

The Effect of Physical Work Environment, Work Motivation and Compensation on the Performance of Employees of The Directorate General of Human Rights

Desi Safitri¹, Achmad Cik², Kumba Digdowiseiso^{3*}

^{1,2,3*} Fakultas Ekonomi dan Bisnis Universitas Nasional, Indonesia

Email: ¹desi27safitri@gmail.com, ²ahmadcik@civitas.unas.ac.id,

^{3*}kumba.digdo@civitas.unas.ac.id

Abstract

This study aims to analyze the influence of the physical work environment, work motivation and compensation on the performance of employees of the Directorate General of Human Rights. This type of research uses quantitative techniques, descriptive methods and data analysis methods using differential analysis of multiple linear regression and uses primary data in the form of a closed questionnaire to 100 respondents assisted by using the Statistical Product and Service Solution (SPSS) program application version 23.0. The results of the analysis in this study prove that the three variables of physical work environment, work motivation and compensation have a significant influence on the defending variables, namely performance in employees. From the results of this study, it is expected that the Institute will pay attention to and evaluate employee performance in order to improve employee performance in order to be good and effective.

Keywords: Physical work environment, Work motivation, Compensation and Employee Performance

INTRODUCTION

In the era of digitalization or digital economy, the development of the business world is characterized by increasingly fierce competition and a rapidly changing environment And the more difficult For predicted. Every company Good private and the government needs to display innovation in the fields of human resources, technology and managerial. This is done to face the demands of environmental change, so companies must be extra selective in choosing human resources who are competitive, capable and have high competitiveness. Company management, especially the HRD (*Human Resource Development*) department , must be selective in selecting prospective employees (Anita Chaudhari, Brinzel Rodrigues, 2016).

Employee performance is very necessary for companies or institutions, if employee performance is less effective and efficient it will cause a decline in the performance of the company or institution. As Siagian (2010) said, performance is feedback about various things such as ability, fatigue, shortcomings and potential which in turn is useful for determining goals, track, plan development career person That Alone specifically organization. Employee performance can be influenced by several possible factors such as work environment, work motivation and compensation.

How to cite: Desi Safitri, Achmad Cik, Kumba Digdowiseiso (2024) The Effect of Physical Work Environment, Work Motivation and Compensation on the Performance of Employees of The Directorate General of Human Rights, (5) 1. Doi:

E-ISSN: [2721-5202](https://doi.org/10.27209/2721-5202)

Published by: [CV. Syntax Corporation Indonesia](http://www.syntaxcorp.com)

Regarding work environmental factors that can influence employee performance, Nitisemito (2015) states that the work environment is everything that is around workers and that can influence them in carrying out their assigned tasks. According to Sedarmayanti (2017) stated that the physical work environment is all something Which tangible or have form physique Which around the workplace.

The work environment is said to be suitable if employees can do their work ideally, safely, healthily and comfortably (Al-Omari and Okasheh, 2017). To carry out work effectively and efficiently requires a work environment Which conducive (Priarsono et al, 2019). Matter This in line with study conducted by Naa (2017) who stated that the physical work environment has an influence significant to performance employee. Study This strengthened by Hanafi's (2018) research results state that the physical work environment is simultaneously and Partial influential to performance employee. Whereas results study which is conducted by Stanley & Remiasa (2022) state environment Work physique not significant to employee performance. Environment Work physique Which conducive And comfortable make employee can communicate with Good And capable Work The same, situation This make employees feel satisfied with the work they do (Andreani & Petrik, 2016).

In reach the goal company or institution need employee loyalty. To achieve this, leaders are expected to be able to motivate their employees. In completing work targets, employees certainly need motivation. Hasibuan (2015) state motivation is giving Power a driving force that creates enthusiasm for someone's work so that they want to work together, work effectively and integrate with all their efforts to achieve satisfaction. Motivation Work will push somebody For finish tasks even surpass the target, Because motivation is activity which result in, channel, And look after behavior man Handoko (2019).

This is in line with research conducted by Rasfiani Damsjik (2017) state results study showing motivation Work influential positive and significant on employee performance. The better work motivation is implemented for employees, the better the impact will be on them to work even better. Strengthened by the results of research conducted by Prabowo, Lindu Anwar (2018) which states that work motivation influences employee performance. Meanwhile, the results of research conducted by Luhur (2014) stated that work motivation No significant and negative effect on employee performance.

When an employee already has motivation, the employee can then strengthen that motivation by providing compensation. Compensation is given on the basis of cooperative ties, job satisfaction, employee stability, discipline, as well as influence union laborer And government. So Employees increasingly improve their performance to become productive and effective, and can help companies or institutions achieve their goals.

