Indonesian Interdisciplinary Journal of Sharia Economics (IIJSE)
e-ISSN: 2621-606X
Vol. 9. No. 2 (2026)
Page: 14882-14888

ANALYSIS OF EMPLOYEE WORK PRODUCTIVITY AT KNIEL SPORT

Jesica Lucky Farabilla[1]
Politeknik NSC Surabaya, Surabaya, Indonesia
jesicaafarabila@gmail.com

Sugeng Prasetyo[2]
Politeknik NSC Surabaya, Surabaya, Indonesia
sugeng.pras2@gmail.com

Eko Tjiptojuwono[3]
Politeknik NSC Surabaya, Surabaya, Indonesia
ekotj2009@gmail.com

Abstract

The purpose of this study is to examine how Kniel Sport employees' productivity is affected by their work environment and motivation. Employees at Kniel Sport were given questionnaires to complete in order to gather data using a quantitative research approach. Whether examined separately or in tandem, the findings show that employee productivity is positively and significantly impacted by both the work environment and work motivation. Employee productivity is increased in a cozy, secure, and supportive workplace, and high work motivation motivates workers to work more successfully and efficiently in order to meet organizational goals. Therefore, enhancing the quality of the workplace and encouraging high work motivation can increase Kniel Sport employees' productivity. The study recommends that Kniel Sport management continue to create a conducive work environment and implement programs that enhance work motivation to support sustained improvements in employee productivity.

Keywords: Work Environment, Work Motivation, Employee Productivity, Kniel Sport

INTRODUCTION

Employee productivity is a key indicator of an organization's capacity to maintain its competitiveness. Productivity is a measure of how well resources are used, as shown by the output to input ratio. (Stevenson, 2012). A number of factors, such as the work environment and employee motivation, can affect productivity levels (Sapitri & Wirawan, 2025).

The internal and external forces that propel people to accomplish work-related objectives—whether via self-awareness, zeal, rewards, compensation, or recognition—are referred to as work motivation (Esisuarni et al., 2024; Junaedi et al., 2024). The physical and non-physical aspects of the workplace, such as lighting, temperature, amenities, interpersonal interactions, leadership, and communication, all have an impact on worker comfort and safety (Norianggono et al., 2014; Rivalita & Ferdian, 2020). Employee productivity can be maximized in a supportive work environment.

Employee productivity is influenced by motivation and the workplace, according to numerous studies. According to Baiti et al. (2020), productivity at work is positively and significantly impacted by both motivation and the workplace.

Similar findings were reported by Pramana et al. (2023), while Sapitri & Wirawan (2025) demonstrated that employee productivity is significantly influenced by the workplace. These results imply that increasing productivity necessitates both a comfortable and supportive work environment and sufficient drive.

Methodologically, research on the relationships between motivation, the work environment, and productivity generally employs a quantitative approach using Likert-scale questionnaires and to investigate the effects of the variables, use multiple linear regression analysis.

, both individually and simultaneously (Baiti et al., 2020; Kurniawan & Cahyaningtyas, 2021). Given this background, the goal of this study is to investigate the effects of work environment and work motivation on employee productivity, both independently and in tandem.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The Concept of Work Motivation

Work motivation can be understood as the process that explains the intensity, direction, and persistence of an individual's effort toward achieving a goal, stemming from either internal or external drives (Robbins & Judge, 2017). Internal drives generally originate from needs for self-actualization, a sense of responsibility, and personal satisfaction, whereas external drives arise from incentives such as salary, bonuses, promotions, and recognition from superiors. To understand how these two sources of motivation develop and influence work behavior, numerous prior studies have drawn upon classic theoretical frameworks, namely Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs, Herzberg's Two-Factor Theory, and Vroom's Expectancy Theory (Herzberg et al., 1959; Maslow, 1943; Vroom, 1964).

The Concept of the Work Environment

The entirety of an employee's surroundings that are directly related to the psychological shifts they undergo while carrying out their responsibilities is referred to as their work environment. This includes both non-physical elements like interpersonal relationships among coworkers, supervisory leadership styles, organizational culture, and the communication climate in the workplace, as well as physical elements like lighting, room

temperature, noise levels, facility layout, and the availability of work equipment. These two dimensions of the work environment have been shown to simultaneously shape employees' perceptions of comfort and contribute to improved performance (Norianggono et al., 2014).

