

# The Role of Work Motivation Towards Work Productivity

Fatwa Tentama  
*Faculty of Psychology*  
*Universitas Ahmad Dahlan*  
 Yogyakarta, Indonesia  
 fatwa.tentama@psy.uad.ac.id

Naila Nasywa  
*Faculty of Psychology*  
*Universitas Ahmad Dahlan*  
 Yogyakarta, Indonesia  
 nailanasywa21@gmail.com

Dwi Agustina  
*Faculty of Psychology*  
*Universitas Ahmad Dahlan*  
 Yogyakarta, Indonesia  
 gustisoepomo@gmail.com

Syam Ardhy Dabi Dabi  
*Faculty of Psychology*  
*Universitas Ahmad Dahlan*  
 Yogyakarta, Indonesia  
 syam.ardhy55@gmail.com

**Abstract**—Work motivation is one of the factors that can affect work productivity of employees. This study aims to examine empirically the relationship between work motivation and work productivity. The subjects in this study are employees at the University of X Yogyakarta. The subject selection was randomized using a simple randomized sampling technique. Methods of collecting data using the work motivation scale and work productivity scale. Data analysis using product moment correlation techniques. Based on the results of hypothesis testing between work motivation and work productivity, the results of the correlation coefficient are = 0.411 with a significance of 0.008 ( $p < 0.05$ ) which means that there is a very significant positive relationship between work motivation and work productivity. Work motivation contributes 16.9% to work productivity, and the remaining 83.1% is influenced by other variables not examined in this study.

**Keywords**—employee, work motivation, work productivity

## I. INTRODUCTION

Human resources are an investment for a company to gain long-term or short-term profits [1]. Human resources are used as movers of other resources that have a strategic position to contribute to realizing the performance of company organizations with competitive advantage [2]. Human resource development will directly increase employee productivity [3]. According to Akinyele [4] productive human resources can improve organizational welfare.

The high work productivity of employees can increase the standard of organizational income [5]. According to Allmon, Haas, Borcharding, and Goodrum [6] high work productivity can contribute to the general welfare of employees. Meanwhile the low work productivity results in low income and organizational poverty [7]. The results of Akinyele's study [5] found that low work productivity can create a less conducive work environment. Supported by the results of research by Chan, Hales, Shear, Lynde, Poulin, and Mittmann [8] who found that low work productivity would produce an economic burden for a very large organization.

Work productivity can be defined as production, fertility and generative abilities [9]. Productivity is one of the most important and influential basic variables that regulate economic production activities [10]. Boyle [11] defines work

productivity as a measure of the amount of output produced by input units. According to Alvesson and Sveningsson [12] the concept of work productivity can be seen from the individual and organizational side. From the individual side productivity is seen as a result of individual personality characteristics that emerge in the form of mental attitudes and imply the desires and efforts of individuals who always strive to improve the quality of life, while the organization is explained in terms of technical relations between input, output, quality and quantity.

One of the predictors of low work productivity is work motivation [13]. According to Subandowo [14] in his research, individuals who have high work motivation will not easily feel tired in working, so that this will have an impact on the high productivity of work. Meanwhile, according to Matthew, Grawhich, and Barber [15] employees with work motivation will be more productive in terms of efficiency and effectiveness, so that it will maximize organizational income and be satisfied in work. Ketkar and Sett [16] explain that work motivation is always considered in organizations to increase work productivity.

Work motivation is an energy source that refers to internal factors that encourage actions and external factors that can act as persuasions to act [17]. According to Grant [18] work motivation is a desire to spend business based on the interest and pleasure of the work itself. Kanfer, Chen, & Pritchard [19] describe work motivation as a series of processes that determine an individual's intention to allocate self-potential in various actions. Meanwhile according to Pinder [20] work motivation is an energy that comes from inside and outside the individual to determine the shape, direction, intensity, duration and start of behavior. Therefore, the purpose of this study was to determine the relationship between work motivation and work productivity on employees at University X.

