Current Research on Practice Economics and Sharia Finance (CAPITAL)
Vol.1 No.3 2023
Pages 101-110

# THE INFLUENCE OF WORK ENVIRONMENT AND WORK MOTIVATION ON EMPLOYEE PERFORMANCE AT PT HADJI KALLA TOYOTA AT POLEWALI MANDAR

**Nurfarah Syaginah[1], Amiruddin Tawe[2], Tenri SP Dipoatmodjo[3], Agung Widhi Kurniawan[4], Muh. Ilham Wardhana Haeruddin[5]**
[1-5)]Management Study Program, Faculty of Economics and Business, Makassar State University

e-mail: [1)]nurfahrahsyaginah@gmail.com, [2)]amiruddin.t@unm.ac.id, [3)]tenrisayu4g@gmail.com
[4)]agungwk@unm.ac.id, [5)]ilham.wardhana@unm.ac.id

**Abstract**

*The aim of this research is to find outThe Influence of Work Environment and Work Motivation on Employee Performance at PT. Hadji Kalla Toyota at Polewali Mandar. Physical work environment (X1), non-physical work environment (X2), and work motivation (X3) are independent variables and employee performance is the dependent variable (Y). The population in this study were all employees at PT. Hadji Kalla Toyota in Polewali Mandar as many as 50 people. The analytical tools used in this research are validity test, reliability test, classical assumption test, multiple linear regression analysis, T test, F test and R2 test. The data used are primary data and secondary data obtained using questionnaire distribution techniques. The results of the research after the data were processed with SPSS.24 showed that there was a result of testing the first hypothesis (H1) showing that there was a significant influence between the physical work environment on employee performance with a significance level of 0.042 (p<0.05). The second hypothesis (H2) shows that there is a significant influence between the non-physical work environment on employee performance with a significance level of 0.004 (p<0.05). The third hypothesis (H3) shows that there is no significant influence between work motivation and employee performance with a significance level of 0.910 (p>0.05). The research results show that the physical work environment and non-physical work environment have a positive and significant effect on employee performance. Meanwhile, work motivation has no effect on employee performance.*

***Keywords:****Work Environment, Work Motivation, Employee Performance*

## INTRODUCTION

Human resources are the greatest asset owned by a companycompany or within the scope of the workplace. Human resources are the driving force in a company to carry out the activities within it. Companies that have goals certainly want to have human resources who are competent in every area of expertise they have. Competent human resources will influence company activities to make these activities effective and efficient.

In human resource management; performance problemsEmployees are very important for the successful achievement of a company's goals. According to Hasibuan (2002) states that performance is "a work result that a person has in carrying out the tasks assigned to him which is based on skill, experience and seriousness as well as time". Realizing the importance of employee performance, in the development of management science there are many records that prove that performance is an interesting focus of study to study, especially when it is related to the work environment and employee work motivation.

The work environment in a company will affect performanceevery employee who works. A comfortable work environment will certainly make it easier for employees to work and vice versa. The company should

reflect working conditions that support each other's work, the conditions created should be family friendly, good communication and self-control(Ningrum, Prasetya, & Riza, 2014).

Apart from the work environment, motivation also influences performanceemployee. Motivation is important for individual achievement in company activities. Motivation is a specific internal condition that directs a person's behavior towards a certain goal. The behavior of company employees who have high work morale certainly comes from internal motivation, and conversely the behavior of company employees who have low work morale certainly comes from a lack of motivation at work.

