

# The Effect of Motivation, Work Discipline And Supervision on the Performance of Employees at Jati Padang Regional General Hospital

**Achmad Fauzi<sup>1</sup>, Herry Krisnandi<sup>2</sup>, Kumba Digdowiseiso<sup>3\*</sup>**

Faculty of Economics and Business, National University, Indonesia<sup>1,2,3</sup>

Email: achmad.fauzi@gmail.com<sup>1</sup>, herry.krisnandi@civitas.unas.ac.id<sup>2</sup>, kumba.digdo@civitas.unas.ac.id<sup>3\*</sup>

## **Keywords**

*Motivation, Work Discipline and Supervision.*

## **ABSTRACT**

This study aims to determine how much influence motivation, work discipline and supervision have on employee performance at the Jati Padang Regional General Hospital, South Jakarta, the population in this study were 278 employees of the Jati Padang Regional General Hospital, South Jakarta. Using the formula, respondents were selected. Slovin as a sample from 278 to 74 employees, based on the results of data analysis using SPSS the results of the study showed the proposed hypothesis 3, there was a significant hypothesis 3. The data collected was then analyzed using inferential data analysis techniques with multiple linear regression and using the application of the Statistical Product and Service Solution (SPSS) version 26 program. With the results of this study, the authors hope that the Jati Padang Regional General Hospital can strive to increase motivation, Work Discipline and Supervision of Employee Performance.

## **INTRODUCTION**

The current era of globalization, which is full of rapid progress in terms of science and technology, forces all aspects of life to develop very quickly as well. This makes competition between companies even tighter. Every company must have goals that it wants to achieve. On the other hand, the company must still be able to survive in the midst of a fast development rhythm and fierce competition.

Human resources are one of the valuable assets that have a great influence on the progress of both companies and government agencies, so that in managing human resources, management is needed that can manage human resources well and contribute to companies and government agencies in achieving their goals.

In order to achieve the goals of an organization, both large and small organizations, motivation, work discipline and good supervision are needed in order to support the performance of an employee. According to (Ardana et al, 2011: 134) performance discipline is an attitude of respect, respect, compliance and obedience to applicable regulations, both written and unwritten and able to carry out and not avoid receiving sanctions. Meanwhile, employee discipline is absolutely necessary so that all activities that are being and will be carried out run according to a predetermined mechanism. With work discipline, employees will not take actions that can harm the company.

According to Sutrisno (2009), motivation is an attitude or drive that comes from within a person to do a certain activity. While the importance of performance motivation according to Handoko (200: 86) as a driving force that can realize a behavior in order to achieve goals and self-satisfaction.

Supervision is an important element for the continuity and growth and safety of the organization at the Jati Padang Regional General Hospital. Supervision is one element in administrative activities which in the order of writing is always behind. This condition is often associated with its placement as the final part of the overall administration and control activities over the cooperation of units and / or a number of employees to achieve company goals. Supervision can be formulated as a process of activities to ensure that activities can be completed as planned and the process of correcting any deviations that occur. Each manager must be involved in the process of supervision of work units so that they function as planned. Managers cannot actually know whether their units are working as they should until they evaluate which activities have been performed and compare actual performance to desired standards. Supervision means determining what has been implemented, meaning evaluating work performance and if necessary determining corrective action actions so that the results of the work are in accordance with the plan.

Based on the results of the study, it can be seen that the achievement rate of employee performance realization in 2017 was 80%, in 2018 it increased 2% to 82%, in 2019 it increased 2% to 84%, in 2020 it decreased 1% to 83% and in 2021 it increased 2% to 85%. Thus, it can be seen that the average percentage of employee performance value has fluctuated and has not been said to be optimal. It is estimated that there are still some activities that cannot be carried out properly according to the plan. This can be caused by the influence of motivation, work discipline and supervision of employee performance.

Based on the background of the above problem, the author is interested in raising the title in this study is "The Effect of Motivation, Work Discipline and Supervision on the Performance of General Hospital Employees".

