

## **The Effect of Motivation and Discipline on Employee Performance at PT. Keb Hana Bank Serpong Branch Office**

**Muhammad Ramdhan**

Sekolah Tinggi Ilmu Ekonomi Ganesha Jakarta

Email: [ramdhan@stieganessa.ac.id](mailto:ramdhan@stieganessa.ac.id)

### **ABSTRACT**

This study aims to determine the effect of motivation and discipline on employee performance at PT. Keb Hana Bank Serpong Branch Office. The method used is explanatory research with analytical techniques using statistical analysis with regression, correlation, determination, and hypothesis testing. The results of this study that motivation has a significant effect on employee performance by 46.5%, hypothesis testing is obtained  $t$  count  $>$   $t$  table or  $(7.965 > 1.993)$ . Discipline has a significant effect on employee performance by 42.7%; hypothesis testing is obtained  $t$  count  $>$   $t$  table or  $(7.380 > 1.993)$ . Motivation and discipline simultaneously have a significant effect on employee performance with the regression equation  $Y = 6.755 + 0.416X_1 + 0.430X_2$ . The influence contribution is 61.1%, hypothesis testing is obtained by  $F$  arithmetic  $>$   $F$  table or  $(56.517 > 2.730)$ .

Keywords Motivation, discipline, employee performance

### **INTRODUCTION**

Human Resources (HR) in an organization is very important in managing, regulating, managing, and using HR to function efficiently, effectively, and productively is the most important thing to achieve company goals (Andrioni & Popp, 2012; Bernardin & Russell, 2006; Kesti, 2012).

In addition, management is also to achieve a goal through the activities of others, meaning that the goal can be achieved when carried out by one or more people. Employees are the company's main asset, so they must be maintained properly. HR management uses a modern approach and macro studies. The factor of concern in HR management is the person itself (Epstein & Harding, 2020; Momir et al., 2014; Piwowar-Sulej, 2021). Currently, it is very much realized that HR is the most important company problem because HR causes other resources in the company to function or run (McDaniel, 1984; Tyson, 2007). Through effective human resources, managers or leaders can find the best way to utilize the people in the company environment to achieve the desired goals.

Associated with human resources, which are the main tool for the smooth activities of an organization, can develop well if the workforce in the organization is given motivation related to the growth and development of a person's nature. Motivation is part of encouraging employees to work according to the goals that have been set, which requires high motivation in carrying out their work.

Motivation is the whole process of motivating to work with subordinates so that they want to work sincerely to achieve organizational goals efficiently and economically. Motivation is a factor that encourages someone to do a certain activity (Rosmani et al., 2015;

Sirait et al., 2019); therefore, motivation is often interpreted as a factor driving the behavior of Edy Sutrisno (2014). Provision of stimuli that can generate enthusiasm and encouragement to work as optimally as possible so that someone wants to work together, work effectively, and be integrated with all his efforts to achieve organizational goals and satisfy individual needs. The influence of work motivation depends on how much intensity of motivation is given, through responsibility in doing work, achievements achieved, self-development, and independence in acting (Beltrán-Martín & Bou-Llusar, 2018; Cucu-Ciuhan & Guită-Alexandru, 2014).

In addition to motivation, work also requires good discipline. Discipline is an attitude of respect for company rules and regulations, which exist within employees, which causes them to conform voluntarily to company regulations and provisions (Goncharenko & Khadaroo, 2020; Ritter et al., 2020). Discipline must be upheld in the company organization. Without the support of good employee discipline, it is difficult for the company to realize its goals. So, discipline is the key to the success of a company in achieving its goals. work discipline is the behavior of a person by the regulations, existing work procedures or attitudes and behavior and actions that are by the regulations of the organization both written and unwritten.” In this study, the indicators used include: obeying the rules of time, obeying the organization’s rules, obeying the rules of behavior at work, obeying other regulations

With these two factors, it can be expected to improve its performance. Work performance results from work in quality and quantity achieved by an employee in carrying out his duties by the responsibilities assigned to (Mangkunegara & Huddin, 2016). From this understanding of performance, employee work performance means achievement or contribution given by employees in carrying out their duties and responsibilities and functions as company employees. Work performance can be achieved by relying on intellectual, emotional, and spiritual abilities and self-defense in dealing with situations in all aspects of life.

