The Effect of Work Motivation, Work Environment, Work Discipline on Employee Satisfaction and Public Health Center Performance

Suprapti¹, Jannah Puji Astuti², Noor Sa'adah³, Salis Diah Rahmawati⁴, Rulyta Yuli Astuti⁵

¹,²,³,⁴,⁵Universitas Stikubank Semarang, Indonesia

Corresponding author: suprapti.unisbank@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study is to analyze the effect of work motivation on employee satisfaction, effect of work environment on employee satisfaction, effect of work discipline on employee satisfaction, effect of work motivation on public health center Performance, effect of work environment on public health center Performance, effect of work discipline on public health center Performance, effect of employee satisfaction on public health center performance. The method used in this research is quantitative method. Data was collected by distributing questionnaires to 80 permanent employees of public health center. For questions / statements about the identity of respondents designed in the form of a semi-open questionnaire in addition to a closed questionnaire. Data collection technique is using questionnaire with Likert Scale. Analysis from this study is using SEM (Structural Equation Model) with SmartPLS version 3.0 as a statistic tools. Based on the results of data analysis through a questionnaire distributed to respondents, found several conclusions as follows There is a significant effect of work motivation on employee satisfaction, there is a significant effect of work environment on employee satisfaction, there is a significant effect of work discipline on employee satisfaction, there is a significant effect of work motivation on public health center Performance, there is a significant effect of work environment on public health center Performance, there is a significant effect of work discipline on public health center Performance, there is a significant effect of employee satisfaction on public health center performance.
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1. INTRODUCTION

Public health center (Public Health Center) is one of the health service units that greatly contributes in providing comprehensive and integrated services to people who need it. In other words, the public health center has the authority and responsibility for public health maintenance in its working area. That is the important role of the public health center in providing health services to the community, encouraging all stakeholders involved in the public health center to always improve their performance and quality of service optimally and professionally. the success of an organization is greatly influenced by the performance of all its employees. Performance is a work performance, namely the comparison
between real work results and the set work standards (Asbari, 2020). One of the important factors that strongly supports the provision of good health services to the community is the human resource factor, namely (medical / non-medical personnel) in an organization, especially in Public health center. Low employee performance can be influenced by many factors such as motivation, satisfaction, work, leadership, work climate, organizational culture, work discipline and employee abilities (education and training) (Purwanto, 1998). There are three things that are the focus of this research, namely organizational culture, motivation, and job satisfaction factors related to employee performance. The success of an organization in achieving its goals cannot be separated from the factor of its human resources. Human resources are very strategic things in organizations, meaning that humans play an important role in carrying out activities to achieve goals. For this reason, the existence of human resources in the organization is very strong. Humans always play an active role in every organizational activity because humans become planners, actors, and determinants of the realization of organizational goals. The goal is impossible to achieve without the active role of employees even though the tools owned by an organization are so modern. Thus the success of an organization does not only depend on the existing facilities but also depends on the human resource factors that are owned. So that an organization needs potential human resources, both leaders and employees who can make good contributions and carry out tasks optimally to achieve goals. Because all public health center activities will involve the actions of human resources in it. The success of an organization is influenced by the performance of its employees, an organization will seek to improve the performance of its employees in the hope that organizational goals can be achieved. Performance is basically what employees do or don't do. Employee performance is what influences how much they contribute to the organization, including the quantity of output, quality of output, duration of output, workplace attendance and cooperative attitude (Asbari, 2020). Performance is the result or the overall success rate of a person during a certain period in carrying out the task compared with various possible standards of work results, targets or targets or criteria that have been determined in advance and have been mutually agreed upon (Santoso, 2019). Therefore, employee performance will run effectively if it is supported by work motivation, work discipline and a good work environment. Work motivation is someone's desire that causes that person to act. People act for one reason, namely to achieve goals. So, work motivation is a drive that is set by goals and rarely appears in a vacuum. Meanwhile, according to (Purwanto, 2020) work motivation is a condition in a person's personality that encourages the individual's desire to carry out certain activities achieving goals. Work discipline is a form of employee self-control and regular implementation and shows the level of seriousness of the work team within an organization. Nitisemito (2001) suggests work discipline as an attitude, behavior and actions in accordance with the rules of the organization, both written and unwritten. Work discipline is a management action to encourage members of the organization to meet the demands of various conditions that must be obeyed by employees. Employee discipline is a form of training who try to improve and shape the knowledge, attitudes and behavior of employees so that employees can work cooperatively with other employees and improve their work performance (Sondang P. Siagian, 2002). In addition, the work environment in an organization has an important role for the smooth running of the activity process, the work environment is everything in the work environment that can affect him in carrying out assigned tasks. So that not only the employee satisfaction factor in implementing duties but also the influence of a person