## **METHODS**

This research uses quantitative descriptive research methods with the object of research in the form of employees of the Jati Padang Regional General Hospital, South Jakarta. The main data source comes from primary data obtained through the distribution of questionnaires to 278 employees. The population of this study was all employees of the Jati Padang Regional General Hospital, and samples were taken as many as 74 respondents using the Slovin formula. Data collection techniques are carried out through questionnaires with a Likert scale that includes motivation, work discipline, supervision, and employee performance variables. Data analysis was carried out using descriptive analysis, multiple linear regression, validity test, reliability test, classical assumption test, model feasibility test (F test and coefficient of determination), and partial t test. All of these research processes are planned and carried out in accordance with the stages that have been prepared, starting from the preparation of proposals, proposal seminars, data collection, data report processing, to the preparation of the final report or thesis.

## **RESULTS**

### **Validity Test**

This study uses a validity test to measure the accuracy of measuring devices, which is declared valid if the rcount (Correlated Item Total Correlation) is greater than the rtable at a significance level of 0.10. With  $n = 74$ , we get  $r_{table}(0.10) = 0.190$ . The results of the validity test showed that all statements (34 items) for motivation, work discipline, supervision, and employee performance variables were declared valid, because the count was greater than the rtable in each statement. Furthermore, reliability tests using Cronbach Alpha showed that the measuring instrument had a high level of reliability, with Cronbach Alpha values for motivation (0.822), work discipline (0.895), supervision (0.878), and employee performance (0.931) all exceeding the minimum limit of 0.6. Thus, the measuring device in this study can be considered

reliable because it has met the established reliability criteria.

**Classical Assumption Test**

**Normality Test**

The normality test aims to test whether in the regression method, the bound variable and the independent variable both have normal distribution data. One of the conditions in parametric analysis is that the distribution must be normal. To achieve data normality can be done using the Kolomogorof-Smirnof test. The results of SPSS version 26 data processing can be shown as in table 4.12 below:

**Table 1. Normality Test Results  
One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test**

		Unstandardize d Residual
N		74
Normal Parameters <sup>a,b</sup>	Mean	.0000000
	Std. Deviation	2.58780763
Most Extreme Differences	Extreme Absolute	.093
	Positive	.068
	Negative	-.093
Test Statistics		.093
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)		.181c

Source : SPSS 26 data processing results

Based on table 1. Kolomogorof-Smirnof Test above, if the results of the One Sample Kolomogrof Smirnov test are at a significant less than 0.05 then it is stated that the data is not normally distributed, but if the significance value is more than 0.05 then the data is normally distributed.

**Autocorrelation Test**

Autocorrelation test is useful to find out whether in a linear regression model there is a strong relationship both positive and negative between data on research variables. In autocorrelation testing, researchers used the Durbin-Watson (DW) method. Autocorrelation test results as follows:

**Table 2. Autocorrelation test results  
Model Summary<sup>b</sup>**

Type	R	R Square	Adjusted Square	R Std. Error of the Estimate	Durbin-Watson
1	.789a	.623	.606	2.64268	1.782

Source : SPSS 26 data processing results

Based on the results of the autocorrelation test table 4.13 it is known that the magnitude of Durbin-Watson = 1.782 compared to Durbin-Watson table using a significance of 10% sample number 74 (n) and the number of independent variables 3 (K = 3), then in the Durbin-Watson table obtained dL = 1.539 and dU = 1.707. because the Durbin-Watson value of 1.782 is greater than the upper bound (dU) of 1.707 and

less than  $4 - 1.707 = 2.293$  ( $4 - dU$ ). This is in accordance with the decision criterion, namely  $dU < DW < 4 - dU$  ( $1,707 < 1,782 < 2,293$ ), so DW is located between dU and  $4 - dU$ , so it can be concluded that there is no auto correlation.

**Heteroscedasticity Test**

Heteroscedasticity testing is performed to test whether in a regression model, there is an inequality of variance from residuals from another observation. If the variance of the residual from one observation to another is fixed, it is called homosceasticity.

