

THE INFLUENCE OF THE WORK ENVIRONMENT AND COMPETENCE ON EMPLOYEE PERFORMANCE AT THE INDONESIAN EMPLOYERS' ASSOCIATION (APINDO)

Amaliyana Chairunnisa¹, Adriza¹, Dudun Junaedi¹

¹ Universitas Mitra Bangsa

Article Info

Article history:

Received April 15, 2026

Revised May 10, 2026

Accepted May 16, 2026

Keywords:

*Work Environment,
Competence, Performance*

ABSTRACT

This study examines the extent to which the work environment and competence influence employee performance at the Indonesian Employers' Association (APINDO). A favorable work environment and competence are expected to be factors that can continuously improve employee performance. The objectives are to describe and analyze the work environment, competence, and employee performance, and to estimate the magnitude of the influence of the work environment and competence on employee performance at APINDO, both simultaneously and partially. The research employed a descriptive quantitative approach. The sample consisted of 30 employees of APINDO. Primary data were obtained from respondents' answers to a questionnaire distributed by the researcher. The results of data analysis indicate that the work environment and competence influence employee performance at APINDO, both partially and simultaneously. Employee performance is explained by the work environment and competence variables by 82.3%, while the remaining 17.7% is attributable to other factors not examined in this study.

This is an open access article under the CC BY-SA license.



Corresponding Author:

Amaliyana Chairunnisa | Universitas Mitra Bangsa

Email: amaliyana.c03@gmail.com

INTRODUCTION

Human resources are one of the most important factors in determining organizational success. The presence of qualified human resources strongly affects the achievement of organizational goals effectively and efficiently. In an era of globalization and intensifying competition, organizations are required to manage human resources optimally in order to improve employee performance. Good employee performance contributes positively to overall organizational productivity.

Organizations are established on various visions for the benefit of the organization; in carrying out their missions they are managed and administered by people. Thus, human beings are a

strategic factor in all institutional and organizational activities. To achieve corporate goals, every company must further develop human resources (HR). Human resources are an active factor in organizational processes and decision-making (Sutrisno, 2011: 2). Because HR is essential for companies that seek long-term survival across periods, human resource management (HRM) means managing employees in line with the corporate vision so that organizational goals can be achieved optimally (Robbins and Judge, 2008).

Many factors contribute to organizational success. One of them is employees, because they are directly involved in organizational activities. Employees are an asset or an important part of an organization or company, acting as planners, implementers, and controllers who actively work toward organizational goals. As contributors to organizational goals, employees have thoughts, feelings, and desires that necessarily shape their attitudes toward assigned work. Dawal and Taha (2006: 267) state that employee job satisfaction is the key to a healthy organization.

According to Davis and Newstrom in Suwatno and Priansa (2011), job satisfaction is employees' pleasant or unpleasant feelings toward their work. Companies will find it difficult to achieve their goals if the surrounding environment is inadequate, so that employee morale is low and affects satisfaction with work in the company. According to Osborn in Suwatno and Priansa (2011), job satisfaction is the degree to which a person feels positive or negative about various aspects of their tasks, workplace, and relationships with coworkers.

The work environment is one of the factors that influence employee performance. If the surroundings of the workplace create an uncomfortable impression, employees feel reluctant to work. As Nitisemito states in Sugiyarti (2012: 75), the work environment is everything around workers that can affect them in carrying out their assigned tasks. The work environment can be categorized into non-physical and physical dimensions. According to Anorogo and Widiyanti in Putranto (2012: 2), the non-physical work environment includes employees' desires regarding adequate wages, security, work, expectations, economic conditions, opportunities for advancement, wise leadership, and cohesive colleagues. The non-physical work environment strongly affects job satisfaction: when conditions around employees are conducive to work, colleagues are easy to cooperate with, and relationships with superiors are good, employees enjoy their work and feel satisfied working there.

