

## **The Effect of Giving Incentives and Work Discipline on Work Achievements that Impact on Employee Performance**

**Sri Mulyani**

University of Pamulang, Tangerang Selatan, Banten, Indonesia

Email: [dosen02246@unpam.ac.id](mailto:dosen02246@unpam.ac.id)



This is an open access article distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution License CC-BY-NC-4.0 ©2021 by author (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>)

---

### **ABSTRACT**

This study aims to determine the effect of incentives and work discipline on work performance which has an impact on employee performance at PT. Median Cipta Graha in Jakarta. The method used is explanatory research with a sample of 120 respondents. The analysis technique uses statistical analysis with regression, correlation, determination and hypothesis testing. The results of this study Incentives have a significant effect on work performance by 36.3%, hypothesis testing obtained a significance of  $0.000 < 0.05$ . Work discipline has a significant effect on work performance by 38.0%, hypothesis testing obtained a significance of  $0.000 < 0.05$ . Incentives and work discipline simultaneously have a significant effect on work performance by 51.9%, hypothesis testing is obtained a significance of  $0.000 < 0.05$ . Work achievement has a significant effect on employee performance by 39.7%, hypothesis testing obtained a significance of  $0.000 < 0.05$ .

**Keywords:** Incentives; Work Discipline; Work Performance; Employee Performance.

---

### **INTRODUCTION**

The problem of human resources is still a problem for a company to survive in the era of globalization (Lanzarone et al., 2012; Manzi et al., 2012). Basically, human resources are different resources from other resources in the company such as natural resources and capital resources (Nathaniel, 2021; Ndikumana & Sarr, 2019).

The role of human resources is very important to achieve company goals (Holá, 2011). This of course does not escape from various supporting factors in increasing employee productivity (Chen et al., 2015; Hanaysha, 2016; Nguyen et al., 2020), including the provision of rewards that are commensurate with employee performance, apart from the salary received by employees, namely incentives (Babajide, 2010; Kwok et al., 2021).

PT. Median Cipta Graha is a company engaged in the construction of both offices and residential (Alusi et al., 2011; Begari, 2015; Quale et al., 2012). In managing the limited resources owned by the company (Babajide, 2010; Mhlanga, 2018), the company is required to be able to empower and optimize in order to achieve its goals and maintain its survival. Human resources

(HR) is one of the company's competitive advantages in terms of efficiency, effectiveness and flexibility of the company in achieving its goals. The task demands that exist in a company are one of the causes of the emergence of work discipline in employees.

Work discipline is something that must be instilled in every employee (Aldulaimi, 2016; Maduningtias, 2020), because this will involve the employee's moral responsibility in his duties. Providing incentives is one of the main things that must be considered by companies. Discipline of employees can also be caused by the size of the incentives received. If employees do not get incentives that are in accordance with the amount of sacrifice in work, then these employees tend to be lazy to work and ultimately affect their work performance.

Incentives are incentives given to certain employees based on their work performance so that employees are encouraged to increase their work productivity. With the provision of appropriate incentives and good working methods so that in the future, the organization's work processes can run according to organizational goals

Employee performance appraisal is quite important for employees and companies because of the work assessment becomes the center of career planning for employees as well as getting promotions. For companies, employee performance appraisal can be a motivation for employees to work better. Performance appraisal can help a leader in anticipating and preventing employee dissatisfaction. Changes in employee attitudes are signs of a change in employee job satisfaction. High employee performance of each employee is very desirable for the company. The more employees who excel, the performance or productivity of the organization as a whole will increase and the company can survive in its business competition.

## **METHOD**

The population in this study amounted to 120 respondents PT. Median Cipta Graha in Jakarta. 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 120 respondents (Etikan et al., 2016; Taherdoost, 2016). The type of research used is associative, where the aim is to find out the relationship between In analyzing the data used instrument test, classical assumption test, regression, coefficient of determination and hypothesis testing.

## **RESULT AND DISCUSSION**

### **Instrument Test Results**

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

**Table 1**  
**Reliability Test Results**

Variable	Cronbach's Alpha	Alpha Critical Standard	Information
Intensive (X1)	0.654	0.600	Reliable
Work Discipline (X2)	0.639	0.600	Reliable
Work Performance (Y)	0.619	0.600	Reliable
Employee Performance (Z)	0.620	0.600	Reliable

Based on the results of the above examination, the overall intensive variable (X1), work discipline (X2), Work Performance (Y) and Employee Performance (Z) obtained a *Cronbach alpha* value greater than 0.600. Thus declared reliable.

