JENIUS **p-ISSN: 2581-2769; e-ISSN: 2598-9502**
Scientific Journal, Human Resource Management DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.32493/JJDP.v10i1.63925

The Influence of Rewards and Punishments on Employee Productivity at CV Banyuwangi Walet Sedong in Cirebon, West Java

Mohamad Sya'banunoz Thala[1*], Sigit Purnomo[2]
Faculty of Economics and Business, Pamulang University, South Tangerang
nunozsyaban72@gmail.com[*1], dosen02152@unpam.ac.id[2]

Received 15 August 2026 | Accepted 28 August 2026 | Published 25 September 2026
* Correspondence Author

Abstract

This study aims to determine the effect of Reward and Punishment on Employee Productivity at CV Banyuwangi Walet Sedong, Cirebon, West Java, both partially and simultaneously. This study employed an associative quantitative method with a population of 54 employees. The sampling technique used was saturated sampling, so that the entire population of 54 respondents was used as the research sample. Data were analyzed using SPSS version 26 through simple linear regression, multiple linear regression, correlation coefficient, coefficient of determination, partial t-test, and simultaneous F-test. The results show that: Reward has a positive and significant partial effect on Employee Productivity, evidenced by a t-value of 8.849 > t-table 2.006 at a significance level of 0.000 < 0.05. Punishment has a positive and significant partial effect on Employee Productivity, evidenced by a t-value of 7.068 > t-table 2.006 at a significance level of 0.000 < 0.05. Reward and Punishment simultaneously have a positive and significant effect on Employee Productivity, evidenced by an F-value of 49.960 > F-table 2.79 at a significance level of 0.000 < 0.05. The coefficient of determination (R Square) of 0.662 indicates that the regression model with Reward (X1) and Punishment (X2) explains 66.2% of the variance in Employee Productivity (Y), while the remaining 33.8% is explained by other variables outside this research model.

Keywords: *Reward; Punishment; Employee Productivity.*

INTRODUCTION

Human resource management is the process of utilizing the workforce effectively and efficiently to achieve organizational goals (Ajabar, 2020), and a key measure of the success of this management is reflected in employee work productivity. Work productivity is a crucial indicator of corporate success, as it reflects an employee's ability to generate optimal output through the efficient use of time, effort, and resources (Rohim & Irayanti, 2022), it is also influenced by the interaction between individuals and their physical, social, and psychological work environments (Winarsih & Anggraini, 2020), as well as by work motivation (Suprapto et al., 2023), individual characteristics (Susanti et al., 2023), and communication (Silalahi et al., 2023). Higher employee productivity increases the company's chances of enhancing its competitiveness and ensuring business sustainability. Two commonly used human resource management instruments to boost productivity are the provision of rewards and the application of punishments. Theoretically, rewards operate through a mechanism of positive reinforcement: rewards granted fairly and in alignment with performance enhance motivation, satisfaction, and loyalty, thereby encouraging employees to deliver their best performance (Rohim & Irayanti, 2022; Sofiati, 2021). Conversely, punishment operates through a mechanism of negative reinforcement: sanctions applied appropriately and wisely can serve as a motivational tool to correct behavior without causing counterproductive effects provided they are implemented consistently and proportionately, and are accompanied by guidance rather than serving merely as a repressive measure (Sardiman, 2018; Suparmi & dkk., 2019). When applied in a balanced manner, these two instruments have the potential to complement each other in fostering a work culture that is both disciplined and motivating.

Rewards are defined as forms of appreciation granted by management to employees whether financial or non-financial in recognition of their dedication, effort, and work contributions (Amal Prihatono et al., 2022; Apriyanti & Sunarti, 2020). Rewards can be categorized into intrinsic rewards, which are intangible (such as recognition and new challenges), and extrinsic rewards, which are tangible (such as salaries, bonuses, and promotions) (Permatasari & Sumartik, 2022). Performance appraisal, rewards, and punishments collectively play a crucial role in shaping employee performance (Ghanitri & Hakim, 2024). In this study, rewards are measured using the five dimensions identified by Hasibuan (2017) wages, salaries, allowances, incentives, and job promotions reflecting the financial and non-financial compensation received by employees. Meanwhile, punishment is defined as a disciplinary measure aimed at correcting the behavior of employees who violate rules, maintaining workplace order, and serving as a learning opportunity for the offender (Mangkunegara, 2021; Purwanto, 2016), in this study, it is measured via the five dimensions outlined by Rivai (2017): light punishment, moderate punishment, severe punishment, the assignment of work targets, and termination of employment. Employee productivity, serving as the dependent variable, is measured through five dimensions according to Mangkunegara (2021): work quantity, work quality, timeliness, work efficiency, and cooperation and responsibility.

CV Banyuwangi Walet Sedong is a company engaged in the processing and trading of swiftlet nests in Cirebon, West Java. The nature of its production process demands a high level of precision, discipline, and responsibility from employees; consequently, the implement-tation of an effective reward and punishment system is crucial for achieving the company's targets. Internal company data indicate a downward trend in productivity over the past three years, as shown in Table 1.