## METHOD

This type of research is quantitative research which is a research method for examining a certain population or sample. As for data collection techniques in the form of observation or direct observations in the field, questionnaires answered by employees and leaders, and documentation, this research uses analytical techniques, namely validity and reliability tests, classic assumption tests (linearity tests, normality tests, multicollinearity tests, heteroscedasticity tests) , multiple linear analysis, hypothesis testing (t test and f test) and coefficient of determination (R2)

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### a. Validity test

Table 1. Validity Test Results

| Variable | Indicator | $r_{hitung}$ | $r_{tabel}$ | Sig value. | Information |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Physical Work Environment (X1) | X1.1 | 0.531 | 0.290 | 0,000 | Valid |
| | X1.2 | 0.583 | 0.290 | 0,000 | Valid |
| | X1.3 | 0.736 | 0.290 | 0,000 | Valid |
| | X1.4 | 0.675 | 0.290 | 0,000 | Valid |
| | X1.5 | 0.721 | 0.290 | 0,000 | Valid |
| | X1.6 | 0.807 | 0.290 | 0,000 | Valid |
| | X1.7 | 0.605 | 0.290 | 0,000 | Valid |
| Non-Physical Work Environment (X2) | X2.1 | 0.77 | 0.290 | 0,000 | Valid |
| | X2.2 | 0.782 | 0.290 | 0,000 | Valid |
| | X2.3 | 0.642 | 0.290 | 0,000 | Valid |
| Work Motivation (X3) | X3.1 | 0.567 | 0.290 | 0,000 | Valid |
| | X3.2 | 0.702 | 0.290 | 0,000 | Valid |
| | X3.3 | 0.584 | 0.290 | 0,000 | Valid |
| | X3.4 | 0.479 | 0.290 | 0,000 | Valid |
| | X3.5 | 0.647 | 0.290 | 0,000 | Valid |
| | X3.6 | 0.436 | 0.290 | 0,000 | Valid |
| | X3.7 | 0.396 | 0.290 | 0,000 | Valid |
| | X3.8 | 0.415 | 0.290 | 0,000 | Valid |
| | X3.9 | 0.718 | 0.290 | 0,000 | Valid |
| | Y.1 | 0.534 | 0.290 | 0,000 | Valid |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Employee Performance (Y) | Y.2 | 0.413 | 0.290 | 0.004 | Valid |
| | Y.3 | 0.558 | 0.290 | 0,000 | Valid |
| | Y.4 | 0.635 | 0.290 | 0,000 | Valid |
| | Y.5 | 0.442 | 0.290 | 0.002 | Valid |
| | Y.6 | 0.453 | 0.290 | 0.002 | Valid |
| | Y.7 | 0.456 | 0.290 | 0.001 | Valid |
| | Y.8 | 0.553 | 0.290 | 0,000 | Valid |
| | Y.9 | 0.473 | 0.290 | 0.001 | Valid |
| | Y.10 | 0.292 | 0.290 | 0.049 | Valid |

Source: Processed Primary Data (2023)

Based on table 1 above, the results of the validity test for variables X1, X2, X3 and Y are declared valid. This is based on the r-count value > r-table (0.290) and the sig value < 0.05 so that all question items are declared valid

**b. Reliability Test**

Table 2. Reliability Test Results

| NO | Variable | *Cronbach's alpha* | Reliability |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Physical Work Environment | 0.842 | Reliable |
| 2 | Non-Physical Work Environment | 0.662 | Reliable |
| 3 | Work motivation | 0.794 | Reliable |
| 4 | Employee performance | 0.861 | Reliable |

Source: Processed Primary Data (2023)

Based on table 2 above, the results of the reliability test for variables X1, X2, X3 and Y can be said to be reliable and can be used as measuring tools because all variables are > 0.6.

**c. Classic assumption test**

Table 3. Multicollinearity Test Results

| Coefficientsa | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Model | | Unstandardized Coefficients | | Standardized Coefficients | t | Sig. | Collinearity Statistics | |
| | | B | Std. Error | Beta | | | Tolerance | VIF |
| 1 | (Constant) | 75,947 | 12,143 | | 6,254 | 0,000 | | |
| | PHYSICAL WORK ENVIRONMENT | -0.273 | 0.676 | -0.097 | -0.403 | 0.689 | 0.392 | 2,554 |
| | NON-PHYSICAL WORK ENVIRONMENT | 1,490 | 1,164 | 0.290 | 1,280 | 0.208 | 0.437 | 2,289 |
| | WORK MOTIVATION | 0.056 | 0.564 | 0.020 | 0.099 | 0.922 | 0.520 | 1,924 |

a. Dependent Variable: Employee Performance

Source: Processed Primary Data (2023)

Based on table 3 above, it can be seen from the Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) that each independent variable has a VIF < 10.0 and a tolerance value > 0.10. This means that the independent variables, namely the

physical work environment, non-physical work environment and work motivation are not correlated with each other, so it can be stated that the multiple linear regression model is free from multicollinearity assumptions.