Keb Hana Bank, to achieve its goals, expects all employees to carry out their duties well. This desire can be achieved if employees have high work motivation. If there is no work motivation, one will not achieve what is expected even though the basis is based on ability and experience because work motivation can affect the quality of the output.

Based on observations, many employees are still not disciplined regarding attendance due to the absence of firm action from leaders against employees who violate discipline. Meanwhile, in terms of employee work performance, there are fundamental problems that the authors found, namely the lack of employees’ ability to carry out the standards determined by their superiors, the lack of tools or facilities provided by superiors in supporting employee work performance, there are employees who are not competent in their fields resulting in a decrease in work performance.

## **METHOD**

This type of research is quantitative; according to Sugiyono (2018:8), quantitative research is: “Research methods based on the philosophy of positivism, used to examine certain populations or samples, data collection using research instruments, data analysis is quantitative or statistical, with the aim of to test the established hypothesis.” The approach in this study used descriptive and verification. The population is a set of determined objects through certain criteria categorized into objects to be studied. Sugiyono (2018) defines “population as the number of generalization areas consisting of objects or subjects that have the qualities and

characteristics set by the researcher and then draw conclusions.” The population in the study amounted to 75 respondents PT. Keb Hana Bank Serpong Branch Office. According to Sugiyono (2018), “The sample is the number and characteristics possessed by the population.” Meanwhile, Suharsini Arikunto (2010) argues that “The sample is part or representative of the population being studied.” The sampling technique used in this study is a saturated sample, where all members of the population are used as samples. Thus the sample in this study amounted to 75 respondents. The type of research used is quantitative, where the aim is to find out the relationship between the independent variables and the dependent variable. In analyzing the data used instrument test, classical assumption test, regression, correlation coefficient, coefficient of determination, and hypothesis testing.

## RESULT AND DISCUSSION

### Instrument Test

From the test results, it was obtained that all questionnaire items on the motivation variable obtained a 2-tailed significance value of  $0.000 < 0.05$ ; thus, the instrument was valid. From the test results, it was obtained that all questionnaire items on the discipline variable obtained a 2-tailed significance value of  $0.000 < 0.05$ ; thus, the instrument was valid. From the test results, it was obtained that all questionnaire items on employee performance variables obtained a 2-tailed significance value of  $0.000 < 0.05$ ; thus, the instrument was valid. From the results of reliability testing, the following results were obtained:

**Table 1.**

**Reliability Test Results**

Variable	Cronbach's Alpha	Alpha Critical Standard	Information
Motivation (X1)	0.756	0.600	Reliable
Discipline (X2)	0.643	0.600	Reliable
Employee Performance (Y)	0.702	0.600	Reliable

Based on the test results above, the overall motivational variable (X1), discipline (X2), obtained a greater Cronbach alpha value than 0.600. Thus declared reliable.

### Classic Assumption Test

The results of the normality test using the Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test are as follows:

**Table 2.**

**Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test . Normality Results**

	Tests of Normality					
	Kolmogorov-Smirnova			Shapiro-Wilk		
	Statistics	df	Sig.	Statistics	df	Sig.
Employee Performance (Y)	.089	75	.200*	.970	75	.069

\*. It is a lower bound of the true significance.

a. Lilliefors Significance Correction

Based on the test results in the table above, a significance value of 0.200 is obtained where the value is greater than the value of  $= 0.050$  or  $(0.200 > 0.050)$ . Thus, the assumption of the distribution of the equations in this test is normal.

Multicollinearity test was carried out by looking at the Tolerance Value and Variance Inflation Factor (VIF). The test results are as follows:

**Table 3.**  
**Multicollinearity Test Results with Collinearity Statistics.**

Coefficients <sup>a</sup>						
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	Collinearity Statistics	
		B	Std. Error	Beta	Tolerance	VIF
1	(Constant)	6,755	3,001			
	Motivation (X1)	.416	.071	.483	.787	1,271
	Discipline (X2)	.430	.083	.431	.787	1,271

a. Dependent Variable: Employee Performance (Y)

Based on the test results in the table above, the tolerance value of each independent variable is  $0.787 < 1.0$ , and the Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) value is  $1.271 < 10$ ; thus, this regression model does not occur multicollinearity.