Table 1. Summary of Employee Productivity at CV Banyuwangi Walet Sedong, 2023–2025

Year	Number of employees	Production Target (Kg)	Realization (Kg)	Productivity
2023	52	200	192	96%
2024	56	220	198	90%
2025	54	210	181	86%

Source: Internal production recapitulation data from the Manager of CV Banyuwangi Walet Sedong, 2023–2025 period (processed, 2026)

Based on Table 1, employee productivity declined from 96% (2023) to 90% (2024) and 86% (2025), indicating that actual production has not optimally met the targets. This situation suggests the existence of operational obstacles that require further investigation specifically, by evaluating the effectiveness of the reward and punishment systems implemented by the company.

Regarding rewards, the company provides employee compensation in five forms, as summarized in Table 2.

Table 2. Components of the Reward System at CV Banyuwangi Walet Sedong, 2025

Component	Form	Information
Worker Wages	Rp1.000.000–Rp3.000.000/month	Daily and piecework systems based on output and working hours.
Manager's Salary	Rp4.000.000/month	Operations, HR, and Finance Manager
Allowance	BPJS Rp30.000/month; THR Rp2.000.000/year	Health and holiday allowances
Incentive	Rp1.500.000/month	Based on performance and attendance
Promotion	Promotion	Based on ability, expertise, and work performance

Source: Primary data from the manager of CV Banyuwangi Walet Sedong, 2025 (processed, 2026)

As shown in Table 2, the base salary provided by the company exceeds the 2025 Cirebon Regency Minimum Wage (UMK) of Rp2,681,382 per month, indicating that the company meets minimum standards regarding basic employee welfare. However, this

relatively comprehensive reward system has not been accompanied by a trend of rising productivity, raising questions about its effectiveness in driving work productivity.

In addition to rewards, the company implements a corrective, tiered system of penalties ranging from verbal warnings to termination of employment as outlined in Table 3.

Table 3. Data on Disciplinary Actions at CV Banyuwangi Walet Sedong, 2023–2025

Year	Light Sentence	Moderate Penalty	Severe Punishment	Setting Work Targets	PHK
2023	2 Employee	4 Employee	1 Employee	2 Employee	-
2024	3 Employee	3 Employee	1 Employee	3 Employee	1 Employee
2025	5 Employee	4 Employee	2 Employee	3 Employee	1 Employee

Source: Primary data from the manager of CV Banyuwangi Walet Sedong, 2023–2025 period (processed, 2026)

These disciplinary measures are applied in a tiered manner, ranging from light penalties such as verbal and written warnings to moderate penalties (e.g., the deferral of salary increments or promotions) and severe penalties (e.g., demotion or removal from office) (Nurhasan & dkk., 2016). Data in Table 3 indicate an increase in the frequency of light penalties from two to five cases over the past three years, primarily due to tardiness and a lack of work discipline; meanwhile, moderate and severe penalties are reserved for more serious violations or instances where performance fails to improve following corrective guidance. The imposition of additional work targets and termination of employment has been relatively limited, suggesting that the company prioritizes guidance and coaching before resorting to harsher sanctions. However, the rising frequency of minor infractions coinciding with a decline in productivity (Table 1) raises the possibility that the current reward and punishment system has not been fully effective in maintaining or enhancing work productivity, thereby warranting empirical examination.

Previous research consistently indicates that rewards and punishments influence employee productivity and performance; however, findings regarding the relative strength of these effects and their underlying mechanisms vary depending on the organizational context. Rahmah and Sari (2023) found that rewards and punishments have a positive and significant impact on employee productivity at Bhakti Kartini Hospital in Bekasi, with rewards exerting a greater influence than punishments. Widhiastuti and Hidayati (2022) demonstrated that rewards, compensation, and the work environment positively affect the productivity of manufacturing employees at PT Metal Hitech Engineering in Gresik a production-target-driven setting that closely resembles the production processes at CV Banyuwangi Walet Sedong. The research gap lies not merely in the difference of the research subjects, but in three specific areas: (1) the lack of consistent findings regarding whether rewards or punishments exert a more dominant influence in small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) characterized by production processes requiring manual precision; (2) the limited research linking actual company productivity data (rather than merely perceived performance) to the simultaneous application of rewards and punishments; and (3) the absence of empirical evidence concerning the edible bird's nest processing industry a labor-intensive sector demanding high precision, with work characteristics that differ significantly from the service or heavy manufacturing sectors frequently studied in the past. The novelty of this study lies in its examination of the impact of rewards and punishments on productivity measured by actual production output within the edible bird's nest processing industry, while simultaneously providing empirical evidence amidst the phenomenon of declining productivity despite the implementation of reward and punishment systems.