**Table 3. Glacier Test Results**  
**Coefficients<sup>a</sup>**

Type	Unstandardized		Standardized		Sig.
	Coefficients		Coefficients		
	B	Std. Error	Beta	t	
1 (Constant)	-2.118	2.085		-1.015	.313
Total_Motivasi	.177	.105	.355	1.695	.095
Total_Disiplin_Kerja	.024	.094	.055	.255	.799
Total_Pengawasan	-.087	.067	-.223	-1.298	.199

Source : SPSS 26 data processing results

Based on Table 3. It can be explained that the heterokedasticity test with the glacier method obtained a significant value greater than 0.05 so that it can be said that the three variables above do not experience heteroxidicity problems.

**Multicollinearity Test**

The Multicolonearity Test is used to determine whether or not there is a deviation from the classical assumption of multicolonearity, namely the existence of linear relationships or independent variables in the regression model. In this test, researchers used the Variance Infation Factor (VIF) method. The test results are as follows:

**Table 4. Multicollinearity Test Results**  
**Coefficients<sup>a</sup>**

Type	Collinearity Statistics	
	Tolerance	VIF
1 (Constant)		
Total_Motivasi	.298	3.352
Total_Disiplin_Kerja	.278	3.593
Total_Pengawasan	.443	2.258

Source : SPSS 26 data processing results

Based on table 4.15 Coefficient above, it is known that the VIF is calculated for Motivation (X1) =

3.352, VIF calculated for Work Discipline (X2) = 3.593 and VIF for Supervision (X3) = 2.258. of the three variables, the VIF value is <10 and the Tolerance value is more than 0.1, which means that the regression model does not contain multicollinearity.

### Multiple Linear Regression Analysis

Multiple linear regression analysis is a form of analysis that discusses the extent to which the influence of the independent variable on the dependent variable. The independent variable in this study is Motivation (X1), Work Discipline (X2), Supervision (X3), while the dependent variable is Employee Performance (Y). The results of multiple linear regression analysis can be seen in the following table:

**Table 5. Multiple Linear Regression Analysis Results**  
Coefficients<sup>a</sup>

Type	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		
	B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.
1 (Constant)	11.519	3.629		3.174	.002
Total_Motivasi	-.125	.182	-.092	-.687	.494
Total_Disiplin_Kerja	.836	.164	.708	5.088	.000
Total_Pengawasan	.213	.117	.201	1.819	.073

Source : SPSS 26 data processing results

Based on table 6. Above about the regression coefficient it can be seen that the multiple linear regression equation is as follows:

$$Y = 0.092 X_1 + 0.708 X_2 + 0.201 X_3$$

Information:

Y = Employee Performance

X1 = Motivation

X2 = Work Discipline

X3 = Surveillance

The regression equation above shows the constant 11.519 and can be explained that:

1. The Motivation variable has a regression coefficient of 0.092 meaning that if motivation decreases by one unit, then employee performance will decrease by 0.092 with a standard error of 0.182 if the variables of work discipline and supervision are constant.
2. The Work Discipline variable has a regression coefficient of 0.708, meaning that if work discipline increases by one unit, then employee performance will increase by 0.708 with a standard error of 0.164 if the motivation and control variables are constant.
3. The supervisory variable has a regression coefficient of 0.201, meaning that if supervision increases by one unit, employee performance will increase by 0.201 with an error standard of 0.117 if the variables of motivation and work discipline are constant.

The results showed that the three independent variables namely Motivation, Work Discipline and Supervision had a positive influence on the variables tied to Employee Performance. Thus, if motivation, work discipline and supervision increase, the variable Employee Performance will also increase.

### Model Due Diligence

#### Test F

The F test is performed to find out that in this model the independent variable is able to explain the dependent variable. And to see whether the analyzed model has a high level of model feasibility, that is, the variables used by the model are able to explain the phenomenon analyzed.