According to Mulyadi (2015), compensation is any form given to all employees as remuneration for the contributions made to the office. According to Hasibuan (2018) Compensation is all income in the form of money, direct or indirect goods received by employees as compensation for services provided to the institution. Supported by the results of research conducted by Masydzulhak Djamil & Dadan Zaenudin 2 (2018) which states that compensation has a positive and significant effect on employee performance. Which can help employees become more active at work. Meanwhile, the results of research conducted by Suhardi (2019) stated that compensation does not have a positive and significant effect on employee performance.

Apart from that, performance, as stated by Adamy (2016), employee performance is how much the employee contributes to the organization, which

includes, among other things, output quantity, output quality, output period, attendance. in place Work And attitude cooperative. Agree with Which said by Kawiana (2020) In essence, performance is the result of work achieved by someone in carrying out their duties in accordance with the standards and criteria set set For work the. Performance is Wrong One The total collection of work available to a worker for a given task.

In 2020 the average presentation increased by 4% and became 86% of the set target. Meanwhile, in 2021 employee performance experienced decline drastic that is as big as 84% from target Which set. Matter this can see Performance Employee Directorate General HAM experience decline and ascension performance. Performance of employees of the Directorate General of Human Rights Still Not yet optimal because it still has not reached the set target of 100%

This research aims to investigate factors that influence employee performance, such as the physical work environment, motivation and compensation, with a focus on the Directorate General of Human Rights. The problems identified involve questions regarding the positive and significant influence of the physical work environment, work motivation, and compensation on employee performance. The research objectives include analyzing the impact of the physical work environment, work motivation, and compensation on employee performance. The benefits are divided between theoretical benefits, such as contributions to the science of human resource management, and practical benefits, including suggestions for the Directorate General of Human Rights to increase employee productivity through providing appropriate motivation. In addition, it is hoped that this research can serve as a guide for readers, institutions and other researchers in further exploring the relationship between environment, motivation and compensation and employee performance.

RESEARCH METHOD

This research aims to examine the performance of employees at the South Jakarta Directorate General of Human Rights, taking into account the variables of the physical work environment, work motivation and compensation. The data source consists of primary data obtained through distributing questionnaires to respondents. The research population included 134 permanent employees at the Directorate General of Human Rights, and a sample of 100 employees was taken using the purposive sampling method. Data analysis methods involve validity and reliability tests, normality tests, multicollinearity tests, autocorrelation tests, and heteroscedasticity tests. Multiple linear regression analysis is used to evaluate the influence of the physical work environment, work motivation, and compensation on employee performance. Next, the t hypothesis test is used to determine the significance of the influence of these variables. The results of the research are expected to provide insight for the Directorate General of Human Rights in improving employee performance through managing the physical work environment, work motivation and optimal compensation.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

A. Research result

1. Results Complete Research Estimates

a. Method Analysis

1) Analysis Description Data

The results of the test are used to determine the average total and total values for each variable. Each variable consists of 4 and 5 questions that must be answered by respondents to support the accuracy of the data in the research being conducted by

the author.

a) Descriptive Data Variable Environment Work Physique

A physical work environment that is fresh, comfortable and meets appropriate needs will have an influence on employee comfort for their duties. The table below is the average total mean work environment result. As follows:

Table 1. Average Total Mean Environment Work Physique (X 1)

No	Statement	Mean
1	The employee's room must have good air circulation room Work so provides comfort moment Work	4.03
2	Place Work No disturbed with voices noisy so that I Work with Good	4.04
3	Lighting in room Work Enough Good And No disturbing I so that support activity work I	4.01
4	Condition environment Work office own security so that make Employee safe And can Work with Good	3.96
5	No There is smell not delicious at workplace	3.87
Average total mean		3.98

Source: processed from SPSS 23 (2022)

Based on from results spread questionnaire to para employee it was found that getting perceptions of answers to physical work environment variables with acquisition mean smallest with mark 3.87 And acquisition mean biggest 4.04 with an overall average score of 3.98.

b) Description Data Variable Motivation Work

Motivation is an encouragement for employees to carry out something activity or work so Can produce performance Which effective in carrying out work. Below are the results of the average total mean work motivation. As follows:

Table 2. Average Total Mean Motivation Work (X 2)

No	Statement	Mean
1	I capable Work with full Employee's sense of responsibility	4.08
2	I feel motivated For do work on a regular basis appropriate And fast in accordance target production	3.96
3	I feel There is satisfaction separately if you can finish it work Which difficult And achieve production unit work targets	4.04
4	I able to use potency self And work properly independent	4.09
Average total mean		4.07