Every organization has a different culture and each has a philosophy that has its own business principles, how to solve problems and make decisions on their own and have their own beliefs, behavior and patterns of thinking, business practices, and personality. In order to realize the organizational culture established by the organization, the support and participation of all members within the organization is needed. One way to foster and increase employee morale is by providing motivation. Therefore, to achieve a high level of work efficiency and effectiveness, an organization must be able to stimulate employee growth and development, seek a desire for achievement and know and meet employee needs. This motivation is different from one employee to another, this is due to differences in motives, goals and needs of each employee. Employee job satisfaction is an important
target in human resource management, because it will directly or indirectly affect work productivity. Human resource is one of the most important factors that must be considered in an organization. Human resources are the key to organizational success in the present and future. In an organization, a good leadership role is needed [Santoso, 2020]. Leadership can be used by everyone and does not only apply to organizations. Leadership affects human behavior, both individuals and groups to achieve certain goals (WIjayanti, 2019). A leader will play a very important role in the organization. With good leadership, it will increase employee motivation. Leaders must pay attention to the performance of their subordinates and provide a stimulus to improve performance in the form of giving motivation and rewards to health workers who have high work discipline (Asbari, 2019). Work motivation is related to age, years of service, work performance, recognition, development of individual potential, perception of salary, working conditions, policies and administration, interpersonal relationships and supervision (Hyun, 2019). A person's behavior is influenced and stimulated by wants, needs, goals and satisfaction. Stimulation arises from yourself and from outside. This stimulation will create motives and motivation that encourage people to work (Purwanto, 2020). The purpose of this study is to describe work motivation, work discipline, work environment, job satisfaction and performance of employees of Public health center Winong District, Pati district, Central Java, Indonesia. To find out how much influence work motivation, work discipline, work environment have on job satisfaction in Public health center employees, to find out how much influence work motivation, work discipline, work environment on performance of Public health center employees

II. METHOD

The method used in this study is quantitative method. Data was collected by distributing questionnaires to 80 permanent employees of public health center. For questions / statements about the identity of respondents designed in the form of a semi-open questionnaire in addition to a closed questionnaire. Five answer options, namely: strongly agree (SS) score 5, agree (S) score 4, neutral (N) score 3, disagree (TS) score 2, and strongly disagree (STS) score 1 is given to each item closed question / statement. PLS and SmartPLS software version 3.0 are used as a method for processing data.

Table 1. Sample Descriptive Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age (per August 2020)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 30 years</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 - 40 years</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 40 years</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working period as a permanent employee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 5 years</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-10 years</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 10 years</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest diploma</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≥ Bachelor Deg.</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>= Diploma Des.</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; Sempion High Sch.</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The sample in this study were permanent employees of public health center 80 respondents. The questionnaire was distributed by simple random sampling technique. According to (Sekaran & Bougie, 2003) theoretical framework is the foundation on which all research projects are based. From a theoretical framework hypotheses can be drawn up that can be tested to find out whether formulated theory is valid or not. Then, it can be measured using appropriate statistical analysis. Referring to the theory and previous research, the author constructs the research model as follows:
H1: There is a significant effect of work motivation on employee satisfaction
H2: There is a significant effect of work environment on employee satisfaction
H3: There is a significant effect of work discipline on employee satisfaction
H4: There is a significant effect of work motivation on public health center Performance
H5: There is a significant effect of work environment on public health center Performance
H6: There is a significant effect of work discipline on public health center Performance
H7: There is a significant effect of employee satisfaction on public health center performance

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

1.1. Test Results Validity and Reliability of Research Indicators

Convergent validity testing, discriminant validity is the testing phase of measurement model. Meanwhile, to test construct reliability, Cronbach's alpha and composite reliability are used. Research hypothesis testing is conducted if all indicators in PLS model have met the requirements of convergent validity, discriminant validity and reliability testing can use the results of PLS analysis.