A comfortable and safe work environment also makes employees feel comfortable working, so that tasks performed by employees are of good quality and affect job satisfaction. Robbins in Fathonah and Utami (2012: 3) notes that employees will work maximally when the work environment is comfortable and supportive because they feel satisfied with the existing work environment. A good work environment includes several aspects that should be addressed, such as comfortable workspaces, safe environmental conditions, stable room temperature, adequate lighting, wall colors, and good relationships with coworkers (Sedarmayanti in Sugiyarti, 2012: 75). When these can be met by the company or organization, employee performance may increase, which in turn affects job satisfaction.

According to Dhermawan (2012: 174), the work environment includes clear job descriptions, adequate authority, challenging work targets, communication patterns, harmonious working relationships, a dynamic work climate, career opportunities, and adequate work facilities. When

these are well integrated, job satisfaction increases. Likewise in hotel settings, the better the work environment, the better employees' job satisfaction.

The work environment at the Indonesian Employers' Association (APINDO) is generally favorable in terms of cleanliness, lighting, sound, air, and security. Cleanliness of floors along access routes should be maintained. Lighting in rooms or corridors should be sufficient so that visitors do not feel glare or darkness when walking through corridors. The presence of parking attendants helps employees feel secure about their vehicles so they can focus on their work.

Besides the work environment, another dimension that influences employee performance is competence. **Manifestations of competence** are often relatively easy to observe at the surface level; at the same time, competence is also a deeper dimension of personality attached to the individual that can predict behavior and performance across diverse situations and jobs.

Employees as professionals must be autonomous across educational activities both in and out of formal schooling; they occupy the most strategic positions. Employees are human resources who, through high commitment, can mobilize other factors so that a quality learning-and-working process is created and become the main determinant of educational quality. Professional employee competence is an important factor in improving employee performance. Charles in Mulyasa in Irawati (2010) states that "*competency as rational performance which satisfactory meets the objective for a desired condition.*" Competence is rational behavior to achieve required goals under expected conditions.

Employee education strongly influences professional performance; as part of employee performance it is essential for achieving national education goals, namely to enlighten the life of the nation and develop complete human beings. In reality, however, many employees violate time discipline—arriving late for work—and are insufficiently prepared for work processes, such as lacking work attributes including uniforms; in the field, some work carelessly or monotonously and are often late, among other issues. Nevertheless, if performance still requires attention, the factors that influence employee performance should also receive attention. Lack of professionalism in planning, implementing, and evaluating work processes and undisciplined attitudes indicate that employees' competence is still low and so is their performance. In other words, higher employee competence is associated with higher performance displayed by employees. Therefore, measures are needed to improve employee competence so that performance also improves.

Research by Saputra (2005), Mulyanto (2008), Kusdi (2013), and Liakopoulou (2011) shows a positive and significant influence of professional competence on employee performance. Different results were obtained by Rahayu, BS (2011), whose study found no positive and significant effect of professional employee competence on performance. Because of this research gap among scholars, further research on "the influence of professional employee competence on employee performance" is warranted. Based on the above discussion, the author suspects that low employee performance is influenced by the work environment—for example, leadership that is reluctant to hear employees' complaints regarding salary increases. The author also suspects that low performance is influenced by employee competence—for instance, employees who wish for salary increases while the owner is still reluctant to raise allowances.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This study used descriptive and verificative methods. According to Sugiyono (2012:53), the descriptive method addresses questions concerning the existence of independent variables, whether one variable or more (an independent variable here stands alone, not in the sense of an independent variable always paired with a dependent variable).

VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY TESTS

Table 1 Recapitulation of the Work Environment (X1)

Item (statement)	Mean	N	Category
Lighting at my workplace makes me feel comfortable	3.67	30	Good
Music makes me more enthusiastic about working	4.07	30	Good
Cleanliness of restrooms for staff at the workplace is well maintained	3.87	30	Good
Health facilities, including a doctor and nursing support, help maintain my condition	4.13	30	Good
Wall colors around the workplace do not disturb my concentration at work	3.93	30	Good
Noise at the workplace does not disturb my concentration at work	3.80	30	Good
I do not feel stuffy at work because air circulation at the workplace is well regulated	3.73	30	Good
I feel the agency provides good work security so I can work calmly	3.93	30	Good
The space to move at my workplace allows me to work freely	3.67	30	Good
I prefer having lunch outside rather than the lunch provided	4.07	30	Good
Every employee maintains good relationships with other employees	3.67	30	Good
At the workplace, employees maintain good relationships with their supervisors	4.07	30	Good
Work environment (overall)	3.88	30	Good

Based on the table above, the work environment variable yields a mean of 3.88, which falls in the **Good** category.

