

# The Influence of Compensation, Work Environment, Work Motivation, Job Satisfaction, and Work Involvement on Employee Productivity in Restaurants in Tegal City

Tiara Diva Putriyanti<sup>1</sup>, Erny Rachmawati<sup>2</sup>, Suyoto<sup>3</sup>, Hengky Widhiandono<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1,2,3,4</sup>Faculty of Economics and Business, Muhammadiyah University of Purwokerto

Email: ernyrachmawati67@gmail.com

---

## Abstract

### **Keywords:**

Compensation, Work Environment, Work Motivation, Job Satisfaction, Work Engagement, Employee Productivity

The purpose of this study is to examine the effects of compensation, work environment, work motivation, job satisfaction, and work engagement on employee productivity in restaurants in Tegal City. This quantitative study employed a survey method involving 153 restaurant employees selected through purposive sampling. Data were collected using a structured questionnaire developed based on the indicators of each research variable. Data analysis was conducted using SPSS version 25, including validity and reliability tests, classical assumption tests, and multiple linear regression analysis. The results indicate that the five independent variables simultaneously have a significant effect on employee productivity ( $F = 128.521$ ;  $Sig. < 0.001$ ), with a coefficient of determination of 0.814, meaning that 81.4% of the variance in employee productivity is explained by the research model. Partially, compensation, work motivation, and work engagement have a positive and significant effect on employee productivity, while work environment and job satisfaction have a positive but insignificant effect. These findings emphasize the importance of integrated and sustainable human resource management in enhancing employee productivity in the restaurant sector.

---

## INTRODUCTION

As the global economy changes, the economic system is shifting from manufacturing to services, including the food industry. This industry has grown rapidly for three main reasons. First, a more realistic lifestyle. Second, higher wages. Third, a greater demand for fast, high-quality food service. The food industry not only provides goods for people to buy, but also contributes to economic growth and job creation.(Lukman et al., 2023).

The food industry in Tegal City is currently experiencing rapid growth, triggering increasingly fierce competition among businesses. In this environment, every business is required to maintain service standards, speed of service, and customer satisfaction levels to remain competitive. One key factor determining the success of a food business is employee productivity. Employee productivity in the food industry is reflected in their ability to serve customers quickly and on time, maintain consistent presentation quality, and establish easy and effective communication with customers.(Manoppo et al., 2021)However, the phenomenon in Tegal City shows that various problems persist in human resource management, such as inconsistent service quality, fluctuating work output, low work discipline, and a lack of employee engagement. These conditions have the potential to hamper operational efficiency and weaken the competitiveness of food businesses amid increasingly intense competition.(Ananda et al., 2023)On the other hand, the fast-paced nature of the food business and its high service demands often creates significant work pressure for employees. If working conditions and employee management are not handled well, it will be difficult to maintain optimal levels of workforce productivity.(Ilhami et al., 2024).

This study uses the Job Demands–Resources (JD-R) approach to obtain a comprehensive picture of the relationship between job demands and job resources in influencing employee productivity. The JD-R theory explains that employees, especially those working in the restaurant sector, are potentially experiencing energy exhaustion due to high workloads, time pressure, and intense mental demands. If these job demands are not balanced with adequate job resources, employee performance and productivity can decline in the long term. Conversely, the presence of job resources such as fair compensation, a conducive work environment, job satisfaction, and work engagement can help employees restore energy, increase motivation, and maintain sustainable performance.(Tummers & Bakker, 2021).

One of the most important things that influences how productive employees are is compensation. According to(Efendi, 2021a)explains that compensation is An important way to motivate employees to work harder. Compensation encompasses all the ways an organization rewards its employees for their achievements, both monetary and non-monetary. This includes things like compensation, wages, prizes, incentives, benefits, meal allowances, and rest breaks. Several previous studies have found that compensation makes employees more productive.(Magai & Ardhianto, 2024);(Maulidiah & Baskoro, 2025);(Tarigan et al., 2022)These results suggest that a fair pay system that takes into account the amount of work involved can increase employee enthusiasm, efficiency, and overall performance. The amount of compensation isn't the only factor that influences how much work they accomplish. Where they work is also crucial. The work environment includes all physical and non-physical conditions experienced by employees while carrying out their work. According to(Ilhami et al., 2024)The work environment encompasses all the physical and non-physical things workers see and hear while they work. People can focus better and feel less tired at work if the work environment is safe, supportive, and pleasant. Numerous studies(Ilhami et al., 2024);(Nopitasari et al., 2025);(Manoppo et al., 2021)have found that the workplace has a large and positive influence on how much work people get done. Different results have been found by a number of other studies. According to(BDD Berlian & Rafida, 2022);(Reivaldo et al., 2023); And(Afgiansyah & Poernomo, 2025)The work environment does not significantly influence the amount of work completed. These differing findings indicate inconsistencies in research findings, necessitating a reexamination of the role of the work environment, particularly in the context of the food industry, which faces high workloads and demands for fast service.

