

Determining the Most Dominant Indicators of Employee Performance in KSP Artha Mulia Kediri with Multiple Linear Regression Methods

D. Kristanti^{1*}, E. Triwidyati², R. L. Pangastuti³

^{1,2,3} Faculty of Economics, Universitas Kadiri, Indonesia

*Corresponding author Email: desikristanti@unik-kediri.ac.id

ABSTRACT

KSP Artha Mulia is a savings and loan cooperative with many members scattered from all regions in Kediri. This study aimed to determine employee performance indicators at KSP Artha Mulia Kediri with multiple linear regression methods. The method used is quantitative. This population includes all 70 employees in KSP Artha Mulia. The sample in this study was employees who worked in the administration as many as 12 people—purposive sampling technique. And for the collection of data is used the questionnaire method. The analysis techniques in this study used t-test, multiple linear regression, and F-test. This study shows that several employee performance indicators, namely leadership, and motivation, positively and significantly affect KSP employee Artha Mulia Kediri. Meanwhile, the work environment has no significant impact on employee performance at KSP Artha Mulia Kediri. Of the three indicators that are the most dominant indicator is motivation.

Keywords: Leadership, Work Environment, Motivation, Employee Performance

1. INTRODUCTION

Cooperative Save Borrow Artha Mulia Kediri or known as KSP Artha Mulia is one of the savings and loan cooperatives that have a large number of members. KSP Artha Mulia Kediri has a number of members who continue to increase every year. KSP Artha Mulia Kediri has a complex organizational structure with different tasks and functions in each administrator so that KSP Artha Mulia Kediri can run a structured working mechanism in achieving goals. The ability of these tasks and functions cannot be separated from the responsibility of each employee of KSP Artha Mulia Kediri. One of these responsibilities is the commitment of KSP Artha Mulia employees to maintain their performance to always be productive. However, not all employees of KSP Artha Mulia Kediri have a performance that is always productive at all times. This is certainly a challenge for KSP Artha Mulia Kediri in managing the resources they have to achieve their goals.

Employee performance is the result achieved by employees in carrying out the work that has been given. Employee performance is influenced by several indicators. From several previously conducted studies, indicators that are widely used in measuring employee performance include leadership, work environment, and

motivation [1]. In research conducted in Jordan, leadership became an important indicator that affects employee performance [2]. The behaviour of a leader who tends to put common interests above his own can make employees experience greater well-being and a more positive attitude.[3]. Conversely, the attitude of a leader who tends to be indifferent and cruel to his employees will make the welfare of employees disturbed. It shows that leadership affects employee performance.[4]. In addition to leadership, another indicator that has been widely used by previous research to determine employee performance indicators is the work environment.[5]. The work environment is a condition created around employees working. The work environment can have a significant effect on the psychological, physical, and social life of an employee at work.[6]. A comfortable work environment can improve the mood of an employee so that it can increase the spirit of an employee in work.[7]. However, if an employee feels uncomfortable or depressed because of their work environment, it can demoralize them at work, so it can affect their performance.[8]. In addition, in research conducted in France, work motivation affects employee performance.[9]. Motivation is the drive in a person to do something with excitement [10]. Work motivation is the encouragement in employees in doing

a job with passion [11]. A study stated that employee work motivation is an indicator that has a significant effect on the performance of an employee.[12]. This can be seen from the more positive the encouragement or motivation that arises in the employee, the more positive the performance of the employee.[13]. Meanwhile, if an employee loses their motivation at work, then the resulting performance will also decrease along with the decrease in motivation that arises in the employee. This can happen because motivation affects the psychological of an employee is doing a job.

Based on the above problems, this study was conducted with the aim to determine the indicators of Employee Performance in KSP Artha Mulia Kediri with Multiple Linear Regression Method

2. METHOD

This research is a type of quantitative research designed to determine the influencing relationships between each indicator through hypothesis testing.[14]. The data used in this study are primary data obtained from the results of the dissemination of questionnaires conducted by researchers to respondents. The population in this study was all employees of KSP Artha Mulia Kediri, who numbered 50 people. The sample in this study was 12 employees who worked in the administration department. The sampling technique used in this study is a non-probability sampling technique and sampling method that is purposive sampling, where the determination of sampling is based on certain criteria. The data collection method in this study used questionnaires. The data analysis technique in this study used several multiple linear regression tests. Multiple linear regression analysis is used to predict how far the value of a dependent indicator changes if the value of an independent indicator is manipulated [15].