Source: processed from SPSS 23 (2022)

Based on from results spread questionnaire to para employee it was found that getting the perception of answers to the work motivation variable with gain mean smallest with mark 3.96 And acquisition mean biggest 4.09 with an overall average gain of 4.07.

c) Description Data Compensation Variables

Compensation is given to employees on the basis of cooperative ties, job satisfaction, employee stability, discipline, and the influence of labor unions and the government. So Employee the more increase performance his become productive And effective, as well can help Institution And employee in reach objective. Under this is the

result of the average total mean compensation. As follows:

Table 3. Average Total Mean Compensation (X 3)

No	Statement	Mean
1	The salary accepted in accordance hope	3.98
2	There is incentive outside wages Which accepted by employees	3.88
3	Allowance Which accepted according to expectations	4.09
4	Facility office (uniform Work, place parker, canteen, place worship, work equipment) complete and adequate.	4.15
	Average total mean	4.02

Source: processed from SPSS 23 (2022)

Based on from results spread questionnaire to para employee it was found that getting the perception of answers to the compensation variable with gain mean smallest with mark 3.88 And acquisition mean biggest 4.15 with an overall average gain of 4.02.

d) Description Data Variable Employee Performance

The core performance is an employee's ability to develop the organization in a way effective as well as efficient, with exists something policy And effective program. Below are the results of the average total employee performance. As follows:

Table 4. Average Total Mean Performance Employee (Y)

No	Statement	Mean
1	I can complete every job with thorough And neat	4.12
2	I capable finish the job in accordance with targets Which determined	4.12
3	I can finish work I in accordance with deadline time Which given on I.	4.36
4	I enter And go home Work in accordance office regulations .	4.03
5	I capable Work The same with other employees	4.00
	Average total mean	4.12

Source: processed SPSS 23 (2022)

Based on from results spread questionnaire to para employee it was found that getting perceptions of answers to employee performance variables with gain mean smallest with mark 4.00 And acquisition mean biggest 4.36 with an overall average gain of 4.12.

2) Analysis Inferential

Inferential analysis is an analysis that emphasizes the influence of variables free that is environment Work physique, motivation Work And compensation to variables bound that is performance employee Which mean generalize sample to in Population, Where from the research results This from a sample the results can be representative for the population.

3) Testing Instrument

a) Validity Test Results

As is the accuracy of the instrument to measure what is being measured. regarding $r_{count} > r_{table}$, the questionnaire is declared valid and is different if $r_{count} < r_{table}$, questionnaire the no valid, use degrees of freedom (df) = n-2 with $\alpha = 0.05$. With this determined using the formula $n = 100 (100-2)$, the results obtained are r

Table (0.05) = 0.196, as follows:

Table 5. Validity Test Results

Variable	Statement	r Count	r Table	Information
Environment Physical Work (X1)	X1_1	0.827	0.196	Valid
	X1_2	0.802	0.196	Valid
	X1_3	0.822	0.196	Valid
	X1_4	0.776	0.196	Valid
	X1_5	0.804	0.196	Valid
Motivation Work (X2)	X2_1	0.820	0.196	Valid
	X2_2	0.896	0.196	Valid
	X2_3	0.855	0.196	Valid
	X2_4	0.895	0.196	Valid
Compensation (X3)	X3_1	0.863	0.196	Valid
	X3_2	0.821	0.196	Valid
	X3_3	0.766	0.196	Valid
	X3_4	0.527	0.196	Valid
Performance Employee (Y)	Y_1	0.644	0.196	Valid
	Y_2	0.696	0.196	Valid
	Y_3	0.736	0.196	Valid
	Y_4	0.804	0.196	Valid
	Y_5	0.774	0.196	Valid

Source: Processed from SPSS 23, 2022

The results of the calculations tested using Spss23 in the table above show that each item in the questionnaire statement that was submitted to the respondent has a calculated r test value that is more than the r table. If you compare r count > r table on sample N to 100 that is 0.196, This This means that the entire statement in the questionnaire for each variable item can be said to be valid.

b) Results Reliability Test

This reliability test is carried out to determine the measurements found something results Which relatively when testing repeated. Method testing namely Cronbach's Alpha, if the measuring instrument or questionnaire has a Cronbach's Alpha value > 0.60 can is known that his research reliable. But when Cronbach's Alpha < 0.6 with This instrument his research Which done No reliable. As for test results from the reliability test results are as follows:

Table 6. Reliability Test Results

No	Variable	Reliability	R Table	Information
1	Environment Work Physical (X1)	0.864	0.6	Reliable
2	Motivation Work (X2)	0.911	0.6	Reliable
3	Compensation (X3)	0.740	0.6	Reliable
4	Performance Employee (Y)	0.781	0.6	Reliable

Source: Processed from SPSS 23, 2022

The results from the table above in the research are said to be good or reliable. Because all the variable results, namely Physical Work Environment (X1), Work

Motivation (X2), Compensation (X3) and Employee Performance (Y) have Cronbach's values Alpha > r table that is 0.6 is known environment Work physique as big as 0.864, whereas motivation Work with 0.911, as well as compensation worth 0.740 And employee performance is 0.781, meaning that all variables can be declared reliable and have met the test requirements.