Table 4. Normality Test Results

| One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test | | |
|---|---|---|
| | | Unstandardized Residuals |
| N | | 46 |
| Normal Parameters, b | Mean | 0.0000000 |
| | Std. Deviation | 9.26968464 |
| Most Extreme Differences | Absolute | 0.115 |
| | Positive | 0.115 |
| | Negative | -0.093 |
| Statistical Tests | | 0.115 |
| Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed) | | .154c |

a. Test distribution is Normal.
b. Calculated from data.
c. Lilliefors Significance Correction.
Source: Processed Primary Data (2023)

Based on table 4 above, the Asymp value is obtained. Sig. (2-tailed) is 0.154, which indicates that this value is greater than 0.05, so it can be said that the data in this study is normally distributed.

Table 5. Heteroscedasticity Test Results

| Coefficientsa | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Model | | Unstandardized Coefficients | | Standardized Coefficients | t | Sig. |
| | | B | Std. Error | Beta | | |
| 1 | (Constant) | -1,160 | 6,928 | | -0.167 | 0.868 |
| | PHYSICAL WORK ENVIRONMENT | -0.289 | 0.386 | -0.178 | -0.748 | 0.459 |
| | NON-PHYSICAL WORK ENVIRONMENT | 0.647 | 0.664 | 0.219 | 0.975 | 0.335 |
| | WORK MOTIVATION | 0.313 | 0.322 | 0.201 | 0.973 | 0.336 |
| a. Dependent Variable: RES2 | | | | | | |

Source: processed primary data (2023)

Based on table 5 above, the results of the heteroscedasticity test using the Glejser test show that each independent variable has a significance value of > 0.05 with details of the physical work environment variable having a Sig value. 0.868 > 0.05, the non-physical work environment variable has a Sig value. 0.335 > 0.05 and the work motivation variable has a value of Sig. 0.336 > 0.05. This shows that there is no heteroscedasticity in the variables tested, which means there is no correlation between the size of the data and the residuals.

Table 6. Linearity Test Results of Physical Work Environment and Employee Performance

| ANOVA Table | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
| EMPLOYEE PERFORMANCE * PHYSICAL WORK ENVIRONMENT | Between Groups | (Combined) | 990,096 | 14 | 70,721 | 0.704 | 0.753 |
| | | Linearity | 68,073 | 1 | 68,073 | 0.678 | 0.417 |
| | | Deviation from Linearity | 922,023 | 13 | 70,925 | 0.706 | 0.743 |
| | Within Groups | | 3113.208 | 31 | 100,426 | | |
| | Total | | 4103.304 | 45 | | | |

Source: Processed Primary Data (2023)

Based on table 6 above, it can be seen that the significance value*Deviation from Linearity*amounting to 0.743 so it can be concluded that 0.743 > 0.05, this shows that there is a linear relationship between the physical work environment variable and employee performance.