**Table 6. F Test Results**  
**ANOVAa**

Type	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1 Regression	806.232	3	268.744	38.481	.000b
Residuals	488.863	70	6.984		
Total	1295.095	73			

Source : SPSS 26 data processing results

Based on the results of the F test in table 4.17 above, it can be explained that the Fcalculate value is 38.481 (significant 0.000). The value of Ftable is obtained from the value of the free degree (df) Residual (remainder) which is 70 as df as the denominator df and df Regression (treatment) which is 3 as df numerator with a significant level of 5%, so that the value of Ftable ( $\alpha = 5\%$ ) is 2.74 because the value of Fcalculate is greater than F table ( $38.481 > 2.74$ ) with a significant level of  $0.000 < 0.05$ , it can be concluded that  $H_a$  is accepted. Then Motivation (X1), Work Discipline (X2), Supervision (X3) and together have a positive and real effect on Employee Performance (Y).

**Test Coefficient of Determination (R<sup>2</sup>)**

The coefficient of determination (R<sup>2</sup>) is a measure to determine the suitability or accuracy of the analysis model made. The greater the value of the coefficient of determination, the better the ability of the independent variable to explain the dependent variable.

**Table 7. Coefficient of Determination Test**  
**Model Summary**

Type	R	R Square	Adjusted Square	R Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.789a	.623	.606	2.64268

Source : SPSS 26 data processing results

Based on table 4.18 above, it can be seen that the value of the coefficient of determination described in the Adjusted R Square column is 0.606 or 60.6%, meaning that the variables of Motivation, Work Discipline and Supervision have an influence on the variables of Employee Performance, while the remaining 30.4% are influenced by other variables that are not analyzed in this study.

**Hypothesis Testing t test**

The t test is used to test the significance of partial coefficients and to determine whether or not the

role of each independent and dependent variable is real. The test used a significant level of 0.05 and 2 sides. The hypothesis test between Motivation (X1), Work Discipline (X2) and Supervision (X3) on Employee Performance (Y) can be used by searching for t test statistics with criteria comparing the value of t count and t table. For more details, the author describes the results of the t test in table 8. as follows:

**Table 8. Test Results t Coefficientsa**

Type	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		
	B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.
1 (Constant)	11.519	3.629		3.174	.002
Total_Motivasi	-.125	.182	-.092	-.687	.494
Total_Disiplin_Kerja	.836	.164	.708	5.088	.000
Total_Pengawasan	.213	.117	.201	1.819	.073

Source : SPSS 26 data processing results

Based on the results of the t test referring to table 4.19 above, it can be seen that the calculated t value for Motivation is -0.687 with a significant level of 0.494 while the table t value with  $df = n-k-1$  ( $74-3-1=70$ ), a significant level of 0.10 is obtained at 1.66691. because  $t \text{ counts} < t \text{ table}$  ( $-0.687 < 1.66691$ ) then  $H_0$  is accepted and  $H_a$  is rejected, which can be concluded that Motivation does not have a positive and significant effect on employee performance.

For the t value of calculate Work Discipline of 5.088 with a significant level of 0.000 while the table t value with  $df = n-k-1$  ( $74-3-1=70$ ), a significant level of 0.10 is obtained the number 1.66691. because  $t \text{ count} > t \text{ table}$  ( $5.088 > 1.66691$ ) then  $H_0$  is rejected and  $H_a$  is accepted, which can be concluded that Work Discipline has a positive and significant effect on employee performance.

For the Monitoring calculated t value of 1.819 with a significant level of 0.073 while the table t value with  $df = n-k-1$  ( $74-3-1=70$ ), a significant level of 0.10 is obtained 1.66691. because  $t \text{ count} > t \text{ table}$  ( $1.819 > 1.66691$ ) then  $H_0$  is rejected and  $H_a$  is accepted, which can be concluded that Supervision has a positive and significant effect on employee performance.