Besides the work environment, work motivation is also considered a crucial factor in increasing employee productivity. Work motivation is another crucial factor that can make employees more productive. Motivation is a drive, both internal and external, that drives them to achieve goals and perform better. According to(Muhtar et al., 2021)explains that motivation is closely related to how individuals behave and act in meeting the demands of their jobs. Employees with high levels of motivation tend to demonstrate better performance, have a willingness to learn, and focus on achieving work targets.(Tanjung & Mardhiyah, 2023b);(Solehati et al., 2024); And(Ze et al., 2024)Several studies have shown that motivated employees are more productive. These results suggest that workers with a strong work ethic are able to perform better. However, other studies have shown different results, particularly when work motivation does not significantly influence employee productivity. (Wahyuni et al., 2023);(BDD Berlian & Rafida, 2022); And(Purwanti et al., 2024). The differences in the results of this study mean that the work motivation aspect needs to be studied further, by looking at how the setting, group characteristics, and individual work conditions can change it.

Another factor often associated with employee productivity is job satisfaction. Job satisfaction describes a person's general feelings about their job, encompassing satisfaction, comfort, and positive feelings while working. According to(Mobaraq et al., 2024)Job satisfaction is how a person feels about their job in general. It is also crucial for maintaining a company's stability and helping it achieve its goals. Job satisfaction tends to improve focus and achieve more over time. Several studies have shown that workers who are happy with their jobs achieve more.(Khasanah et al.,

2025);(Sari & Liliana, 2022); And(Maulidiah & Baskoro, 2025). On the other hand, while job satisfaction is a good thing, it has not been shown to have a significant impact on how much work gets done. This was found by(Mobaraq et al., 2024)And(Murti et al., 2023)stated that job satisfaction had no significant effect on employee productivity. This discrepancy in results indicates a research gap that requires further study, particularly in the culinary field, which is characterized by high-pressure and fast-paced work.

In addition, work engagement is also considered an important factor in increasing productivity. According to(Khusanova et al., 2021)defines job engagement as a good mental state that includes vigor (energy and resilience at work), commitment (feelings of meaning, enthusiasm, and pride in one's work), and absorption (full focus on one's work). Employees who have high job engagement tend to be more proactive, have a greater sense of responsibility, and continuously strive to improve their performance. Several studies support that job engagement has a significant effect on employee productivity.(Faadilah et al., 2025);(Yuntina et al., 2025)However, other studies show different things.(Nugraha & Rukhviyanti, 2024); And(Sasando et al., 2025), all of them say that job engagement does not have a big influence on how productive an employee is.

Various research results show inconsistent findings, indicating that comprehensive studies on the determinants of employee productivity are still limited. Research results according to(Putra & Mujiat, 2022)shows that compensation, work environment, and work motivation have a positive and significant effect on employee productivity. Meanwhile, according to(Susanto et al., 2023)stated that job satisfaction has a positive effect, but job engagement has no effect on employee productivity. This discrepancy in findings indicates a research gap influenced by differences in variables and research context. Research in the restaurant sector, with its specific work dynamics and service demands, may allow for differences in the influence of certain variables compared to other sectors. Thus, the influence of employee productivity factors is contextual and heavily influenced by the characteristics of the business sector studied.

The purpose of this research is to add new theories to the field of human resource management research, specifically regarding what makes workers more productive in the culinary field. The data is also expected to assist managers in planning for long-term economic growth.

## RESEARCH METHODS

This study aims to determine how compensation, work environment, work motivation, job satisfaction, and work engagement influence employee productivity. The data for this study were collected from a questionnaire, a quantitative method. The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) version 25 was used to process the data for this research method.(Sugiyono, 2013)explains that quantitative research methods are ways of thinking about how to study a specific population or group by using research tools to gather information. Positivism is the main idea behind quantitative research. The people who participated in this study worked in restaurants in Tegal City.

The population in this study were employees working in the restaurant sector in Tegal City. Based on data from the Central Statistics Agency (BPS), the number of restaurant businesses in Tegal City in the 2022–2024 period was 216 units, consisting of 68 businesses in 2022, 68 businesses in 2023, and 80 businesses in 2024. These restaurants have relatively uniform service systems and operational characteristics, thus being considered relevant as research objects.

The sampling technique used is purposive sampling, which is a non-probabilistic method that selects respondents based on certain criteria that are in accordance with the research objectives.(Tajik et al., 2025)The respondent criteria for this study were restaurant employees who were still actively working and had at least one year of work experience. This criterion was established to ensure respondents had adequate understanding and experience regarding working conditions, wage systems, work environment, motivation, job satisfaction, and work engagement.

Determination of the number of samples is carried out using the Slovin formula, which according to (Sugiyono, 2013) used to determine a representative sample size of a population with a certain level of error. The Slovin formula is stated as follows:

$$n = \frac{N}{1 + N(e)^2}$$

**Description: n = number of samples**

**N = population size**

**e = error tolerance**

With a population (N) of 216 and an error rate (e) of 10%, the minimum sample size obtained based on the Slovin formula calculation is as follows:

$$n = \frac{216}{1 + 216 (0,1)^2} = \frac{216}{1 + 2,16} = \frac{216}{3,16} \approx 68$$

Although the calculation results using the Slovin formula indicate a minimum sample size of 68 respondents, the number of respondents used in this study exceeds this minimum. Increasing the number of respondents was done to increase statistical power and data reliability, as well as to minimize potential errors due to incomplete or invalid responses. Methodologically, increasing the sample size above the minimum limit set by the Slovin formula is permissible as long as the respondent characteristics remain in accordance with the research criteria and do not change the population structure, thereby avoiding bias in the interpretation of the research results.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### Results