Table 7. Linearity Test Results of Physical Work Environment and Employee Performance

| ANOVA Table | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
| EMPLOYEE PERFORMANCE * NON-PHYSICAL WORK ENVIRONMENT | Between Groups | (Combined) | 896,684 | 7 | 128,098 | 1,518 | 0.191 |
| | | Linearity | 221,163 | 1 | 221,163 | 2,621 | 0.114 |
| | | Deviation from Linearity | 675,521 | 6 | 112,587 | 1,334 | 0.266 |
| | Within Groups | | 3206.620 | 38 | 84,385 | | |
| | Total | | 4103.304 | 45 | | | |

Source: Processed Primary Data (2023)

Based on table 7 above, it can be seen that the significance value*Deviation from Linearity*amounting to 0.266 so it can be concluded that 0.266 > 0.05, this shows that there is a linear relationship between non-physical work environment variables and employee performance

Table 8. Linearity Test Results of Work Motivation and Employee Performance

| ANOVA Table | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
| EMPLOYEE PERFORMANCE * WORK MOTIVATION | Between Groups | (Combined) | 976,481 | 12 | 81,373 | 0.859 | 0.594 |
| | | Linearity | 74,640 | 1 | 74,640 | 0.788 | 0.381 |
| | | Deviation from Linearity | 901.841 | 11 | 81,986 | 0.865 | 0.581 |
| | Within Groups | | 3126.824 | 33 | 94,752 | | |
| | Total | | 4103.304 | 45 | | | |

Source: Processed Primary Data (2023)

Based on table 8 above, it can be seen that the significance value*Deviation from Linearity*amounting to 0.581 so it can be concluded that 0.581 > 0.05, this shows that there is a linear relationship between the variable work motivation and employee performance

**d. Multiple Linear Regression Test**

Table 9. Multiple Linear Regression Test Results

| Coefficients[a] | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Model | | Unstandardized Coefficients | | Standardized Coefficients | Q | Sig. |
| | | B | Std. Error | Beta | | |
| 1 | (Constant) | 2,938 | 0.557 | | 5,276 | 0,000 |
| | PHYSICAL WORK ENVIRONMENT_(X1) | 0.174 | 0.083 | 0.280 | 2,102 | 0.042 |
| | NON-PHYSICAL WORK ENVIRONMENT_(X2) | 0.256 | 0.085 | 0.404 | 3,031 | 0.004 |
| | WORK MOTIVATION_(X3) | 0.017 | 0.152 | 0.015 | 0.114 | 0.910 |
| a. Dependent Variable: EMPLOYEE PERFORMANCE_(Y) | | | | | | |

Source: Processed Primary Data (2023)

Based on table 9 above, the multiple regression equation in this research is as follows:

**Y =2,938 + 0.174X1 +0.256X2 + 0.017X3 + e**

Based on the multiple linear regression equation, it can be concluded that:

a) Based on the results of the multiple linear regression test in table 4.17, it can be seen that the coefficient constant value α is 2.938, the coefficient constant is positive. With this, it can be interpreted that if all the independent variables in this research, including the work environment and work motivation variables, are constant or have a value of zero, then the amount of employee workload is 2,938.

b) The regression coefficient for the physical work environment variable is 0.174, which indicates that for every increase in the physical work environment by one unit, performance will increase by 0.174, assuming that the other variables are constant.

c) The regression coefficient for the non-physical work environment variable is 0.256, which indicates that for every increase in the non-physical work environment by one unit, performance will increase by 0.256, assuming that the other variables are constant.

d) The regression coefficient for the work motivation variable is 0.017, which shows that for every one unit increase in work motivation, employee performance will increase by 0.017, assuming that the other variables are constant.

**e. Hypothesis testing**

Table 10. F Test Results

| ANOVAa | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Model | | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
| 1 | Regression | 382,304 | 3 | 127,435 | 5,393 | .003b |
| | Residual | 992,414 | 42 | 23,629 | | |
| | Total | 1374,717 | 45 | | | |
| a. Dependent Variable: EMPLOYEE PERFORMANCE | | | | | | |
| b. Predictors: (Constant), WORK MOTIVATION, PHYSICAL WORK ENVIRONMENT, NON-PHYSICAL WORK ENVIRONMENT | | | | | | |

Source: Processed Primary Data (2023)