## Discussion

### The Effect of Motivation on Employee Performance

Based on the results of hypothesis testing, it was found that the value of the motivation coefficient for variable X1 was 0.092 and marked negative, this shows that motivation has a counter-directional relationship with employee performance. This means that for every increase in motivation of one unit, the employee performance variable (Y) will decrease by 0.92% assuming that the other independent variables of the regression model are fixed. This is also reinforced from the results of previous research (Isnaini Diana Putri Abdullah, 2018). That motivation has a significant negative influence on employee performance.

$$Y = 0.092 X_1 + 0.708 X_2 + 0.201 X_3$$

From the results of the multiple linear regression test, which is 0.092 or 0.92%, it means that if work discipline increases by one unit, then employee performance will decrease by 0.092% assuming other independent variables have a fixed value. While the results of the t test show that  $t \text{ count} < t \text{ table}$  ( $-0.687 < 1.66691$ ) then  $H_0$  is accepted and  $H_a$  is rejected, resulting in the conclusion that Work Discipline has a

significant negative effect on Employee Performance.

### **The Effect of Work Discipline on Employee Performance**

Based on the results of hypothesis testing in this research analysis, it was found that the value was significantly smaller than the probability limit of the error rate used, which was 10% = (0.000 < 0.10), meaning that the Work Discipline variable had a positive and significant effect on employee performance at the Jati Padang Regional General Hospital. This is also reinforced from the results of previous research (Budiman, 2019). That there is a positive and significant influence of competence, motivation and work discipline on employee performance. The positive influence generated by the work discipline variable in this study shows that employees are always present on time, complete work in accordance with company procedures, employees always obey the rules made by the company and accept all consequences from the Jati Padang Regional General Hospital if they violate the rules and regulations that have been made by the company. Based on the results of multiple liner regression analysis, namely:

$$Y = 0.092 X_1 + 0.708 X_2 + 0.201 X_3$$

From the results of the multiple linear regression test, which is 0.708 or 70.8%, it means that if work discipline increases by one unit, then employee performance will increase by 70.8% assuming other independent variables have a fixed value. While the results of the t test showed that t count > t table (5.088 > 1.66691) then Ho was rejected and Ha was accepted, resulting in the conclusion that Work Discipline had a positive and significant effect on Employee Performance.

### **The Effect of Supervision on Employee Performance**

Based on the results of hypothesis testing in this research analysis, it was found that the value was significantly smaller than the probability limit of the error rate used, which was 10% = (0.073 < 0.10), meaning that the supervisory variable had a positive and significant effect on employee performance at the Jati Padang Regional General Hospital. This is also reinforced from the results of previous research (Ni Luh Made herawati etc., 2013). There is a positive and significant influence of employee supervision, discipline and competence on employee performance. The positive influence generated by the Supervision variable in this study shows that with objective and comprehensive supervision at the Jati Padang Regional General Hospital, it can improve employee performance at the Jati Padang Regional General Hospital. Based on the results of multiple liner regression analysis, namely:

$$Y = 0.092 X_1 + 0.708 X_2 + 0.201 X_3$$

From the results of the multiple linear regression test, which is 0.201 or 20.1%, it means that if Supervision increases by one unit, then employee performance will increase by 20.1% assuming other independent variables have a fixed value. While the results of the t test showed that t count > t table (1.819 > 1.66691) then Ho was rejected and Ha was accepted, resulting in the conclusion that Supervision has a positive and significant effect on Employee Performance.

## **CONCLUSION**

Based on the results of analysis and discussion of the performance of employees of the Jati Padang Regional General Hospital, South Jakarta, this study concluded several findings. First, the Motivation variable (X1) has a significant negative influence on employee performance, indicated by the results of a multiple linear regression test of -0.092 or 0.92%. It can be concluded that better attention to motivation, especially on indicators of employee needs and facilities, can improve performance in accordance with planned goals. Second, the Work Discipline variable (X2) has a positive and significant influence on employee performance, with multiple linear regression test results of 70.8%. A good understanding of work discipline, especially in the aspect of compliance with work standards, can help achieve health service



operational targets optimally. Third, the Supervision variable (X3) also has a positive and significant effect on employee performance, with multiple linear regression test results of 20.1%. These results show that supervision carried out in accordance with plans and strategies can improve employee performance, especially in the aspect of accuracy. Thus, accurate and thorough supervision can help achieve company goals and solve problems that arise.