Table 2 Recapitulation of Competence (X2)

Item (statement)	Mean	N	Category
Can cooperate with other employees	3.73	30	Good
Shows diligence in performing work	3.93	30	Good
Persistent in completing work	3.97	30	Good
Always courteous toward other employees	3.80	30	Good
Always emphasizes discipline in carrying out duties	4.07	30	Good
Always honest in every work activity	3.97	30	Good
Firm in making decisions in line with job description	3.87	30	Good
Always confident that work performed is in line with job description	3.93	30	Good

In the agency, discipline is continuously strengthened	3.73	30	Good
I always comply with applicable work rules at my workplace	3.93	30	Good
Competence (overall)	3.89	30	Good

Based on the table above, the competence variable yields a mean of 3.89, which falls in the **Good** category.

Table 3 Recapitulation of Performance (Y)

Item (statement)	Mean	N	Category
Work performed can be assessed for its quality	3.97	30	Good
Work performed already meets targets or expectations	4.00	30	Good
Work performed is highly satisfactory	3.90	30	Good
Work performed can be completed within the deadlines set	3.93	30	Good
At work, I do not like postponing completion of tasks	4.07	30	Good
At work, I have a high level of initiative	4.10	30	Good
I have creative ideas and thinking to improve the quality of work	3.80	30	Good
I provide input to leadership on what will be done	3.93	30	Good
At work, I have my own ways to achieve targets	4.07	30	Good
At work, I always exceed the targets that have been set	3.67	30	Good
At work, I become a role model and example for other employees	4.07	30	Good
I always communicate well with leadership	3.87	30	Good
I always communicate well with coworkers	3.97	30	Good
In resolving problems, I am able to mediate their resolution	4.00	30	Good
Performance (overall)	3.95	30	Good

Based on the table above, the performance variable yields a mean of 3.95, which falls in the **Good** category.

Validity Tests

Table 4 Validity Test for the Work Environment (X1)

Item (summary)	Pearson <i>r</i>	Sig. (2-tailed)	Validity
Lighting comfort	0.675**	0.000	Valid
Music and enthusiasm	0.607**	0.000	Valid
Restroom cleanliness	0.583**	0.001	Valid
Health facilities	0.733**	0.000	Valid
Wall color and concentration	0.642**	0.000	Valid
Noise and concentration	0.613**	0.000	Valid
Air circulation	0.675**	0.000	Valid
Work security	0.675**	0.000	Valid
Movement space	0.675**	0.000	Valid
Lunch preference	0.607**	0.000	Valid
Peer relationships	0.675**	0.000	Valid
Relationship with supervisor	0.607**	0.000	Valid

Work environment total	1.000	—	—
------------------------	-------	---	---

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

* Correlation significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

For each item, Pearson correlation with the total score for the **work environment** scale, two-tailed significance, and $N = 30$ were computed. All items showed $p < 0.05$ (and most $p < 0.01$) relative to the criterion used in the study (r critical < 0.025 for item–total correlation); therefore **all items are declared valid**.

Table 5 Validity Test for Competence (X2)

Item (summary)	Pearson r	Sig. (2-tailed)	Validity
Cooperation with others	0.708**	0.000	Valid
Diligence in work	0.865**	0.000	Valid
Persistence	0.803**	0.000	Valid
Courtesy toward others	0.854**	0.000	Valid
Emphasis on discipline	0.823**	0.000	Valid
Honesty	0.700**	0.000	Valid
Firm decisions per job description	0.708**	0.000	Valid
Confidence work matches job description	0.708**	0.000	Valid
Agency strengthens discipline	0.708**	0.000	Valid
Compliance with work rules	0.865**	0.000	Valid
Competence total	1.000	—	—

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

* Correlation significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

All items showed significance below the criterion used with $N = 30$ for the **competence** scale; **all items are declared valid**.