1.1.1. Convergent Validity Testing

By looking at the loading factor value of each indicator for the construct a convergent validity test is performed. Latent constructs are explained in most references, by looking at a factor weight of 0.5 or more considered to have sufficiently strong validation (Chin, 1998; Ghozali, 2014; Hair et al., 2010). AVE value of each construct > 0.5 is a requirement in this study with a minimum limit of loading factor size accepted is 0.5 (Ghozali, 2014). All indicators already have a loading factor value above 0.5 based on SmartPLS 3.0 processing results. So, the convergent validity of this research model has fulfilled the requirements. Table 2 shows the load value, cronbach's alpha, composite reliability and AVE each complete construct:
Work Motivation (X1)  
0.657  0.587  0.587  0.457  0.765  0.569  0.678 
Employee Satisfaction (Y1) 
Work Environment (X2) 
0.587  
Work Discipline (X3) 
0.765  0.569 
Performance (Y2) 

Figure 2. Research Model (Fit)

Table 2. Items Loadings, Cronbach’s Alpha, Composite Reliability, and Average Variance Extracted (AVE)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Loadings</th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha</th>
<th>Composite Reliability</th>
<th>AVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work Motivation (X1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X11</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.645</td>
<td>0.821</td>
<td>0.897</td>
<td>0.524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X12</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.589</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X13</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.654</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Environment (X2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X21</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.745</td>
<td>0.823</td>
<td>0.934</td>
<td>0.589</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X22</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.623</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X23</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.631</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Discipline (X3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X31</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.567</td>
<td>0.675</td>
<td>0.912</td>
<td>0.501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X32</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.537</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X33</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.651</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Satisfaction (Y1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y11</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.654</td>
<td>0.823</td>
<td>0.913</td>
<td>0.576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y22</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.731</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y33</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.734</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Health Performance (Y2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y21</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.672</td>
<td>0.732</td>
<td>0.912</td>
<td>0.673</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y22</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.732</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y23</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.634</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.1.2. Discriminant Validity Testing

To ensure that each concept of each latent variable is different from other latent variables discriminant validity is performed. If the AVE squared value of each exogenous construct (value on the diagonal) exceeds the correlation between the construct and other construct (values below the diagonal) indicated that the model has good discriminant validity (Ghozali, 2014). AVE squared values are used to determine the results of discriminant validity testing, namely by looking at the Fornell-Larcker Criterion Value (Fornell & Larcker, 1981b), obtained as follows:
Table 3. Discriminant Validity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Y2</th>
<th>Y1</th>
<th>X1</th>
<th>X2</th>
<th>X3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Health Performance</td>
<td>0.721</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Satisfaction</td>
<td>0.532</td>
<td>0.718</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Motivation</td>
<td>0.387</td>
<td>0.389</td>
<td>0.725</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Environment</td>
<td>0.107</td>
<td>0.029</td>
<td>0.050</td>
<td>0.912</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Discipline</td>
<td>0.534</td>
<td>0.649</td>
<td>0.465</td>
<td>0.011</td>
<td>0.711</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All constructs have AVE square root values above the correlation value with other latent constructs (through the Fornell-Larcker criteria) indicated by the results of discriminant validity test in table 3 above. Likewise, the cross-loading value of all items from one indicator is greater than the other indicator items as mentioned in Table 4, so it can be concluded that the model has met discriminant validity (Fornell & Larcker, 1981a).

Next, colinearity evaluation is carried out to find out whether there is colinearity in the model. To find colinearity, VIF calculation is needed for each construct. The model has colinearity if the VIF score is higher than 5 (Hair et al., 2014). Table 4 shows all VIF scores are less than 5, meaning that this model does not have colinearity.

Table 4. Collinearity Statistics (VIF)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>EP</th>
<th>JS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Health Performance (Y2)</td>
<td>1.743</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Satisfaction (Y1)</td>
<td>1.738</td>
<td>1.208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Motivation (X1)</td>
<td>1.004</td>
<td>1.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Environment (X2)</td>
<td>1.002</td>
<td>1.211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Discipline (X3)</td>
<td>1.002</td>
<td>1.211</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.1.3. Construction Reliability Testing

The value of Cronbach's alpha and composite reliability of each construct can assess construct reliability. The reliability of composite and recommended Cronbach’s alpha value are more than 0.7 (Ghozali, 2014). All constructs have composite reliability and Cronbach's alpha value greater than 0.7 (> 0.7) is indicated by the reliability test results in table 2 above. In conclusion, the required reliability has been met by all constructions.