4) Test Assumption Classic

a) Normality Test Results

The normality test uses the Kolmogorov Smirnov test. In taking test values that are significant (sig) > $\alpha = 0.05$, it is stated that the data is normally distributed. As follows is the result of data analysis carried out:

**Table 7. Results Test Normality
One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test**

		Unstandardized Residuals
N		100
Normal Parameters a, b Mean		,0000000
Std. Deviation		1.87470207
Most Extreme Differences	Absolute	,047
	Positive	,047
	Negative	- \$1,045
Test Statistics		,047
Asymp. Sig. (2- tailed)		,200 c,d

a. Test distribution is Normal.

b. Calculated from data.

c. Lilliefors Significance Corrections.

d. This is a lower bound of the true significance.

Source: Processed from SPSS 23, 2022

It is known from the results of the normality test results, that the Asymp.Sig value is known to be 0.200, indicating that the data is normally distributed because the significance is $0.200 > 0.05$.

b) Multicollinearity Test Results

The multicollinearity test to detect the presence or absence of multicollinearity can be seen from the VIF and Tolerance values, the absence of multicollinearity in model regression If on results $VIF < 10$ or tolerance > 0.1 stated that multicollinearity does not occur, but if on the contrary, multicollinearity occurs. The results are as follows:

Table 8. Multicollinearity Test Results

		Coefficients ^a		
		Collinearity Statistics		
Model		Tolerance	VIF	
1	Environment Physique (X1)	Work	,987	1,013
	Motivation Work (X2)		,985	1,015
	Compensation (X3)		,995	1,005

a. Dependent Variables: Performance Employee (Y)

Source: Processed from SPSS 23, 2022

The known results from the multicollinearity test in the table can be stated that there is no multicollinearity, with the following results the independent variable, namely the physical work environment, has a VIF of $1.013 < 10$ and a tolerance value of $0.987 > 0.1$, for motivation work has a VIF test value of $1.015 < 10$ And own tolerance with mark $0.985 > 0.1$, And compensation own VIF results $1.005 < 10$ and with a tolerance value of $0.995 > 0.1$.

c) Results Test Autocorrelation

This test is to detect autocorrelation, using the Durbin Watson (DW) method. The comparison results produce conclusions such as $dU < dW < 4-dU$, meaning that it is determined that there is no autocorrelation. In the test results on autocorrelation, the author uses Durbin Watson (DW) statistics as follows:

Table 9. Autocorrelation Test Results

Model Summary ^b	
Model Durbin-Watson	
1	1,990

b. Dependent Variables: Employee Performance (Y)

Source: Processed from SPSS 23, 2022

As is known from the results of the autokeneration test in table 4.13, it is explained that Durbin Watson (DW) has a value of 1.990 where the K value or number of variables free is 3 And mark N or as many samples as possible 100. So that The known value of dL is 1.613 and the known value of dU is 1.736. From calculations and comparison with the Durbin Waston table, the value is in Du and 4- Du, it is known that $dU < dW < 4-dU = 1.736 < 1.990 < 4- 1.736(2.264)$. As from the results of the tests carried out, it can be determined that the regression model does not have autocorrelation.

d) Heteroscedasticity Test Results

The regression heteroscedasticity test is categorized as good, of course heteroscedasticity does not occur. The significance value is > 0.05 , so if it is known that heteroscedasticity does not occur then this is good. As for knowing whether there is heteroscedasticity or not, the Glejser Test is carried out by aggregating the independent variables into Abs RES. The results of the heteroscedasticity test can be seen from the following results:

Table 10. Heteroscedasticity Test Results

		Coefficients ^a			
		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	
Model		B	Std. Error	Beta	t Sig.
1	(Constant)	1,069	1,308		,817 ,416
	Environment Physique (X1)	Work- \$1.002	,046	- \$1.005	- ,052,959
	Motivation Work (X2)	,049	,043	,117	1,148,254
	Compensation (X3)	- \$1.023	,049	- \$1.048	- ,471,639

a. Dependent Variables: RES

Source: Processed from SPSS 23, 2022

From the test results carried out in Table 10, namely testing heteroscedasticity using the Glejser Test, it is explained that the regression model in this study can be stated that heteroscedasticity does not occur. All variable independent environment Work physique own magnitude mark test with significance worth $0.959 > 0.05$, as well as work motivation own magnitude The significance test value is $0.254 > 0.05$ and the compensation significance test value is $0.639 > 0.05$.