Table 6 Validity Test for Performance (Y)

Item (summary)	Pearson r	Sig. (2-tailed)	Validity
Quality of work assessable	0.743**	0.000	Valid
Meets targets/expectations	0.760**	0.000	Valid
Highly satisfactory	0.849**	0.000	Valid
Completed within deadlines	0.596**	0.001	Valid
Does not postpone tasks	0.904**	0.000	Valid
High initiative	0.743**	0.000	Valid
Creative ideas for quality	0.733**	0.000	Valid
Input to leadership	0.517**	0.003	Valid
Own ways to achieve targets	0.505**	0.004	Valid
Exceeds targets	0.583**	0.001	Valid
Role model for others	0.505**	0.004	Valid
Communication with leadership	0.743**	0.000	Valid
Communication with coworkers	0.743**	0.000	Valid

Mediation in problem-solving	0.760**	0.000	Valid
Performance total	1.000	—	—

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

* Correlation significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

All performance items met the significance criterion; **all items are declared valid.**

Reliability Tests

Table 7 Reliability of the Work Environment (X1)

Reliability Statistics		
Cronbach's Alpha	Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items	N of Items
,838	,840	12

Among 30 respondents for the work environment variable, Cronbach’s alpha is **0.838** for all items; the instrument is **reliable**.

Table 8 Reliability of Competence (X2)

Reliability Statistics		
Cronbach's Alpha	Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items	N of Items
,847	,862	10

Among 30 respondents for competence, Cronbach’s alpha is **0.847**; the instrument is **reliable**.

Table 9 Reliability of Performance (Y)

Reliability Statistics		
Cronbach's Alpha	Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items	N of Items
,873	,870	14

Among 30 respondents for performance, Cronbach’s alpha is **0.873**; the instrument is **reliable**.

Multiple Regression, Coefficient of Determination, and F-Test

Table 5.10 Model Summary: Work Environment (X₁) and Competence (X₂) **Simultaneously**

Model Summary ^b					
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Durbin - Watson
1	,907 ^a	,823	,810	3,306	2,207
a. Predictors: (Constant), Competence, Work environment					
b. Dependent Variable: Performance					

Table 10 (continued). ANOVA

ANOVA ^a						
Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	1369,602	2	684,801	62,663	,000 ^b
	Residual	295,065	27	10,928		
	Total	1664,667	29			
a. Dependent Variable: Performance						
b. Predictors: (Constant), Competence, Work environment						

The ANOVA table yields a significance value of 0.000, which is less than $\alpha = 0.05$ (5%). Statistically, the hypothesis that the work environment and competence **jointly** influence employee performance is **accepted**; the work environment and competence have a **significant** joint effect on employee performance at APINDO, explaining **82.3%** of the variance in performance ($R^2 = 0.823$). The remaining **17.7%** is attributable to other factors not included in this study. The regression coefficients for the two predictors satisfy $p < 0.05$.

Table 11 Regression Coefficients

Coefficients ^a					
Model	Unstandardized Coefficients	Standardized	t	Sig.	Collinearity Statistics

				d Co effi cie nts				
		B	St d. Er ror	Bet a			T o le r a n c e	V I F
1	(Con stant)	3, 16 5	4, 70 2		, 6 7 3	, 5 0 7		
	Wor k envi ron ment	,7 52	,1 27	,64 2	5 , 9 2 7	, 0 0 0	,5 6 0	1 , 7 8 5
	Com pete nce	,4 40	,1 39	,34 4	3 , 1 7 8	, 0 4	,5 6 0	1 , 7 8 5
a. Dependent Variable: Performance								

Partial hypothesis tests: For work environment (X_1), $p = 0.000 < 0.05$; for competence (X_2), $p = 0.004 < 0.05$. **Decisions:** (1) H_0 is rejected and H_a is accepted: the work environment (X_1) has a **partial** effect on performance (Y). (2) H_0 is rejected and H_a is accepted: competence (X_2) has a **partial** effect on performance (Y).

