

ANALYSIS THAT INFLUENCES THE PERFORMANCE OF HOME INDUSTRIAL EMPLOYEES IN DURUNGBEDUG VILLAGE, SIDOARJO DISTRICT, SIDOARJO DISTRICT

Indira Shofia Maulida¹, Ike Susanti², Ruswaji³, Bella Fernanda⁴
^{1,2,3,4} Fakultas Ekonomi, Universitas Islam Lamongan

ARTICLE INFO

Keywords:
work discipline
motivation
leadership style
employee performance

ABSTRACT

Soybean became known in Indonesia since the 16th century. Initially, the spread and cultivation of soybeans was on the island of Java, then developed to Bali, Nusa Tenggara and other islands. Soybean is one of the main ingredients in the process of making tofu. Industry can run well because it is influenced by employee performance. The purpose of this research is to analyze the performance of employees in the tofu industry in Durungbedug Village, Sidoarjo District, Sidoarjo Regency. The method used in this research is Descriptive – Quantitative. Using a sample of tofu industry employees, the analytical tool used is multiple linear regression, to test the hypothesis used the coefficient of determination, F test and T test. The results of data processing, namely the T-test, obtained t count for work discipline of 1.592, motivation of 0.856 and leadership style 2.815. To determine the t table, use the statistical attachment t table, using $\alpha = 5\%$. The procedure for testing the t test is to use a 2-tailed test ($\alpha = 5\% : 2 = 2.5\%$), with (df) $n-1$ or $50-1=49$. Then obtained t table 2.009. The results of the multiple linear regression test $Y = 1.608 + 0.328X_1 + 0.410X_2 + 0.554X_3 + e$ namely the leadership style variable (X_3) is more dominant in influencing the variable (Y) namely employee performance, this is evidenced by the value of the regression coefficient of 0.554. Which is greater than the regression coefficient variable work discipline (X_1) and motivation (X_2). The results of the F-test show that work discipline (X_1), motivation (X_2), and leadership style (X_3) simultaneously affect employee performance (Y). Where is the calculated F count of 24.362 with a significance level of 0.05.

E-mail:
Indirashofia@unisla.ac.id

Copyright © 2023 Jurnal Ekonomi. All rights reserved.
is Licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License \(CC BY-NC 4.0\)](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/)

1. INTRODUCTION

Soybean is native to mainland China and has been cultivated by humans since 2500 BC. In line with the growing trade between countries that occurred in the early 19th century, led to soybean crops as well also spread to various trading destination countries, namely Japan, Korea, Indonesia, India, Australia and America. Soybean began to be known in Indonesia since 16th century. The beginning of the spread and cultivation of soybeans was on the island Java, then expanding to Bali, Nusa Tenggara and other islands (Irwan, 2006).

Tofu is a lump of soy protein obtained from soybean extraction which has been ground with the addition of water (Sarwono and Saragih, 2016). Tofu is known as people's food because the price is cheap, easily accessible by all society. In general, tofu is used as a side dish to replace meat (animal protein) because the price is cheaper when compared to meat. Apart from being cheap, tofu is in great demand because it is a healthy food and can be processed into various kinds of cuisine.

Human resources are a central factor in an organization. Whatever the form of the goal, the organization is made up of various visions for the benefit of humans and in carrying out its mission it is managed and taken care of by humans. Employee performance is one dimension that can be used to measure, evaluate the strength of employees in surviving and carrying out their duties and obligations to the organization in which they are a part. Work discipline is one of the keys to achieving a company goal. In addition, the motivation and leadership style applied by the leadership will affect employee performance so that it will produce good performance and be able to achieve a business goal that has been carried out.

2. METHOD

The type of research used is descriptive quantitative using data analysis methods. The purpose of this study was to analyze the effect of the performance of employees in the tofu industry in Durungbedug Village, Sidoarjo District, Sidoarjo Regency.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Characteristics of Respondents Based on Gender

Gender analysis is processed based on the answers to questions that can be seen in the following table:

Table 1. Characteristics of Respondents by Gender

No	Gender	number respondents	Percentage %
1	male	45	90%
2	famale	5	10%
Amount		50	100%

Based on the table above it is known that most of the respondents in this study were male, namely 45 respondents or around 90% while the remaining 5 respondents or 10% were female. From these data it was concluded that most of the respondents were male.