3. RESULT AND DISCUSSIONS

Based on the answers of 12 respondents studied can be obtained the results of validity tests show that all question items have a corrected item-total Correlation (r-calculate) > r-table, which is 0.793. This means that all existing items can be declared valid. Reliability tests showed that Cronbach's Alpha was 0.676>0.60. So it can be concluded that the entire construct of questions in this study is reliable. Based on research conducted on 12 respondents obtained the results shown in the following table:

Indicators	t count	t table	sig. count	sig
Leadership (X1)	2,278	2,23	0,047	0,05
Work Environment (X2)	1,480	2,23	0,177	0,05
Motivation (X3)	5,421	2,23	0,001	0,05

Table 1. Result t-Test

Based on the table of results of the t-test can be obtained the result that the leadership indicator (X1) has a positive and significant effect on employee performance (Y) in KSP Artha Mulia with a value of t calculated > t table, which is 2,278 with a significant level of 0.047. In the Work Environment indicator (X2), it is known that the indicator does not have a significant effect on employee performance (Y) with a value of t calculated < t table, which is 1,480. This shows that indicators of the work environment cannot have a significant influence on performance in KSP Artha Mulia employees. While in the motivational indicator (X3), the value of t calculates the < t table is 5,421 with a significant level of 0.001. Based on these results, it can be known that the motivational indicator (X3) has a positive and significant influence on the employee performance (Y) of KSP Artha Mulia Kediri.

Indicators	F count	F table	sig. count	sig
X1, X2, X3 →	15,045	3,259	0,001	0,05

Table 2. Result of F Test

Based on the table of F test results that have been conducted, the value of F calculates 15.045 > F table 3.259 with a significant level of 0.001 < 0.05, which means significant. This shows that leadership indicators (X1), work environment (X2), and motivation (X3) simultaneously have a significant effect on employee performance at KSP Artha Mulia. Based on the table of F test results that have been conducted, the value of F calculates 15.045 > F table 3.259 with a significant level of 0.001 < 0.05, which means significant. This shows that leadership indicators (X1), work environment (X2), and motivation (X3) simultaneously have a significant effect on employee performance at KSP Artha Mulia.

Based on the results of multiple linear regression analysis obtained the following equations:

$$Y = 0,651 X1 + 0,254 X2 + 0,709 X3 + 11, 77$$

From the equation, it is known that the most dominant indicator in influencing employee performance is motivation. This shows that the higher the motivation of KSP Artha Mulia Kediri employees, the higher performance of KSP Artha Mulia Kediri employees in completing their work.

R Square	Adjusted Square	R	Standard Errors of Estimation
,849	,793		,577

Table 3. Results of Coefficient of Determination (R²)

In table 3, the results of the coefficient of determination (R²) can be known that leadership, work environment, and motivation give a value of 0.793 (79.3% to the performance of the work on KSP Artha Mulia while the remaining 20.7% is influenced by other indicators).

4. CONCLUSION

Based on the statistical analysis conducted obtained the results that from several indicators of employee performance, namely leadership, work environment, and motivation, simultaneously affect the performance of KSP employee Artha Mulia Kediri. Of the three indicators that are the most dominant indicator is the work environment.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

Thank you so much for the support and opportunity provided so that authors can write and publish this research for your attention. Thanks.