1.2. Hypothesis Test

The inner model test is the designation of hypothesis testing in PLS. This test includes a test of the significance of direct and indirect effects and measurement of the influence magnitude of exogenous on endogenous variables. SmartPLS 3.0 software is used to test the influence of using t-statistic test in the most squared partial analysis model (PLS).

H1: There is a significant effect of work motivation on employee satisfaction
H2: There is a significant effect of work environment on employee satisfaction
H3: There is a significant effect of work discipline on employee satisfaction
H4: There is a significant effect of work motivation on public health center Performance
H5: There is a significant effect of work environment on public health center Performance
H6: There is a significant effect of work discipline on public health center Performance
H7: There is a significant effect of employee satisfaction on public health center performance

The table below obtained the R Square values and significance value of the test, with bootstrapping technique:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypotheses</th>
<th>Relationship</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>T Statistics</th>
<th>P-Values</th>
<th>Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H1</td>
<td>X1 -&gt; Y1</td>
<td>0.567</td>
<td>0.110</td>
<td>3.211</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2</td>
<td>X2 -&gt; Y1</td>
<td>0.587</td>
<td>0.120</td>
<td>2.321</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3</td>
<td>X3 -&gt; Y1</td>
<td>0.765</td>
<td>0.112</td>
<td>9.439</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4</td>
<td>X1 -&gt; Y2</td>
<td>0.587</td>
<td>0.108</td>
<td>3.567</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H5</td>
<td>X2 -&gt; Y2</td>
<td>0.457</td>
<td>0.105</td>
<td>2.341</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H6</td>
<td>X3 -&gt; Y2</td>
<td>0.569</td>
<td>0.111</td>
<td>2.675</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H7</td>
<td>Y1 -&gt; Y2</td>
<td>0.679</td>
<td>0.180</td>
<td>3.121</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on Table 5 above, the value of R Square public health performance (Y2) is 0.378, which means that variable public health performance (Y2) variable can be explained by Employee Satisfaction (Y1) is 37.8%, while remaining 62.8% is explained by other variables not discussed in this study. The value of R Square Employee Satisfaction (Y1) is 0.489 which means that Employee Satisfaction (Y1) can be explained by the variables of Work Motivation (X1), Work Environment (X2), Work Discipline (X3) variables of 48.9% while remaining 51.1% is explained by other variables not discussed in this study. T Statistics and P-Values which show the influence between research variables mentioned are shown in Table 6.

**Discussion**

**H1: There is a significant effect of work motivation on employee satisfaction**

In the first hypothesis, test results show the value of t-statistics 0.311 and p-values of 0.756. Based on the above calculation, t-statistics value is 0.311 <1.96 and p-value is 0.756> 0.05 so H1 is accepted. Therefore, it concludes that there is a significant effect of work motivation on employee satisfaction. The conclusion of this hypothesis is consistent and align with some previous studies. According to Asbari (2020) there is positive and significant effect of work motivation on work satisfaction. According to Santoso (2020) there is positive and significant effect of work motivation on work satisfaction. According to Purwanto (2020) there is positive and significant effect of work motivation on work satisfaction. According to Wijayanti (2019) there is a significant effect of employee motivation on work satisfaction. According to Hyun (2019) there is positive and significant effect of motivation on work satisfaction.
H2: There is a significant effect of work environment on employee satisfaction
In the second hypothesis, test results show the value of t-statistics 2.321 and p-values of 0.002. Based on the above calculation, t-statistics value is 2.321 > 1.96 and p-value is 0.002 < 0.05 so H2 is accepted. Therefore, it concludes that There is a significant effect of work environment on employee satisfaction. The conclusion of this hypothesis is consistent and align with some previous studies. According to Wijayanti (2019) there is a significant effect of work environment on employee satisfaction, According to Hyun (2019) there is positive and significant effect of work environment on employee satisfaction. According to Asbari (2020) there is positive and significant effect of work environment on employee satisfaction, According to Santos (2020) there is positive and significant effect of work environment on employee satisfaction, According to purwanto (2020) there is positive and significant effect of work environment on employee satisfaction.