#### Respondent Characteristics

The 153 individuals who participated in this study can be categorized by gender, age (in years), highest level of education, length of service, job title or position, and compensation. Detailed information about the individuals who responded to the survey is shown in Table 1 below:

**Table1** Respondent Characteristics

Characteristi cs	Category	Frequenc y	Percentage (%)
<b>Gender</b>	Man	89	58.17
	Woman	64	41.83
<b>Age (years)</b>	< 20	35	22.88
	21-25	69	45.10
	26-30	24	15.69
	31-35	10	6.54
	> 35	15	9.80
<b>Last education</b>	Elementary School /	1	0.65
	Equivalent	14	9.15
	Junior High School /	89	58.17
	Equivalent	15	9.80
	High School / Vocational School / Equivalent	34	22.22
	Diploma		
	Bachelor degree)		
<b>Length of work</b>	< 1 year	50	32.68
	1-3 years	62	40.52
	4-6 years	30	19.61
	7-10 years	3	1.96

	> 10 years	8	5.23
<b>Position or Title</b>	Manager / Branch Manager Supervisor / Assistant Manager Chef Barista Waiter / Waitress Cashier Steward Delivery Order	11 9 34 16 47 31 3 2	7.19 5.88 22.22 10.46 30.72 20.26 1.96 1.31
<b>Employee Status</b>	Still Contract Part-time	101 36 16	66.01 23.53 10.46
<b>Income</b>	Rp. 500,000 – 2,000,000 > Rp. 2,000,000 - Rp. 3,500,000 > Rp. 3,500,000 – Rp. 5,000,000 > Rp. 5,000,000	59 59 17 18	38.56 38.56 11.11 11.76

*Source: Processed primary data, 2025*

Most of the survey respondents were male (58.17%), most were between 21 and 25 years old (45.10%), most had only completed high school or vocational school (58.17%), most were between 1 and 3 years old (40.52%), most worked as waiters (30.72%), most had permanent jobs (66.01%), and most earned between Rp. 500,000 and Rp. 2,000,000 and between Rp. 2,000,000 and Rp. 3,500,000 (38.56%).

#### Descriptive Statistical Analysis

These factors need to be analyzed using descriptive statistics so you can get an overview of the data. This table shows the mean, maximum, minimum, and standard deviation for each of the following variables: Compensation (X1), Job Engagement (X5), Job Satisfaction (X4), Motivation (X5).Work (X3), and Employee Productivity (Y). The basic statistical tests for this study are shown in Table 2.

**Table2Descriptive Statistical Test**

	<b>N</b>	<b>Minimum</b>	<b>Maximum</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Standard Deviation</b>
<b>Compensation</b>	153	9.00	45.00	33.5033	8.54179
<b>Work environment</b>	153	5.00	25.00	18.2222	4.91938
<b>Work motivation</b>	153	5.00	25.00	18.5752	4.71796
<b>Job satisfaction</b>	153	5.00	25.00	18.9804	4.96497
<b>Job Engagement</b>	153	9.00	45.00	34.0654	8.58600
<b>Employee Productivity</b>	153	10.00	50.00	38.8105	9.23861
<b>Valid N (listwise)</b>	153				

*Source: Processed primary data, 2025*

Descriptive analysis shows that the average values of all variables are above the measurement scale range. Compensation and work engagement variables use a range of 9–45, work environment, motivation, and job satisfaction 5–25, and employee productivity 10–50. High data variation is found in compensation, work engagement, and productivity ( $SD > 8$ ), while work motivation is more consistent with an  $SD$  of 4.71796.

### Validity Test

#### Table 3 Validity Test

Indicator	Pearson Correlation (r Count)	Significance	Description
<b>K1</b>	0.769	0,000	Valid
<b>K2</b>	0.845	0,000	Valid
<b>K3</b>	0.792	0,000	Valid
<b>K4</b>	0.804	0,000	Valid
<b>K5</b>	0.839	0,000	Valid
<b>K6</b>	0.792	0,000	Valid
<b>K7</b>	0.764	0,000	Valid
<b>K8</b>	0.799	0,000	Valid
<b>K9</b>	0.848	0,000	Valid
<b>LK1</b>	0.807	0,000	Valid
<b>LK2</b>	0.828	0,000	Valid
<b>LK3</b>	0.840	0,000	Valid
<b>LK4</b>	0.852	0,000	Valid
<b>LK5</b>	0.878	0,000	Valid
<b>MK1</b>	0.815	0,000	Valid
<b>MK2</b>	0.835	0,000	Valid
<b>MK3</b>	0.831	0,000	Valid
<b>MK4</b>	0.831	0,000	Valid
<b>MK5</b>	0.862	0,000	Valid
<b>KK1</b>	0.887	0,000	Valid
<b>KK2</b>	0.887	0,000	Valid
<b>KK3</b>	0.870	0,000	Valid
<b>KK4</b>	0.935	0,000	Valid
<b>KK5</b>	0.925	0,000	Valid
<b>KK6</b>	0.815	0,000	Valid
<b>KK7</b>	0.881	0,000	Valid
<b>KK8</b>	0.907	0,000	Valid
<b>KK9</b>	0.864	0,000	Valid
<b>KKr1</b>	0.889	0,000	Valid
<b>KKr2</b>	0.907	0,000	Valid
<b>KKr3</b>	0.892	0,000	Valid
<b>KKr4</b>	0.919	0,000	Valid
<b>KKr5</b>	0.863	0,000	Valid
<b>PK1</b>	0.759	0,000	Valid
<b>PK2</b>	0.879	0,000	Valid
<b>PK3</b>	0.831	0,000	Valid
<b>PK4</b>	0.874	0,000	Valid
<b>PK5</b>	0.910	0,000	Valid
<b>PK6</b>	0.841	0,000	Valid
<b>PK7</b>	0.902	0,000	Valid