## II. RESEARCH METHOD

### A. Population and Sample

The samples in this study were 40 educative employees at the University of X. The sampling technique was randomized, with a simple random sampling technique. The criteria as a population in this study are those permanent employees at

University X because this kind of employees have already passed the training period and have sufficient understanding of their job descriptions and have worked at least 1 year because in that period employees can adjust to conditions, situations and environment at University X as well as being able to internalize norms and rules and understand the values of the goals of University X.

**B. Measuring Instrument**

Methods of collecting are using a scale. The first scale is the work productivity scale and the second scale is the work motivation scale. Work productivity is revealed by using a productivity scale that refers to the factors stated by Simamora [21] which are used in indicators or measurements of work productivity including quantity (amount) of work, quality (quality) of work and timeliness. Work motivation is revealed by the work motivation scale that is arranged using aspects of the degree of response of the subject to work motivation factors, namely intrinsic factors and extrinsic factors [22]. The scaling model uses a Likert scale model with four answer choices, namely: SS (very suitable), S (appropriate), TS (inappropriate), STS (very inappropriate).

**C. Validity and Reliability of Measuring Instruments**

Based on the results of the scale analysis, for the work productivity scale consisting of 24 items, the results of the reliability coefficient ( $\alpha$ ) were 0.905 and the item correlation coefficient (rit) moved between 0.301 to 0.725. Based on these results, the work productivity scale can be used as a valid and reliable data collection tool.

The results of the scale analysis of the test on the work motivation scale consists of 40 items obtained reliability coefficient ( $\alpha$ ) of 0.917 with a correlation coefficient (rit) that move in the range 0.281 and 0.824. Based on these results, the work motivation scale can be used as a valid and reliable data collection tool.

**D. Data Analysis**

Methods Analysis of the data used to test this hypothesis is the product moment testing technique from Pearson. Before analyzing the data using the conversation technique, the normality test and linearity test were first carried out. Data analysis was performed using Static SPSS for Windows Release 17.0.

**III. RESULT AND ANALYSIS**

**A. Prerequisite Test**

**1) Normality Test**

A variable is said to be normal if the value of  $p > 0.05$ . The results of the analysis show that the work productivity scale is obtained by  $p = 0.410$  while the work motivation scale results  $p = 0.868$  which means  $p > 0.05$  so it is concluded that the distribution of research data is normally distributed.

TABLE I. NORMALITY TEST

No	Variable	Score K-SZ	Sig	Explanation
1	Produktivitas Kerjs	0.888	0.410	Normally distributed
2	Motivasi Kerja	0.597	0.868	Normally distributed

**2) Linearity Test**

Linearity test uses the F test (test for linearity) if the value of  $p < 0.05$ , it can be concluded that the relationship between the two variables is linear. The results of the analysis obtained a value of  $p = 0.003$  which means  $p < 0.05$ . Thus, there are linear relationships between work motivation variables and work productivity.

TABLE II. LINEARITY TEST

No	Variable	F	Significance	Criterion	Explanation
1	Work motivation towards work productivity	11,747	0.003	$P < 0.05$	Linier

**3) Hypothesis Test Result**

Based on hypothesis testing using the Pearson correlation test, the correlation coefficient obtained was (r) of = 0.411 between work motivation and work productivity with a significance level ( $p$ ) = 0.008 ( $p < 0.01$ ) which means there is a very significant positive relationship between work motivation and work productivity.

TABLE III. HYPOTHESIS TSET

No	Variable	Pearson Correlation	R Squared	Significance	Criteria	Explanation
1	Work motivation with work productivity	0,411	0,169	0,008	$P < 0.01$	There is a very significant relationship

The results showed that there was a very significant positive relationship between work motivation and work productivity on employees at University X. This reinforces previous studies conducted by Olomolaiye [23] who found that work motivation affects the percentage of work time spent productively, which means work motivation is related to work productivity. Supported by the results of research by Luintel, Selim, and Bajracharya [24] who found that efforts to motivate employees can improve efficiency and higher work productivity. The findings produced by Doloi [25] found that motivational factors are related to work productivity of employees in the organization, because human psychological conditions certainly greatly affect their workforce to remain competitive and network.