5) Analysis Regression Linear Multiple

Multiple linear regression analysis is known as a form of analysis that discusses the extent of influence of an independent variable on a dependent variable. In terms of calculating multiple linear regression coefficients in testing using the SPSS program, the results of the tests that have been carried out can be seen as follows:

Table 11. Results Test Analysis Regression Linear Multiple

		Coefficients ^a			t	Sig.
Model		Unstandardized	Standardized			
		Coefficients	Coefficients	Beta		
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	1,234	2,100		,588	,558
	Environment Physique (X1)	Work,258	,073	,257		3,536,001
	Motivation Work (X2)	,441	,069	,465		6,389,000
	Compensation (X3)	,439	,079	,402		5,554,000

a. Dependent Variables: Performance Employee (Y)

Source: Processed from SPSS 23, 2022

Based on from results test on table 11 show If that the independent variable from the multiple linear regression test is

$$KP = 0.257 LKF + 0.465 MK + 0.402 K$$

Interpretation:

Y = Employee Performance

LKF = Environment Work Physique

MK = Work Motivation

K = Compensation

Based on the results of multiple linear regression, the following conclusions are drawn:

- Mark coefficient regression For variable environment Work physique on matter the regression equation shows a value of 0.257 if physical work environment variables have increased 1% so can interpreted environment Work physique experience increase, then performance employee will experience something enhancement as big as 0.257 assuming the other independent variables have fixed values. The positive sign indicates a unidirectional influence between the independent variable and the dependent variable. This means that physical work environment variables have a positive and significant effect on employee performance.
- value for work motivation in the regression equation shows a value of 0.465. If the work motivation variable has increased by 1%, it can be interpreted that work motivation has increased, then employee performance will experience an increase of

0.465 assuming the variable free other own mark still. Sign positive showing unidirectional influence between the independent variable and the dependent variable. This means that the work motivation variable has a positive and significant effect on employee performance.

- c) value for compensation in the regression equation shows a value of 0.402. If the compensation variable increases by 1%, it can be interpreted that if compensation increases, then employee performance will experience an increase of 0.402 assuming the variable free other own mark still. Sign positive showing unidirectional influence between the independent variable and the dependent variable. This means that the compensation variable has a positive and significant effect on employee performance.

6) Model Feasibility Test Results

a) F Test Results

Testing of the hypothesis uses the F test with ANOVA which is carried out by looking at a significant level or comparing the magnitude of the calculated F value and F table. The test on the F statistic has level significance Which set that is 0.05. As inner criteria taking decision on test F If there is mark sig < 0.05 said H0 is rejected And Ha accepted, Which stated that variable free influential positive as well significant to variable bound in meaning variable free together have an effect on the dependent variable. The results of the F test are as follows:

Table 12. F Test Results (ANOVA)

ANOVA ^a						
Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	347,374	3	115,791	31,948	,000 ^b
	Residual	347,936	96	3,624		
	Total	695,310	99			

a. Dependent Variables: Performance Employee (Y)

b. Predictors: (Constant), Compensation (X3), Environment Work Physique (X1), Motivation Work (X2)

Source: Processed from SPSS 23, 2022

As from the results of the f test carried out in the ANOVA test above, it is known that F count with mark 31,948, with have significance 0.000. Is known that F table obtained from mark degrees free df (residual) namely 2.70 on level confidence 5% ($\alpha=0.05$). F count stated more big than f table ($31.948 > 2.70$) with a significance level of $0.000 < 0.05$. Can be concluded every variable together influential on variable bound namely employee performance.

b) Results Test Coefficient Determination (R^2)

In study this coefficient determination for now influence of variables. The higher the value on R Square, the better. Results that are close to 100% indicate that the variable provides the information needed to predict. The test results of the coefficient of determination (R^2) are in the table:

**Table 13. Results Test Coefficient Determination
Model Summary ^b**

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	,707 a	,500	,484	1,904

a. Predictors: (Constant), Compensation (X3), Environment Work Physical (X1), Work Motivation (X2)

b. Dependent Variables: Performance Employee (Y)

Source: Processed from SPSS 23, 2022

It is known from the results that the R Square is 0.500 or if the percentage is 50%, which means that employee performance variables are influenced by the physical work environment, work motivation and compensation variables of 50%, while the remaining 50% is influenced by other variables outside the regression model that has been researched by the author.

