur Sipil Negara*, Depok: Khan Ali and Afzal Muhammad (2016). The Effect of reward Systems, Organizational Commitment and Experience on Job Satisfaction with respect to Employee's Perceived Performance, 11, 1-15
- Moenir A S, 2010. *Manajemen Pelayanan Umum Di Indonesia*.Bumi Aksara : Jakarta. Hlm 88
- Prof. Dr. Sugiono, *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif, Kualitatif dan R&D*, (Bandung: Alfabeta, 2006), 267.Raja grafindo .
- Sonang Ahmad Suffian Mohd Zahari, Rosminita Kamaruddin, Raja Mariam Rja Banimin (2020). The Relationship Between Compensation System And Employee Performance: A Literature Review. *Universitاسي Teknologi MARA Cawangan Terengganu, Malaysia*.
- Tim Relaksi Laksana, 2019, *Himpunan Peraturan Tentang ASN dan Manajemen PNS*, Yogyakarta, Laksana. [Http://kemenag.go.id/](http://kemenag.go.id/)
- Yusuf Murni, 2013, *Metode Penelitian Kualitatif, Kuantitatif Gabungan*, Jakarta: Kencana.

---

**Marolop Bungaran Tua S**

Muhammadiyah University of Jember, Indonesia

**Dwi Cahyono**

Muhammadiyah University of Jember, Indonesia

**Diah Probowulan**

Muhammadiyah University of Jember, Indonesia

---