### Classic Assumption Test Results

#### 1. Normality 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-Smirnov <sup>a</sup>			Shapiro-Wilk		
	Statistics	df	Sig.	Statistics	df	Sig.
Work Performance (Y)	.076	120	.088	.970	120	.008

\*. This 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 0.088 is obtained where the value is greater than the value of  $= 0.050$  or  $(0.088 > 0.050)$ . Thus, the assumption of the distribution of equations in this test is normal.

#### 2. Multicollinearity Test

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 .**

Model	Coefficients <sup>a</sup>				
	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	Collinearity Statistics	
	B	Std. Error	Beta	Tolerance	VIF
1 (Constant)	8.422	2,738			
Incentive (X1)	.378	.065	.413	.814	1,229
Work Discipline (X2)	.424	.069	.438	.814	1,229

#### a. Dependent Variable: Work Performance (Y)

Based on the test results in the table above, the *tolerance* value of each independent variable is  $0.814 < 1.0$  and the *Variance Inflation Factor* (VIF) value is  $1.229 < 10$ , thus this regression model does not occur multicollinearity.

### 3. Autocorrelation Test

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. Error of the Estimate	Durbin-Watson
1	.720 <sup>a</sup>	.519	.511	2.467	1,596

a. Predictors: (Constant), Work discipline (X2), Incentives (X1)

b. Dependent Variable: Work Performance (Y)

The test results in the table above obtained the *Durbin-Watson* value of 1,596, the value was between the interval 1,550 – 2,460. Thus, the regression model stated that there was no autocorrelation disorder.

### 4. Heteroscedasticity Test

The test was carried out with the *Glejser Test Model* test tool . The test results are as follows:

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

Coefficients <sup>a</sup>					
Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
1 (Constant)	5.043	1,536		3.282	.001
Incentive (X1)	.041	.036	.111	1.123	.264
Work Discipline (X2)	-.121	.039	-.307	-3.122	.132

a. Dependent Variable: RES2

The results of the test using the *glejser* test obtained the value of Sig. > 0.050. Thus, the *regression model* has no heteroscedasticity disorder.

### Descriptive Analysis

In this test, it is used to determine the minimum and maximum scores, the highest scores, the rating scores and the standard deviation of each variable. The results are as follows:

Table 6. Results of *Descriptive Statistics* Analisis Analysis

Descriptive Statistics					
	N	Minimum	Maximum	mean	Std. Deviation
Incentive (X1)	120	29	46	38.03	3.857
Work Discipline (X2)	120	31	46	38.33	3,642
Work Performance (Y)	120	32	46	39.06	3,527
Employee Performance (Z)	120	31	50	39.28	3.572

Valid N (listwise)	120				
--------------------	-----	--	--	--	--

Incentives obtained a minimum *variance* of 29 and a *maximum variance* of 46 with a rating *score* of 3.7803 with a standard deviation of 3.857. Work discipline obtained a minimum *variance* of 31 and a *maximum variance* of 46 with a rating *score* of 3.833 with a standard deviation of 3.642. Work performance obtained a minimum *variance* of 32 and a *maximum variance* of 46 with a rating *score* of 3.906 with a standard deviation of 3.527. Employee performance obtained a minimum *variance* of 31 and a *maximum variance* of 50 with a rating *score* of 3.928 with a standard deviation of 3.572.

### Quantitative Analysis.

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

#### 1. Multiple Linear Regression Analysis

This regression test is intended to determine changes in the dependent variable if the independent variable changes. The 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)	8.422	2,738		3.076	.003
Incentive (X1)	.378	.065	.413	5.808	.000
Work Discipline (X2)	.424	.069	.438	6.165	.000

a. Dependent Variable: Work Performance (Y)

Based on the test results in the table above, the regression equation  $Y = 8.422 + 0.378X_1 + 0.424X_2$  is obtained. From these equations it is explained as follows:

- 1) A constant of 8.422 means that if there are no incentives and work discipline, then there is a work performance value of 8.422 points.
- 2) The incentive regression coefficient is 0.378, this number is positive, meaning that every time there is an increase in incentives of 0.378 points, work performance will also increase by 0.378 points.
- 3) The regression coefficient of work discipline is 0.424, this number is positive, meaning that every time there is an increase in work discipline of 0.424 points, work performance will also increase by 0.424 points.

#### 2. Coefficient of Determination Analysis

The analysis of the coefficient of determination is intended to determine the percentage of the influence of the independent variable on the dependent variable either partially or simultaneously. The test results are as follows:

**Table 8**  
**Results of the Coefficient of Determination of Incentives on Work Performance.**

Model Summary				
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.602 <sup>a</sup>	.363	.357	2.828

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

Based on the test results obtained a determination value of 0.363, meaning that incentives have an influence contribution of 36.3% on work performance.

