

**The Effect Of *Kaizen* Culture On The Work Performance Of The
Kalla Toyota Alauddin Makassar Service Division**

Lita Limpo¹⁾ Rasyid Kamase²⁾

^{1,2)}Management Department, Faculty o Universitas Atma Jaya Makassar
Jl. Tanjung Alang No. 23, Makassar
lita_limpo@lecturer.uajm.ac.id¹⁾, rasyid_kamase@lecturer.uajm.ac.id²⁾

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this paper is to investigate the application of the kaizen philosophy to organizational performance, including human resource outcomes. The research was conducted at Toyota Pettarani dealers. Data were collected using a questionnaire. A total of 60 questionnaires were delivered and 43 questionnaires were completely filled out. The findings of the questionnaire were analyzed descriptively and the impact of applying the kaizen philosophy on performance was analyzed using multiple linear regression analysis. The results revealed that the kaizen philosophy in the form of customer focus, continuous improvement, developing self-discipline, and employee empowerment had a significant influence on organizational performance. Based on these findings, it is recommended that leaders continue to develop the mechanism for implementing the Kaizen philosophy to improve organizational performance and ensure organizational sustainability.

Keywords: customer focus, empowerment, kaizen, performance

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Research Background

Given Indonesia's participation in the implementation of the ASEAN Economic Community (MEA), many preparedness factors need to be considered. One factor that needs to be considered is the readiness of Human Resources (HR). HR readiness in Indonesia can still be said to be less competitive than other countries. This statement was supported by the results of a survey by a leading business education institution in Switzerland, *the Institute of Management Development (IMD)* in its research entitled "*IMD World Talent Report 2015*".

In a study involving 61 countries, Indonesia was declared down 16 ranks from 25th in 2014 to 41st in 2015. This ranking was calculated through certain weights by considering three factors, namely development and investment factors, attractiveness factors a country, and the factor of human resource readiness. For the first two factors Indonesia has a ranking that is relatively the same as the previous year. However, in the third factor, namely the readiness of the workforce, Indonesia was ranked 42nd. Indonesia's position is far below that of neighboring countries such as Singapore, Malaysia and even the Philippines.

In addition, Anatan and Ellitan (quoted by Suwatno & Priansa, 2011: 11) once explained that all problems caused by humans in business development and competition can only be solved by humans. Business competition that occurs in this global era presents challenges and opportunities

for companies to understand and conceptualize the management of effective multinational companies through human resource management (HRM).

In order to be able to compete, then as a nation we must continue to develop and improve the quality of our human resources. Therefore, improving the quality of human resources needs to be carried out in a planned, directed, intensive, effective and efficient manner in the development process, if you want to compete in the era of globalization (Akhyar, 2014).

Suwatno and Priansa (2011: 16) states that humans play an active and dominant role as planners, actors, and determinants of the realization of organizational goals. However, managing employees is more difficult and complex, because they have different thoughts, feelings, statuses, desires and backgrounds that are brought to the organization so that they cannot be fully regulated like machines, capital, or buildings. Employees need to be regulated by management theories that focus on regulating the role of humans in realizing optimal goals. One of them is organizational culture.

Robbins and Coulter (2010: 63) say that "Organizational culture has been presented as values, principles, traditions, and ways of working shared by members of the organization and influencing the way they act." Along with the times, culture is growing (*shared*) rapidly and greatly influences the running of the organization.

Every organization has a culture with different strong intensities. If the level of employee acceptance of the organization's core values and their commitment to these values is high, the stronger the culture of the organization. The stronger the organizational culture, the more *loyal* employees will be.

One culture that has been popular in international circles is the *Kaizen* Culture. *Kaizen* was accepted as one of the key management concepts since the publication of the book "*Kaizen: The Key to Japan's Competitive Success*" in 1986. The first decade of the 21st century, Toyota Motor Company surpassed General Motor as the best automotive manufacturer. Since then, there has been an awareness of the vital role of *kaizen* in Toyota's success (Imai, 2012).

The important role of culture in the company was also examined by William G. Ouchi. He argued that the culture of Japanese companies is very different from ordinary US corporate culture, and this difference explains the success of many Japanese companies (Moorhead & Griffin, 2013: 491).

Imai (2012: 47) also said that now various organizations in the world have adopted the *kaizen* methodology and philosophy. Although with different designations starting from *total quality management*, *just-in-time*, to *six sigma*, the core success of this strategy is to focus on customers, environmental orientation, and driven by *Kaizen*.

Kaizen has become Toyota's culture in Japan and abroad. Kalla Toyota is a company engaged in the automotive trade sector and is the sole agent of Toyota car marketing for the South, Central and Southeast Sulawesi regions. Thanks to the achievements in the sale of passenger and commercial vehicles, the company often obtained a Triple Crown Award from Toyota Corporation, Japan. They serve sales, service, and supply of spare parts (3S - *Sales, Service, Spare Parts*). In achieving these achievements, of course can not be separated from the organizational culture that can motivate employees to continue to improve performance and obtain brilliant achievements. This is what makes why interested in taking the title of the thesis about: "The Effect of *Kaizen* Culture on the Work Performance of the Kalla Toyota Alauddin Makassar Service Division".