Based on the preceding explanation, this study aims to analyze the influence of reward and punishment on employee productivity at CV Banyuwangi Walet Sedong in Cirebon, West Java, both partially and simultaneously. The findings are expected to provide a basis for the company to manage its human resources more effectively. Based on the theoretical review and prior research, the study's hypotheses are formulated as follows: H1: Reward has a significant partial effect on employee productivity; H2: Punishment has a significant partial effect on employee productivity; H3: Reward and punishment have

a significant simultaneous effect on employee productivity.

METHOD

This study employs a quantitative approach using an associative method research aimed at determining the relationship or influence between two or more variables (Sugiyono, 2018). The research design is cross-sectional, with data collected during a single time period via questionnaires distributed to all respondents. The study was conducted at CV Banyuwangi Walet Sedong located at Dusun Sedong Kidul No. 1, Blok Paleben, RT.03/RW.01, Sedong Kidul, Sedong District, Cirebon Regency, West Java between April and June 2026.

The study population consists of all 54 employees of CV Banyuwangi Walet Sedong. A saturated sampling technique was used a method in which the entire population serves as the sample (Sugiyono, 2018) resulting in a sample size equal to the total population of 54 employees. Respondent characteristics include gender, age, education level, and tenure.

This study employs two independent variables Reward (X1) and Punishment (X2) and one dependent variable, Employee Productivity (Y). The operationalization of the variables, along with the sources of the indicators, is presented in Table 4 to facilitate the replication of the research instrument.

Table 4. Operationalization of Research Variables

Variable	Dimensions/Indicators	Source	Scale
Reward (X1)	Wages, Salaries, Allowances, Incentives, Promotions	Hasibuan (2017)	Likert 1–5
Punishment (X2)	Light penalty, Moderate penalty, Severe penalty, Assignment of work targets, Termination of employment (layoff)	Rivai (2017)	Likert 1–5
Employee Productivity (Y)	Work quantity, work quality, timeliness, work efficiency, teamwork and responsibility.	Mangkunegara (2021)	Likert 1–5

Source: Data processed by the author (2026)

Primary data were collected using two techniques: direct observation of employees' working conditions and the distribution of closed-ended, Likert-scale questionnaires to 54 respondents (Sugiyono, 2018). Secondary data comprising productivity figures and records regarding the granting of rewards and punishments were obtained from internal documents held by the manager of CV Banyuwangi Walet Sedong for the 2023–2025 period.

Validity testing was conducted by comparing the calculated r-value (r-count) with the r-table value at a 5% significance level. With a sample size of n = 54 and two independent variables, the degrees of freedom (df) were calculated as n − 2 = 52, resulting in an r-table value of 0.268. A statement item was considered valid if the calculated r-value exceeded the r-table value. Reliability testing employed Cronbach's Alpha coefficient, with the criterion that an instrument is deemed reliable if the Cronbach's Alpha value exceeds 0.60 . Data analysis was performed using SPSS version 26 through the following stages: (1) classical assumption testing, comprising normality, multicollinearity, autocorrelation, and heteroscedasticity tests; (2) simple linear regression analysis to examine the partial effect of each independent variable; (3) multiple linear regression analysis using the model Y = a + b1X1 + b2X2 + e, where Y represents Employee Productivity, X1 represents Reward, X2 represents Punishment, a is the constant, b1 and b2 are regression coefficients, and e is the error term; (4) analysis of the correlation coefficient and the coefficient of determination (R-squared); and (5) hypothesis testing via partial t-tests and simultaneous F-tests at a 5% significance level.

RESULTS and DISCUSSION

Results

Classical Assumption Test

Prior to conducting the regression analysis, classical assumption tests are performed to ensure the regression model satisfies the BLUE (Best Linear Unbiased Estimator) criteria; these include tests for normality, multicollinearity, autocorrelation, and heteroskedasticity.

Normality Test

The normality test aims to determine whether the regression model's residuals are

normally distributed, using the One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test. The test results are presented in Table 5.

Table 5. Normality Test Results
One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test

		Unstandardized Residual
N		54
Normal Parameters[a,b]	Mean	,0000000
	Std. Deviation	3,78198685
Most Extreme Differences	Absolute	,074
	Positive	,074
	Negative	-,050
Test Statistic		,074
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)		,200[c,d]

a. Test distribution is Normal.
b. Calculated from data.
c. Lilliefors Significance Correction.
d. This is a lower bound of the true significance.

Source: Data processed using SPSS 26 (2026)

Based on Table 5, the Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed) value for the regression model residuals is 0.200 (> 0.05); therefore, it can be concluded that the regression model residuals are normally distributed and the model is suitable for proceeding to the next stage of analysis.