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Conclusion

Based on quantitative data processing and discussion of the influence of the work environment and competence on employee performance at the Indonesian Employers’ Association (APINDO), the following **findings** are obtained:

1. The work environment influences employee performance at APINDO, with a reported magnitude of **75.6%**.
2. Competence influences employee performance at APINDO, with a reported magnitude of **59.2%**.

3. The work environment and competence **jointly** influence employee performance at APINDO, with a combined explanatory magnitude of **82.3%**.

Recommendations

Recommendations arising from this study on the work environment, competence, and performance of employees at APINDO are as follows:

1. Improve the quality of the work environment, including facilities, workspace comfort, and relationships among employees.
2. Develop employee competence through training and development, and provide opportunities to enhance skills and knowledge.
3. Employee performance at APINDO is in the **good** category but can still be improved—for example, through **recognition and rewards** from leadership.
4. To improve performance through the work environment at APINDO, leadership should pay attention to key elements of **sound competence** among staff.
5. To improve performance, leadership should strengthen orderly work environments and foster competence among employees in carrying out their duties.
6. For future research: add other variables such as work motivation, job satisfaction, or leadership; use more complex analytical methods such as SEM; extend the research setting to other sectors or organizations; and use a larger sample to improve representativeness.

REFERENCES

- Atmosoeparto, Kisdarto. (2000). *Kinerja Aktualisasi Budaya Perusahaan, mewujudkan organisasi yang efektif dan efisien melalui SDM berdaya* [Performance and Corporate Culture Actualization: Toward Effective and Efficient Organizations through Capable HR]. Jakarta: PT Elex Media Komputindo.
- Bangun, W. (2012). *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia* [Human Resource Management]. Jakarta: Penerbit Erlangga.
- Brotharsojo, J. W., & Hartanto. (2003). *Tingkatan Kinerja Perusahaan Anda dengan Merit System* [Raising Your Company's Performance with a Merit System]. Jakarta: PT Raja Grafindo Persada.
- Ghozali, I. (2006). *Aplikasi Analisis Multivariat Dengan Program SPSS* [Multivariate Analysis Applications with SPSS]. Semarang: UNDIP.
- Gibson, J. L., Ivancevich, J. M., & Donnelly, J. H. (1995). *Organizations: Behavior, Structure, Process* (8th ed.). Illinois.
- Gomes, F. C. (2000). *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia* [Human Resource Management] (4th printing). Yogyakarta: Andy Offset.
- Hasibuan, M. S. P. (2000). *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia, Dasar dan Kunci Keberhasilan* [Human Resource Management: Foundations and Keys to Success]. Jakarta: CV Haji Masagung.
- Irianto, J. (2001). *Tema-Tema Pokok Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia* [Main Themes in Human Resource Management]. Surabaya: Insan Cendekia.
- Kusriyanto, K., & Bambang. (2000). *Meningkatkan Kinerja Pegawai* [Improving Employee Performance]. Jakarta: Gramedia.

