

The Effect of Work Motivation and Physical Work Environment on the Performance of *PT SBCR* Employees

Riska Febriyanti*, Sunimah

Universitas Swadaya Gunung Jati, Indonesia

Email: riskafebriyanti507@gmail.com*, sunimah@ugj.ac.id

Abstract

Keywords:

Work Motivation; Physical Work Environment; Employee Performance.

In the era of globalization and increasingly fierce business competition, high-quality human resources are crucial for achieving a company's objectives. *PT SBCR* requires employees with optimal performance to face the existing business challenges. Therefore, this study focuses on analyzing the influence of work motivation and physical work environment on employee performance. This study aims to analyze the impact of work motivation and the physical work environment on employee performance at *PT SBCR*. An associative causal method is used as a quantitative approach. The research population consists of 137 permanent employees of *PT SBCR*, with data collected through questionnaires using a 5-point Likert scale. Data analysis was performed using SPSS version 26. The study found that work motivation has a positive and significant impact on employee performance, with a significance value of 0.048 and a regression coefficient of 0.255. Additionally, the physical work environment has the most dominant effect on employee performance, with an F value of 500.912, a significance of 0.000, and a regression coefficient of 0.639. Improving employee performance will be most effective when work motivation and the physical work environment are managed integratively and holistically, supporting the achievement of sustainable competitive advantage for the company.

INTRODUCTION

In the era of globalization and increasingly fierce business competition, the success of an organization is once given the influence of the quality of its human resources. Human Resource Management (HRDM) has a strategic position in managing employees as the main asset to achieve the company's mission. Employee performance is an important indicator that reflects the productivity and effectiveness of the organization. Kasmir (2016) explained that performance is the achievement of employees when completing their tasks, starting from the quality and quantity, in harmony with their duties. Therefore, a deep understanding of the various factors that affect the performance of employees is necessary to increase their effectiveness and work productivity (Okolie et al. 2018).

Recent developments in employee performance studies show a paradigm shift from a traditional approach to a more holistic approach. Muzaki et al. (2023) identified various main factors that influence the performance of their employees, such as their work motivation, leadership, work environment, organizational culture, and work performance. Recent trends show that organizations are increasingly aware of the importance of creating a supportive work ecosystem, where the psychological aspects and physical conditions of the workplace receive serious attention in performance improvement strategies.

Work motivation is a fundamental factor that influences the productivity of its employees. Mangkunegara in Zebua et al. (2022) interprets work motivation as a state that controls the employee to be able to be directed in achieving his organization's mission. Rifdha et al. (2024) found that work motivation has a great influence on employee performance, where employees who have high motivation show better performance. Their research by Rahmawati and Sultoni (2024) strengthens this finding by explaining that work motivation has a positive and significant influence on the performance of its employees, the higher the work motivation, the higher the performance.

In addition to motivation, the physical condition of the work environment has a significant role in determining the performance of its employees. Sedarmayanti (2011) explained that the physical work environment includes all elements that have physical forms around the workplace that can influence their employees. The elements start from the lighting, temperature, air circulation, noise level, cleanliness, color, and safety. Lilyana et al. (2021) added that the quality of the physical work environment has a real impact on the effectiveness and productivity of employees, especially in the company's production sector. The study by Astuti and Mulyadin (2022) at the Sape Sub-district Office found that there is a significant influence of the physical work environment on the performance of its employees.

The latest study found that there is an interaction between work motivation and the work environment to influence the performance of its employees. Arianto and Septiani (2021) found that their motivation and physical work environment have an influence on their employees' performance with job satisfaction that they intervene. Jahroni and Darmawan (2022) explain that their motivation, discipline, and work environment have an influence on the performance of their employees. Amelia et al. (2023) found that the work environment has an influence on the performance of its employees with motivation as mediators.

Although there are many studies that examine the influence of work motivation and physical work environment on employee performance, there is still a gap in the study. First, most studies focus on direct influence without exploring in depth the processes and mechanisms that occur within the organization. Second, there are still limited studies that integrate the two variables in one comprehensive framework to understand the dynamics of the interaction between the two. Third, studies on the optimal combination between work motivation and physical work environment in maximizing employee performance have not been widely implemented.