Multicollinearity Test

Table 6. Multicollinearity Test Results
Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Collinearity Statistics	
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Tolerance	VIF
1	(Constant)	2,032	3,564		,570	,571		
	Reward	,597	,117	,555	5,097	,000	,558	1,791
	Punishment	,338	,111	,331	3,038	,004	,558	1,791

a. Dependent Variable: Produktivitas Karyawan
Source: Data processed using SPSS 26 (2026)

Based on the multicollinearity test results in Table 6, the Reward (X1) and Punishment (X2) variables have Tolerance values of 0.558 (> 0.10) and VIF values of 1.791 (< 10), respectively. These results indicate that the Tolerance values for both variables exceed 0.10 and the VIF values are below 10. Thus, it can be concluded that there is no multicollinearity among the independent variables in the regression model.

Autocorrelation Test

Table 7 Autocorrelation Test Results Using Durbin-Watson
Model Summary[b]

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Durbin-Watson
1	,814[a]	,662	,649	3,855	1,798

a. Predictors: (Constant), Punishment, Reward
b. Dependent Variable: Produktivitas Karyawan
Source: Data processed using SPSS 26 (2026)

Based on the test results in the table above, the regression model exhibits no autocorrelation; this is evidenced by a Durbin-Watson value of 1.798, which falls within the 1.550-2.460 interval.

Heteroskedasticity Test

Table 8. Heteroskedasticity Test
Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	4,014	2,075		1,935	,059
	Reward	-,117	,068	-,314	-1,723	,091
	Punishment	,091	,065	,255	1,400	,168

a. Dependent Variable: Abs_RES
Source: Data processed using SPSS 26 (2026)

Based on Table 8, the results of the heteroscedasticity test using the Glejser method indicate that the Reward variable (X1) has a significance value of 0.091 (> 0.05) and the

Punishment variable (X2) has a significance value of 0.168 (> 0.05). Since all independent variables have significance values greater than 0.05, it can be concluded that heteroscedasticity is not present in the regression model.

Simple Linear Regression Test

Table 9. Linear Regression Test of Reward on Employee Productivity

Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients
		B	Std. Error	Beta
1	(Constant)	5,840	3,591	
	Reward	,833	,094	,775

a. Dependent Variable: Produktivitas Karyawan

Source: Data processed using SPSS 26 (2026)

The simple linear regression analysis yielded the equation Y = 5.840 + 0.833X1. The constant value of 5.840 indicates that when Reward (X1) is zero, Employee Productivity (Y) is predicted to be 5.840. The regression coefficient for X1 is 0.833 and carries a positive sign, meaning that every one-unit increase in Reward is predicted to increase Employee Productivity by 0.833 units, assuming other variables remain constant (ceteris paribus).

Table 10 Linear Regression Test of Punishment on Employee Productivity

Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients
		B	Std. Error	Beta
1	(Constant)	10,338	3,857	
	Punishment	,715	,101	,700

a. Dependent Variable: Produktivitas Karyawan

Source: Data processed using SPSS 26 (2026)

The simple linear regression analysis yielded the equation Y = 10.338 + 0.715X2. The constant value of 10.338 indicates that when Punishment (X2) is zero, Employee Productivity is predicted to be 10.338. The regression coefficient for X2 is 0.715 and carries a positive sign, meaning that for every one-unit increase in the application of Punishment, Employee Productivity is predicted to increase by 0.715 units.

Multiple Linear Regression Analysis

Table 11. Multiple Linear Regression Test

Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients
		B	Std. Error	Beta
1	(Constant)	2,032	3,564	
	Reward	,597	,117	,555
	Punishment	,338	,111	,331

a. Dependent Variable: Produktivitas Karyawan

Source: Data processed using SPSS 26 (2026)

Based on the data in Table 11 regarding the multiple linear regression analysis of the variables Reward and Punishment and their effect on Employee Productivity, the regression yielded the equation Y = 2.032 + 0.597X1 + 0.338X2.

1. The constant value of 2.032 indicates that if Reward and Punishment are zero, Employee Productivity is predicted to be 2.032.
2. The Reward regression coefficient of 0.597 indicates that for every one-unit increase in Reward with Punishment held constant Employee Productivity is predicted to increase by 0.597 units.
3. The Punishment regression coefficient of 0.338 indicates that for every one-unit increase in Punishment with Reward held constant Employee Productivity is predicted to increase by 0.338 units.

Correlation Coefficient Test

Table 12. Correlation Coefficient Test of Reward on Employee Productivity

Correlations

		Reward	Produktivitas Karyawan
Reward	Pearson Correlation	1	,775**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		,000
	N	54	54
Produktivitas Karyawan	Pearson Correlation	,775**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,000	
	N	54	54

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Source: Data processed using SPSS 26 (2026)

Based on the results in Table 12 regarding the correlation coefficient test between Reward and Employee Productivity, the correlation value for the Reward variable (X1) is 0.775. This value falls within the 0.600–0.779 range, indicating a strong relationship between the Reward variable (X1) and Employee Productivity (Y).antara variabel *Reward* (X1) terhadap Produktivitas Karyawan (Y).