**Table 9**  
**Results of the Coefficient of Determination of Work Discipline on Work Performance.**

Model Summary				
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.617 <sup>a</sup>	.380	.375	2,789

a. Predictors: (Constant), Work discipline (X2)

Based on the test results, the determination value is 0.380, meaning that work discipline has a 38.0% influence contribution to work performance.

**Table 10**  
**Results of Testing the Coefficient of Determination of Incentives and Work Discipline Simultaneously on Work Performance.**

Model Summary				
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.720 <sup>a</sup>	.519	.511	2.467

a. Predictors: (Constant), Work discipline (X2), Incentives (X1)

Based on the test results obtained a determination value of 0.519, which means that incentives and work discipline simultaneously have an influence contribution of 51.9% on work performance, while the remaining 48.1% is influenced by other factors.

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

Model Summary				
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.630 <sup>a</sup>	.397	.391	2,786

a. Predictors: (Constant), Job Performance (Y)

Based on the test results obtained a determination value of 0.397, meaning that work performance has an influence contribution of 39.7% on employee performance.

### 3. Hypothesis testing

#### Partial hypothesis test (t test)

Hypothesis testing with t test is used to determine which partial hypothesis is accepted. The test results are as follows:

**Table 12**  
**Results of Incentive Hypothesis Testing on Work Performance.**

Model	Coefficients <sup>a</sup>				
	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
1 (Constant)	18111	2,570		7.048	.000
Incentive (X1)	.551	.067	.602	8.193	.000

a. Dependent Variable: Work Performance (Y)

Based on the test results in the table above, the value of t count > t table or (8,193 > 1,979), thus the hypothesis proposed that there is a significant influence between incentives on work performance is accepted.

**Table 13**  
**Hypothesis Test Results Work Discipline Against Work Performance.**

Model	Coefficients <sup>a</sup>				
	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
1 (Constant)	16.168	2,703		5,983	.000
Work Discipline (X2)	.597	.070	.617	8,508	.000

a. Dependent Variable: Work Performance (Y)

Based on the test results in the table above, the value of t arithmetic > t table or (8.508 > 1.979), thus the hypothesis proposed that there is a significant influence between work discipline on work performance is accepted.

**Table 14**  
**Results of Hypothesis Testing of Work Performance on Employee Performance.**

Coefficients <sup>a</sup>					
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta	
1	(Constant)	14.370	2.839		.000
	Work Performance (Y)	.638	.072	.630	.000

a. Dependent Variable: Employee Performance (Z)

Based on the test results in the table above, the value of t arithmetic > t table or (8.806 > 1.979), thus the proposed hypothesis that there is a significant influence between work performance on employee performance is accepted.

### Simultaneous Hypothesis Testing (F Test)

Hypothesis testing with the F test is used to determine which simultaneous hypothesis is accepted. Third hypothesis: There is a significant influence between incentives, work discipline and motivation on work performance.

**Table 15**  
**Results of Simultaneous Incentive and Work Discipline Hypothesis Testing on Work Performance.**

ANOVA <sup>a</sup>						
Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	768,287	2	384.144	63.098	.000 <sup>b</sup>
	Residual	712.304	117	6.088		
	Total	1480,592	119			

a. Dependent Variable: Work Performance (Y)

b. Predictors: (Constant), Work discipline (X2), Incentives (X1)

Based on the test results in the table above, the calculated F value > F table or (63,098 > 2,680), thus the fourth hypothesis proposed that there is a significant influence between incentives and work discipline simultaneously on work performance is accepted.

## Discussion

### 1. Influence of Incentives on Work Performance

Incentives have a significant effect on work performance with a coefficient of determination of 36.3%. Testing the hypothesis obtained the value of t count > t table or (8,193 > 1,979). Thus the hypothesis proposed that there is a significant effect between incentives on work performance is accepted.

### 2. The Influence of Work Discipline on Work Performance

Work discipline has a significant effect on work performance with a coefficient of determination of 38.0%. Testing the hypothesis obtained the value of t count > t table or (8,508 > 1,979). Thus the hypothesis proposed that there is a significant effect between work discipline on work performance is accepted.



### 3. The Effect of Incentives and Work Discipline on Work Performance

Incentives and work discipline have a significant effect on work performance with the regression equation  $Y = 8.422 + 0.378X_1 + 0.424X_2$ , with a coefficient of determination of 51.9% while the remaining 48.1% is influenced by other factors. Hypothesis testing is obtained by the calculated F value > F table or (63.098 > 2.680). Thus the hypothesis proposed that there is a significant effect between incentives and work discipline on work performance is accepted.