The urgency of this study is even more important considering the challenges faced by organizations in maintaining and improving employee performance. In a practical context, many companies have difficulty identifying the root cause of low employee performance, whether it comes from a lack of motivation or unfavorable work environment conditions. This study can provide empirical guidance for MSDM practitioners in designing targeted interventions to improve employee performance.

Based on this description, studies related to the influence of their work motivation and physical work environment on employee performance have high relevance. This study aims to dissect the process of how their work motivation and physical work environment affect employee performance at PT SBCR in depth and comprehensively. With better insight into the dynamics of these three variables, organizations can develop optimal tactics to manage their human resources in achieving their sustainable competitive advantage.

RESEARCH METHOD

Types of Research

This research used a type of quantitative research with a causal associative approach. Sugiyono (2021) interprets quantitative research as a way of study whose foundation is on the philosophy of positivism which is maximized by studying studies on the population or the sample using quantitative/statistical data analysis to examine the hypothesis. The causal associative approach was chosen because this study aims to understand the influence of their work motivation and physical work environment on the performance of their employees at PT SBCR.

Population and Sample

The population of this study is 137 permanent employees of PT SBCR. According to Sugiyono (2021), a population is a general area that includes objects or subjects with certain characteristics that will be tested and analyzed. This study uses a census technique, where all members of the population are sampled. Arikunto (2021) stated that saturated sampling is a sampling method in which all members of the population are used as samples, which is carried out when the population is relatively small (less than 200 people).

Data Collection Techniques

The data collection technique uses questionnaires as the main instrument. Sugiyono (2021) interprets the questionnaire as an effort to collect data by giving several questions in writing to the respondents. The questionnaire uses a 5-point Likert scale: Strongly Agree (5), Agree (4), Neutral (3), Disagree (2), and Strongly Disagree (1). Then the study uses a literature study for secondary data in the form of company profiles and HR policy documents.

Data Analysis Techniques

The data analysis technique uses multiple linear regression analysis through SPSS version 26. Ghazali (2021) explained that this analysis was used to examine the influence of more than one independent on its dependents. The model of the equation: $Y = a + b_1X_1 + b_2X_2 + e$. The hypothesis test uses the t-test (partial), the F test (simultaneous), and the determination coefficient (R^2).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Data Quality Results

Table 1. Validity Test Results

Variable	Statement	r-count	r-table	Remarks
Motivation Work	1	0.751	0.1678	Valid
	2	0.782	0.1678	Valid
	3	0.798	0.1678	Valid
	4	0.768	0.1678	Valid
	5	0.742	0.1678	Valid
	6	0.715	0.1678	Valid
	7	0.735	0.1678	Valid
	8	0.768	0.1678	Valid
	9	0.780	0.1678	Valid
Physical Work Environment	1	0.879	0.1678	Valid
	2	0.869	0.1678	Valid
	3	0.877	0.1678	Valid

Variable	Statement	r-count	r-table	Remarks
	4	0.894	0.1678	Valid
	5	0.896	0.1678	Valid
	6	0.874	0.1678	Valid
	7	0.862	0.1678	Valid
	8	0.880	0.1678	Valid
	9	0.857	0.1678	Valid
	10	0.889	0.1678	Valid
	11	0.888	0.1678	Valid
	12	0.881	0.1678	Valid
	13	0.869	0.1678	Valid
	1	0.895	0.1678	Valid
	2	0.898	0.1678	Valid
	3	0.885	0.1678	Valid
	4	0.889	0.1678	Valid
	5	0.844	0.1678	Valid
Employee	6	0.886	0.1678	Valid
Performance	7	0.871	0.1678	Valid
	8	0.847	0.1678	Valid
	9	0.856	0.1678	Valid
	10	0.872	0.1678	Valid
	11	0.877	0.1678	Valid
	12	0.839	0.1678	Valid

Based on the table of validity test results, all statement items in work motivation (X1), physical work environment (X2), and employee performance (Y) show a calculated r score that exceeds the r of the table (0.1678) with a significance level below 0.05, then all indicators are considered valid.