Based on the results in table 10 above, it shows the value mounting to 5,393. This value is greater than (5.393 > 4.073). The significant value in the F test is 0.003, which indicates that the value is smaller than 0.05 (0.003 < 0.05). If the value is greater than and the significance value is less than 0.05, it can be concluded that the physical work environment, non-physical work environment and work motivation simultaneously influence employee performan

Table 11. T Test Results

| Coefficientsa | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Model | | Unstandardized Coefficients | | Standardized Coefficients | t | Sig. |
| | | B | Std. Error | Beta | | |
| 1 | (Constant) | 2,938 | 0.557 | | 5,276 | 0,000 |
| | PHYSICAL WORK ENVIRONMENT_(X1) | 0.174 | 0.083 | 0.280 | 2,102 | 0.042 |
| | NON-PHYSICAL WORK ENVIRONMENT_(X2) | 0.256 | 0.085 | 0.404 | 3,031 | 0.004 |
| | WORK MOTIVATION_(X3) | 0.017 | 0.152 | 0.015 | 0.114 | 0.910 |
| a. Dependent Variable: EMPLOYEE PERFORMANCE_(Y) | | | | | | |

Source: Processed Primary Data (2023)

Hypothesis testing via the t test, the overall level used by the author is 0.05 and degrees of freedom with the formula, (a = 5%/2). df= n – k (46-3) shows a value of1,681, the t test results in the t test results table using SPSS are as follows:

1) The physical work environment variable (X1) has a value of 2.102 while it is 1.681 and the Sig value. of 0.042. This shows that > (2.102 > 1.681) and the Sig. amounting to 0.042 < 0.05 or in other words H1 is accepted, which means that the physical work environment influences employee performance.
2) The non-physical work environment variable (X2) has a value of 3.031 while it is 1.681 and the value of Sig. of 0.004. This shows that > (3.031 > 1.681) and the Sig. amounting

to 0.004 < 0.05 or in other words H2 is accepted, which means that the non-physical work environment influences employee performance.

3) The Work Motivation variable (X3) has a value of 0.114 while it is 1.681 and the Sig. of 0.910. This shows that < (0.114 < 1.681) and the Sig. 0.910 > 0.05 or in other words H3 is not accepted, which means that work motivation has no effect on employee performance.

Table 12. Coefficient of Determination Test Results

| Model Summary | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Model | R | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate |
| 1 | .527a | 0.278 | 0.227 | 4.86096 |
| a. Predictors: (Constant), WORK MOTIVATION, PHYSICAL WORK ENVIRONMENT, NON-PHYSICAL WORK ENVIRONMENT | | | | |

Source: Processed Primary Data (2023)

Based on the test results, it is known that the coefficient of determination is 0.278 or 27.8%. This shows that employee performance is influenced by the physical work environment, non-physical work environment and work motivation by 27.8% while the remaining 72.2% is influenced by other variables not examined in this research.

## CONCLUSION

1. The work environment variable shows that there is a positive and significant influence on employee performance. It can be said that the better the work environment provided to employees, the more comfortable it will be for employees in the workplace so that it can improve employee performance.
2. The work motivation variable shows that there is a positive and insignificant influence on employee performance. It can be said that although work motivation is important, research shows that work environment factors have a more significant impact on employee performance.
3. The work environment and work motivation variables show that together they have a positive and significant influence on employee performance. It can be said that these two variables are interconnected which can have an impact or influence on employee performance, where employee performance can be carried out well and in accordance with what is expected by the company.

## SUGGESTION

1. Companies should pay more attention to the arrangement of work spaces to provide comfort to employees, including room audits, listening to employee input, improving lighting and ergonomics, attention to layout, improving sound systems, personalizing rooms, consulting with design experts, promoting work-personal separation, investing in ventilation, as well as

routine evaluation. By taking these steps, companies can create a more comfortable work environment and support better performance for employees.