## REFERENCES

- Agustini, F. (2011). *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia Lanjutan*. Medan: Madenatera.
- Badrudin. 2014. *Dasar-dasar Manajemen*. Alfabeta, Bandung.
- Donelly, Gibson (1995), *Organisasi, Prilaku, Skruktur proses*, Jakarta : Indonesia.
- Doni, Juni, Priansa, dan Suwanto.(2013). *Manajemen SDM dalam Organisasi Publikdan Bisnis*.Bandung: Alfabeta.
- Fathoni, Abdurrahmat. 2006. *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia*. Rineka Cipta, Jakarta.
- Halsey, 2003, *Pengawasan Organisasi, tahun (2014)*.
- Harahap, Sofyan Sari. (2001). *Sistem Pengawasan Manajemen (Management ControlSystem)*, PT Pustaka Quantum: Jakarta.
- Herman. Sofyandi. (2009). *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia, Graha ilmu*. Yogyakarta.
- Hasibun, Malayu S.P, 2006. *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia, Edisi Revisi*, PT. Bumi Aksara, Jakarta.
- Kaswan. (2012). *Coaching dan Mentoring Untuk Pengembangan SDM dan Peningkatan Kinerja Organisasi*, Bandung: Alfabeta.
- Lucyda, Irma dan Wia Adawiyah, (2017), *Manajemen Perpustakaan Digital (Studi Sistem Manajemen Perpustakaan Digital Universitas Islam Bandung)*, *Jurnal Kependidikan Islam VII (1)*
- Mangkunegara, Anwar Prabu, (2005). *Perencanaan dan pengembangan sumber dayamanusia*. Cetakan Kedua, penerbit PT retika aditamo, Bandung
- Muhamad Zainur Roziqin, (2010). *Kepuasan kerja*, Averroes Press: Malang Payaman J. Simanjuntak, (2005), *Manajemen dan Evaluasi Kinerja*, Jakarta: Lembaga Penerbit Fakultas Ekonomi UI.
- Santoso, Singgih, dan Fandy Tjiptono, (2002), *Riset Pemasaran : Konsep dan Aplikasinya dengan SPSS*, Jakarta : PT Elex Media Computindo Kelompok Gramedia
- Sarwoto, (2001), *Dasar-Dasar Organisasi dan Manajemen*, cetakan keenambelas, Penerbit : Ghalia Indonesia, Jakarta.
- Simamora, Henry. (2006). *Manajemen sumber daya manusia, Edisi 2*, STIE YKPN. Yogyakarta.
- S.P, Hasibuan, Malayu. (2013). *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia*. Jakarta: PT Bumi Aksara
- Sugiyono. (2014). *Metode Penelitian Pendidikan Pendekatan Kuantitatif, Kualitatif, dan R&D*. Bandung: Alfabeta.
- Surdamayanti. 2001. *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia*. Mandar Maju: Bandung.
- Suyad Prawirosentono, 2008. *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia; Kebijakan Kinerja Karyawan; Kiat Membangun Organisasi Kompetitif Era Perdagangan Bebas Dunia*. BPF: Yogyakarta.
- Terry, George R. (1993). *Prinsip-prinsip Manajemen*. Jakarta: Bumi Aksara.
- Ukas, Maman. (2004). *Manajemen : Konsep, Prinsip dan Aplikasi*. Agnini. Bandung.
- Veithzal, Rivai. 2009. *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia Untuk Perusahaan. Dariteori ke praktek*. Rajawali Pers: Jakarta
- Walpole, R. E., Myers, R. H., Myers, S. L., & Ye, K. (2007). *Probability & Statistics for Engineers & Scientists*. New Jersey: Pearson Prentice Hall.
- Wirawan. (2009). *Evaluasi Kinerja Sumber Daya Manusia Teori Aplikasi dan Penelitian*. Jakarta. Penerbit: Salemba Empat.

---

**Copyright holder:**

Achmad Fauzi, Herry Krisnandi, Kumba Digdowiseiso (2024)

**First publication rights:**

International Journal of Social Service and Research (IJSSR)

**This article is licensed under:**