c) t Test Results

Test hypothesis as analysis Which done For determine the influence of the physical work environment, work motivation, and compensation on employee performance by using a significance level of 0.05. It is known that the t table is known through the formula $df=nk-1$, namely ($df=100-3-1=96$) it is known that the t table has a value of 1.984, the calculated t value is at significant <0.05 , meaning H_0 is rejected and H_a is accepted, which means the proposed hypothesis can be declared accepted. This hypothesis test is carried out by looking for a t test by comparing a calculated t and t table value and $sig < 0.05$. The test results are as follows:

Table 14. t Test Results

		Coefficients ^a			
		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	
Model		B	Std. Error	Beta	t Sig.
1	(Constant)	1,234	2,100		,588 ,558
	Environment Physique (X1)	Work,258	,073	,257	3,536 ,001
	Motivation Work (X2)	,441	,069	,465	6,389 ,000
	Compensation (X3)	,439	,079	,402	5,554 ,000

a. Dependent Variables: Performance Employee (Y)

Source: Processed from SPSS 23, 2022

From results test t Which is known that aligned from A analysis carried out, based on the t test, it can be concluded as follows:

- (1) Testing the hypothesis of physical work environment variables on employee performance by obtaining tcount with a value of $3.536 > t_{table} 1.984$ at a significance level of $0.001 < 0.05$. So it can be concluded that the physical work environment has a positive and significant effect on the performance of employees of the Directorate General of Human Rights.
- (2) Testing the hypothesis of work motivation variables on employee performance obtained a calculated t value of $6.389 > t_{table} 1.984$ at a significance level of $0.000 < 0.05$. So it can be concluded that work motivation has a positive and significant effect on the performance of employees of the Directorate General of Human Rights.

- (3) Testing the hypothesis of compensation variables on employee performance obtained a calculated t value of $5.554 > t \text{ table } 1.984$ at a significance level of $0.000 < 0.05$. So that means the conclusion is compensation influential positive as well as significant to on performance employee of the Directorate General of Human Rights.

Discussion

A. Physical Work Environment on Employee Performance of the Directorate General of Human Rights

Based on the analysis in this research, it is known that the physical work environment has a positive and significant influence on the performance of employees of the Directorate General of Human Rights. The following is reinforced by the analysis results which are known through several tests carried out by researchers as well as test results from several tests. Including the results of the t test showing that $t_{\text{count}} > t_{\text{table}}$, namely the t_{count} value $3.536 > t_{\text{table}} 1.984$ and the significant value obtained $< \alpha = 0.05$, namely ($0.001 < 0.05$). It can be concluded that the physical work environment has a positive and significant effect on employee performance at the Directorate General of Human Rights. As the results of the research were strengthened by a questionnaire submitted by the researcher, the average result was 3.98. Which means that the majority of respondents' answers agreed with the need to pay attention to the physical work environment. The results of this research are also strengthened by the results of the analysis by Rasfiani Damsjik (2017) which states environment Work physique influential significant in a way simultaneous on employee performance

This shows that the physical work environment makes employees motivated to work diligently from the presence of a physical work environment. The work environment produces a positive and real influence on employee performance, even though the scope of the work environment does not play an active role, it produces an influence that has an impact on employee performance.

B. Work Motivation on Employee Performance of the Directorate General of Human Rights Man

Based on the analysis in this research, it is known that work motivation have influence positive as well as significant on performance employee Directorate General of Human Rights. The following is reinforced by the analysis results which are known through several tests carried out by researchers as well as test results from several tests. Including the results of the t test shows that $t_{\text{count}} > t_{\text{table}}$ that is mark t count $6,389 > t \text{ table } 1,984$ and by obtaining a significant value $< \alpha = 0.05$, namely ($0.000 < 0.05$). It can be concluded that work motivation has a positive and significant effect on employee performance at the Directorate General of Human Rights. As the results of the research were strengthened by a questionnaire submitted by the researcher, the average result was 4.07. Which means that the majority of respondents' answers stated that they agreed with providing work motivation to employees in order to improve employee performance and to encourage employees to work optimally to carry out their duties. his job. Results than study Which done This Also This is strengthened by the analysis results of Badar *et al* (2020) which states that work motivation has a positive and significant effect on employee performance.

As this shows, work motivation is a basic factor a employee Work with Good so that can Can give good efforts from employees to be able to advance the vision and mission of the institutional organization that has been established in order to improve and shape attitudes and behavior so that the employee strives effectively

and professionally.