- Lasmahadi, A. (2000). *Sistem Manajemen SDM Berbasis Kompetensi* [Competency-Based HR Management System]. www.epsikologi.com
- Mangkunegara, A. A. P. (2001). *Manajemen sumber daya manusia perusahaan* [Corporate Human Resource Management]. Bandung: PT Remaja Rosdakarya.
- Mathis, R. L., & Jackson, J. H. (2012). *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia* [Human Resource Management] (1st ed.). Jakarta: Salemba Empat.
- Miner, J. B. (1988). *Organizational Behavior: Performance and Productivity* (1st ed.). New York: Random House, Inc.
- Miranda (2019) in Pepih Akromah, Harries Madiistriyatno, & Edy H. H. Panjaitan (2024:4). *Pengaruh Motivasi dan Pelayanan Prima Terhadap Kinerja Pegawai di Rumah Sakit Pelabuhan Jakarta* [The Effect of Motivation and Service Excellence on Employee Performance at Pelabuhan Jakarta Hospital]. *Jurnal Cahaya Mandalika*, Jakarta.
- Panggabean, M. S. (2002). *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia* [Human Resource Management]. Bogor: Ghalia Indonesia.
- Prawirosentono, S. (1999). *Analisis Kinerja Organisasi* [Organizational Performance Analysis]. Bandung: PT Rineka Cipta.
- Purwodarminto. (1990). *Kamus Umum Bahasa Indonesia* [General Indonesian Dictionary]. Jakarta: Pusat Pembinaan dan Pengembangan Bahasa, Depdikbud.
- Retnaningsih et al. (2020) in Gita Hapsari, Harries Madiistriyatno, & Eddy H. H. Panjaitan (2024:3). *Pengaruh Budaya Organisasi dan Disiplin Kerja terhadap Kinerja Perawat di Rumah Sakit Ibu dan Anak Buah Hati Pamulang* [The Effect of Organizational Culture and Work Discipline on Nurse Performance at Buah Hati Pamulang Mother and Child Hospital]. *Jurnal Mahasiswa Humanis*, Jakarta.
- Sedarmayanti. (2002). *Tata Kerja dan Kinerja* [Work Procedures and Performance]. Jakarta: PT Gramedia Pustaka Utama.
- Siagian (2008:8) in Nurwulan Kusuma Devi Amanda Rahayu Putri (2019:3). *Pengaruh Motivasi dan Kompetensi terhadap Kinerja Karyawan Alih Daya (Outsourcing) di PT. Multisarana Karya Mandiri Karawang* [The Effect of Motivation and Competence on Outsourced Employee Performance at PT Multisarana Karya Mandiri Karawang].
- Simamora, H. (2004). *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia* [Human Resource Management]. Yogyakarta: STIE YKPN.
- Solimun, A., Armanu, & Fernandes. (2018) in Santoso, I., & Harries Madiistriyatno, H. (2021:4). *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif* [Quantitative Research Methods]. Jakarta: Indigo Media.
- Steers, R. M. (1999). *Efektivitas Organisasi: Kajian Perilaku* [Organizational Effectiveness: A Behavioral Perspective] (trans. M. Yamin). Jakarta: Erlangga.
- Stoner, J. A. F., & Gilbert, D. R. (1995). *Management* (6th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall International, Inc.
- Susanto. (2001). *Change Management*. Jakarta: Kompas, 7 October 2001.
- Sutarto. (2002). *Dasar-dasar Organisasi* [Fundamentals of Organization]. Yogyakarta: Gadjah Mada University Press.
- Thoha, M. (2008). *Perilaku Organisasi: Konsep Dasar dan Aplikasinya* [Organizational Behavior: Basic Concepts and Applications]. Jakarta: Raja Grafindo Persada.
- Tjiptono, F., & Santoso, S. (2001). *Riset Pemasaran: Konsep dan Aplikasinya dengan SPSS* [Marketing Research: Concepts and Applications with SPSS]. Jakarta: PT Elex Media Komputindo.

- Umar, H. (2003). *Evaluasi Kinerja Perusahaan* [Company Performance Evaluation]. Jakarta: Gramedia Pustaka Utama.
- Usmara, A. (2006). *Praktek Manajemen SDM: Unggul Melalui Orientasi dan Pelatihan Pegawai* [HRM in Practice: Excellence through Orientation and Employee Training]. Yogyakarta: Santusta.
- Vroom, V. H. (1964). *Work and Motivation*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc. (Cited in Malayu S. P. Hasibuan, *Organisasi dan Kompetensi*, Jakarta: Bumi Aksara, 2007.)
- Wibowo. (2012). *Manajemen kinerja* [Performance Management]. Jakarta: RajaGrafindo Persada.
- Wirawan (2009:5) in Nurwulan Kusuma Devi Amanda Rahayu Putri (2019:3). *Pengaruh Motivasi dan Kompetensi terhadap Kinerja Karyawan Alih Daya (Outsourcing) di PT. Multisarana Karya Mandiri Karawang* [The Effect of Motivation and Competence on Outsourced Employee Performance at PT Multisarana Karya Mandiri Karawang]