Table 2. Reliability Test Results

Variable	Cronbach's Alpha	N of Item	Remarks
Work Motivation	0.938	9	Valid
Physical Work Environment	0.975	13	Valid
Employee Performance	0.971	12	Valid

The realism test table shows that Cronbach's Alpha score for Work Motivation reaches 0.938, Physical Work Environment 0.975, and Employee Performance 0.975, so that this study instrument is declared realistic and can be used in the next stage of analysis.

Multiple Regression Analysis

Table 3. Yield Coefficient

Model	Variable	B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.	Tolerance	VIF
1	(Constant)	6.658	1.444	-	4.611	0.000	-	-
	Work Motivation	0.255	0.128	0.198	1.993	0.048	0.089	11.263
	Physical Work Environment	0.639	0.085	0.748	7.510	0.000	0.089	11.263

Based on the regression table, it was found that the constant score was 6.658, the work motivation coefficient (X1) was 0.225, and the physical work environment (X2) was r 0.639. So, the multiple linear equations are:

$$Y = 6.658 + 0.225X1 + 0.639X2$$

T Test (Partial)

Table 4. Partial Test Results

Model	Variable	B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.	Tolerance	VIF
1	(Constant)	6.658	1.444	-	4.611	0.000	-	-
	Work Motivation	0.255	0.128	0.198	1.993	0.048	0.089	11.263
	Physical Work Environment	0.639	0.085	0.748	7.510	0.000	0.089	11.263

The results of the partial test show that Work Motivation (X1) has a significance p-value score of $0.048 < (0.05)$, so it can be concluded that Work Motivation has a great influence on the Performance of the Employees. Therefore, the H1 hypothesis is accepted. Then with the Physical Work Environment (H2) showing a p-value significance score of $0.00 < (0.05)$, it means that the Physical Work Environment has a significant influence on the Performance of the Employees. So the H2 hypothesis is accepted.

F Test (Simultaneous)

Table 5. F Test Results

Model	Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	12198.713	2	6099.356	500.912	0.000
	Residual	1631.652	134	12.177	-	-
	Total	13830.365	136	-	-	-

- a. Dependent Variable: Employee Performance
- b. Predictors: (Constant), Physical Work Environment, Work Motivation

The results of the simultaneous test showed an F score of 500,912 with a significant p-value of $0.00 < (0.50)$. This means that their work motivation and physical work environment together have a significant influence on the performance of their employees, so H3 is accepted.

Determination Test (R2)

Table 6. Determinant Test Results

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	0.939	0.882	0.880	3.48949

- a. Predictors: (Constant), Physical Work Environment, Work Motivation
- b. Dependent Variable: Employee Performance

The score from the Adjusted R Square reached 0.880, which means that 88% of the variation in Employee Performance can be described by Work Motivation and Physical Work Environment, then the remaining 12% is influenced by other variables that are not included in this study.

The Influence of Work Motivation on Employee Performance

The results of the first hypothesis test found that work motivation had a positive influence on the performance of its employees at PT SBCR, with a p-value of 0.003 ($p < 0.04$), so the H1 was accepted. This achievement is in line with the Vroom Expectation theory where employees who get motivation will work hard to achieve optimal performance because they believe that their efforts will get optimal performance, and their good performance will get rewards (Luthans, 2022). It shows that when employees have high work motivation, they will be more focused, productive, and committed to completing their tasks.

Sedarmayanti (2011) explained that job security guarantees are fundamental factors that affect the psychological stability of their employees which then affects their commitment and performance. On the other hand, the dimension with the lowest score is the physiological need related to the suitability of salary and workload. Although it is still in the high category, it indicates that there is room for improvement in the compensation system to further increase employee work motivation. This finding is relevant to Maslow's hierarchy of needs adapted by Mangkunegara (2013) in the context of work motivation. When their basic needs and security needs are met, employees will be more motivated to achieve higher needs such as social needs and rewards. Robbin and Judge (2023) added that motivation has an influence on three important aspects: the intensity of the business run by its employees, the direction of efforts that are consistent with the mission of their office, and the persistence in maintaining the business.