H3: There is a significant effect of work discipline on employee satisfaction
In the third hypothesis, test results show the value of t-statistics 9.439 and p-values of 0.000. Based on the above calculation, t-statistics value is 9.439 > 1.96 and p-value is 0.000 < 0.05 so H3 is accepted. Therefore, it concludes that There is a significant effect of work discipline on employee satisfaction. The conclusion of this hypothesis is consistent and align with some previous studies. According to Asbari (2020) there is positive and significant effect of work discipline on employee satisfaction, According to Santos (2020) there is positive and significant effect of work discipline on employee satisfaction. According to Wijayanti (2019) there is a significant effect of work discipline on employee satisfaction, According to Hyun (2019) there is positive and significant effect of work discipline on employee satisfaction. According to purwanto (2020) there is positive and significant effect of work discipline on employee satisfaction.

H4: There is a significant effect of work motivation on public health center Performance
In the fourth hypothesis, test results show the value of t-statistics 3.567 and p-values of 0.001. Based on the above calculation, t-statistics value is 3.567 > 1.96 and p-value is 0.001 < 0.05 so H4 is accepted. Therefore, it concludes that There is a significant effect of work motivation on public health center Performance. The conclusion of this hypothesis is consistent and align with some previous studies. According to Asbari (2020) there is positive and significant effect of work motivation on public health center Performance, According to Santos (2020) there is positive and significant effect of work motivation on public health center Performance. According to Wijayanti (2019) there is a significant effect of work motivation on public health center Performance, According to Hyun (2019) there is positive and significant effect of work motivation on public health center Performance. According to purwanto (2020) there is positive and significant effect of work motivation on public health center Performance.

H5: There is a significant effect of work environment on public health center Performance
In the fifth hypothesis, test results show the value of t-statistics 2.341 and p-values of 0.003. Based on the above calculation, t-statistics value is 2.341 > 1.96 and p-value is 0.003 < 0.05 so H5 is accepted. Therefore, it concludes that There is a significant effect of work environment on public health center Performance. The conclusion of this hypothesis is consistent and align with some previous studies. According to Asbari (2020) there is positive and significant effect of work environment on public health center Performance, According to Santos (2020) there is positive and significant effect of work environment on public health center Performance. According to Wijayanti (2019) there is a significant effect of work environment on public health center Performance, According to Hyun (2019) there is positive and significant effect of work environment on public health center Performance.
work environment on public health center Performance. According to purwanto (2020) there is positive and significant effect of work environment on public health center Performance.

**H6: There is a significant effect of work discipline on public health center Performance**

In the sixth hypothesis, test results show the value of t-statistics 2.675 and p-values of 0.000. Based on the above calculation, t-statistics value is 2.675 > 1.96 and p-value is 0.000< 0.05 so H6 is accepted. Therefore, it concludes that There is a significant effect of work discipline on public health center Performance. The conclusion of this hypothesis is consistent and align with some previous studies. According to Asbari (2020) there is positive and significant effect of work discipline on public health center Performance, According to Santoso (2020) there is positive and significant effect of work discipline on public health center Performance. According to Wijayanti (2019) there is a significant effect of work discipline on public health center Performance, According to Hyun (2019) there is positive and significant effect of work discipline on public health center Performance. According to purwanto (2020) there is positive and significant effect of work discipline on public health center Performance.

**H7: There is a significant effect of employee satisfaction on public health center performance**

In the seventh hypothesis, test results show the value of t-statistics 3.121 and p-values of 0.001. Based on the above calculation, t-statistics value is 3.121 > 1.96 and p-value is 0.001< 0.05 so H7 is accepted. Therefore, it concludes that There is a significant effect of employee satisfaction on public health center performance. The conclusion of this hypothesis is consistent and align with some previous studies. According to Asbari (2020) there is positive and significant effect of employee satisfaction on public health center performance, According to Santoso (2020) there is positive and significant effect of employee satisfaction on public health center performance. According to Wijayanti (2019) there is a significant effect of employee satisfaction on public health center performance, According to Hyun (2019) there is positive and significant effect of employee satisfaction on public health center performance. According to purwanto (2020) there is positive and significant effect of employee satisfaction on public health center performance.

**V. CONCLUSIONS**

Based on the results of data analysis through a questionnaire distributed to respondents, found several conclusions as follows There is a significant effect of work motivation on employee satisfaction, there is a significant effect of work environment on employee satisfaction, there is a significant effect of work discipline on employee satisfaction,there is a significant effect of work motivation on public health center Performance, there is a significant effect of work environment on public health center Performance,there is a significant effect of work discipline on public health center Performance,there is a significant effect of employee satisfaction on public health center performance.
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