1.2. Formulation of The Problem

From the above description the problem can be formulated as follows:

1. Is there a significant effect of *Kaizen* cultural variables on work performance simultaneously?
2. Is there a significant effect of *Kaizen* cultural variables on work performance partially?

1.3. Research objectives

Specifically this study aims to:

1. Analyze whether there is a simultaneous influence of *Kaizen* cultural variables on the work performance of division service employees Kalla Toyota Alauddin Makassar;
2. Analyzing whether there is a partial effect of *Kaizen* cultural variables on the work performance of division service employees Kalla Toyota Alauddin Makassar.

1.4. Benefits of research

The benefits of research consist of theoretical benefits and practical benefits.

1.4.1. Theoretical Benefits

Theoretically, the results of this study are expected to be useful for:

1. Increase understanding of the influence of Kaizen culture on work performance;
2. Being a reference material for other researchers who want to study the same problem.

1.4.2. Practical Benefits

Practically, the results of this study are expected to be useful for:

1. Providing alternatives with respect to variables in Kaizen culture that can improve the work performance of Kalla Toyota Alauddin's service division employees;
2. As one of the conditions for obtaining a Bachelor of Economics degree in Management Studies Program.

2. THEORETICAL BASIS

2.1. Literature Review

The *Kaizen* word in Japanese is written 改善 with two kanji letters which means "change" and "good". The word *kaizen* itself originated in China and rooted as far as the period of the Qing dynasty in China (1644-1911). This term always means improvement, although it is not used exactly in the sense that we use it in *lean manufacturing*, business and process improvement (Kato & Smalley, 2013).

Sometimes people misunderstand that *kaizen* is an activity. At Toyota, *kaizen* is an integral part of leadership. *Kaizen* is the way companies operate at the most basic level. They do *kaizen* every day (Liker & Convis, 2011: 118).

2.1. Kaizen

2.1.1. The Main Concept of Kaizen

Kaizen is a continuous improvement practice. Imai (2012: 50) says that managers must learn to implement **basic concepts** in realizing *kaizen* strategies, including:

1. *Kaizen* and Management, in the *Kaizen* context, management has two main functions, namely maintenance and improvement (*maintenance and improvement*). Maintenance aims to maintain technology, leadership and operational standards. Improvement or improvement aims to improve the applicable standards.
2. Process versus Results, *Kaizen* is process oriented because the process must be improved to improve results. Failure to achieve planned goals signifies failure in the process. Here management must identify and justify errors in the process. *Kaizen* focuses on human efforts, contrary to results-oriented thinking from the west.
3. Following the PDCA / SDCA Cycle, the step in the *Kaizen* process is to establish a cycle of plan-do-check-act (PDCA) as a driver of sustainability for *Kaizen* in making a policy to maintain and improve standards. The plan (planning) refers to setting goals for the improvement and design of actions to achieve the target. Do (do) refers to the implementation

of the plan. *Check* (check) to ascertain whether the implementation remains on track and bring planned improvements. The *Act* (action) displays and sets standards for new procedures to prevent recurrence of problems or to set new goals for improvement. Before PDCA, a process needs to be stabilized in the *standardize-do-check-act* (SDCA) cycle. When a problem occurs, it is necessary to ask whether it happened because there is no standard or because the standard is inadequate. The SDCA cycle refers to maintenance and PDCA refers to repairs.

4. Prioritizing Quality, from several main objectives including quality, cost, and delivery (*Quality, Cost, and Delivery* - QCD), quality is always a priority. No matter how attractive the price and time of delivery, the company will not be able to compete if the quality of the product or service is lacking.
5. Data based problem-solving, Kaizen is a problem solving process. For problems to be understood and resolved correctly, problems must be recognized, relevant data collection and analysis. Trying to solve problems without clear data is similar to switching to hunches and feelings, not a scientific and objective approach.
6. The next process is the customer, every job is a series of processes, and each process has its suppliers and customers. A material or piece of information provided by process A (supplier) is done and improved in process B and then sent to process C. The next process is always considered as a customer. The axiom "the next process is the customer" refers to two types of customers: internal (within the company) and external (on the market).

2.1.2. Kaizen Main System

Here are some of the main systems that need to be implemented so that the kaizen strategy runs successfully:

1. Total Quality Management (*Total Quality Management* - TQM)

Robbins and Coulter (2010: 42) stated: "Total quality management (TQM) is a management philosophy that is fully focused on continuous improvement efforts and the ability to respond quickly to various customer needs (*continuous improvement*) and expectations." Meanwhile, according to Akhyar (2014), TQM is a management system that empowers various quality sources that exist within the organization through the stages of management to improve the quality of service to customers effectively and efficiently.

Total quality management is not a rapid improvement of management, but about changing the way things are done in an organization's lifetime (Kanji & Asher, 1996). Kumar (2005) in his thesis said that the core philosophy of TQM is that each step in a process is seen as a relationship between customers and suppliers (both internal and external). Suppliers must meet the lowest and explicit cost of express and implied customer requirements.