The results of this study are similar to various previous empirical studies. Rifdha et al. (2024) found that work motivation has a significant influence on employee performance, where highly motivated employees tend to show better performance. Rahmawati and Sultoni (2024) reinforce this finding by explaining that work motivation has a positive influence on the performance of its employees, the higher the work motivation, the higher the performance. Hidayat and Budiman (2022) provide evidence that work motivation contributes up to 52.3% of employee performance. The consistency of these findings shows that work motivation is a universal factor that plays a central role in improving employee performance in various organizational contexts. Hasibuan (2020) explained that motivation plays a role as a driver of individual work spirit so that he is encouraged to collaborate, carry out tasks productively, and exert all the skills and efforts he has to achieve personal and professional satisfaction. In other words, the development of work motivation is a strategic investment that will directly improve the overall performance of the organization and encourage the achievement of company goals more optimally.

The Influence of the Physical Work Environment on Employee Performance

The second hypothesis test obtained found that if the physical work environment had a positive influence on the performance of its employees PT SBCR, with a p-value score of 0.000 ($p < 0.05$), then the H2 was accepted. It's very small significance score (0.000) indicates that the physical work environment has a strong influence on the performance of its employees. This is in line with the theory of Sedarmayanti (2011) where the physical work environment is a material condition around the work area that can have an impact on the performance of its employees, both directly and through indirect influences on their comfort, health, and productivity.

These findings support his research from Nawawi (2023) where a good physical work environment can minimize physical and mental fatigue, increase concentration levels, and provide comfort that supports work productivity. Physical conditions such as adequate lighting, comfortable temperatures, good air circulation, and low noise levels have been shown to affect employees' health, comfort, and work efficiency. Wirawan (2020) added that a conducive physical work environment can increase the level of work productivity, reduce the attendance rate, increase the level of job satisfaction, and reduce employee turnover.

The findings of this study are consistent with various other empirical studies. Sari and Susanti (2021) provide evidence that the physical work environment has a positive influence

on the performance of its employees. Astuti and Mulyadin (2022) found that there was a great influence of the physical work environment on the performance of their employees at the Sape Sub-district Office. Lilyana et al. (2021) explained that the physical work environment has an effect on the performance of its employees in the production part of their company. The consistency of these findings indicates that the physical work environment is a central element that cannot be ignored in efforts to improve organizational performance.

The Effect of Work Motivation and Physical Work Environment Simultaneously on Employee Performance

The third hypothesis test results show that the work motivation and physical work environment have a positive influence on the performance of PT SBCR's employees, with a significance value of the F test of 0.001 ($p < 0.05$), then the second hypothesis (H2) is accepted. Then the R-Square Adjusted score of 0.889 or 88.9% shows that the two independents can describe the variation in employee performance very well. According to the criteria of Hair et al. (2016), the R^2 value above 0.75 is included in the strong group, so this research model can be considered to be very elaborate on the phenomenon of employee performance.

These findings are supported by the open systems theory in Robbins and Judge (2023) which describes that performance is a function of the interaction between individual characteristics and situational characteristics (including the physical work environment). These two factors do not work separately, but interact synergistically in influencing employee performance. The concept of person-environment fit put forward by Armstrong and Taylor (2020) explains that employees who have a strong work drive need a conducive work environment in order to be able to express their skills and potential to the fullest. Conversely, adequate workplace facilities and physical conditions will have the most significant impact on highly motivated employees. According to Kasmir (2016), performance emerges as a result of the interaction between ability, motivation, and opportunity

The results of his study are in line with various previous empirical studies. Pratama and Wardana (2020) provide evidence that anyanyasnaya's work motivation and work environment have a positive influence on the performance of their employees. Hidayat and Budiman (2022) found a simultaneous contribution of 74.8% to employee performance, showing that the combination of their work motivation and physical work environment had an influence that exceeded the partial influence of each variable. Putri et al. (2023) confirmed that their R^2 value was 0.687 or 68.7%, where their physical work environment ($\beta=0.324$) and work motivation ($\beta=0.412$) both contributed greatly to the performance of their employees.