<b>PK8</b>	0.831	0,000	Valid
<b>PK9</b>	0.873	0,000	Valid
<b>PK10</b>	0.783	0,000	Valid

*Source: Processed primary data, 2025*

The table above shows that all indicators in each research variable meet the validity criteria, because the calculated  $r$  value  $>$   $r$  table (0.172) with a significance level of 0.000 ( $<0.05$ ). The Pearson correlation value for compensation (K1–K9) is in the range of 0.764–0.848, work environment (LK1–LK5) 0.807–0.878, work motivation (MK1–MK5) 0.815–0.862, job satisfaction (KK1–KK9) 0.815–0.935, work engagement (KKr1–KKr5) 0.863–0.919, and employee productivity (PK1–PK10) 0.759–0.910, so that all indicators are declared valid and suitable for use in further research.

### Reliability Test

Table4Realism Test

Variables	Number of Items	Cronbach's Alpha Value	Criteria	Information
<b>Compensation (KK)</b>	9	0.932	$> 0.60$	Reliable
<b>Work Environment (WE)</b>	5	0.896	$> 0.60$	Reliable
<b>Work Motivation (MK)</b>	5	0.898	$> 0.60$	Reliable
<b>Job Satisfaction (KK)</b>	9	0.965	$> 0.60$	Reliable
<b>Work Engagement (KKr)</b>	5	0.937	$> 0.60$	Reliable
<b>Employee Productivity (PK)</b>	10	0.956	$> 0.60$	Reliable

*Source: Processed primary data, 2025*

The table shows that all research variables have a Cronbach's Alpha value  $> 0.60$ , thus declared reliable. The compensation variable (9 items) has a value of 0.932, work environment (5 items) 0.896, work motivation (5 items) 0.898, job satisfaction (9 items) 0.965, work engagement (5 items) 0.937, and employee productivity (10 items) 0.956. Based on the standard(Ghozali, 2018), all instruments have good internal consistency and are suitable for use in data collection.

### Classical Assumption Test

#### Normality Test

(Ghozali, 2018)states that the purpose of the normality test is to determine whether the independent and dependent factors in a regression model have a normal data distribution. The accuracy of statistical test results can be affected by non-normally distributed data. Therefore, the One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test is one way to check stability. For this test, data is said to be normally distributed if the significance value is greater than 0.05. Conversely, if the significance value is less than 0.05, the data is not normally distributed.

Table5Normality Test

Information	Mark
<b>N</b>	153
<b>Mean</b>	0.0000000
<b>Division Standards</b>	3.42048337
<b>Most Extreme</b>	.115
<b>Differences (Absolute)</b>	
<b>Test Statistics</b>	.083
<b>Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)</b>	.161

*Source: Processed primary data, 2025*

The results of the Kolmogorov-Smirnov normality test show that from 153 samples, the Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed) value was 0.161 ( $> 0.05$ ), so that the data in the regression model was normally distributed and met the normality assumption for further regression analysis.

### Multicollinearity Test

According to (Ghozali, 2018) The multicollinearity test aims to detect a linear relationship between independent variables in a regression model. Multicollinearity can increase variance and standard error, thereby reducing the significance of test results. Therefore, the test is performed using tolerance values ( $<0.10$ ) and VIF ( $>10$ ) as indicators of multicollinearity in the model.

**Table6**Multicollinearity Test

Variables	Tolerance	VIF	Information
Compensation	0.221	4,516	No Multicollinearity Occurs
Work environment	0.283	3,537	No Multicollinearity Occurs
Work motivation	0.143	7,003	No Multicollinearity Occurs
Job satisfaction	0.191	5,232	No Multicollinearity Occurs
Job Engagement	0.140	7,148	No Multicollinearity Occurs

*Source: Processed primary data, 2025*

The results of the multicollinearity test show that all independent variables have a VIF value  $<10$  and a tolerance  $>0.10$ , so there is no multicollinearity. The compensation variable has a VIF of 4.516 and a tolerance of 0.221; work environment VIF of 3.537 and a tolerance of 0.283; work motivation VIF of 7.003 and a tolerance of 0.143; job satisfaction VIF of 5.232 and a tolerance of 0.191; and work involvement VIF of 7.148 and a tolerance of 0.140. Thus, the regression model is declared valid and meets the multicollinearity assumptions.

### Heteroscedasticity Test

The heteroscedasticity test using the Glejser method shows that the significance value (Sig.) of all independent variables is  $> 0.05$ , so it can be concluded that there is no heteroscedasticity and the regression model meets the classical assumptions.

