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Human resource is one of important assets that should be owned by company and well managed, because basically human has a great ability to grow and develop. Maintaining and upgrading the company’s human resource is a core function of corporative management. One of the tools to get qualified human resource that is employee’s motivation through various company programs such as allowances, furlough, career path and others. The aim of this study was to determine the effect of motivation on employee performance in the marketing department of Indonesian National Bureau of Plantation, Bandung Branch. The method used in this study was descriptive analysis by using literature and field technique such as observation, interview, questionnaires and data analysis. The conclusion of the research indicated that there is a very high positive effect of motivation on the employee’s performance in analyzed organization.
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Introduction

Human resource is one of the elements that must exist in an organization. In human resource managing company actively uses motivation tools. The aim of this study is to consider an influence of the motivation on employee’s performance in marketing department of Indonesian National Bureau of Plantation, Bandung Branch (hereandafter – Company). Company is located in Jalan Sindangsirna No.4, Bandung, Indonesia and is engaged in the cultivation of tea, rubber, quinine and palm oil.

Motivation’s Effects on Work Performance

Motivation theory proposed by Mc Clelland (2013) states that the employee has a potential energy reserve. How this energy is released and used depends on the strength of one’s encouragement and situations, opportunities that are available. According to Robbins (2009), motivation is “the processes that account for an individual’s intensity, direction, and persistence of effort toward attaining a goal”. That is the willingness to issue a high level of effort toward organizational goals, that is conditioned by the effort’s ability to satisfy an individual requirement.

Work performance according to Pradana & Wijaksana (2017) is a result of the quality and quantity of work which was achieved by employee in performing tasks based on given responsibilities.

Hasibuan (2007) states that work performance is a result of work which was achieved by the employee in executing task assigned based on employees’ skills, experiences, and determination.

From the definition of the experts above, it can be concluded that the work performance is a record of work result that was successfully achieved carrying out the tasks assigned to employee based on skills, experiences, and determination for a certain period of time.

Research Methodology

In order to conduct the research the following variables were used:
Independent Variable (X) - Motivation (X).
Dependent Variable (Y) - Work Performance (Y)

Regarding the discussion of the results, the following table is presented the operationalization of the variables as follow (Tab. 1):
Table 1 – Framework of the study
(made by co-authors)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motivation (X)</th>
<th>Work Performance (Y)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physical needs</td>
<td>Work quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security needs</td>
<td>Work quantity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social needs</td>
<td>Knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-esteem needs</td>
<td>Work adjustment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-actualization needs</td>
<td>Work relation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Work Initiative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The respondents examined in this study were 16 employees of Company (13 males and 3 females; 9 respondents are above 40 years old and 4 respondents are between 31-40 years old, 15 respondents have more than 5 years working experience).

Here is an interpretation of the total score that would be obtained from each indicator:
- The number of respondents that the researcher took was 16 people.
- The measurement scale value was 4, while the smallest measurement scale was 1.
- Thus obtained the largest cumulative number was 16 x 4 = 64, and the smallest cumulative number was 16 x 1 = 16.
- The lowest percentage of the value is (16 : 64) x 100% = 25%. The value range is 100% - 25% = 75%.

If to divide the measurable scale for 4 levels (18,75% each) classification presented in Tab. 2 can be obtained:

Table 2 - Percentage Categories for research data measurement
(created by co-authors)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Categories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>25% - 43,75 %</td>
<td>Very Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>&gt; 43,75% - 62,5%</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>&gt;62,5% - 81,25%</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>&gt;81,25% - 100%</td>
<td>Very High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Descriptive Analysis**

From the calculation result of descriptive analysis on Motivation variable (X) the value of 83.74% obtained.
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![Figure 1 - Continuum Line of Motivation (X) (created by co-authors)](83.74%)
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From (Fig. 1) the average total value of 15 items from Motivation variable (X) resulted 83.74%, which meant the score was in the category of “Very high”. It showed that Motivation variable (X) by the Indicators of Physic needs, Security needs, Social Needs, Self-esteem Needs, and Self-actualization Needs could be accepted by the employee in Company.

Based on the calculation result of descriptive analysis on Work Performance variable (Y) we obtained value of 84.52% (Fig. 2).

![Figure 2 - Continuum Line of Work Performance Variable (Y) (created by co-authors)](84.52%)
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From Fig. 2, the average score from 15 items on Work Performance variable (Y) resulted value of 84.52%, which meant that score was in category of “Very High”. It showed that Work Performance variable (Y) with indicators of Work Quality, Work Quantity, Knowledge, Work Adjustment, Work Relation, and Work Initiative could be accepted by the employee in Company.