The test was carried out with the Darbin-Watson test (DW test). The test results are as follows:

**Table 4.**  
**Autocorrelation Test Results**

Model Summary <sup>b</sup>					
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. The error of the Estimate	Durbin-Watson
1	.782a	.611	.600	2.263	2,071

a. Predictors: (Constant), Discipline (X2), Motivation (X1)

b. Dependent Variable: Employee Performance (Y)

The test results in the table above obtained the Durbin-Watson value of 2,071; the value is between the intervals 1,550 – 2,460. Thus the regression model stated that there was no autocorrelation disorder.

The results of the heteroscedasticity test are as follows:

**Table 5.**  
**Heteroscedasticity Test Results with Glejser Test Model**

		Coefficients <sup>a</sup>				
		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		
Model		B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.
1	(Constant)	-2.610	1,726		-1.512	.135
	Motivation (X1)	.022	.041	.069	.543	.589
	Discipline (X2)	.096	.048	.255	2009	.058

a. Dependent Variable: RES2

The results of the test using the glejser test obtained the value of Sig. > 0.05. Thus, the regression model has no heteroscedasticity disorder.

**Descriptive Analysis**

This test is used to determine the minimum and maximum scores, mean scores, and standard deviations of each variable. The results are as follows:

**Table 6.**  
**Results of Descriptive Statistics Analysis Analysis**

	Descriptive Statistics				
	N	Minimum	Maximum	mean	Std. Deviation
Motivation (X1)	75	29	48	36.96	4.160
Discipline (X2)	75	29	45	37.24	3.586
Employee Performance (Y)	75	32	47	38.12	3,579
Valid N (listwise)	75				

Motivation obtained a minimum variance of 29 and a maximum variance of 48 with a mean score of 3,696 with a standard deviation of 4,160. Discipline obtained a minimum variance of 29 and a maximum variance of 45 with a mean score of 3,724 with a standard deviation of 3,586. Employee performance obtained a minimum variance of 32 and a maximum variance of 47 with a mean score of 3.812 with a standard deviation of 3.579.

**Inferential Statistical Analysis**

This analysis is intended to determine the effect of the independent variable on the dependent variable. The test results are as follows:

Multiple linear regression test results are as follows:

**Table 7.**  
**Multiple Linear Regression Test Results**

Coefficients <sup>a</sup>						
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	6,755	3,001		2.251	.027
	Motivation (X1)	.416	.071	.483	5.829	.000
	Discipline (X2)	.430	.083	.431	5.196	.000

Based on the test results in the table above, the regression equation  $Y = 6.755 + 0.416X1 + 0.430X2$  is obtained. From these equations, it is explained as follows:

- 1) A constant of 6.755 means an employee performance value of 6.755 points if there is no motivation and discipline.
- 2) The motivation regression coefficient is 0.416; this number is positive, meaning that every time there is an increase in motivation of 0.416, the employee's performance will also increase by 0.416 points.
- 3) The discipline regression coefficient is 0.430; this number is positive, meaning that every time there is an increase in the discipline of 0.430, the employee's performance will also increase by 0.430 points.

The results of the correlation coefficient test are as follows:

**Table 8.**  
**Results of Testing the Correlation Coefficient of Motivation on Employee Performance.**

Correlations <sup>b</sup>			
		Motivation (X1)	Employee Performance (Y)
Motivation (X1)	Pearson Correlation	1	.682**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
Employee Performance (Y)	Pearson Correlation	.682**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	

The test results obtained a correlation value of 0.682, meaning that motivation has a strong relationship to employee performance.

**Table 9.**  
**Results of the Discipline Correlation Coefficient Testing on Employee Performance.**

		Correlations <sup>b</sup>	
		Discipline (X2)	Employee Performance (Y)
Discipline (X2)	Pearson Correlation	1	.654**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
Employee Performance (Y)	Pearson Correlation	.654**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	

The test results obtained a correlation value of 0.654 means that discipline has a strong relationship to employee performance.