Based on the results of the analysis also shows that the magnitude of the effect of work motivation on job satisfaction is 0.169 which means that work motivation contributes 16.9% to work productivity and the remaining 83.1% is influenced by other variables not identified in the study. According to Olomolaiye [23] other factors that influence work productivity include job security problems, accurate description of work and challenging tasks. Meanwhile, Doloi [25] in his research found that a conducive work environment and work contract incentives in the organization will increase employee productivity.

Work motivation factors consist of intrinsic factors and extrinsic factors [22]. According to this theory there are two factors that influence a person's work conditions, namely motivation factors which are also called satisfiers or intrinsic motivation and health factors (hygiene) which are also called dissatisfiers or extrinsic motivation. This theory sees that there are two factors that encourage motivated employees, namely intrinsic factors and extrinsic factors.

The two factors of Frederick Herzberg include intrinsic factors and extrinsic factors, where intrinsic factors are factors that encourage employees to be motivated, namely the impulse that arises from within each person, and extrinsic factors, namely the impulse that comes from outside a person, especially the organization where he works. Motivational / intrinsic factors are factors that encourage enthusiasm to achieve higher performance. Motivational / intrinsic factors associated with work content include success, recognition, challenging work, improvement and growth in work. When employees are working to get success and get recognition for their work by various parties, especially bosses and coworkers, employees will be motivated to work and will eventually show the quality of work and quantity of work by doing their best, working optimally and completing work on time.

The second factor is hygiene factors or extrinsic factors to work. Hygienic factors are descriptions of individual physiological needs that are expected to be met. Hygiene factors (health factors) include salary, personal life, and quality of supervision, working conditions, guaranteed employment, interpersonal relations, company policy and administration. This is shown when employees in work are given a salary that is appropriate to their work and workload, work in a comfortable environment and get support from a boss who provides guidance, direction and helps their subordinates. The employee will try to maintain the quality of his work, work his best and produce work in the appropriate amount the provisions. They can even exceed the target. In addition, employees also get guaranteed employment both health insurance, guaranteed occupational safety and pension benefits, salaries to thirteen and fourteenth and also allowances for Islamic holidays so that employees will be more productive in their work, more qualified work, and trying to complete tasks right time.

The implication of this research is that work motivation is very important in increasing the work productivity of its employees. Organizations need to pay attention to both internal and external factors in strengthening the work motivation of their employees. The organization must also be able to create a positive work environment that will have an impact on internal and external factors of employees so that employee productivity can be consistent and increase.

#### IV. CONCLUSION

The conclusion of this study is that there is a very significant positive relationship between work motivation and work productivity. That is, the higher the work motivation, the higher the work productivity and vice versa the lower the work motivation, the lower the work productivity. Work motivation contributes 16.9% to work productivity and the remaining 83.1% is influenced by other variables.

#### ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The author would like to thank the Institute of Research and Community Service (LPPM) of Universitas Ahmad Dahlan Yogyakarta for providing research funds so that this research could be carried out and resolve smoothly.