**Table7**Heteroscedasticity Test

Variables	Sig.	Information
Compensation	0.843	No Heteroscedasticity Occurs
Work environment	0.182	No Heteroscedasticity Occurs
Work motivation	0.322	No Heteroscedasticity Occurs
Job satisfaction	0.218	No Heteroscedasticity Occurs
Job Engagement	0.127	No Heteroscedasticity Occurs

*Source: Processed primary data, 2025*

The results of the Glejser heteroscedasticity test method show that all independent variables, namely compensation, work environment, work motivation, job satisfaction, and work participation, have a Sig. value  $> 0.05$ , so they do not have a significant effect on the absolute value of the residual. Based on the criteria (Ghozali, 2018), the regression model does not experience heteroscedasticity and meets the assumption of homoscedasticity, so it is suitable for use for regression analysis and further hypothesis testing.

### F-Test of Model Feasibility

According to (Ghozali, 2018) The F-test is a method used to assess the extent of variance differences between two or more groups. The goal is to assess whether all independent variables influence each other on the dependent variable. The F-test is conducted to determine the overall impact of all independent variables on the dependent variable. The significance level used is 0.5 or 5%. If the F-value is less than 0.05, it can be concluded that the independent variables are related.

**Table8**F test

Model	Sum Of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig
Regression	7774.007	5	1554,801	128,521	<.001

Residual	1778.355	147	12,098
Total	9552.362	152	

**Source: Processed primary data, 2025**

The results of the F test in multiple regression analysis show an F value of 128.521 with Sig. <0.001 (<0.05), so that the overall regression model is significant and at least one independent variable influences the dependent variable. The Regression Sum of Squares value is 7,774.007, the Residual Sum of Squares is 1,778.355, and the Total Sum of Squares is 9,552.362. The total degrees of freedom (Df) of 152 is obtained from the formula  $n - 1$ , so the number of research samples is 153 respondents.

**Multiple Regression Analysis****Table9**Multiple Linear Regression Test

Variables	Regression Coefficient (B)	Std Error	t Count	Sig.	Information
(Constant)	2,289225	1,176194	1,946	0.054	
Compensation	0.326	0.087	3,732	0,000	Influential
Work environment	0.030	0.133	0.228	0.820	No effect
Work motivation	0.495	0.188	2,639	0.009	Influential
Job satisfaction	-0.330	0.180	-1,829	0.069	No effect
Job Engagement	0.610	0.087	7,037	0,000	Influential

**Source: Processed primary data, 2025**

The results of multiple linear regression indicate that compensation, work motivation, and work engagement have a Sig. <0.05, thus having a positive and significant effect on employee productivity. Conversely, job satisfaction and work environment have a Sig. >0.05, thus having no significant effect. This finding indicates that employee productivity is more influenced by factors that directly drive motivation and work engagement than by environmental conditions and job satisfaction. The constant value in the regression model indicates that there is a baseline level of productivity that employees maintain even when all independent variables are held constant, reflecting the presence of other factors outside the model that also influence productivity.

**Determination Test (R-Square)**

(Sugiyono, 2013)states that the determinant is a numerical value obtained by adding the products of the elements in a square matrix and their cofactors using existing rules. You can use the determinant to determine the adjoint and inverse of a matrix. The coefficient of determination in linear regression analysis indicates how much the independent variable helps explain changes in the dependent variable. If squaring coefficient of association (R), you will get the R-squared, also called the coefficient of determination. The R-squared value can range from 0 to 1. The higher the R-squared value, the better the regression model can explain changes in the dependent variable.

**Table10**R Square Test

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Standard Error of the Estimate
1	0.902	0.814	0.807	3.47817

**Source: Processed primary data, 2025**

The results of the determination coefficient test show an  $R^2$  value of 0.814 and an Adjusted  $R^2$  of 0.807, which means that compensation, work environment, work motivation, job satisfaction, and work participation together are able to explain 80.7% of the variation in employee productivity, while 19.3% is influenced by other factors outside the model. The correlation coefficient value of R of 0.902 indicates a very strong relationship between the independent and

dependent variables, while the Std. Error of the Estimate of 3.47817 indicates that the model's prediction results are relatively close to the actual value.

## Discussion

### The Effect of Compensation on Employee Productivity

Based on research results, compensation has been shown to have a positive and significant impact on employee productivity. A fair and proportional compensation system, both monetary and non-monetary, can encourage employees to work more effectively and efficiently. In the context of the restaurant sector, which demands speed of service and consistent performance, compensation acts as a behavioral control instrument that motivates employees to maintain performance according to operational standards. This finding aligns with(Efendi, 2021a)And(Khasanah et al., 2025)which confirms that performance-based compensation increases employee trust, loyalty, and work quality. The results of this study are also consistent with research(Magai & Ardhianto, 2024);(Maulidiah & Baskoro, 2025);(Tarigan et al., 2022). so it can be concluded that compensation is a strategic factor in increasing employee productivity sustainably.