The statistical T test basically shows how far the influence of the explanatory variables/independent variable individually in explaining the variation of the dependent variable (Ghozali 2013)

H0 = Motivation (X) does not significantly affect the Work Performance (Y) on Company.

H1 = Motivation (X) significantly affect the Work Performance (Y) on Company.
This research was conducted by looking at the significant value of each variables on the output of regression result by using SPSS program. If the probability value of T counted < 0.05 then there was a strong influence between independent variable and dependent variable and vice versa, if the probability value of T counted > 0.05 then there was no strong influence between independent variable and dependent variable (Madiawati, 2016).

Next, based on the result of testing, obtained T counted of 2.399 and the value of T table from distribution T table with α = 0.05 on two way testing was 0.4683 which meant grater from T table (T counted ≥ T table), besides the significant value on T counted table was 0.00 less than 0.05, then could be concluded for H0 was rejected and H1 was accepted.

Therefore, the conclusion was the Motivation variable (X) significantly influenced the Work Performance (Y) in Company. The test of data normality in this research was helped by using SPSS 16 application, the following results were obtained.

![Histogram](image)

**Figure 3** - The result of normality test on histogram
(results of co-authors Calculation Data on SPSS, 2016)

Fig. 3 explained that the histogram graphic has normal distribution. The normality test also could be conducted by using P-Plow through the scatter of data residual on the graphic above, such the figure below:
Based on the figure above, it could be seen that the spread of dots happened around the diagonal line and follow the diagonal line which indicated that the regression model in this research met the assumptions of normality. Normality test was also conducted with statistic calculation named Kolmogorov-Smirnov in order to result more detailed values and seeing whether the regression equation would be used passed the assumptions of normality.

Table 4 - Result of Normality Test
(calculated by co-authors)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>x</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>N</strong></td>
<td><strong>16</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normal Parameters</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>59.0625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>4.44925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most Extreme Differences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absolute</td>
<td>.129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>.129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>-.120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z</td>
<td>.517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.952</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Test distribution is Normal.

The result of the test showed that the probability value (Asymptotic Significanted) > α (0.155) > 0.05 so it could be concluded that the regression model on this research met the assumptions of normality.
The analysis of simple linear regression was used to determine how big the influence of the variable (Work Performance) change was caused by the X variable (Motivation). The statistic calculation on this analysis used SPSS 16 which could be seen on Tab. 5.

Table 5 - The result of Simple Linear Regression Test Coefficients\(a\)
(calculated by co-authors)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>48.892</td>
<td>6.302</td>
<td>7.758</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x</td>
<td>-.255</td>
<td>.106</td>
<td>-.540</td>
<td>-2.399</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(a = \) Dependent Variable (Y)

Based on the output above obtained the constant value and regression of coefficient, therefore it could be made the equation of simple linear regression as follow:

\[ Y = 48,892 + 0,255 (X) \]

\(a = 48,892\), means if Motivation (X) value is 0, then the Work Performance (Y) will have value 48,892.

\(b = 0,255\), means if Motivation (X) increases by one unit, then Work Performance (Y) will increase by 0,255 units.

The statistical of T test basically shows how far the influence of the explanatory variables / independent variable individually in explaining the variation of the dependent variable (Ghozali 2013:98)

**Hypothesis Testing and conclusions**

\(H_0 = \) Motivation (X) does not significantly affect the Work Performance (Y) on the marketing unit at PT. Perkebunan Nusantara VIII.

\(H_1 = \) Motivation (X) significantly affect the Work Performance (Y) on the marketing unit at PT Perkebunan Nusantara VIII.

This research was conducted by looking at the significant value of each variables on the output of regression result by using SPSS program. If the probability value of T counted < 0.05 then there was a strong influence between independent variable and dependent variable and vice versa, if the probability value of T counted > 0.05 then there was no strong influence between independent variable and dependent variable.
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Table 6 - Hypothesis Test Coefficientsa
(calculated by co-authors)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>48.892</td>
<td>6.302</td>
<td>7.758</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x</td>
<td>-.255</td>
<td>.106</td>
<td>-.540</td>
<td>-2.399</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a = Dependent Variable (Y)

In order to determine the influence of Motivation (X) to Work Performance (Y) in Company in percentage form, we used also the test of the coefficient determination shown in Tab. 6.

Tab. 6 shows that the R value = 0.840 which meant the relation between independent variable and work performance variable (84% means close relation). The R Square value = 0.791 means that 79.1% of employee’s work performance was influenced by independent variable (Motivation) while the rest 20.9% was influenced by others variable which was not studied on this study.

Table 7 - Result of Determination of Coefficient Test Model Summaryb

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.840a</td>
<td>.791</td>
<td>.241</td>
<td>1.83384</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), x

b. Dependent Variable: y
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