The Concept of Employee Productivity

Productivity is generally understood as a measure of the effective use of resources, typically expressed as a ratio of output produced to input utilized during the work process—whether in terms of time, labor, or other resources (Stevenson, 2012). Employee productivity is assessed not only by the quantity of work output but also by various other indicators, such as capability, performance improvement, morale, personal development, quality, and efficiency. The ability of an employee to continuously improve work methods to attain higher quality over time is increasingly linked to productivity in the context of modern businesses (Sutrisno, 2010).

The Relationship Between Motivation and Productivity

Various literature reviews indicate that work motivation plays a crucial role in determining employee productivity levels within an organization (Ajijah et al., 2021). Workers that are highly motivated at work typically exhibit more initiative, a desire to put in more effort, and a strong dedication to reaching company goals. Conversely, when the motivational drive experienced by employees is insufficient, this can lead to a decline in overall work productivity (Arianto & Kurniawan, 2020).

The Relationship Between the Work Environment and Productivity

A favorable workplace has been shown to contribute positively to increased employee productivity, as evidenced by various studies on the impact of improved working conditions on employee performance (Hanaysha & Majid, 2018). A workspace that is comfortable, safe, and well-equipped enables employees to concentrate and work efficiently, free from unnecessary distractions. Furthermore, harmonious social relationships and a high-quality physical work environment significantly influence job satisfaction, which in turn supports stable employee performance over the long term (Kurniati & Jaenab, 2020).

The Interaction Between Motivation and the Work Environment

Motivation and the work environment do not operate in isolation; rather, they reinforce each other in influencing employee productivity (Wardani, 2024). A poor work environment has the potential to diminish motivation—even when employees possess a strong internal drive—whereas a favorable work environment can amplify the positive effects of existing employee motivation. Consequently, many research models treat these two variables as simultaneous predictors to examine their individual contributions as well as their interaction regarding employee productivity (Berlian & Rafida, 2022).

RESEARCH METHOD

To ascertain the impact of work environment (X2) and work motivation (X1) on employee job productivity (Y), this study uses a quantitative method with a causal-associative design. Questionnaires were used to gather data, which were then statistically examined.

All workers at the business that is The study's topic make up the study population. Because of the comparatively small population size, a census sampling technique known as saturated sampling was employed, in which every member of the community participated as

a respondent. In addition to observation and documentation, a 5-point Likert scale questionnaire was used to gather data.

Pearson Product Moment correlation was used to assess the study instrument's validity, while Cronbach's Alpha was used to assess its reliability. If the computed r-value was higher than the table r-value, the instrument was considered valid; if the Cronbach's Alpha coefficient was higher than 0.60, it was considered reliable.

To make sure the regression model satisfied the required assumptions, tests for normality, heteroscedasticity, multicollinearity, and linearity were performed prior to regression analysis.

Multiple linear regression was used to analyze the data using the following equation:

$Y = a + b_1X_1 + b_2X_2 + e$

This study sought to determine the partial and concurrent effects of motivation and the work environment on productivity.

The t-test was used to evaluate each variable's partial influence, the F-test was used to evaluate the simultaneous effect, and the coefficient of determination (R2) was used to gage how much each independent variable contributed to work productivity. A 5% significance threshold ($\alpha = 0.05$) was used.

In order to ascertain the direction, significance, and magnitude of the impact of work environment and motivation on worker productivity, the research data were analyzed using the direction of the regression coefficients, significance values, and R2.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The variable structure used corresponds to the research title: X1 = Work Motivation → items 57–68 (12 items); X2 = Work Environment → items 37–56 (20 items); Y = Work Productivity → items 17–36 (21 items). The number of respondents was 41. Variable scores were calculated as the average of the scores for all items within each variable.