### The Influence of Work Environment on Employee Productivity

The results of the study indicate that the work environment does not significantly influence employee productivity. Theoretically, the work environment functions to create a sense of security and comfort that supports performance. However, in the restaurant sector, which has a high work pace, time pressure, and strict standard operating procedures, employees focus more on completing tasks and achieving service targets than on the work environment. Thus, the work environment plays a more supportive role in maintaining work comfort, but does not directly determine productivity levels. This finding aligns with(BDD Berlian & Rafida, 2022);(Reivaldo et al., 2023); And(Afgiansyah & Poernomo, 2025), which states that the work environment is not the main factor determining productivity, especially in jobs with high time pressure and workload, so that the work environment plays a more supporting role than a direct determinant of productivity.

### The Influence of Work Motivation on Employee Productivity

The research results show that work motivation has a positive and significant effect on employee productivity. Motivation, whether derived from internal or external sources, encourages employees to work harder, be more dedicated, and consistently complete tasks. In the restaurant sector, characterized by the pressure of service and direct interaction with customers, work motivation is a crucial factor in maintaining employee intensity and persistence in their work. This finding aligns with(Muhtar et al., 2021)And(Susanto et al., 2023)and supported by(Tanjung & Mardhiyah, 2023b);(Solehati et al., 2024); And(Ze et al., 2024), which concluded that work motivation is a key factor in increasing employee productivity.

### The Influence of Job Satisfaction on Employee Productivity

The research results show that job satisfaction does not significantly impact employee productivity. Theoretically, job satisfaction is associated with a positive attitude and psychological well-being at work. However, in the restaurant sector, high work pressure, demands for speedy service, and the obligation to follow standard operating procedures require employees to maintain performance targets regardless of their perceived level of satisfaction. Several studies have shown that employees who are satisfied with their jobs achieve more.(Khasanah et al., 2025);(Sari & Liliana, 2022); And(Maulidiah & Baskoro, 2025). On the other hand, while job satisfaction is a good thing, it has not been shown to have a significant impact on how much work gets done. This was found by(Mobaraq et al., 2024)And(Murti et al., 2023)stated that job satisfaction had no significant effect on employee productivity. This discrepancy in results indicates a research gap that requires further study, particularly in the culinary field, which is characterized by high-pressure and fast-paced work.

### The Influence of Work Engagement on Employee Productivity

The results of the study indicate that job engagement has a positive and significant effect on employee productivity. Employees with high levels of job engagement tend to demonstrate

focus, consistency, and a willingness to put in extra effort in carrying out their duties. In the restaurant sector, which demands stable performance and service quality, job engagement is a crucial factor in maintaining sustainable productivity. This finding aligns with the concept of job engagement proposed by Schaufeli & Bakker (2006) and is supported by (Zamralita & Wilis, 2023) And (Khusanova et al., 2021), which emphasizes aspects of work enthusiasm, commitment, and involvement in work. The results of this study are also consistent with (Yuntina et al., 2025) And (Faadhilah et al., 2025), so it can be concluded that work engagement is a key factor that companies need to pay attention to in order to increase employee productivity sustainably.

## CONCLUSION

Based on the research findings, of the five factors analyzed, compensation, work motivation, and work engagement were shown to have a positive and significant influence on employee productivity, while job satisfaction and the work environment did not show a significant influence. Fair and proportional compensation, both financial and non-financial, has been shown to increase employee morale, thus encouraging higher productivity. Work motivation, as an internal and external driver, makes employees work with greater enthusiasm, dedication, and sincerity in completing their tasks. Furthermore, work engagement plays a crucial role because employees with high levels of engagement tend to be more focused, proactive, and consistent in carrying out their work. For restaurant managers, these results suggest that efforts to increase productivity should focus on managing a fair compensation system, providing motivation through rewards and performance recognition, and creating working conditions that encourage active employee involvement in restaurant operations. Although the work environment and job satisfaction contribute to employee comfort and happiness, these two factors have not been statistically proven to have a direct effect on productivity in this study. The limitations of this study lie in the scope of the objects and variables studied. Therefore, further research is recommended to involve a wider variety of restaurants or add other variables that could potentially influence employee productivity.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

Afgiansyah, MR, & Poernomo, AH (2025). THE EFFECT OF COMPENSATION, WORK ENVIRONMENT ON EMPLOYEE PRODUCTIVITY (CASE STUDY OF BUMDES IN KEDUNGUDI VILLAGE, TRAWAS DISTRICT, MOJOKERTO REGENCY IN THE TOURISM SECTOR). Majapahit Islamic University.

Ananda, IWATM, Ekasani, KA, & Sinaga, F. (2023). Professional Performance of Restaurant Service at Plataran Hotel Ubud. *Scientific Journal of Tourism and Business*, 2(5), 1153–1176. <https://doi.org/https://dx.doi.org/10.22334/paris.v2i5>

Berlian, BDD, & Rafida, V. (2022). The Influence of Work Motivation, Compensation, and Work Environment on Employee Productivity at PT. Winaros Kawula Bahari Beji-Pasuruan. *Journal of Office Administration Education (JPAP)*, 10(1), 81–93.

Berlian, B., & Rafida, V. (2022). The Influence of Work Motivation, Compensation, and Work Environment on Employee Productivity at PT. Winaros Kawula Bahari Beji-Pasuruan. *Journal of Office Administration Education (JPAP)*, 10(1), 81–93.