### 4. The Influence of Work Performance on Employee Performance

Work performance has a significant effect on employee performance with a coefficient of determination of 39.7%. Testing the hypothesis obtained the value of t arithmetic > t table or (8.806 > 1.979). Thus the hypothesis proposed that there is a significant effect between work performance on employee performance is accepted.

## CONCLUSION

Incentives have a significant effect on work performance with a contribution of 36.3%. Hypothesis test obtained value of t count > t table or (8,193 > 1,979). Work discipline has a significant effect on work performance with a contribution of 38.0%. Hypothesis test obtained value of t count > t table or (8,508 > 1,979). Incentives and work discipline simultaneously have a significant effect on work performance with a contribution of 51.9% influence while the remaining 48.1% is influenced by other factors. Hypothesis testing is obtained by the calculated F value > F table or (63.098 > 2.680). Work performance has a significant effect on employee performance with an influence contribution of 39.7%. Hypothesis test obtained value of t count > t table or (8.806 > 1.979).

## REFERENCES

- Aldulaimi, S. H. (2016). Fundamental Islamic perspective of work ethics. *Journal of Islamic Accounting and Business Research*.
- Alusi, A., Eccles, R. G., Edmondson, A. C., & Zuzul, T. (2011). Sustainable cities: oxymoron or the shape of the future? *Harvard Business School Organizational Behavior Unit Working Paper*, 11–062, 11–62.
- Babajide, E. O. (2010). The influence of personal factors on workers turnover intention in work organizations in South-West Nigeria. *Journal of Diversity Management (JDM)*, 5(4).
- Begari, V. K. (2015). Comparative Studies of Power Quality Issues in Offices and Residential Buildings. *International Journal of Power Electronics Controllers and Converters*, 1(1), 29–40.
- Chen, L., Hannon, P. A., Laing, S. S., Kohn, M. J., Clark, K., Pritchard, S., & Harris, J. R. (2015). Perceived workplace health support is associated with employee productivity. *American Journal of Health Promotion*, 29(3), 139–146.
- Etikan, I., Alkassim, R., & Abubakar, S. (2016). Comparision of snowball sampling and sequential sampling technique. *Biometrics and Biostatistics International Journal*, 3(1), 55.
- Hanaysha, J. (2016). Improving employee productivity through work engagement: Evidence from

- higher education sector. *Management Science Letters*, 6(1), 61–70.
- Holá, J. (2011). The Communication–Way to Achieve Goals. *Proceedings of the 10th International Conference Liberec Economic Forum*, 195–202.
- Kwok, A. O. J., Watabe, M., & Ahmed, P. K. (2021). Excessive Extrinsic Rewards in Workplace Relationships. In *Augmenting Employee Trust and Cooperation* (pp. 11–21). Springer.
- Lanzarone, E., Matta, A., & Sahin, E. (2012). Operations management applied to home care services: the problem of assigning human resources to patients. *IEEE Transactions on Systems, Man, and Cybernetics-Part A: Systems and Humans*, 42(6), 1346–1363.
- Maduningtias, L. (2020). The Effect of Working Discipline and Training on Employee Performance (at PT. Transkom Indonesia in Tangerang). *PINISI Discretion Review*, 1(2), 65–72.
- Manzi, F., Schellenberg, J. A., Hutton, G., Wyss, K., Mbuya, C., Shirima, K., Mshinda, H., Tanner, M., & Schellenberg, D. (2012). Human resources for health care delivery in Tanzania: a multifaceted problem. *Human Resources for Health*, 10(1), 1–10.
- Mhlanga, L. T. (2018). *The Impact of Commercialization of State Owned Entities in Zimbabwe with Reference to the Cold Storage Company*. Lupane State University.
- Nathaniel, S. P. (2021). Environmental degradation in ASEAN: assessing the criticality of natural resources abundance, economic growth and human capital. *Environmental Science and Pollution Research*, 28(17), 21766–21778.
- Ndikumana, L., & Sarr, M. (2019). Capital flight, foreign direct investment and natural resources in Africa. *Resources Policy*, 63, 101427.
- Nguyen, P. T., Arifani, A. Z. T., Susanti, A. Y., & Mahaputra, M. R. (2020). Literature Review Factors Affecting Employee Performance: Competence, Compensation And Leadership. *Dinasti International Journal of Economics, Finance & Accounting*, 1(3), 538–549.
- Quale, J., Eckelman, M. J., Williams, K. W., Sloditskie, G., & Zimmerman, J. B. (2012). Construction matters: comparing environmental impacts of building modular and conventional homes in the United States. *Journal of Industrial Ecology*, 16(2), 243–253.
- Taherdoost, H. (2016). Sampling methods in research methodology; how to choose a sampling technique for research. *How to Choose a Sampling Technique for Research* (April 10, 2016).