Table 13. Correlation Coefficient Test of Punishment on Employee Productivity

Correlations

		Punishment	Produktivitas Karyawan
Reward	Pearson Correlation	1	,700**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		,000
	N	54	54
Produktivitas Karyawan	Pearson Correlation	,700**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,000	
	N	54	54

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Source: Data processed using SPSS 26 (2026)

Based on the results in Table 13 regarding the correlation coefficient test between Punishment and Employee Productivity, the correlation value for the Punishment variable (X2) is 0.700. This value falls within the 0.600–0.779 range, indicating a strong relationship between the Punishment variable (X2) and Employee Productivity (Y).

Table 14. Correlation Coefficient Test of Reward and Punishment on Employee Productivity

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics				
					R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change
1	,814[a]	,662	,649	3,855	,662	49,960	2	51	,000

a. Predictors: (Constant), Punishment, Reward

Source: Data processed using SPSS 26 (2026)

Based on the results presented in Table 14 regarding the correlation coefficient test between Reward and Punishment and Employee Productivity, it can be observed that the correlation figure for the Reward (X1) and Punishment (X2) variables is 0.814. This value falls within the 0.800–1.000 interval, indicating a "Very Strong" level of relationship between the Reward (X1) and Punishment (X2) variables and Employee Productivity (Y).

Coefficient of Determination Test

Table 15. Coefficient of Determination Test: Reward on Employee Productivity

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	,775[a]	,601	,593	4,149

a. Predictors: (Constant), Reward

Source: Data processed using SPSS 26 (2026)

Based on Table 15, which presents the coefficient of determination test for the impact of Reward on Employee Productivity, the R-squared value is 0.601. This indicates that Reward (X1) has a relatively strong influence on Employee Productivity (Y), accounting for 60.1% of the variance. The remaining 39.9% is attributable to variables not analyzed in this study.

Table 16. Coefficient of Determination Test: Punishment and Employee Productivity

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	,700[a]	,490	,480	4,691

a. Predictors: (Constant), Punishment

Source: Data processed using SPSS 26 (2026)

Based on Table 16 regarding the coefficient of determination test for the effect of Punishment on Employee Productivity, the R-square value is 0.490. This indicates that the Punishment variable (X2) explains 49.0% of the variation in Employee Productivity, while the remaining 51.0% is influenced by other variables outside the scope of this study.

Table 17 Coefficient of Determination Test for Reward and Punishment on Employee Productivity

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	,814[a]	,662	,649	3,855

a. Predictors: (Constant), Punishment, Reward

Source: Data processed using SPSS 26 (2026)

Based on Table 17 regarding the coefficient of determination test for Reward and Punishment in relation to Employee Productivity, the R-square value is 0.662. This indicates that the Reward (X1) and Punishment (X2) variables, within the model, collectively explain 66.2% of the variation in Y, while the remaining 33.8% is influenced by factors outside this study.

Uji t Parsial

Table 18. t-test for the Reward Variable on Employee Productivity

Coefficients[a]

Model		t	Sig.
1	(Constant)	1,626	0,11
	Reward	8,849	0

a. Dependent Variable: Produktivitas Karyawan

Source: Data processed using SPSS 26 (2026)

Based on Table 18, the results of the partial t-test indicate that the Reward variable (X1) has a calculated t-value of 8.849 which is greater than the t-table value of 2.006 and a significance level of 0.000 (less than 0.05); consequently, Ho1 is rejected and Ha1 is accepted. Thus, it can be concluded that Reward has a significant partial effect on the employee productivity of CV Banyuwangi Walet Sedong in West Java.

Table 19. t-test for the Punishment Variable on Employee Productivity

Coefficients[a]

Model		t	Sig.
1	(Constant)	2,680	,010
	Reward	7,068	,000

a. Dependent Variable: Produktivitas Karyawan

Source: Data processed using SPSS 26 (2026)

Based on the results of the partial t-test shown in Table 19, the Punishment variable (X2) yielded a calculated t-value of 7.068 which exceeds the t-table value of 2.006 with a significance level of 0.000 (less than 0.05); consequently, Ho2 is rejected and Ha2 is accepted. This indicates that Punishment has a significant partial effect on the employee productivity at CV Banyuwangi Walet Sedong in Cirebon, West Java.

Simultaneous F-test

Table 20. Simultaneous F-test

ANOVA[a]

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	1485,252	2	742,626	49,960	,000[b]
	Residual	758,082	51	14,864		
	Total	2243,333	53			

a. Dependent Variable: Produktivitas Karyawan

b. Predictors: (Constant), Punishment, Reward

Source: Data processed using SPSS 26 (2026)

Based on the results of the simultaneous F-test shown in Table 20, the calculated F-value is 49.960, which exceeds the F-table value of 2.79, with a significance level of 0.000 (< 0.05). Consequently, Ho3 is rejected and Ha3 is accepted. This indicates that Reward and Punishment have a significant simultaneous effect on the employee productivity of CV Banyuwangi Walet Sedong in Cirebon, West Java.