The findings of his research with an R^2 value of 88.9% even showed a higher contribution, indicating that the combination of the two factors in PT SBCR worked very effectively. In their research, Arianto and Septiani (2021) found that motivation and physical work environment have an influence on the performance of employees with job satisfaction as an intervening variable, found that there is a psychological mechanism that unites the two variables with performance. Amelia et al. (2023) found that the work environment has an influence on employee performance with motivation as the mediator, indicating that a good work environment can increase motivation, then improve performance. These findings confirm that the relationship between work motivation, physical work environment, and employee performance is complex and involves many interrelated psychological mechanisms.

CONCLUSION

Based on the results of the analysis of studies related to the influence of work motivation and physical work environment on the performance of PT SBCR employees, it can be concluded that work motivation has a positive and significant influence on the performance of its employees with a significance value of 0.048 ($p < 0.05$) and a regression coefficient of 0.255. The dimension of the need for a sense of security related to work safety guarantees is the most dominant factor that gives a boost to the enthusiasm and commitment of employees when carrying out their duties. This finding is in line with Vroom's Expectation theory which emphasizes that motivated employees will strive to achieve optimal performance because they believe their efforts will get good results and the desired rewards. The physical work environment showed a very strong influence on employee performance with a significance of 0.000 ($p < 0.05$) and a regression coefficient of 0.639, more dominant than work motivation. Aspects of lighting, temperature, air circulation, noise, cleanliness, and spatial planning are proven to create conducive working conditions that minimize physical and mental fatigue, increase concentration, and boost employee productivity. Simultaneously, work motivation and physical work environment have a very significant effect with an F value of 500.912 and a significance of 0.000. The Adjusted R Square value is 0.880, meaning that the two variables describe 88% variation in employee performance, indicating a strong synergistic effect. This proves that efforts to improve performance will be more effective if both aspects are managed in an integrated and comprehensive manner to achieve organizational goals.

REFERENCE

- Amelia, D., Agustin, D., & Suhadarliyah, S. (2023). Lingkungan kerja dan kinerja karyawan: Peran motivasi sebagai mediator. *Jurnal Cahaya Mandalika*, 4(3), 1955–1965.
- Arianto, N., & Septiani, R. (2021). Pengaruh motivasi dan lingkungan kerja fisik terhadap kinerja karyawan dengan kepuasan kerja sebagai variabel intervening pada PT AJS. *Jurnal Arastirma*, 1(2), 198–214.
- Arikunto, S. (2021). *Prosedur penelitian: Suatu pendekatan praktik (Edisi Revisi)*. Rineka Cipta.
- Armstrong, M., & Taylor, S. (2020). *Armstrong's handbook of human resource management practice (15th ed.)*. Kogan Page.
- Astuti, S. S., & Mulyadin. (2022). Analisis lingkungan kerja fisik dan non fisik terhadap kinerja pegawai pada Kantor Camat Sape. *Jurnal Disrupsi Bisnis*, 5(3), 255–262.
- Ghozali, I. (2021). *Aplikasi analisis multivariate dengan program IBM SPSS 26 (Edisi 10)*. Badan Penerbit Universitas Diponegoro.
- Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., & Anderson, R. E. (2022). *Multivariate data analysis (8th ed.)*. Cengage Learning.
- Hasibuan, M. S. P. (2020). *Manajemen sumber daya manusia (Edisi Revisi)*. Bumi Aksara.
- Hidayat, R., & Budiman, A. (2022). Pengaruh motivasi kerja dan lingkungan kerja terhadap kinerja pegawai Dinas Pendidikan Kabupaten Bandung. *Jurnal Ilmu Administrasi dan Organisasi*, 29(1), 34–45.
- Jahroni, J., & Darmawan, D. (2022). Pengaruh motivasi, disiplin, dan lingkungan kerja terhadap kinerja karyawan. *Jurnal Terapan Ilmu Manajemen dan Bisnis*, 5(2), 95–106.
- Kasmir. (2016). *Manajemen sumber daya manusia: Teori dan praktik*. Rajawali Pers.
- Lilyana, B., Yusa, V. De, & Yutami, I. (2021). Pengaruh lingkungan kerja fisik dan kompensasi non finansial terhadap kinerja karyawan bagian produksi pada PT. Rudant Maju Selaras. *Jurnal Manajemen Mandiri Saburai*, 5(3), 163–170.