The estimation results yielded the following regression equation: $Y = 0.175 + 0.153X1 + 0.816X2$, or Work Productivity = 0.175 + 0.153(Work Motivation) + 0.816(Work Environment).

Table 1.
Multiple Linear Regression Results

Variable	Coefficient B	t-test	Sig.	Beta Standard
Constant	0.175	0.459	0.649	-
Work Motivation (X1)	0.153	0.659	0.514	0.132
Work Environment (X2)	0.816	3.078	0.004	0.758

Source: Processed primary data (2025)

Work motivation exerts a positive influence, yet it was not found to have a statistically significant effect on work productivity once the influence of the work environment was controlled for.

A coefficient of 0.153 indicates that, under the assumption that the work environment stays constant, a one-unit increase in work motivation is mathematically equivalent to an increase in work productivity of roughly 0.153 units. Nevertheless, this relationship is not strong enough to be considered a significant effect within the research population because

the significance value is more than 0.05. Consequently, work motivation does not have a significant effect on employee work productivity. The work environment has a positive and significant influence on work productivity.

If work motivation stays constant, a one-unit improvement in the workplace is expected to boost productivity by 0.816 units, according to a coefficient of 0.816. Employee productivity is therefore positively and significantly impacted by the workplace.

These results also indicate that the work environment is a far stronger variable in explaining productivity than work motivation. This is evident from the standardized Beta value for the work environment (0.758), whereas that for work motivation is only 0.132.

Since the F-value was 73.06 with a significance level of 0.000 (< 0.05), the variables of work motivation and work environment are simultaneously and significantly related to work productivity. This means that work motivation and the work environment collectively make a significant contribution to employee work productivity.

The R^2 value of 0.769 means that 76.9% of the combination of the work environment and job motivation can account for the difference in productivity, while the Adjusted R^2 value was 0.756. Meanwhile, the remaining 23.1% (100% − 76.9%) is explained by other factors not included in this research model, such as work ability, compensation, leadership, work discipline, workload, and work experience. For a study with 41 respondents, an Adjusted R^2 value of 75.6% indicates a reasonably strong explanatory power for the model.

Table 2.
Standardized Beta Coefficients

Variable	Beta
Work Motivation	0.132
Work Environment	0.758

Source: Processed primary data (2025)

As a result, the most important variable in this regression model is the workplace. Workplace motivation has a much less relative impact than the work environment.

Substantively, these results indicate that within this dataset, work environment conditions—such as workplace comfort, lighting, air circulation, facilities, relationships with colleagues, supervisor support, safety, and the work atmosphere—are more closely linked to employee productivity than the motivation indicators measured in the questionnaire.

CONCLUSION

The findings from the aforementioned studies hold significant practical implications for human resource management within organizations. Companies need to design reward and career development systems capable of boosting both intrinsic and extrinsic employee motivation, while simultaneously investing in improved physical facilities and a supportive work culture. Human resource management policies that strike a balance between these two aspects are considered likely to yield more sustainable productivity gains than focusing on a single factor alone.

Overall, motivation and the work environment are complementary determinants that influence employee productivity. While the workplace provides the encouraging conditions that enable this desire to materialize into concrete performance, motivation provides the psychological push for employees to perform at their best. A comprehensive understanding of the relationship between these two variables is essential for researchers and management

practitioners alike when formulating effective and sustainable productivity enhancement strategies across various types of organizations.

REFERENCES

Ajijah, A. H. N., Khoerunnisa, Y., Hidayanto, D. K., & Rosid, R. (2021). Peran motivasi terhadap produktivitas karyawan (Literature review). *Jurnal Publisitas*, *8*(1), 1–10. https://doi.org/10.37858/publisitas.v8i1.56

Arianto, N., & Kurniawan, H. (2020). Pengaruh motivasi dan lingkungan kerja terhadap kinerja karyawan. *JENIUS (Jurnal Ilmiah Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia)*, *3*(3), 312–321.