2. To increase good cooperation among employees, companies can take several actions, such as encouraging open communication, organizing collaboration training, holding team strengthening activities, ensuring understanding of shared goals, providing recognition, and involving supportive leadership.
3. Companies should take steps such as better planning, evaluation of duties and responsibilities, consultation with employees, preparation of rational schedules, training and development, flexibility in working hours, evaluation of leadership performance, promotion of work-life balance, and respecting time limits. employee. With this approach, companies can create a more supportive environment for employees, avoid the need for unwanted overtime, and maintain their satisfaction and well-being.
4. Suggestions that the author can give to overcome employees who often come late are that they should be given an evaluation of the causes of tardiness, better morning planning, schedule adjustments, transportation assistance, communication with superiors, personal discipline, monitoring and improvement, utilizing company resources, and understanding the importance of time. By implementing these steps, employees can improve their attendance at work and avoid repeatedly arriving late.

**REFERENCE**

Ahyari, & Agus. (2009). Production Management 2, Fourth Edition. BPFE Yogyakarta Publisher.

Amalia, N.M. (2018). The Influence of the Work Environment and Work Motivation on Employee Performance at the Sleman Regency Labor and Social Service. Faculty of Economics, 622-634.

Atmosoeprapto, & Kisdarto. (2001). Productivity Actualization of Company Culture. Jakarta: Publisher PT. Scholastic.

Dharma. (2013). Personnel Management, Third Edition. Jakarta: Erlangga.

Ferawati, A. (2017). Analysis of the Influence of Work Motivation, Work Environment and Work Stress on Employee Performance at RSU Putri Asih Salatiga. AGORA Journal, 1-131.

Gibson, I., & Donelly. (2006). Organization and Management, Behavior, Structure and Process. Jakarta: Erlangga.

Hasi, HR, Effendy, S., & Rambe, MF (2019). The Influence of Work Environment, Work Culture and Work Motivation on Employee Performance at the North LabuhanBatu Regency Fire and Fire Department. Akmami (Accounting, Management, Economics), 209-219.

Hasibuan, SM, & Bahri, S. (2018). The Influence of Leadership, Work Environment and Work Motivation on Performance. Maneggio: Master of Management Scientific Journal, 71-80.

Hendri, E. (2018). The Influence of Physical and Non-Physical Work Environments on Employee Job Satisfaction at PT Asuransi Wahana Tata Palembang Branch. Media Wahana Ekonomika, 1-16.

Mangkuneara, A. (2009). Corporate Human Resources Management. Bandung: PT Teen Rosdakarya.

Ningrum, Prasetya, & Riza. (2014). The Influence of the Work Environment on Employee Performance (Study of Auto 2000 Sukun Malang Employees). Journal of Business Administration (JAB), Vol. 11 No.1.

Novyanti, J. (2015). The Influence of Work Motivation, Work Environment and Work Discipline on Employee Performance at the Bappeda of Central Sulawesi Province. Catalog e-Journal, 105-11.

Prastiyo, FD (2019). The Influence of Work Stress, Work Environment and Work Motivation on Employee Performance at JNE Madiun Branch. SIMBA, 1039-1048.

Putri, YS (2016). The Influence of Intellectual Intelligence, Emotional Intelligence, and Work Environment on the Performance of PT Employees. PLN Persero Klaten Area. Management and Organization Studies, 88-97.

Putri, YS (2016). The Influence of Intellectual Intelligence, Emotional Intelligence, and Work Environment on PT Employee Performance. PLN Persero Klaten Area. Journal of Management & Organization Studies, 88-97.

Rahmawanti, NP, Swasto, B., & Prasetya, A. (2014). The Influence of the Work Environment on Employee Performance (Study on Employees of the North Malang Pratama Tax Service Office). Business Administration (JAB), 1-9.

Reksohadiprodjo, Soekanto, & Handoko, H. (2007). Corporate Organization: Theory, Structure and Behavior. Yogyakarta, BPFE.

Rivai, V., & Basri, AF (2004). Performance Appraisal. First Printing, PT Raja Grafindo Persada, Jakarta.

Sedarmayanti. (2009). Human Resources and Work Productivity. Bandung: Mandar forward.