Efendi, J. (2021a). The Influence of Work Environment, Compensation, and Work Discipline on Employee Productivity at PT Xyz. *Jurnal Mitra Manajemen*, 12(2), 23–32. <https://journal.universitassuryadarma.ac.id/index.php/jmm/article/view/744%0Ahttps://journal.universitas suryadarma.ac.id/index.php/jmm/article/download/744/727>

Efendi, J. (2021b). The Influence of Work Environment, Compensation, and Work Discipline on Employee Productivity at PT Xyz. *Management Partner Journal*, 12(2), 23–32.

Faadhilah, NR, Andriani, D., & Firdaus, V. (2025). The Influence of Work Environment, Job Skills, and Work Engagement on Employee Productivity in MSMEs. *Scientific Journal of Unity Management*, 13(1), 271–281. <https://doi.org/10.37641/jimkes.v13i1.3028>

Ghozali, I. (2018). Multivariate analysis application with IBM SPSS 23 program.

Ilhami, P., Firdaus, V., & Andriani, D. (2024). Work Environment, Work Discipline, Workload on Employee Productivity at PT. Aneka Rupa. *Ekonomis: Journal of Economics and Business*, 8(2), 1329–1336. <https://doi.org/10.33087/ekonomis.v8i2.1771>

Khasanah, MP, Indriyani, F., & Napitupulu, RL (2025). THE EFFECT OF COMPENSATION AND WORK MOTIVATION ON EMPLOYEE PRODUCTIVITY OF CV SVN GROUP JAKARTA. *JIXN: Jurnal*

Intelek Dan Cendikiawan Nusantara, 2(5), 7837–7845.

Khusanova, R., Kang, S. W., & Choi, S. B. (2021). Work Engagement Among Public Employees: Antecedents and Consequences. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12(October), 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.684495>

Lukman, L., Sudradjat, A., & Sinambela, T. (2023). Utilization of Digitalization in the Creative Industry Culinary Sector Post-Covid-19 Pandemic. *Borobudur University National Seminar*, 2(1), 273–288.

Magai, AT, & Ardhianto, M. (2024). The Effect of Compensation, Motivation, and Job Satisfaction on Employee Performance. *Grenze International Journal of Engineering & Technology (GIJET)*, 10.

Manoppo, PKP, Tewal, B., & Trang, I. (2021). THE EFFECT OF WORKLOAD, WORK ENVIRONMENT AND INTEGRITY ON EMPLOYEE PRODUCTIVITY AT PT. EMPAT SAUDARA MANADO. *EMBA Journal*, 9(4), 773–781.

Maulidiah, U., & Baskoro, H. (2025). The Effect of Work Discipline, Work Environment and Work Motivation on Employee Performance. *Majapahit Journal of Islamic Finance and Management*, 5(1), 910–924.

Mobaraq, MRF, Sunaryo, H., & Mustapita, AF (2024). The Influence of Work Motivation, Job Satisfaction, and Work Environment on Employee Productivity at PT. Literindo Berkah Karya. *E – Journal of Management Research, MANAGEMENT STUDY PROGRAM*, Faculty of Economics and Business, Unisma, 14(01), 10–17.

Muhtar, SR, Hariyani, DS, & Dessimarti, RS (2021). The Influence of Work Discipline, Work Attitude, Work Motivation and Rewards on Employee Productivity at CV. Ahlul Maospati in Magetan Regency. *Business Management and Accounting Innovation Seminar (SIMBA) II*, 3.

Murti, AD, Sheviyani, H., & Desirée, HS (2023). As-Syirkah: Islamic Economics & Financial Journal. *As-Syirkah: Islamic Economics & Financial Journal*, 2(2), 153–161. <https://doi.org/10.56672/assyirkah.v3i2.214>

Nopitasari, H., Setianingsih, R., & Hastuti, D. (2025). The Influence of Work Environment, Workload, and Motivation on Employee Productivity at PT. Padasa Enam Utama. *EMBA Independent Student Scientific Journal*, 4(1), 1632–1640.

Nugraha, BW, & Rukhviyanti, N. (2024). The Effect of Work Engagement, Work-Life Balance, and Work Overload on Employee Productivity: The Role of Job Satisfaction as a Mediating Variable at BRI Employees in Bandung City. *Indonesian Interdisciplinary Journal of Sharia Economics (IIJSE)*, 7(2), 3808–3833.

Purwanti, T., Subkhan, M., & Purwanto, W. (2024). THE EFFECT OF WORK MOTIVATION, WORK ENVIRONMENT AND WORK EXPERIENCE ON EMPLOYEE PRODUCTIVITY OF CV PRIMA INDAH II BANTUL (Case Study on Employees of CV Prima Indah II Bantul). *Indonesian Journal of Accounting and Business Research STIE Widya Wiwaha*, 4(1), 165–177.