- Luthans, F. (2022). *Organizational behavior: An evidence-based approach* (14th ed.). McGraw-Hill Education.
- Mangkunegara, A. A. P. (2013). *Manajemen sumber daya manusia perusahaan*. Remaja Rosdakarya.
- Muzaki, F. I., Sari, U. W., Putri, I. K., Arianto, R. S., & Putra, R. S. (2023). Faktor-faktor yang mempengaruhi kinerja karyawan: Motivasi, kepemimpinan, lingkungan kerja, budaya organisasi dan prestasi kerja. *GREENOMIKA*, 1(2), 112–124.
- Nawawi, H. (2023). *Manajemen sumber daya manusia untuk bisnis yang kompetitif*. Gadjah Mada University Press.
- Pratama, I. G. S., & Wardana, I. M. (2020). Pengaruh motivasi kerja dan lingkungan kerja terhadap kinerja karyawan PT Bank BRI Kantor Cabang Denpasar. *E-Jurnal Manajemen Unud*, 9(4), 1520–1539.
- Putri, A. D., Rahman, F., & Sari, D. P. (2023). Pengaruh lingkungan kerja dan motivasi kerja terhadap kinerja karyawan PT Telkom Indonesia Regional Sumatera. *Jurnal Manajemen dan Bisnis Sriwijaya*, 21(1), 45–62.
- Rahmawati, R., & Sultoni, M. R. (2024). Pengaruh motivasi terhadap kinerja karyawan. *Karimah Tauhid*, 3(2), 1652–1659. <https://doi.org/10.30997/karimahtauhid.v3i2.11887>
- Rifdha, A., Oktavia, R., Pasaribu, N. M. P., & Saliyanto, S. (2024). Pengaruh motivasi kerja terhadap kinerja karyawan: Studi literatur. *Jurnal Review Pendidikan dan Pengajaran (JRPP)*, 7(3), 8792–8798. <https://doi.org/10.31004/jrpp.v7i3.30527>
- Robbins, S. P., & Judge, T. A. (2023). *Organizational behavior* (19th ed.). Pearson Education.
- Sari, R. N., & Susanti, E. (2021). Pengaruh lingkungan kerja fisik terhadap kinerja karyawan dengan motivasi sebagai variabel intervening pada perusahaan manufaktur Surabaya. *Jurnal Ilmu Manajemen*, 9(3), 1047–1062.
- Sedarmayanti. (2011). *Manajemen sumber daya manusia: Reformasi birokrasi dan manajemen pegawai negeri sipil*. Refika Aditama.
- Sugiyono. (2021). *Metode penelitian kuantitatif, kualitatif, dan R&D* (Edisi Ketiga). Alfabeta.
- Wirawan. (2020). *Kepemimpinan: Teori, psikologi, perilaku organisasi, aplikasi dan penelitian*. Rajawali Pers.
- Zebua, Y., Harahap, D. S., & Nasution, L. N. (2022). Pengaruh keterampilan kerja dan motivasi kerja terhadap kinerja karyawan pada PTPN I Regional I Tanjung Morawa. *Jurnal Manajemen*, 14(2), 245–256.
- Okolie, Ugo Chuks, and Okafor Prosper Kawedo. 2018. “Factors Influencing Employees’ Performance at Workplace. An Integrated Perspective.” *Journal of Economics & Business Research* 24(1).