C. Compensation for Employee Performance of the Directorate General of Human Rights

As based on the analysis in this research, it is known that compensation has a positive and significant influence on employee performance Directorate General Right Asasi Man. Matter following strengthened with from the analysis results that are known through several tests carried out by researchers as well as test results from several tests. Including the results of the t test showing that $t_{count} > t_{table}$, namely the t_{count} value $5.554 > t_{table} 1.984$ and the obtained significant value $< \alpha = 0.05$, namely $(0.000 < 0.05)$. It can be concluded that compensation has a positive and significant effect on employee performance at the Directorate General of Human Rights. As the results of the research were strengthened by a questionnaire submitted by the researcher, the average result was 4.02. Which means that the majority of respondents' answers stated that they agreed with good compensation in an organization or government institution. Results of the research conducted This Also strengthened from results analysis Mashdzulhak Djamil Ps & Dadan Zaenudin (2018) who state compensation influential in a way positive and significant on employee performance.

As is known with para employee Which have Good compensation will create employees who are disciplined and can improve performance in institutions in order to carry out productivity in government institutions. Compensation itself means everything that employees get. from organization as reply service on Work Which done. This included as one of the most effective ways to improve work performance, employee performance, motivation and job satisfaction for employees.

CONCLUSION

The results of research at the Directorate General of Human Rights show that the physical work environment, work motivation and compensation have a positive and significant influence on employee performance. A good physical work environment, optimal work motivation, and adequate compensation can make a positive contribution to improving employee performance. Therefore, it is recommended that the Directorate General of Human Rights pay attention to and improve the physical work environment, provide effective work motivation, and develop a structured compensation system. Furthermore, this research provides suggestions to focus on improving the physical work environment, paying attention to needs and facilities that support employee performance, providing motivation with an effective approach, and preparing well-organized compensation. For further research, it is recommended to expand the research variables and use these results as a guide for further studies in the same field.

REFERENCES

- Afiyah, SN, Djaelani, AQ, & Priyono, AA (2017). *Effects of Compensation, Environment Work, And Motivation To Satisfaction Work Employee (Case Study at the Malang Regency National Land Agency)* . Journal of Management Research, 124–135.
- Anita Chaudhary, Brinzel Rodrigues, S. m (2016). *Influence Work Environment, Motivation, and Rewards on Employee Performance* . 390–392.
- Endraswara, A. (2016). *Chapter iii Research Methods* . 35. <http://repository.unika.ac.id/13303/4/12.60.0261> Argita Endraswara CHAPTER III.pdf
- HW N, et al (2021). *On Employee Performance Effect of Individual Characteristics,*

- Work Environment, Organizational Climate, Motivation and Compensation. Details Article: Character individual with character organization giving rise to forms of interaction of individual performance within the organization . 10 (April), 317–330.*
- Handoko., TH (2019). *Management*
- Hanafi, A. (2018). *Influence Environment Work And Discipline Work As well as Work Motivation on Employee Performance .*
- Hartono, S., & Farida, U. (2016). *Human Resources Management II. Unmuh Ponorogo Press.*
- Hasibuan, MS (2015). *Human Resource Management, Revised Edition . Earth Script.*
- Hasibuan, MSP (2016). *Human Resource Management. Revision. PT Bumi Aksara, Jakarta.*
- Hustia, A. (2020). *Influence Motivation Work, Environment Work And Discipline Work Against Performance Employee On Company WFO Period Pandemic . Journal Knowledge Management, 10 (1), 81. <https://doi.org/10.32502/jimn.v10i1.2929>*
- Kadarisman, M. (2012). *Compensation Management . Rajawali Press, Jakarta.*
- Kawiana, IGP (2020). *Company Human Resources Management "HRM". (UNHI) Press Indonesian Hindu University Campus Jl. Sangalangit, Tembau, Penatih, Denpasar - Bali Tel. (0361) 464700/464800 Email : unhipress@unhi.ac.id Distributor.*
- Kawulur, TK, Areros, WA, & Pio, R. . (2018). *The Effect of Reward and Punishment To Loyalty Employee in PT. Columbia Prime Manado Branch . Journal of Business Administration, 6 (2).*
- sublime, R. Y. (2014). *Influence Leadership, Motivation Work And Work Environment on Employee Performance at the Supervision and Inspection Bureau of PT Bank Panin Tbk . OE Journal, VI (3), 327–344.*
- Mangkunegara, A. A. A. P (2013). *Management Source Power Company Man . Rosdakarya Teenager. Bandung.*
- Meganovitasari, EDWA and IHA (2020). *The Influence of the Work Environment, Work Motivation and Work Discipline on Employee Performance (Study at the Tumpang Water Resources Management Unit) . 1–16.*
- Mukrodi, Hermawati, R., & Alifiah, S. (2019). *Management source Power human II. Unpam Press.*
- Marwansyah. (2010). *Management Source Power Man .*
- Meganovitasari, EDWA and IHA (2020). *Influence of Work Environment, Motivation Work And Discipline Work To Performance Employee (Studies At Tumpang Water Resources Management Upt) . 1–16.*
- Mz, MD, & Zaenudin, D. (2018). *The Influence of Compensation, Motivation and Environment Work To Performance Employee Pt. Aem . Management Analysis Journal, 5 (2), 1–16.*
- Naa, A. (2017). *Influence of Work Environment, Work Motivation and Training To Performance Employee in Office Bintuni District Regency Bay Bintuni . Journal Renaissance, 2 (02), 167– 176. <http://www.ejournal-academia.org/index.php/renaissance>*
- Nazir, M. (2003). *Research methods. Ghalia Indonesia .*
- Nitisemito. (2015). *Management Source Power Man. References loyal .*
- Nur Azizah. (2019). *Analysis of Placement, Work Motivation, and Career Development on Job Satisfaction at PT. Angkasa Pura II (PERSERO) Husain Sastra Negara Bandung Airport . Doctoral Dissertation, Indonesian Computer University, 30–32.*
- Prabowo, Lindu Anwar, S. (2018). *The Influence of Work Environment, Work Motivation and Work Stress on Lindu Employee Performance. Journal of Research*