Putra, INSK, & Mujiati, NW (2022). The Effect of Work Discipline, Work Environment and Work Motivation on Employee Performance. *Majapahit Journal of Islamic Finance and Management*, 7(2), 212–215. <https://doi.org/10.31538/mjifm.v5i1.458>

Reivaldo, Sukri, & Latif, D. (2023). The Effect of Compensation, Work Discipline, and Motivation on Employee Productivity at PT Esta Dana Ventura, Palopo City. *JMBI UNSRAT (Scientific Journal of Business Management and Innovation, Sam Ratulangi University)*, 10(1), 298–310. <https://doi.org/10.35794/jmbi.v10i1.46324>

Sari, DPP, & Liliana. (2022). The Influence of Work Environment, Motivation, and Job Satisfaction on Employee Productivity at CV. Angkutan Terang Mandiri (ATM) Palembang. *Competitive Journal*, 11(1), 30–39. <https://doi.org/10.52333/kompetitif.v1i1.897>

Sasando, A., Harmastuti, PP, & Faizal, AMBA (2025). The Effect of Flexible Work and Work Engagement on Job Satisfaction with Performance as a Mediator. *Journal of Business, Management, and Accounting (BISMAK)*, 5(1), 56–78. <https://doi.org/10.47701/bismak.v5i01.5018>

Solehati, DT, Hasnawati, R., Sakinah, SP, & Hendayana, Y. (2024). THE EFFECT OF WORK ENVIRONMENT, WORK MOTIVATION, AND WORK DISCIPLINE ON EMPLOYEE PRODUCTIVITY AT PT. XYZ. *SENTRI: Scientific Research Journal*, 3(1), 328–338.

Sugiyono, D. (2013). Educational research methods using quantitative, qualitative and R&D approaches.

Susanto, PC, Sawitri, NN, Ali, H., & Rony, ZT (2023). Employee Productivity: Analysis of Job Satisfaction and Work Engagement in the Shipping Line Industry. *Int. J. Glob. Sustain. Res*, 1(2), 251–262. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.59890/ijgsr.v1i2.665>

Tajik, O., Golzar, J., & Noor, S. (2025). Purposive sampling. *International Journal of Education & Language Studies*, 1–9.

Tanjung, AF, & Mardhiyah, A. (2023a). The Influence of Compensation, Work Discipline, and Motivation on the Productivity of Indonesian Sharia Bank Employees. *Transekonomika: Accounting, Business and Finance*, 3(3), 570–585.

Tanjung, AF, & Mardhiyah, A. (2023b). THE EFFECT OF COMPENSATION, WORK DISCIPLINE, AND MOTIVATION ON EMPLOYEE PRODUCTIVITY OF INDONESIAN SYARIAH BANK (Study at Indonesian Syariah Bank, Kabanjahe District). *TRANSECONOMICS: Accounting, Business and Finance*

PENGARUH, 3(3), 570–585.

Tarigan, AK, Setiawan, B., Tarigan, HM, Nofa, M., Manurung, P., Sirait, YT, Siantar, UE, Faculty, M., & University, E. (2022). The Effect of Compensation on Employee Productivity at Efarina University, Pematangsiantar. *JOURNAL OF ECONOMICS* 45, 10(1), 265–268.

Tummers, L. G., & Bakker, A. B. (2021). Leadership and Job Demands-Resources Theory: A Systematic Review. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12(September), 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.722080>

Wahyuni, T., Suryana, AKH, & Purwanto, H. (2023). The Influence of Work Discipline, Job Satisfaction, and Work Motivation on Employee Productivity at Waroeng Spesial Sambal Heritage Boyolali. *EKOBIS: Journal of Management and Accounting Science*, 11(2), 288–296. <https://doi.org/10.36596/ekobis.v11i2.1085>

Yuntina, L., Saepudin, TH, Perwitasari, EP, Setiawan, A., & Suhendra, A. (2025). The Influence of Coaching, Mentoring and Work Engagement on Organizational Sustainability through Employee Productivity in a Dynamic Work Environment. *Journal of Information Systems and Business Management Publication*, 4(3), 329–349.

Zamralita, & Wilis, APL (2023). WORKPLACE WELL-BEING TO IMPROVE EMPLOYEE WORK ENGAGEMENT. *Journal of Economics and Business Sciences*, 7(2), 413–422.

Zamralita, Z., & Putri Leleng Wilis, A. (2023). Workplace Well-Being to Improve Employee Work Engagement. *Journal of Economics and Business Studies*, 7(2), 413–422. <https://doi.org/10.24912/jmieb.v7i2.26050>

Ze, HG, Nasrul, HW, Oktavianti, Ratnasari, SL, Sutjahjo, G., Winarso, W., Aini, SN, Nainggolan, AR, Heriyanto, M., Bon, AT, & Salman, NFB (2024). The Influence of Leadership Style, Organizational Culture, Work Environment, and Work Motivation on Employee Productivity. *JOURNAL OF MANAGEMENT, ORGANIZATION, AND BUSINESS*, 4(1), 1–17. <https://www.journal.unrika.ac.id/index.php/JMOB/article/view/7576>

Zen, HG, Nasrul, HW, Oktavianti, O., Ratnasari, SL, Sutjahjo, G., Winarso, W., Aini, SH, Nainggolan, AR, Heriyanto, M., & Bon, AT (2024). THE EFFECT OF LEADERSHIP STYLE, ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE, WORK ENVIRONMENT, AND WORK MOTIVATION ON EMPLOYEE PRODUCTIVITY. *JOURNAL OF MANAGEMENT, ORGANIZATION AND BUSINESS (JMOB)*, 4(1), 1–17.