**Table 10.**  
**Results of Testing the Correlation Coefficient of Motivation and Discipline Simultaneously on Employee Performance.**

Model Summary				
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.782a	.611	.600	2.263

a. Predictors: (Constant), Discipline (X2), Motivation (X1)

The test results obtained a correlation value of 0.782, meaning that motivation and discipline simultaneously have a strong relationship to employee performance.

The results of testing the coefficient of determination are as follows:

**Table 11.**  
**Results of Testing the Coefficient of Determination of Motivation on Employee Performance.**

Model Summary				
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.682a	.465	.458	2,636

a. Predictors: (Constant), Motivation (X1)

The test results obtained a value of determination of 0.465, meaning that motivation contributes to 46.5% influence on employee performance.

**Table 12.**  
**Results of the Coefficient of Discipline Determination Testing on Employee Performance.**

Model Summary					
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	
1	.654a	.427	.419	2,727	

a. Predictors: (Constant), Discipline (X2)

The test results obtained a determination value of 0.427, meaning that discipline contributes 42.7% influence on employee performance.

**Table 13.**  
**Results of the Coefficient of Determination of Motivation and Discipline on Employee Performance.**

Model Summary					
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	
1	.782a	.611	.600	2.263	

a. Predictors: (Constant), Discipline (X2), Motivation (X1)

Based on the test results, the determination value of 0.611 means that motivation and discipline simultaneously contribute 61.1% influence on employee performance, while other factors influence the remaining 38.9%.

Hypothesis testing with a t-test is used to determine which partial hypothesis is accepted. The first hypothesis: There is a significant effect of motivation on employee performance. The second hypothesis: There is a significant effect of discipline on employee performance.

**Table 14.**  
**The results of the motivational hypothesis test on employee performance.**

Coefficients <sup>a</sup>						
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	16,439	2,739		6.002	.000
	Motivation (X1)	.587	.074	.682	7,965	.000

a. Dependent Variable: Employee Performance (Y)

Based on the test results in the table above, the value of  $t_{count} > t_{table}$  or  $(7.965 > 1.993)$ , thus the first hypothesis proposed that there is a significant influence between motivation on employee performance is accepted.



**Table 15.**  
**Discipline Hypothesis Test Results on Employee Performance.**

Model	Coefficients <sup>a</sup>		Standardized Coefficients Beta	t	Sig.
	Unstandardized Coefficients B	Std. Error			
1 (Constant)	13,826	3.307		4.181	.000
Discipline (X2)	.652	.088	.654	7.380	.000

a. Dependent Variable: Employee Performance (Y)

Based on the test results in the table above, the value of  $t_{count} > t_{table}$  or  $(7.380 > 1.993)$ , thus the second hypothesis proposed that there is a significant influence between discipline on employee performance is accepted.

Hypothesis testing with the F test is used to determine which simultaneous hypothesis is accepted.

The third hypothesis There is a significant influence between motivation and discipline on employee performance.

**Table 16.**  
**Hypothesis Test Results of Motivation and Discipline on Employee Performance.**

Model	ANOVA <sup>a</sup>				
	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1 Regression	579,067	2	289,534	56.517	.000b
Residual	368,853	72	5.123		
Total	947,920	74			

Based on the test results in the table above, the calculated  $F_{count} > F_{table}$  or  $(56.517 > 2.730)$ , thus the third hypothesis proposed that there is a significant influence between motivation and discipline on employee performance is accepted.

**CONCLUSION**

Motivation has a significant effect on employee performance; the correlation value is 0.682 or is strong with a contribution of 46.5%. Hypothesis test obtained value of  $t_{count} > t_{table}$  or  $(7.965 > 1.993)$ . Thus there is a significant influence between motivation on employee performance at PT. Keb Hana Bank Serpong Branch Office. Discipline significantly affects employee performance with a correlation value of 0.654 or more, contributing to 42.7%. Hypothesis test obtained value of  $t_{count} > t_{table}$  or  $(7.380 > 1.993)$ . Thus there is a significant influence between discipline on employee performance at PT. Keb Hana Bank Serpong Branch Office. Motivation and discipline have a significant effect on employee performance with a correlation value of 0.782 or strong with a contribution of 61.1% influence while other factors influence the remaining 38.9%. Hypothesis test obtained value  $F_{count} > F_{table}$  or  $(56.517 > 2.730)$ . Thus there is a significant influence between motivation and discipline simultaneously on employee performance at PT. Keb Hana Bank Serpong Branch Office.