When the TQM runs well, the organization can empower its members to make the right and reasonable decisions at their level to improve the process or product. TQM also builds a sense of belonging. This provides an opportunity for vertical communication and free exchange of opinions (Heizer & Render quoted by Varma, 2015).

TQM in Japan includes activities such as policy dissemination, building a quality assurance system, standardization, training and education, cost management, and quality control groups.

2. *Just-in-Time* Production Systems (JIT)

Originating from Toyota Motor Company under the leadership of Taiichi Ohno, this system focuses on eliminating futile activities and achieving a lean production system that is flexible enough to accommodate fluctuations in customer orders. This reduces costs, makes delivery on time, and increases company revenue.

3. *Total Productive Maintenance (TPM)*

If TQM focuses on improving overall quality and management performance, TPM focuses on improving the quality of equipment. TPM seeks to maximize equipment efficiency through a preventative maintenance system that covers the lifetime of the equipment.

4. *Policy Deployment (Policy Deployment)*

Management must set clear targets to guide all members of the organization and lead all kaizen activities to achieve these targets. First, top management must establish a long-term strategy, then break it down into medium and short term and then reduce the strategy based on the management level. The further down, the strategy must be translated into more specific activities and actions.

5. *Suggestion System*

The suggestion system functions as an integral part of individual oriented kaizen and emphasizes the benefits of increasing morale from positive employee participation. Managers in Japan see their main role as an example that inspires employees in kaizen by providing a variety of suggestions, however small it is. Employees in Japan often discuss their advice with supervisors verbally and state it in action. They don't expect a lot of economic rewards from every suggestion. Building employees who are disciplined and patterned thinking Kaizen is the main goal.

6. *Small Group Activities (Small-Group Activities)*

A kaizen strategy includes informal activities - small groups, voluntary, intra-company groups organized to carry out certain tasks in a workshop environment. The most popular small group activities are *quality circles*. The success of *quality circle* activities indicates that management plays a vital role but is not visible in supporting these activities.

2.1.3. **Five Steps of Work Organization (5S)**

5S activities can bring a group of people together towards a common goal and build a kaizen culture. The contents of 5S activities include:

1. 整理 (*seiri*), Sort, is an activity to get rid of items that are not needed so that all items in the work site are only goods that are really needed in work activities.
2. 整頓 (*seiton*), Arrange, everything must be placed according to the specified position so that it is ready to be used when needed.
3. 清楚 (*seiso*), Sapu, is an activity to clean equipment and work areas so that all work equipment is maintained in good condition.
4. 清潔 (*seiketsu*), Standardization, is an activity to maintain personal hygiene while adhering to the previous three stages.
5. 躰 け (*shitsuke*), Self-discipline, which is the maintenance of personal discipline of each worker in carrying out all 5S stages.

2.2. **Employee Empowerment**

Based on the Dictionary of Indonesian Language (in Suwatno & Priansa, 2011: 182), empowerment is defined as the process of making to make capable. According to Imai (2012: 845), employee empowerment means that everyone has the authority and responsibility to improve their own work as long as they are part of the team, have appropriate data, and follow a standard improvement process. And there are also researchers who define employee empowerment as a process of enabling individuals to think, behave, act, and control work and make decisions autonomously (Rankinen, Suominen et al. Cited Sampe, 2012).

According to Suwatno and Priansa (2011: 189), employee empowerment can be implemented through the provision of clear authority, competency development, trust development, utilization of opportunities, giving responsibility, developing organizational culture,

and developing mutual support. The purpose of employee empowerment, namely for the realization of employees who have the ability, clear authority, and have responsibility.

2.3. Learning Organization

Learning organizations can be defined as a condition of the organization that provides opportunities for continuous individual learning through investigation and dialogue, shared knowledge, feedback, *trial and error*, and team learning aimed at improving the quality and performance of the organization so that it can remain competitive in the future. front (Uniati, 2014). In addition to the above opinions, Ruzikna (2010) agrees that learning organizations are organizations that have a placement system, mechanisms and processes, which are used to continuously improve their ability to achieve sustainable goals for themselves and the communities in which they participate.

The main idea of learning organizations, namely solving problems, is not like traditional organizations that are centered on achieving efficiency. In learning organizations, all staff are involved in finding problems and finding alternative solutions (Raharso & Amalia, 2011).

Learning organizations have an unlimited environment, where employees work together and collaborate in handling various organizational tasks as well as possible, and learn from each other. In this condition, the work team formed tends to make decisions in solving problems, while managers act as facilitators, supporters, and *motivators* (Robbins & Coulter, 2010: 254).

Liker (2003) explains that managers can dramatically improve their business processes. One of them is to build a learning culture for continuous improvement. He also said that the example of a true learning organization was Toyota, which had evolved and studied for almost a century.

2.4. Work performance

According to Suwatno and Priansa (2011: 196), work performance is defined as the results achieved by individuals according to the standards that apply, within a certain period of time, according to their work and affective. Job performance can also be interpreted as performance or results of performance. Sampe (2012) said that organizational performance is the ability of a company to achieve its intended goals. If it is changed to the individual level, then performance is the ability of a person to achieve a set goal.

The purpose of performance appraisal is to recognize the strengths and weaknesses of employees, so that the feedback process as a motivator can work well to improve employee errors in work and determine the right *rewards* according to the work performance of each employee (Milkovich quoted Suwatno & Priansa, 2011: 198) The factors that influence work performance are quantity of work results, quality of work results, and timeliness (Vyona, 2014).

There are two ways to assess work performance, namely objective and subjective actions. Objective measures use real numbers from companies, while subjective measures use respondents' perceptions (Ariningsih, 2007).

2.5. Relationship between Kaizen Culture and Work Achievement

Based on Achyani's research (2014) entitled "Achievement Motivation, Organizational Culture, and Work Achievement", he found that organizational culture has a greater influence on work achievement. Ahcyani said that because organizational culture is the basic philosophy of an organization that contains shared beliefs, norms and values that are the core characteristics of how to do something in the organization, where all three things become the handle of all HR in the organization to carry out their duties and produce good achievements.

There is also an Artono study (2011) entitled "The Effect of Kaizen Culture on Employee Performance of SAE Cooperatives, Pujon, Malang". In his research, Artono found that the *Kaizen* Culture variables consisting of Education and training, work relations, workplace, supervisors,

and work discipline had a significant influence on the performance of employees in the "SAE" Pujon cooperative at a significant level $\alpha = 0.05$.

3. RESEARCH METHODS

3.1. Types of research

The method used in this research is an association study with using quantitative methods. This research is to find out the influence of Kaizen philosophy implementation on Organizational performance.

3.2. Population and Sample

3.2.1. Population

The population in this study is employees of Kalla Motor Toyota Dealer at jl. Andi Pangeran Pettarani Makassar.

3.2.2. Respondents

Silaen (2018:87) the sample is part of the population used in a certain way to measure its characteristics. Respondents for this study were employees who have been working at the Toyota dealers form more than 2 years.

3.3. Operastional Devinition of Variables

1. Kaizen Culture (X)

Kaizen is a mandate to continuously improve performance. At Toyota, *kaizen* is not a special project or activity. That is the way people in companies think at the most *fundamental* level (Liker & Ogden, 2011: 12). There are two kinds of kaizen, namely (*maintenance*) and (*improvement*). Maintenance is the process of dealing with unexpected changes by meeting the standards set at this time. Improvement is not just the job of maintaining standards but increasing them.

Vyona (2014) divides the Kaizen Culture into four variables. Each of the two variables represents maintenance and improvement. The first two variables refer to improvements, including:

a. Customer Focus (X1)

Quality improvements carried out by a company must focus on *customer satisfaction* (Semuel & Zulkarnain, 2011). Customers in this context are divided into two, namely processes (internal) and markets (external).

b. Continuous Improvement (X2)

When the kaizen philosophy is applied, all aspects of the organization must be improved over time (Ekoanindiyo, 2013). Continuous improvement (*continuous improvement*) can strengthen commitment and sense of belonging (*sense of belonging*).

c. Develop Personal Discipline (X3)

Develop important work habits that are important for the next stage in implementing downsizing (Liker & Meier, 2005). To build a Kaizen culture and achieve common goals, discipline from each person is needed. In order for this culture to continue to be applied, developing personal discipline has become an obligation of every member of the organization.

In this study, the statement for variables developing personal discipline is a positive statement so that the highest scoring score is Strongly Agree (SS) with a value of 5 while

the lowest score is Strongly Disagree (STS) with a value of 1. The higher the category of developing personal discipline also good influence on work performance, this is because respondents agree with the statement.

d. Empowerment of Employees (X4)

Through working with each worker as an individual to ensure their success, providing them with the skills needed for a job, and increasing their abilities, will help them find a way of success for themselves. All great leaders know that they are successful through the success of those they lead (Liker & Meier, 2007).

In this study, statements for variables make employees capable of being a positive statement so that the highest score is Strongly Agree (SS) with a value of 5 while the lowest score is Strongly Disagree (STS) with a value of 1. The higher the category makes each employee able to this study also has better influence on work performance, this is because respondents agree with the statement.

2. Work Achievement (Y)

Work performance is a result that can be achieved by a person or group of people in carrying out their duties. Good work, which means achieving goals or standards that have been set and or can even exceed the standards set by the company for a certain period (Moh. As'ad quoted Mulyanto, 2008).

The indicators that will be used in this study include:

1. Focus on Customers (X1)

The indicators used in this variable include:

- a. The importance of customer arrivals
- b. Focus on serving customers
- c. Providing excellent service

2. Continuous improvement (X2)

The indicators used in this variable include:

- a. Management functions as a motivator
- b. Management functions as a consultant
- c. There is an opportunity for employees to express creative ideas

3. Develop Personal Discipline (X3)

The indicators used in this variable include:

- a. Arrive on time
- b. Responsible for the work done
- c. Works according to standards

4. Empowerment of Employees (X4)

The indicators used in this variable include:

- a. Able to do assignments
- b. Able to work without being watched
- c. Able to be placed elsewhere

5. Work Achievement (Y)

The indicators used in this variable include:

- a. Quantity of work
- b. Quality of work
- c. Punctuality

Descriptive analysis aims to determine the frequency distribution of respondents' answers to the results of the questionnaire (questionnaire) that was disseminated. The results of the questionnaire include independent variables, namely Kaizen Culture (X) which consists of Customer Focus (X1), Continuous Improvement (X2), Developing Personal Discipline (X3), and Employee Empowerment (X4), as well as dependent variables namely Work Achievement (Y).

4. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

4.1. Overview of Respondents

The data analysis reveals that the average respondent's answer for the five items variable statement focus to the customer as follows.

1. Respondent's answer to item X1.1: "always identifies customer needs.", 18 people answered doubtfully (41.9%), 19 people answered agreed (44.2%), and those who answered strongly agreed as many as 6 people (14%). Average value of 3.72. It can be concluded that the average respondent agrees.
2. Respondent's answer to item X1.2: "always tries to meet customer satisfaction.", Who answered did not agree as much as 1 person (2.3%), who answered doubtfully as many as 17 people (39.5%) , who answered agreed as many as 13 people (30.2%), and those who answered strongly agreed were 12 people (27.9%). Average value of 3.84. It can be concluded that the average respondent agrees.
3. Respondents' answers to item X1.3: "always plan the needs or expectations of future customers.", Those who answered did not agree as many as 3 people (7%), who answered in doubt as many as 18 people (41.9 %), who answered agreed as many as 15 people (34.9%), and those who answered strongly agreed were 7 people (16.3%). Average value of 3.60. It can be concluded that the average respondent agrees.
4. Respondent's answer to item X1.4: "Customer needs are transformed into the planning process for quality improvement.", Who answered did not agree as many as 2 people (4.7%), who answered doubtfully as many as 16 people (37.2 %), who answered agreed as many as 17 people (39.5%), and those who answered strongly agreed were 8 people (18.6%). Average value of 3.72. It can be concluded that the average respondent agrees.
5. Respondent's answer to item X1.5: "always resolves consumer problems right away.", Who answered in doubt as many as 19 people (44.2%), who answered agreed as many as 15 people (34.9%) , and those who answered strongly agreed were 9 people (20.9%). Average value of 3.77. It can be concluded that the average respondent agrees.

For the continuous improvement, respondents reveal that.

1. Respondent's answer to item X2.1: "Managers always set targets for continuous improvement to certain standards.", Who answered in doubt as many as 11 people (25.6%), who answered agreed as many as 28 people (65.1%) , and those who answered strongly agreed were 4 people (9.3%). Average value of 3.84. It can be concluded that the average respondent agrees.
2. Respondents' answers to item X2.2: "Managers always listen to complaints from regarding work.", Who answered did not agree as many as 2 people (4.7%), who answered doubtfully as many as 18 people (41, 9%), who answered agreed as many as 20 people (46.5%), and those who answered strongly agreed were 3 people (7%). Average value of 3.56. It can be concluded that the average respondent agrees.
3. Respondents' answers to item X2.3: "always consider input from customers to improve all aspects of quality.", Who answered disagree as many as 3 people (7%), who answered doubtfully as many as 16 people (37, 2%), who answered agreed as many as 21 people

(48.8%), and those who answered strongly agreed were 3 people (7%). Average value of 3.56. It can be concluded that the average respondent agrees.

4. Respondents' answers to item X2.4: "always make continuous improvements in all aspects without waiting for problems.", Who answered in doubt as many as 19 people (44.2%), who answered agreed as many as 23 people (53.5%), and those who answered strongly agreed were 1 person (2.3%). Average value of 3.58. It can be concluded that the average respondent agrees.
5. Respondents' answers to item X2.5: "always given the opportunity to express fresh ideas.", Who answered did not agree as much as 1 person (2.3%), who answered doubtfully as many as 23 people (53.5 %), who answered agreed as many as 17 people (39.5%), and those who answered strongly agreed as many as 2 people (4.7%). Average value of 3.47. It can be concluded that the average respondent agrees.

For personal development, respondents reaction reveal that:

1. Respondents' answers to item X3.1: "always arrive on time on certain workdays and events.", Who answered did not agree as many as 1 person (2.3%), who answered doubtfully as many as 23 people (53.5%), who answered agreed as many as 11 people (25.6%), and those who answered strongly agreed were 8 people (18.6%). Average value of 3.60. It can be concluded that the average respondent agrees.
2. Respondents' answers to item X3.2: "understand and obey all kinds of regulations that apply in the company.", Who answered in doubt as many as 11 people (25.6%), who answered agreed as many as 28 people (65 , 1%), and those who answered strongly agreed were 4 people (9.3%). Average value of 3.84. It can be concluded that the average respondent agrees.
3. Respondent's answer to item X3.3: "concern on norms as a part of you which is a good reflection of the company.", Who answered did not agree as much as 1 person (2.3%), who answered doubtfully as many as 14 people (32.6%), who answered agreed as many as 21 people (48.8%), and those who answered strongly agreed as many as 7 people (16.3%). Average score of 3.79. It can be concluded that the average respondent agrees.
4. Respondents' answers to item X3.4: "responsible for all forms of work that have been done.", Who answered in doubt as many as 6 people (14%), who answered agreed as many as 28 people (65.1%), and 9 people answered very agree (20.9%). Average value of 4.07. It can be concluded that the average respondent agrees.
5. Respondents' answers to item X3.5: "Responsibility in work is an obligation for all fathers / mothers.", Who answered disagree as many as 2 people (4.7%), who answered doubtfully as many as 23 people (53, 5%), who answered agreed as many as 15 people (34.9%), and those who answered strongly agreed were 3 people (7%). Average value of 3.44. It can be concluded that the average respondent is hesitant.

For empowerment, respondents' response reveal that :

1. Respondent's answer to item X4.1: "able to complete all assignments given.", Who answered doubtfully as many as 13 people (30.2%), who answered agreed as many as 24 people (55.8%) , and those who answered strongly agreed were 6 people (14%). Average value of 3.84. It can be concluded that the average respondent agrees.
2. Respondents' answers to item X4.2: "feel comfortable working without being watched by anyone.", Who answered did not agree as much as 1 person (2.3%), who answered doubtfully as many as 16 people (37.2 %), who answered agreed as many as 19 people (44.2%), and those who answered strongly agreed were 7 people (16.3%). Average value of 3.74. It can be concluded that the average respondent agrees.
3. Respondent's answer to item X4.3: "feel there is no difference between working with or without supervision.", Who answered did not agree as much as 1 person (2.3%), who

answered doubtfully as many as 15 people (34 , 9%), who answered agreed as many as 21 people (48.8%), and those who answered strongly agreed as many as 6 people (14%). Average value of 3.74. It can be concluded that the average respondent agrees.

4. Respondents' answers to item X4.4: "understand the standards or work methods of other divisions.", Who answered did not agree as much as 1 person (2.3%), who answered doubtfully as many as 6 people (14%) , who answered agreed as many as 32 people (74.4%), and those who answered strongly agreed were 4 people (9.3%). Average value of 3.91. It can be concluded that the average respondent agrees.
5. Respondents' answers to item X4.5: "have the ability to do any work.", Who answered in doubt as many as 16 people (37.2%), who answered agreed as many as 22 people (51.2%) , and those who answered strongly agreed were 5 people (11.6%). Average value of 3.74. It can be concluded that the average respondent agrees.

For the performance indicators, respondent's response on the seven statement items of work performance variables is as follows.

1. Respondent's answer to item Y.1: "is able to complete a lot of work in a short time.", Who answered disagree as many as 4 people (9.3%), who answered doubtfully as many as 16 people (37, 2%), who answered agreed as many as 20 people (46.5%), and those who answered strongly agreed were 3 people (7%). Average value of 3.51. It can be concluded that the average respondent agrees.
2. Respondents' answers to item Y.2: "make the best use of work time.", 19 people answered in doubt (44.2%), who answered agreed as many as 23 people (53.5%), and those who answered strongly agreed were 1 person (2.3%). Average value of 3.58. It can be concluded that the average respondent agrees.
3. Respondent's answer to item Y.3: "Efficiency of work time helps you to manage time for personal activities.", Who answered doubtfully as many as 13 people (30.2%), who answered agreed as many as 25 people (58 , 1%), and those who answered strongly agreed were 5 people (11.6%). Average value of 3.81. It can be concluded that the average respondent agrees.
4. Respondent's answer to item Y.4: "do your best so that all parties can feel the benefits of the performance that has been carried out.", Who answered doubtfully as many as 10 people (23.3%), who answered agreed as much 29 people (67.4%), and those who answered strongly agreed were 4 people (9.3%). Average value of 3.86. It can be concluded that the average respondent agrees.
5. Respondents' answers to item Y.5: "complete work in accordance with Work Operational Standards (SOP).", Who answered did not agree as many as 2 people (4.7%), who answered in doubt as many as 16 people (37.2%), who answered agreed as many as 18 people (41.9%), and those who answered strongly agreed were 7 people (16.3%). Average value of 3.70. It can be concluded that the average respondent agrees.
6. Respondents' answers to item Y.6: "have a performance that is useful for the progress of the company.", Answered doubtfully as many as 13 people (30.2%), who answered agreed as many as 24 people (55.8%) , and those who answered strongly agreed were 6 people (14%). Average value of 3.84. It can be concluded that the average respondent agrees.
7. Respondent's answer to item Y.7: "is able to complete the work according to the target and the time specified.", Who answered did not agree as much as 1 person (2.3%), who answered doubtfully as many as 16 people (37 , 2%), who answered agreed as many as 18 people (41.9%), and those who answered strongly agreed were 8 people (18.6%). Average value of 3.77. It can be concluded that the average respondent agrees.

The statement of the work performance variable with the lowest mean score is Y.1 which says "is able to complete a lot of work in a short time". Ohno (in Liker, 2003: 128) says that slow but consistent turtles cause a lack of futile things and are far more desirable than fast rabbits who lead races and then stop once asleep. Liker (2013: 53) argues that one of Toyota's management principles is to work like a turtle, not a rabbit, so that it can be said that employees who do not agree with the ability to complete a lot of work in a short time are more careful and thorough at work. Another thing that can affect the lack of speed of work is the difference in work capacity, work experience, and other factors not examined.

4.2. Multiple Regression Analysis

To test the research hypotheses, regression analysis was applied. The results are provided in the following table :

Table 1
Multiple Regression Analysis

| Model | Unstandardized Coefficients | | Standardized Coefficients | t | Sig. |
|------------------------|-----------------------------|------------|---------------------------|-------|------|
| | B | Std. Error | Beta | | |
| (Constant) | ,103 | ,236 | | ,434 | ,666 |
| Customer focus | ,381 | ,084 | ,440 | 4,546 | ,000 |
| Continuous improvement | ,180 | ,084 | ,195 | 2,151 | ,038 |
| Discipline development | ,163 | ,076 | ,196 | 2,153 | ,038 |
| Employee empowerment | ,248 | ,094 | ,246 | 2,637 | ,012 |

Source: Data analysis for the study

Based on data in table 4.13, the regression equation is obtained as follows:

$$Y = 0,103 + 0,381X_1 + 0,180X_2 + 0,163X_3 + 0,248X_4$$

Where:

Y = Work performance

X₁ = Focus on customers

X₂ = Continuous improvement

X₃ = Develop personal discipline

X₄ = Empowerment of employees

With the following explanation:

- The constant 0.103 shows the level of work performance if it is considered to have no influence on the Kaizen culture. With a significance level of 0.666 constant greater than 0.05 or a not significant constant, if the Kaizen culture is not considered by the company, then there is no thing that encourages employees to improve work performance.
- Customer focus (X₁) is tested to have a significant effect on work performance, indicated by a significance value of 0,000 less than 0.05, while the regression coefficient of 0.381 indicates that if the focus on customers is further developed, work performance will increase.
- Continuous improvement (X₂) is tested to have a significant effect on work performance, indicated by a significance value of 0.038 smaller than 0.05, while the regression coefficient of 0.180 indicates that if continuous improvement is developed, work performance will increase.

-
-
- d. Developing personal discipline (X3) is tested to have a significant effect on work performance, indicated by a significance value of 0.038 smaller than 0.05, while the regression coefficient of 0.163 shows that if developing personal discipline is increasingly developed, work performance will increase.
 - e. Employee empowerment (X4) is tested to have a significant effect on work performance, indicated by a significance value of 0.012 smaller than 0.05, while the regression coefficient of 0.248 shows that if employee empowerment is developed, work performance will increase.

From the regression equation above can be seen how the influence of independent variables (X1, X2, X3, X4) on the dependent variable (Y). Positive influence shows that changes in the independent variable of Kaizen Culture will be in line with changes in Job Performance.

4.5. Discussion

Based on the results of the regression analysis in this study, the *Kaizen* Culture variables consisting of focusing on customers ($b_1 = 0.381$), continuous improvement ($b_2 = 0.180$), developing personal discipline ($b_3 = 0.163$), and employee empowerment ($b_4 = 0.248$) has a positive (unidirectional) and significant effect (in real level $\alpha = 5\%$) on the performance of the division of service at Kalla Toyota Alauddin Makassar. In addition, the coefficient of determination (R^2) of 0.864 also shows a strong effect of the four Kaizen Culture variables above (X1, X2, X3, X4) on work performance (Y). This is an opportunity for Indonesia to be able to improve the readiness of human resources by implementing a good culture and continue to improve themselves to compete in the Asean Economic Community (MEA) and the world.

5. CONCLUSION

5.1. Conclusion

Based on the results of the analysis and discussion, a number of conclusions can be presented, including the following:

1. Simultaneously, the Kaizen Culture variables (X) significantly influence the Work Performance (Y) of the service division of Kalla Toyota Alauddin Makassar. This is shown in table 4.14, where the coefficient of determination (R^2) of 0.864 proves that the independent variables (X1, X2, X3, X4) together contribute to changes in the dependent variable (Y) of 86.4% and the remainder of 13.6% is influenced by other variables not included in this study;
2. Partially, the Kaizen Culture (X) variables significantly influence the Work Performance (Y) of the service division of Kalla Toyota Alauddin Makassar. This is shown in table 4.13 where each variable has a significance of 50.05 described as follows: Focus on customers (X1) with $b = 0.381$ and sig. 0,000; Continuous improvement (X2) with $b = 0.180$ and sig. 0.038; Develop personal discipline (X3) with $b = 0.163$ and sig. 0.038; and Empowerment of employees (X4) with $b = 0.248$ and sig. 0.012. All independent variables mentioned each have a sig value. ≤ 0.05 ;
3. The results of the regression analysis with the equation $Y = 0.103 + 0.381X_1 + 0.180X_2 + 0.163X_3 + 0.248X_4$ shows the positive influence of the Kaizen Culture variables (X) on Work Performance (Y), where changes in (X1, X2, X3, X4) in line with changes in Y. That is, the results of the study are in line with existing theories;
4. Among the four Kaizen Culture variables used in this study, the dominant influence is the focus on the customer (X1) with the regression coefficient value (b) the highest 0.381 and the lowest significance value of 0,000.

5.2. Suggestion

The suggestions that can be given include the following:

-
-
1. Company employees should apply the Kaizen Culture not only in the company, but also in everyday life from every small thing, so that they form a good person and become qualified human resources;
 2. The procedure for writing thesis should be given clear and consistent standards in order to prevent minor errors from occurring which can lead to waste of natural resources;

We recommend that the academic consider giving a choice of other final assignments besides thesis, for example doing business with clear reports in the long term period with national or international standards so that students can graduate with a theoretical understanding as well as practical experience.

REFERENCES

- Ablanedo-Rosas H.; Alidaee B., et al.; (2010), "Quality improvement supported by the 5S, an empirical case study of Mexican organisations", *International Journal of Production Research*, iFirst, pp. 1-25, <http://www.informaworld.com/10.1080/00207540903382865>
- Anders, B. (1997), "Continuous improvement and Kaizen: standardization and organizational designs", *Integrated Manufacturing Systems*, Vol. 8 No. 2, pp. 110-117.
- Aoki, K.; (2008), "Transferring Japanese Kaizen activities to overseas plants in China", *International Journal of Operation & Production Management*, Vol.28, Num. 6, p.518-539.
- Arya, A.K. and Jain, S.K. (2014), "Impacts of Kaizen in a small-scale industry of India: a case study", *International Journal of Lean Six Sigma*, Vol. 5 No. 1, pp. 22-44.
- Bateman, N.; (2005), "Sustainability: the elusive element of process improvement", *International Journal of Operations & Production Management*, Vol.25, Num. 3, pp. 261-276.
- Berger, A.; (1997), "Continuous Improvement and Kaizen: Standardizations and organizational designs", *Integrated Manufacturing System*, Vol. 8, Num. 2, pp. 110-117.
- Bicheno, J.; Holweg, M.; (2009), "The Lean Toolbox". PICSIE Books, 4^a edición. Buckingham.
- Brunet, A. P.; New, S.; (2003), "Kaizen in Japan: an empirical study", *International Journal of Operations & Production Management*, Vol. 23, Num. 12, pp. 1426-1446.
- Chen, J.C., Dugger, J. and Hammer, B. (2000), "A Kaizen based approach for cellular manufacturing design: a case study", *The Journal of Technology Studies*, Vol. 27 No. 2, pp. 19-27.
- Dahlgaard, J.J. and Mi Dahlgaard-Park, S. (2006), "Lean production, six sigma quality, TQM and company culture", *The TQM Magazine*, Vol. 18 No. 3, pp. 263-281
- Doolen, T.L., Van Aken, E.M., Farris, J.A., Worley, J.M. and Huwe, J. (2008), "Kaizen events and organizational performance: a field study", *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management*, Vol. 57 No. 8, pp. 637-658.
- Farris, J., Van Aken, E.M. and Doolen, T.L. (2006), "Studying Kaizen event outcomes and critical success factors: a model-based approach", *Proceedings of the Industrial Engineering and Research Conference*, May, pp. 20-24.
- Farris, J.A., Van Aken, E.M., Doolen, T.L. and Worley, J. (2008), "Learning from less successful Kaizen events: a case study", *Engineering Management Journal*, Vol. 20 No. 3, pp. 10-20.
- Farris, J.A., Van Aken, E.M., Doolen, T.L. and Worley, J. (2009), "Critical success factors for human resource outcomes in Kaizen events: an empirical study", *International Journal of Production Economics*, Vol. 117 No. 1, pp. 42-65.
- Gondhalekar, S.; Babu, S., et al.; (1995), "Towards using Kaizen process dynamics: a case study", *International Journal of Quality & Reliability Management*, Vol. 12, Num. 9, pp. 192-209.
- Hammer, M.; (2004), "Deep Change. How Operational Innovation Can Transform your Company", *Harvard Business Review*, April, pp. 84-93

JManagER

Journal of Management, E-Business & Entrepreneurship Research

Vol. 01 No. 02, 2022

Kobayashi, K.; Fischer, R.; et al.; (2008), "Business improvement strategy or useful tool? Analysis of the application of the 5S concept in Japan, the UK and the US", *Total Quality Management*, Vol. 19, Num. 3, pp. 245-262.

Ortíz, C.; (2009), "Kaizen and Kaizen event implementation", Prentice-Hall, New York