REFERENCES

- [1] A. Eliyana, S. Ma'arif, and Muzakki, "Job satisfaction and organizational commitment effect in the transformational leadership towards employee performance," *Eur. Res. Manag. Bus. Econ.*, vol. 25, no. 3, pp. 144–150, 2019, doi: 10.1016/j.iedeen.2019.05.001.
- [2] R. Masa'deh, B. Y. Obeidat, and A. Tarhini, "A Jordanian empirical study of the associations among transformational leadership, transactional leadership, knowledge sharing, job performance, and firm performance: A structural equation modelling approach," *J. Manag. Dev.*, vol. 35, no. 5, pp. 681–705, 2016, doi: 10.1108/JMD-09-2015-0134.
- [3] D. Montano, A. Reeske, F. Franke, and J. Hüffmeier, "Leadership, followers' mental health and job performance in organizations: A comprehensive meta-analysis from an occupational health perspective," *J. Organ. Behav.*, vol. 38, no. 3, pp. 327–350, 2017, doi: 10.1002/job.2124.
- [4] A. Schmitt, D. N. Den Hartog, and F. D. Belschak, "Transformational leadership and proactive work behaviour: A moderated mediation model including work engagement and job strain," *J. Occup. Organ. Psychol.*, vol. 89, no. 3, pp. 588–610, 2016, doi: 10.1111/joop.12143.
- [5] I. Buil, E. Martínez, and J. Matute, "Transformational leadership and employee performance: The role of identification, engagement and proactive personality," *Int. J. Hosp. Manag.*, vol. 77, no. October 2017, pp. 64–75, 2019, doi: 10.1016/j.ijhm.2018.06.014.
- [6] S. Naseer, U. Raja, F. Syed, M. B. L. Donia, and W. Darr, "Perils of being close to a bad leader in a bad environment: Exploring the combined effects of despotic leadership, leader member exchange, and perceived organizational politics on behaviors," *Leadersh. Q.*, vol. 27, no. 1, pp. 14–33, 2016, doi: 10.1016/j.leaqua.2015.09.005.
- [7] M. Topcic, M. Baum, and R. Kabst, "Are high-performance work practices related to individually perceived stress? A job demands-resources perspective," *Int. J. Hum. Resour. Manag.*, vol. 27, no. 1, pp. 45–66, 2016, doi: 10.1080/09585192.2015.1043136.
- [8] J. Sharma and R. L. Dhar, "Factors influencing job performance of nursing staff: Mediating role of affective commitment," *Pers. Rev.*, vol. 45, no. 1, pp. 161–182, 2016, doi: 10.1108/PR-01-2014-0007.
- [9] K. Strauss, S. K. Parker, and D. O'Shea, "When does proactivity have a cost? Motivation at work moderates the effects of proactive work behavior on employee job strain," *J. Vocat. Behav.*, vol. 100, pp. 15–26, 2017, doi: 10.1016/j.jvb.2017.02.001.
- [10] C. Bailey, A. Madden, K. Alfes, and L. Fletcher, "The Meaning, Antecedents and Outcomes of Employee Engagement: A Narrative Synthesis," *Int. J. Manag. Rev.*, vol. 19, no. 1, pp. 31–53, 2017, doi: 10.1111/ijmr.12077.
- [11] A. Kianto, M. Vanhala, and P. Heilmann, "The impact of knowledge management on job satisfaction," *J. Knowl. Manag.*, vol. 20, no. 4, pp. 621–636, 2016, doi: 10.1108/JKM-10-2015-0398.
- [12] E. Miron-Spektor, A. Ingram, J. Keller, W. K. Smith, and M. W. Lewis, "Microfoundations of organizational paradox: The problem is how we think about the problem," *Acad. Manag. J.*, vol. 61, no. 1, pp. 26–45, 2018, doi: 10.5465/amj.2016.0594.
- [13] M. B. L. Donia, U. Raja, A. Panaccio, and Z. Wang, "Servant leadership and employee outcomes: the moderating role of subordinates' motives," *Eur. J. Work Organ. Psychol.*, vol. 25,

no. 5, pp. 722–734, 2016, doi:
10.1080/1359432X.2016.1149471.

- [14] C. Knight, M. Patterson, and J. Dawson, “Building work engagement: A systematic review and meta-analysis investigating the effectiveness of work engagement interventions,” *J. Organ. Behav.*, vol. 38, no. 6, pp. 792–812, 2017, doi: 10.1002/job.2167.
- [15] T. Foy, R. J. Dwyer, R. Nafarrete, M. S. S. Hammoud, and P. Rockett, “Managing job performance, social support and work-life conflict to reduce workplace stress,” *Int. J. Product. Perform. Manag.*, vol. 68, no. 6, pp. 1018–1041, 2019, doi: 10.1108/IJPPM-03-2017-0061.