Discussion

The Influence of Rewards on Employee Productivity

The simple regression analysis yielded the equation Y = 5.840 + 0.833X1, indicating that for every one-unit increase in Reward, Employee Productivity is predicted to rise by 0.833 units. The relationship between the two variables is strong (r = 0.775); Reward accounts for 60.1% of the variation in Employee Productivity (R^2 = 0.601), while the remaining 39.9% is explained by other factors. Hypothesis testing resulted in a calculated t-value of 8.849, exceeding the critical t-value of 2.006 at a significance level of 0.000; consequently, the null hypothesis (Ho1) was rejected and the alternative hypothesis (Ha1) accepted, confirming that Reward has a positive and significant partial effect on Employee Productivity.

These findings align with the positive reinforcement mechanism proposed by Sofiati (2021): rewards distributed fairly and in proportion to performance boost employees' intrinsic motivation, thereby encouraging them to maintain or enhance their work output. In the context of CV Banyuwangi Walet Sedong, this is particularly relevant as the company's reward structure incorporates both financial components (wages, incentives) and non-financial elements (promotions), thereby addressing both the economic needs and the need for recognition among employees.

These findings align with the research conducted by Rahmah and Sari (2023) at Bhakti Kartini Hospital in Bekasi, which also identified rewards as having a more dominant influence on productivity than punishments. The consistency of findings across two vastly different organizational contexts healthcare services versus the seafood processing industry suggests that the motivational effect of rewards is relatively generalizable across sectors, provided that rewards are administered in a structured and measurable manner. This study also aligns with the work of Widhiastuti and Hidayati (2022) at PT Metal Hitech Engineering Gresik; that study involved a production-target-based manufacturing context with characteristics relatively similar to those of CV Banyuwangi Walet Sedong. Both studies demonstrate that for jobs with quantitatively measurable outputs (such as production targets in kilograms, units, etc.), financial rewards tend to send a clear signal that workers directly associate with target achievement; consequently, their impact on productivity is statistically easier to detect than in service-based roles where output is more difficult to quantify.

Nevertheless, the R^2 value of 0.601 indicates that nearly 40% of the variation in productivity is explained by factors other than rewards such as the physical and psychological work environment (Winarsih & Anggraini, 2020) or individual characteristics (Susanti et al., 2023). This reinforces the argument that rewards are not the sole determinant of productivity but rather one instrument within a broader human resource management system.

The Effect of Punishment on Employee Productivity

The simple regression analysis yielded the equation Y = 10.338 + 0.715X2, indicating that for every one-unit increase in the application of punishment, employee productivity is predicted to rise by 0.715 units. The relationship between the two variables is strong (r = 0.700) albeit slightly weaker than that of rewards with punishment accounting for 49.0% of the variation in employee productivity (R^2 = 0.490). Hypothesis testing resulted in a calculated t-value of 7.068, exceeding the t-table value of 2.006 at a significance level of 0.000; consequently, Ho2 was rejected and Ha2 was accepted, confirming that punishment has a positive and significant partial effect on employee productivity.

Theoretically, this pattern can be explained through the mechanism of negative reinforcement: sanctions applied in a graduated manner ranging from verbal warnings to termination of employment serve as signals for behavioral correction rather than merely acting as repressive punishments (Sardiman, 2018; Suparmi & dkk., 2019). In other words,

punishment perceived by employees as fair and proportional tends to foster improvements in work discipline without provoking excessive resistance.

These findings align with the results obtained by Jenia and Anah (2023) at CV Hastaningrat Jombang, who also identified a significant impact of punishment on productivity within a small-to-medium-sized enterprise. This similarity is significant because both studies were conducted in the context of SMEs characterized by relatively simple organizational structures and direct, personal supervision by owners or managers contrasting with the hospital setting studied by Rahmah and Sari (2023), where punishment had a comparatively smaller impact than reward. This distinction suggests that the effectiveness of punishment as a productivity driver is more pronounced in small-scale organizations with direct supervision than in large, formal organizations, where the hierarchical distance between those administering and those receiving sanctions is greater.

It is worth noting that data on the administration of punishment reveals an increase in the frequency of minor penalties rising from two to five cases over the past three years coinciding with a downward trend in productivity from 96% (2023) to 86% (2025). This pattern does not contradict the regression results indicating a positive impact of punishment; rather than causing the decline in productivity, punishment serves as the company's response to pre-existing disciplinary issues. Thus, these findings are consistent with the view that punishment functions reactively and correctively rather than as a proactive preventive measure (Mangkunegara, 2021).

The Impact of Rewards and Punishments on Employee Productivity

The multiple regression analysis yielded the equation Y = 2.032 + 0.597X1 + 0.338X2, with a multiple correlation coefficient of 0.814 (indicating a very strong relationship) and an R^2 of 0.662; this means that Reward and Punishment collectively explain 66.2% of the variation in Employee Productivity, while the remaining 33.8% is explained by factors outside the model. The F-test resulted in an F-calculated value of 49.960, exceeding the F-table value of 2.79 at a significance level of 0.000; consequently, Ho3 was rejected and Ha3 was accepted, confirming that Reward and Punishment have a simultaneous, positive, and significant effect on Employee Productivity.