Baiti, K. N., Djumali, D., & Kustiyah, E. (2020). Produktivitas kerja karyawan ditinjau dari motivasi, disiplin kerja dan lingkungan pada PT. Iskandar Indah Printing Textile Surakarta. *Jurnal Ilmiah Edunomika*, *4*(1), 69–87. https://doi.org/10.29040/jie.v4i01.812

Berlian, B., & Rafida, V. (2022). Pengaruh Motivasi Kerja, Kompensasi, Dan Lingkungan Kerja Terhadap Produktivitas Karyawan di PT. Winaros Kawula Bahari Beji-Pasuruan. *Jurnal Pendidikan Administrasi Perkantoran (JPAP)*, *10*(1), 81–93.

Esisuarni, E., Alqadri, H., & Nellitawati, N. (2024). Pentingnya motivasi kerja dalam meningkatkan kinerja karyawan. *Jurnal Niara*, *17*(2), 478–488. https://doi.org/10.31849/niara.v17i2.23149

Hanaysha, J., & Majid, M. (2018). Employee motivation and its role in improving the productivity and organizational commitment at higher education institutions. *Journal of Entrepreneurship and Business*, *6*(1), 17–28.

Herzberg, F., Mausner, B., & Snyderman, B. B. (1959). *The motivation to work* (2nd edition). John Wiley & Sons.

Junaedi, D., Ridwan, S., & Jusdijachlan, R. (2024). Analisis motivasi kerja dalam meningkatkan kinerja karyawan KPRI Karya Dharma Paiton. *Indo-Fintech Intellectuals: Journal of Economics and Business*, *5*(3), 6525–6536.

Kurniati, T., & Jaenab, J. (2020). Pengaruh lingkungan kerja fisik terhadap kepuasan kerja pegawai pada Dinas Perpustakaan Kota Bima. *SULTANIST: Jurnal Manajemen Dan Keuangan*, *8*(1), 79–84. https://doi.org/10.37403/sultanist.v8i1.195

Kurniawan, I. S., & Cahyaningtyas, T. (2021). Peningkatan produktivitas: Peran kemampuan, lingkungan, dan motivasi pada Azzahra Moslem Wear Yogyakarta. *Jurnal Produktivitas*, *8*(2), 296–304.

Maslow, A. H. (1943). A theory of human motivation. *Psychological Review*, *50*(4), 370–396. https://doi.org/10.1037/h0054346

Norianggono, Y. C. P., Hamid, D., & Ruhana, I. (2014). Pengaruh lingkungan kerja fisik dan non fisik terhadap kinerja karyawan (Studi pada karyawan PT Telkomsel Area III Jawa-Bali di Surabaya). *Jurnal Administrasi Bisnis*, *8*(2), 1–10.

Pramana, H., Herawati, J., & Septyarini, E. (2023). Pengaruh motivasi kerja, disiplin kerja dan lingkungan kerja terhadap produktivitas kerja pada Dinas Kependudukan dan Pencatatan Sipil Kabupaten Gunungkidul. *Transformasi Manageria: Journal of Islamic Education Management*, *3*(2), 331–351. https://doi.org/10.47467/manageria.v3i2.2478

Rivalita, C., & Ferdian, A. (2020). Pengaruh lingkungan kerja fisik dan lingkungan kerja non fisik terhadap kinerja pegawai outsource cleaning service di Universitas Telkom. *Jurnal Mitra Manajemen*, *4*(4), 509–522.

Robbins, S. P., & Judge, T. A. (2017). *Organizational behavior* (17th edition). Pearson.

Sapitri, M., & Wirawan, S. (2025). Pengaruh lingkungan kerja terhadap produktivitas kerja karyawan PT Air Minum Tabalong Bersinar (Perseroda). *JAPB*, *8*(1), 619–633. https://doi.org/10.35722/japb.v8i1.1194

Stevenson, W. J. (2012). *Operations management* (11th edition). McGraw-Hill.

Sutrisno, E. (2010). *Manajemen sumber daya manusia*. Kencana Prenada Media Group.

Vroom, V. H. (1964). *Work and motivation*. Wiley.

Wardani, A. (2024). Pengaruh motivasi kerja dan lingkungan kerja terhadap produktivitas kerja karyawan. *Jurnal Kewirausahaan Dan Inovasi*, *3*(4), 998–1011.