#### REFERENCES

- [1] B. E. Becker, M. E. Huselid, and D. Ulrich, *The HR Scorecard: Linking People, Strategy, and Performance*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press, 2001.
- [2] P. M. Wright, T.M. Gardner, L. M. Moynihan, and M. R. Allen, "The relationship between HR practices and firm performance: Examining causal order," *Personnel Psychology*, vol. 58(2), 2005, pp. 409-446.
- [3] K. A. Paul, and R. N. Anantharaman, "Impact of people management practices on organizational performance: Analysis of a causal model," *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, vol. 14(7), 2003, pp. 1246-1266.
- [4] S.T. Akinyele, "The influence of work environment on workers productivity: A case of selected oil and gas industry in Lagos, Nigeria," *African Journal of Business Management*, vol. 4(3), 2010, pp. 299-307.
- [5] S.T. Akinyele, "Examination of motivation and work performance the salespeople: Role of supervisors' behavior," *Journal of Contemporary Management Research*, vol. 3(2), 2009, pp. 1-8.
- [6] E. Hass. Allmon, C. T. Borcharding, and P. M. Goodrum, U.S, "Construction labor productivity trends, 1970-1998," *Journal of Construction Engineering and Management*, vol. 26(2), 2000, pp. 97-104.
- [7] T.M. Yesufu, *The Human Factor In National Development: Nigeria*. Ibadan: Spectrum Books Limited, 2001.
- [8] B. Chan, B. Hales, N. Ho. V. Shear, C. Lynde, Y. Poulin, and N. Mittmann, "Work-related lost productivity and its economic impact on Canadian patients with moderate to severe psoriasis," *Journal of Cutaneous Medicine and Surgery*, vol. 13(4), 2009, pp. 192-197.
- [9] A. Mougheli, and A. Azizi, *Human Resources Productivity Management*. Tehran: Payam Nour University, 2011.
- [10] S. Tangen, "Demystifying peroductivity and performane," *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management*, vol. 54(1), 2005, pp. 34-46.
- [11] R. Boyle, *Measuring Public Sector Productivity: Lessons From International Experience*. Dublin: Institute of Public Administration, 2006.
- [12] M. Alvesson, and S. Sveningsson, *Changing organizational culture: Cultural change work in progress*. New York: Routledge, 2015.
- [13] A. Banerjee, "Integrating human motivation in service productivity," *Procedia Manufacturing*, vol. 3, 2015, pp. 3591-3598.
- [14] M. Subandowo, "The effect of training on work motivation, attitude, fatigue, and productivity," *International Journal of Management and Administrative Sciences*, vol. 3(7), 2016 pp. 41-52.
- [15] J. Grawhich, Matthew, and L. K. Barber, *Are you focusing both employees and organizational out comes*. *Organizational Health Initiative at Saint Louis University*, 1-5.M. W. Drafke and S. Kossen, *The Human Side of Organizations*. United States: Addison Longman, Inc, 1998.
- [16] S. Ketkar, and P. K. Sett, "HR flexibility and firm performance: Analysis of a multi-level causal model," *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, vol. 20(5), 2009, pp. 109-1038.
- [17] E. A. Locke, and G.P. Latham, "What should we do about motivation theory? Six recommendations for the twenty-first century," *Academy of Management Review*, vol. 29(3), 2004, pp. 388-403.
- [18] A. M. Grant, "Does intrinsic motivation fuel the prosocial fire? Motivational synergy in predicting persistence, performance, and productivity," *Journal of Applied Psychology*, vol. 93(1), 2008, pp. 48-58.
- [19] R. A. Kanfer, G. Chen, and R. D. Pritchard, *Work Motivation: Past, Present, And Future Frontiers*. New York: Taylor and Francise, 2008.
- [20] C. C. Pinder. *Work Motivation In Organizational Behavior*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 2004.
- [21] H. Simamora, *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia*. Jakarta: Bina Rupa Aksara, 2004.

- [22] S. P. Robbins. *Organisational Behaviour*. San Diego: Prentice Hall, 2006.
- [23] P. O. Olomolaiye, "An evaluation of the relationships between bricklayers' motivation and productivity," Routledge, 2013, pp. 37-41
- [24] K. B. Luintel, S. Selim, and P. Bajracharya, "Liberalization, bankers' motivation and productivity: A simple model with an application", *Economic Modelling*, vol. 61, 2017, pp. 102-112.
- [25] H. Doloi, "Twinning motivation, productivity and management strategy in construction projects," *Engineering Management Journal*, vol. 19(3), 2007, pp. 30-40.