When compared to the R^2 values of the partial models (60.1% for Reward alone and 49.0% for Punishment alone), the combination of both variables increased the model's explanatory power regarding Employee Productivity variation to 66.2%, demonstrating that reward and punishment function complementarily rather than cancelling each other out. This aligns with the perspective of Ghanitri and Hakim (2024), who argue that performance appraisal, reward, and punishment should be implemented together to optimize employee performance: rewards reinforce existing productive behaviors, while punishments correct deviant behaviors, resulting in a more comprehensive work control system than relying on a single instrument alone.

These findings regarding simultaneous effects are consistent with those of Putri, Ramadhan, and Setianingsih (2023) at PT Pegadaian (Pekanbaru City Branch) and Saputra, Nurlina, and Hasan (2017) at PT Kereta Api Indonesia (Persero) Regional Division II West Sumatra; both studies identified a simultaneous impact of rewards and punishments on employee productivity or performance. The consistency of these findings across four distinct contexts a financial services SOE, a transportation SOE, a private hospital, and now an SME-scale swiftlet nest processing industry strengthens the generalization that the combination of rewards and punishments serves as a relevant human resource management instrument across sectors, regardless of business scale or type. However, this study complements existing empirical evidence with a unique contribution: unlike previous studies that typically measured productivity through employee perceptions or self-reports, this research links reward and punishment data with the company's actual production realization figures. This provides more objective evidence regarding the relationship between the reward-punishment system and real output, rather than merely perceived performance.

Regarding interpretation, the proportion of variance in employee productivity explained by the model indicates that factors other than rewards and punishments also contribute to productivity. This aligns with the findings of Suprapto, Mahaputra, and Mahaputra (2023), who identified work

motivation and the work environment as additional determinants of productivity. Consequently, this opens avenues for future research to examine rewards and punishments alongside other variables such as work motivation or the work environment acting as mediating or moderating variables.

CONCLUSION

Based on the results of the analysis and discussion, this study draws three conclusions in response to the proposed hypotheses.

First, rewards were proven to have a positive and significant partial effect on employee productivity at CV Banyuwangi Walet Sedong (t-count 8.849 > t-table 2.006; significance 0.000 < 0.05); thus. This finding confirms that the company's compensation system encompassing wages, incentives, allowances, and promotions is effective in boosting employee work motivation through positive reinforcement mechanisms.

Second, punishment was also proven to have a positive and significant partial effect on employee productivity (t-count 7.068 > t-table 2.006; significance 0.000 < 0.05). This indicates that the application of tiered and proportional sanctions ranging from verbal warnings to termination of employment serves as a behavioral correction tool that fosters discipline and work productivity.

Third, rewards and punishment were proven to have a positive and significant simultaneous effect on employee productivity (F-count 49.960 > F-table 2.79; significance 0.000 < 0.05). Together, these two variables explain 66.2% of the variation in employee productivity, indicating that rewards and punishment function complementarily within the human resource management system, although the remaining 33.8% of the variation is influenced by factors outside this research model, such as the work environment or work motivation.

In practical terms, these findings imply that CV Banyuwangi Walet Sedong needs to maintain and balance the consistent application of both rewards and punishment, rather than relying on just one of these instruments, as a strategy to address the declining productivity trend observed over the past three years. Theoretically, this study reinforces empirical evidence that positive and negative reinforcement mechanisms are equally relevant for application in manual production-based small and medium-sized enterprises, while also paving the way for further research to examine other variables such as work motivation or the work environment as additional factors influencing employee productivity.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Ajabar. (2020). *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia*.
2. Amal Prihatono, Muljadi, Puspo Wardoyo, & Leny Candra Kurniawan. (2022). The Effect of Job Training, Reward, and Punishment on Employee Work Performance at the Indonesian Harmoni Healthy Traditional Health Center. *Konfrontasi: Jurnal Kultural, Ekonomi Dan Perubahan Sosial*, *9*(3), 432–438. https://doi.org/10.33258/konfrontasi2.v9i3.236
3. Apriyanti, M., & Sunarti. (2020). Pengaruh reward dan punishment terhadap kinerja karyawan PT. Telkom Witel Jambi. *Jurnal Manajemen Terapan Dan Keuangan*, *9*(3), 244–253. https://doi.org/10.22437/jmk.v9i3.10138
4. Ghanitri, E., & Hakim, L. (2024). Analisis pengaruh penilaian kinerja, reward, dan punishment terhadap kinerja pegawai pada CV. Saprotan Utama Demak. *Jurnal Ekobis Dewantara*, *7*(1), 692–704. https://jurnalfe.ustjogja.ac.id/index.php/ekobis/article/view/4013
5. Hasibuan, M. S. P. (2017). *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia*. Bumi Aksara.
6. Jenia, H., & Anah, L. (2023). Pengaruh Punishment dan Reward Terhadap Produktivitas Kerja Karyawan CV Hastaningrat Jombang. *Jurnal Ekonomi Dan Bisnis*, *1*(2), 222–233.
7. Mangkunegara, A. A. A. P. (2021). *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia Perusahaan*. PT Remaja Rosdakarya.
8. Nurhasan, R., & dkk. (2016). *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia*. Pustaka Setia.
9. Permatasari, A. D., & Sumartik, S. (2022). Pengaruh keterlibatan karyawan, reward intrinsik, dan reward ekstrinsik terhadap kinerja karyawan. *Jurnal Manajemen Bisnis*, *13*(2), 234–245. https://doi.org/10.33096/jmb.v13i2.1121
10. Purwanto, M. (2016). *Psikologi Pendidikan*. Remaja Rosdakarya.
11. Putri, S. Y., Ramadhan, R. R., & Setianingsih, R. (2023). Pengaruh Reward Dan Punishment Terhadap Produktivitas

Kerja Karyawan Pada PT. Pegadaian CP Pekanbaru Kota. In *Prosiding Seminar Nasional Ekonomi, Bisnis & Akuntansi* (Vol. 3, pp. 89–98). https://ejurnal.umri.ac.id/index.php/sneba/article/view/5866

12. Rahmah, U. S., & Sari, R. K. (2023). Pengaruh Punishment Dan Reward Terhadap Produktivitas Kerja Pegawai Di Rumah Sakit Bhakti Kartini Bekasi. *Jurnal Economina*, *2*(3), 785–798. https://ejournal.45mataram.ac.id/index.php/economina/article/view/400
13. Rivai, V. (2017). *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia untuk Perusahaan: Dari Teori ke Praktik*. RajaGrafindo Persada.
14. Rohim, A., & Irayanti, L. (2022). Produktivitas dan efisiensi karyawan dalam organisasi publik dan privat. *Jurnal Ekonomi Dan Bisnis Terapan*, *7*(3), 91–102. https://ejournal.usu.ac.id/index.php/jmbt/article/view/2563
15. Saputra, D., Nurlina, N., & Hasan, L. (2017). Pengaruh reward dan punishment terhadap produktivitas kerja karyawan PT. Kereta Api Indonesia (persero) divisi regional II Sumatera Barat. *Manajemen Dan Kewirausahaan*, *8*(1), 53–66. https://www.ojs.unitas-pdg.ac.id/index.php/manajemen/article/view/87
16. Sardiman, A. M. (2018). *Interaksi dan Motivasi Belajar Mengajar* (Cetakan ke). Rajawali Pers.
17. Silalahi, J. J., Rajab, A., & Hanum, A. (2023). Pengaruh komunikasi kerja dan lingkungan kerja terhadap produktivitas kerja karyawan pada PT. Triroyal Timurraya di Medan. *Journal Economic Management and Business*, *2*(1), 1–11. https://doi.org/10.46576/jfeb.v2i1.3418
18. Sofiati, E. (2021). Pengaruh reward dan punishment terhadap kinerja pegawai. *Ekono Insentif*, *15*(1), 34–46. https://doi.org/10.36787/jei.v15i1.502
19. Sugiyono. (2018). *Metode penelitian kuantitatif, kualitatif, dan R&D*. Alfabeta.
20. Suparmi, D., & dkk. (2019). Punishment dan reward sebagai alat motivasi kerja karyawan. *Jurnal Administrasi Dan Pendidikan*, *5*(2), 115–126. https://journal.uny.ac.id/jpio/article/view/11673
21. Suprapto, E., Mahaputra, M. R., & Mahaputra, M. R. (2023). Pengaruh lingkungan kerja, motivasi terhadap produktivitas kerja karyawan pada PT REMCO Jambi. *Jurnal Ilmu Multidisiplin*, *1*(4), 948–955. https://doi.org/10.38035/jim.v1i4.164
22. Susanti, R., Salfadri, & Yuliastanty, S. (2023). Pengaruh karakteristik individu dan motivasi terhadap produktivitas kerja pegawai pada Satuan Kerja Pengembangan Sistem Penyediaan Air Minum Sumatera Barat. *Ekasakti Matua Jurnal Manajemen*, *1*(2), 146–153. https://doi.org/10.31933/emjm.v1i2.851
23. Widhiastuti, A. Y., & Hidayati, R. A. (2022). Pengaruh Reward, Kompensasi, dan Lingkungan Kerja Terhadap Produktivitas Kerja Karyawan Pada PT Metal Hitech Engineering Gresik. *SENTRI: Jurnal Riset Ilmiah*, *1*(2), 445–454. https://ejournal.nusantaraglobal.ac.id/index.php/sentri/article/view/248
24. Winarsih, V., & Anggraini, D. (2020). Analisis produktivitas karyawan dalam konteks lingkungan kerja. *Jurnal Pariwisata Dan Bisnis Perhotelan*, *11*(4), 302–310.