- in Economic Sciences*, 8(1), 24–31.
- Pratama, IW, & Sukarno, G. (2021). *Analysis of Performance Appraisals, Rewards and Punishments on Employee Performance at the Regional Civil Service Agency of East Java Province*. STEI Journal of Economics, 30 (02). <https://doi.org/10.36406/jemi.v30i02.460>
- Prawirosentono. (2017). *Source Human Power*.
- Saputra, D. 2012. MKJRP (2017). *The Influence of Reward (Awards) and Punishment (Sanctions) on the Work Productivity of PT Employees*. Train Indonesia (Persero) Division Regional II Sumatra West. Journal Management And Entrepreneurship, 8 (1).
- Saputra, N. (2021). *Management Source Power Man*. Diandra Creative. Yogyakarta.
- Sedarmayanti. (2015). *Management Source Power Man*. Refika Aditama. Bandung.
- Sedarmayanti. (2017). *Book Review Planning & Development Resources Introduction*. Unitomo. Surabaya.
- Setyadi, D. (2021). *Management Source Power Man And Study Scientific*. University Mulawarman. Samarinda.
- Siti Mujanah, m P . (2019). *Library National Republic Indonesia In-Published Catalog (Kdt)*, Compensation Management.
- Stanley, S., & Remiasa, M. (2022). *The Influence of Physical and Non-Physical Work Environments on Employee Performance through Employee Creativity as a Variable Mediation on Shop Gold in Market Atom Surabaya*. Agora, 10 (1), 1–8. <https://www.neliti.com/id/publications/358491/Influence-lingkungan-physical-work-and-non-ffbfbe1d.pdf>
- Suhardi, S. (2019). *Influence Motivation Work, Competence, Environment Work and Compensation for PT Employee Performance*. Life Insurance in Batam City with Organizational Citizenship Behavior as an Intervening Variable. Journal of Benefita, 4 (2), 296. <https://doi.org/10.22216/jbe.v4i2.3670>
- Shoimin, A. (2018). *Model Learning Innovative in Curriculum 2013*. Siagian, SP (2012). *Human Resource Management*.
- Sugiyono. (2017). *Quantitative qualitative research methods and R&D*. Sunyoto, D. (2012). *Human Resource Management*. CAP . Sutrisno, E. (2016). *Management Source Power Man*. Media Groups .
- Suwatno. (2012). *Human Resource Management in Public and Business Organizations*. Erlangga. Jakarta.
- Wicaksana, A. (2016). *Rewards and Punishment*. <https://Medium.Com/>, 6–33. <https://medium.com/@arifwicaksanaa/pengertian-use-case-a7e576e1b6bf>
- Hero, A., & Afani, I. N. (2018). *Influence Rewards And Punishment On Employee Performance and Motivation at CV Media Kreasi Bangsa*. Journal of Applied Business Administration, 2 (2). <https://doi.org/10.30871/jaba.v2i2.1124>
- Yilmaz. (2018). *The Influence of the Work Environment on Employee Job Satisfaction at the Makassar City Transportation Service Office*.

Copyright holder:

Desi Safitri, Achmad Cik, Kumba Digidowiseiso (2024)

First publication rights:

Journal of Social Science

This article is licensed under:

