RESEARCH ARTICLE

CrossMark
click for updates

The Influence Of Work Environment And Individual Characteristics On Employee Performance At Pt. Sarana Bengkulu Ventura

Intihan[1*] , Defi Triansyah[2], Evita Sari[3], Leo Tarnando[4], Tyara Anggelya Putri[5]

Abstract

This This research was carried out at PT. Sarana Bengkulu Ventura. The formulation of the research problem is 1) Does the work environment influence the performance of PT. Sarana Bengkulu Ventura? 2) Do individual characteristics influence PT. Sarana Bengkulu Ventura? 3) Do the environment and individual characteristics influence the performance of PT. Sarana Bengkulu Ventura. The objectives of this research are 1) To determine the influence of the work environment on employee performance at PT. Sarana Bengkulu Ventura. 2) To determine the influence of individual characteristics on employee performance at PT. Sarana Bengkulu Ventura. 3) To determine the influence of the work environment and individual characteristics on employee performance at PT. Sarana Bengkulu Ventura. The population of this research is all employees of PT. Sarana Bengkulu Ventura as many as 25 people. This research sample used a total sampling method of 25 people. The data analysis used is multiple linear regression analysis, Determinant Coefficient, Hypothesis Testing with f-test and t-test. The results of the research are: 1) From the calculation of the multiple linear regression equation, it can be seen that the Work Environment (X1) and Individual Characteristics (X2) influence employee performance at PT. Sarana Bengkulu Ventura. Work environment coefficient (b) = 0.471 means that the work environment has a positive influence on employee performance or in other words, if the work environment increases 1 time, it will be followed by an increase in employee performance of 0.471. Individual characteristics coefficient (b) = 0.336 means that individual characteristics have a positive influence on employee performance or in other words, if individual characteristics increase 1 time, this will be followed by an increase in employee performance of 0.336. 2) The determinant coefficient (R^2) value was 0.658. This value means that the work environment and individual characteristics contribute to employee performance by 0.658 or 65.8% and the remaining 34.2% is not studied in this research. 3) With the f-test, the hypothesis can also be proven to be true, where the work environment variables (X1) and individual characteristics (X2) show a p-value = 0.00 < 0.05 so that H0 is rejected and H1 is accepted. With the t test, the hypothesis was also proven to be true, where the work environment variable showed a calculated t value = 2.478 > t table 2.060 so it was concluded that Ha was accepted. The individual characteristic variable shows the calculated t value = 2.680 > t table 2.060 so it can be concluded that Ha is accepted.

Keyword: Work Environment, Individual Characteristics, Employee Performance.

Introduction

The very rapid development of technology brings changes to life and its development cannot be avoided. Human resource management is a part of organizational management that focuses on human resource elements. In a company or organization, human resources are an important element in an organization. Without the role of human resources, various necessary factors are available, a company or organization cannot run. Because human resources are the driving force and determinant of an organization. Therefore, companies or organizations should provide positive direction to achieve organizational goals.

In a company or organization, human resources are the most important element in an organization. Without the role of human resources, the various factors needed are available, a company or organization cannot run. Because human resources are the driving force and determinant of the running of an organization. Therefore, companies or organizations should provide positive direction to achieve organizational goals.

Apart from that, human resources are the only resources that have reason, feelings, desires, abilities, skills, knowledge, encouragement, power and work, as well as the only resources that have ratio, taste and intention. All of these human resource potentials greatly influence the organization's efforts to achieve its goals. So that the organization and the individuals within it are talents that cannot be separated.

The work environment is a place where employees carry out activities every day. A conducive work environment provides a sense of security and allows employees to work optimally. The work environment can affect employee emotions. According to Anorogo and Widiyanti (2007) the work environment is everything that is around the employee and that can influence him in carrying out the tasks assigned to him.

The most important resources in an organization are human resources, people who provide their energy, talent, creativity and effort to the organization so that an organization can continue to exist. Mathiue & Zajac (2008) state that, personal (individual) characteristics include age, gender, length of service, level of education, ethnicity and personality. Robbins (2007) states that, factors that are easily defined and available, data that can be obtained mostly from the information available in an employee's personnel file indicate individual

[1]Universitas Muhammadiyah Bengkulu

*) corresponding author

Intihan

Email: intihan001@gmail.com

characteristics including age, gender, marital status, number of dependents and length of service. in the organization.

Performance is the work result that can be achieved by a person or group of people in an organization in accordance with their respective authority and responsibilities, in order to achieve the goals of the organization concerned legally, without violating the law and in accordance with morals and ethics, Prawirosentono (2008). Jobs almost always have more than one job criterion or dimension. Job criteria are the most important factors in what people do in their jobs. In a sense, job criteria explain what people do in their jobs. Therefore these criteria are important, individual performance in work must be measured, compared with existing standards, and the results communicated to each employee, Mathis and Jackson (2007).

Based on the explanation above, researchers are interested in researching the title "The Influence of the Work Environment and Individual Characteristics on Employee Performance at PT. SARANA BENGKULU VENTURA"

Method

Place and time of research

The location used as the research site is PT. Sarana Bengkulu Ventura . The implementation of this research was carried out for 1 month.

Population and Sample

According to Sugiyono (2010), population is a generalized area of objects/subjects with certain qualities and characteristics that the researcher determines to be studied and then concludes. In this study, the population and sample were employees of PT. Sarana Bengkulu Ventura, totaling 25 people. In this research, the sampling method used a total sampling technique. In this research, the entire population was taken as a sample, namely 25 people.

Data collection technique

Interviews obtain information for research purposes by means of face-to-face questions and answers between the questioner or interviewer and the answerer or respondent using a tool called an interview guide or interview guide.

Data collection observations were carried out by conducting direct observations on PT. Sarana Bengkulu Ventura. Regarding matters related to research

Questionnaires are the most common tool used to collect primary data, questionnaires contain a set of questions that are asked to be answered by employees. The questionnaire in this research is the main technique for collecting data.

Data analysis technique

The analytical method used in this research is multiple linear regression analysis. The purpose of this regression analysis is to obtain a comprehensive picture of the relationship between the independent variables and the dependent variable, for the performance of each to obtain a comprehensive picture of the relationship between the independent variables and the dependent variable, for the performance of each company partially or partially. Simultaneously.

Results and Discussion

Test Research Instruments

Validity test

Data processing begins by carrying out a validity test using the r coefficient, which is obtained from the Product Moment Correlation (Pearson) formula. By using this formula which is entered into the SPSS 26 program, the correlation figures for each question item are obtained:

Table 1. Validity Test Results

Variable	Question	correlation (r)	Information
X1	1	0,747	Valid
	2	0,671	Valid
	3	0,705	Valid
	4	0,645	Valid
X2	5	0,868	Valid
	6	0,620	Valid
	7	0,563	Valid
	8	0,632	Valid
	9	0,724	Valid
	10	0,484	Valid
Y	11	0,898	Valid
	12	0,928	Valid
	13	0,783	Valid
	14	0,842	Valid

From the table above it can be seen that the 14 questions meet the validity test or are valid.

Reliability Test

Below is a summary of the results of Cronbach's alpha (α) calculations using the SPSS 26 program

Table 2. Reliability Test Results

Variable	CroanbachAlpha	Information
X1	0.630	Reliable
X2	0.733	
Y	0.880	

As can be seen in the table, the Cronbach's Alpha (α) value above exceeds the minimum limit of α (= 0.6), namely X1 = 0.630, X2 = 0.733, Y = 0.880. Cronbach's alpha (α) for all variables obtained is more than 0.6, this shows that all questions are reliable.

Table 3. Results of Multiple Linear Regression Analysis

Coefficients[a]

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		
	B	Std. Error	Beta	T	Sig.
(Constant)	1.595	2.362		.675	.507
X1	.471	.190	.424	2.478	.021
X2	.336	.125	.459	2.680	.014

a. Dependent Variable: Y

Coefficient of Determination Test (R2)

Table 4. Coefficient of Determination Test Results

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
dimension0	.811[a]	.658	.626	1.17932

a. Predictors: (Constant), X2, X1

From the coefficient of determination table, a coefficient of determination value of 0.658 is obtained, which means that 65.8% of the factors that influence employee performance can

be explained by work environment variables and individual characteristic variables. Meanwhile, the remaining 34.2% is explained by other factors that have not been included in the model

Simultaneous Test (F Test)

Table 5.   Simultaneous Test Results (F Test)

ANOVAa

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	58.763	2	29.381	21.126	.000b
	Residual	30.597	22	1.391		
	Total	89.360	24			

a. Dependent Variable: Y
b. Predictors: (Constant), X2, X1

Based on the table, it can be seen that the p-value = 0.00, this value is ≤ α (= 0.05) so H0 is rejected. In this way, a decision can be taken that the work environment variables (X1) and individual characteristics (X2) together influence the dependent variable of employee performance.

Disscussion

From the data above we can see how much respondents assess the work environment (X1) and individual characteristics (X2) on employee performance (Y) at PT. Bengkulu Ventura Facility. In the Work Environment variable (X1) the average is 3.97. This value, if interpreted in the assessment criteria for respondents' answers, is in the range 3.41 – 4.20 with good criteria. So it can be concluded that employees assess that the Work Environment variable is classified as good. The Individual Characteristics variable (X2) has an average of 3.84. This value, if interpreted from the assessment criteria for respondents' answers, is in the range 3.41 – 4.20 with good criteria. So it can be concluded that employees assess that the Characteristics variable is classified as good. In the Employee Performance variable (Y) the average is 4.21. This value, if interpreted in the assessment criteria for respondents' answers, is in the range 4.21 – 5.00 with very good criteria. So it can be concluded that employees assess that the employee performance variable is classified as very good.

In the work environment variable (X1) with the work space layout indicator at PT. Bengkulu Ventura Suggestions obtained an average of 3.84, while other indicators obtained an average of above 4.00. From these data, it can be concluded that the work space planning indicators at PT. Sarana Bengkulu Ventura must be increased, so as to increase employees' sense of comfort in carrying out their duties in order to improve employee performance..

In the individual characteristic variable (X2), of the existing indicators, only the Difference in Talent indicator produces an average above 4.00. Meanwhile, other indicators are below 4.00. From this data, it can be concluded that other indicators must be improved, so that individual characteristic variables have a big influence on employee performance.

From the validity test table it can be seen that the 14 questions meet the validity test or are valid. The requirement to fulfill validity is if the correlation value r calculated > rcritical where rcritical is obtained from the coefficient value in the table with a total of 25 respondents and a significance level of 5% producing a value of 0.396.

In the reliability table, the Cronbach's Alpha (α) value exceeds the minimum limit of α (= 0.6), namely X1 = 0.630, X2 = 0.733, Y = 0.880. Cronbach's alpha (α) for all variables obtained is more than 0.6, this shows that all questions are reliable.

Based on the results of multiple linear regression analysis calculations, the equation Y = 1.595 + 0.471X1 + 0.336X2 with a constant of 1.595, a regression coefficient (b1) of 0.471 and a regression coefficient (b2) of 0.336. This means that with a risk of making a mistake of 5%, it can be said that when the work environment improves by 1 point, employee performance will

increase by 0.471 points. With a risk of making a mistake of 5%, it can be said that when individual characteristics increase by 1 point, employee performance will increase by 0.336 points.

From the R2 test, the coefficient of determination value is 0.658, which means that 65.8% of the factors that influence employee performance can be explained by work environment variables and individual characteristic variables. Meanwhile, the remaining 34.2% is explained by other factors that have not been included in the model.

From the results of the T test calculation, where in the work environment variable, the T column in the table obtained a t-calculated value of 2.478, meaning the calculated t value > t table (2.478 > 2.060) so it can be concluded that Ha is accepted. So it can be said that the Work Environment variable (X1) influences the performance of PT employees. Bengkulu Ventura Facility. Individual Characteristic Variable (X2) where in column T in the table the t-calculated value is 2.680, meaning the calculated t value > t table (2.680 > 2.060) so it can be concluded that Ha is accepted. So it can be said that the Individual Characteristics variable (X2) influences the performance of PT. Sarana Bengkulu Ventura.

From the results of the F Test calculation, it can be seen that the p-value = 0.00, this value is ≤ α (= 0.05) so that H0 is rejected. In this way, a decision can be taken that the work environment variables (X1) and individual characteristics (X2) together influence the dependent variable of employee performance PT. Sarana Bengkulu Ventura.

From the results of the F Test calculation, it can be seen that the p-value = 0.00, this value is ≤ α (= 0.05) so that H0 is rejected. In this way, a decision can be taken that the work environment variables (X1) and individual characteristics (X2) together influence the dependent variable of employee performance".

Regarding individual characteristic variables, researchers refer to the theory of Robbin (2007), which states "that one of the things that influences performance is individual characteristics, because they are directly related to employees"

Conclusions and Recommendations

From the results of the partial hypothesis test that has been carried out, it can be concluded that the work environment variable (X1) influences employee performance at PT. Sarana Bengkulu Ventura. This can be proven based on the results of the T test, where in column T in the table the t-calculated value is 2.478, meaning the calculated t value > t table (2.478 > 2.060) so it can be concluded that Ha is accepted.

From the results of the partial hypothesis test that has been carried out, it can be concluded that the individual characteristic variable (X2) influences employee performance at PT. Sarana Bengkulu Ventura. This can be proven based on the results of the T test, where in column T in the table the t-calculated value is 2.680, meaning the calculated t value > t table (2.680 > 2.060) so it can be concluded that Ha is accepted.

From the results of simultaneous hypothesis testing that has been carried out, it can be concluded that the work environment variables (X1) and individual characteristics (X2) jointly influence the dependent variable of PT. Sarana Bengkulu Ventura. This can be proven based on the results of the F Test calculation, it can be seen that the p-value = 0.00, this value is ≤ α (= 0.05) so that H0 is rejected Ha is accepted.

References

Alex. S Nitisemito. 2007. Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia, Ghalia Indonesia, Jakarta

Anorogo, Widiyanti. 2007. Manajemen Bisnis, PT Rineka Cipta, Jakarta

Armstrong, M. 2008. Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia, Media Kompetindo, Jakarta

Bambang Wahyudi. 2007. Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia. Sulita, Bandung

Dessler, Gary. 2007 . Manajemen Personalia. Terjemahan. Erlangga, Jakarta

rida, Syafarudin Alwi. 2007. Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia. Erlangga, Jakarta

Karmisa. 2007. Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia. Sulita, Bandung

Kreitner, Robert dan Kinicki, Angelo. 2007. Perilaku Organisasi, Salemba Empat, Jakarta

Mathis, R. L., dan J.H. Jackson. 2007, Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia Terjemahan, Salemba Empat, Jakarta.

Mathiue dan Zajac. 2008. A Review and Meta Analysisof the Antecedents, Correlates, and Consequences of Organisational Commitment, Psychological Bulletin, New York

Mowday, R. T. 2008. Employee Organisational Linkages: The Psychology of Commitment, Absenteeism, and Turnover, Academic Press, New York

Prawiro Sentono. 2008. Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia, Media Kompetindo, Jakarta

Prayitno, 2008. Model Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia, Bumi Aksara, Jakarta

Rivai Veithzal. 2008. Performance Appraisal Sistem Yang Tepat Untuk Menilai Kinerja Karyawan Dan Meningkatkan Daya Saing Perusahaan. PT Raja Grafindo Persada, Jakarta

Robbins, Stephen, P. 2007. Perilaku Organisai, Erlangga, Jakarta

Schultz. 2006. Psikologi Pertumbuhan, Model-model Kepribadian Sehat, PT Gramedia Pustaka Utama, Jakarta

Sedarmayati. 2009. Sumber Daya Manusia dan Produktivitas Kerja. Mandar Maju, Bandung

Sugiyono. 2010. Metode Penelitian Administrasi. Alfabeta, Bandung

Suryadi Perwiro S. 2001. Model Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia Indonesia, Asia dan Timur Jauh, Bumi Aksara, Jakarta

T. Hani Handoko. 2007. Manajemen Personalia dan Sumber Daya Manusia, BPFE, Yogjakarta