## REFERENCES

- Andrioni, F., & Popp, L. E. (2012). Plea For The Development of Human Resources Through Professional Training in Romania. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 62, 413–417. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2012.09.067>
- Beltrán-Martín, I., & Bou-Llusar, J. C. (2018). Examining the intermediate role of employee abilities, motivation and opportunities to participate in the relationship between HR bundles and employee performance. *BRQ Business Research Quarterly*, 21(2), 99–110. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.brq.2018.02.001>
- Bernardin, H. J., & Russell, J. E. A. (2006). *Human resource management*. Tata McGraw-Hill.
- Cucu-Ciuhan, G., & Guită-Alexandru, I. (2014). Organizational Culture Versus Work Motivation for the Academic Staff in a Public University. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 127, 448–453. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.03.288>
- Epstein, A. L., & Harding, G. H. (2020). *Chapter 48 - Management styles and human resource development* (E. B. T.-C. E. H. (Second E. Iadanza (ed.); pp. 308–320). Academic Press. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-813467-2.00049-3>
- Goncharenko, G., & Khadaroo, I. (2020). Disciplining human rights organisations through an accounting regulation: A case of the ‘foreign agents’ law in Russia. *Critical Perspectives on Accounting*, 72, 102129. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cpa.2019.102129>
- Kesti, M. (2012). Organization Human Resources Development Connection to Business Performance. *Procedia Economics and Finance*, 2, 257–264. [https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/S2212-5671\(12\)00086-X](https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/S2212-5671(12)00086-X)
- Mangkunegara, A. A. A. P., & Huddin, M. (2016). The Effect of Transformational Leadership and Job Satisfaction on Employee Performance. *Universal Journal of Management*. <https://doi.org/10.13189/ujm.2016.040404>
- McDaniel, D. (1984). Human resources development for communications in the Third World. *Telematics and Informatics*, 1(2), 141–146. [https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/S0736-5853\(84\)80004-0](https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/S0736-5853(84)80004-0)
- Momir, B., Petroman, I., Lile, R., Iancu, T., Merce, I., Petroman, C., Marin, D., & Dumitrescu, C. (2014). Human resources management in Romanian agrotourism. *Journal of Biotechnology*, 185, S68. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbiotec.2014.07.231>
- Nachtsheim, C. J., Neter, J., Li, W., & Kutner, M. H. (2004). Applied Linear Statistical Models. *Journal Of The Royal Statistical Society Series A General*. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2984653>.
- Piwowar-Sulej, K. (2021). Human resources development as an element of sustainable HRM – with the focus on production engineers. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 278, 124008. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2020.124008>
- Ritter, R., Wehner, A., Lohaus, G., & Krämer, P. (2020). Effect of same-discipline compared to

different-discipline collaboration on teacher trainees' attitudes towards inclusive education and their collaboration skills. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 87, 102955. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2019.102955>

Rosmani, S. R., Amirullah, A. H., & Saleh, S. (2015). Pengaruh Motivasi Kerja terhadap Kinerja Pegawai pada Dinas Kebersihan dan Pertamanan Kabupaten Soppeng. *Jurnal Office*, 1(1), 31–37.

Sirait, E. J. M., Arhas, S. H., & Suprianto, S. (2019). The Influence of Assignment of Lecturers at School (ALS) Program on Students Learning Motivation in Tarakan City. *Jurnal Ad'ministrare*, 6(1), 79–88.

Tyson, D. (2007). 19 - *The human resources perspective* (D. B. T.-S. C. Tyson (ed.); pp. 141–161). Butterworth-Heinemann. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-075068425-5/50022-7>