Characteristics of Respondents by Age

Age-based analysis can be seen in the following table:

Table 2. Characteristics of Respondents by Age

Age	Frequency (People)	Percentage (%)
19-30 years	16	32%
31-40 years	23	46%
≥ 41 years	11	22%
Total Respondents	50	100%

Based on the results of the table above, it can be seen that the respondents in this study aged 19-30 years were 16 people or 32%, those aged 31-40 years were 23 people or 46%, and those aged ≥41 years were 11 people or 22%. So it can be concluded that the majority of respondents aged 31-40 years.

Multiple Linear Regression

To calculate the quantitative influence of a change in events (variable X) on other events (variable Y). Statistical calculations in multiple linear regression analysis can be seen in the following table:

Table 3 Results of Multiple Linear Regression Analysis Coefficients^a

Model	Coefficients ^a			T	Sig.
	Unstandardized Coefficients B	Std. Error	Standardized Coefficients Beta		
(Constant)	1.608	2.513		.513	.611
1 WORK DISCIPLINE	.328	.909	.349	1.592	.021
MOTIVATION	.410	.815	.094	.856	.454
LEADERSHIP STYLE	.554	.616	.459	2.815	.000

a. Dependent Variable: EMPLOYEE PERFORMANCE

From the calculation results of table 3, it can be presented in the form of a standardized regression equation as follows:

$$Y = a + \beta_1X_1 + \beta_2X_2 + \beta_3X_3 + e$$

$$Y = 1,608 + 0,328X_1 + 0,410X_2 + 0,554X_3 + e$$

Where:

Y: Employee Performance

a: Constant

β_1 to β_3 : Regression coefficient

X1: Work Discipline
X2: Motivation
X3: Leadership Style
e: Standard Error

- The value of the constant (a) is to show the value of the employee's performance (Y). The variables of work discipline, motivation, and leadership style are stated to be constant with an employee performance value of 1.608.
- The coefficient of work discipline variable (X1) is 0.328, indicating that there is an influence between work discipline and employee performance, if the better the work discipline, the employee's performance will increase positively.
- The regression coefficient of the motivation variable (X2) is 0.410, which means that there is an influence between motivation and employee performance, if the motivation is better, the employee performance will increase positively.
- The coefficient of the leadership style variable (X3) is 0.554, indicating that there is an influence between leadership style and employee performance, if the better the leadership style, the employee's performance will increase positively.

The coefficient of determination R²

Statistical calculations in the Coefficient of Determination analysis in this study are as follows:

Table 4. Results of the Coefficient of Determination of the Summary Model

Model Summary ^b				
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.896 ^a	.666	.608	3.64883

a. Predictors: (Constant), LEADERSHIP STYLE, MOTIVATION, WORK DISCIPLINE

b. Dependent Variable: EMPLOYEE PERFORMANCE

Based on table 4 above, it can be concluded that the adjusted R Square coefficient of determination is 0.608 or 60.8%. The greater the Adjusted R Square number, the stronger the relationship between the two variables in the regression model. So it can be concluded that 60.8% of employee performance variables can be explained by work discipline, motivation, and leadership style variables. While the other 39.2% is influenced and explained by other variables that are not included in this study.

Test t (Partial Testing)

The t test basically shows whether the independent variable partially (individually) has a significant influence on the dependent variable.

Table 5. T-Test Results (Partial)

Coefficients ^a					
Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.
	B	Std. Error			
1 (Constant)	1.608	2.513		.513	.611
WORK DISCIPLINE	.328	.909	.349	1.592	.021
MOTIVATION	.410	.815	.094	.856	.454
LEADERSHIP STYLE	.554	.616	.459	2.815	.000

a. Dependent Variable: EMPLOYEE PERFORMANCE

From the results of the t test in table 5 above, the t count for work discipline is 1.592, motivation is 0.856, and leadership style is 2.815. To determine the t table, use the statistical attachment t table, using $\alpha = 5\%$. The procedure for testing the t test is to use a 2-tailed test ($\alpha = 5\% : 2 = 2.5\%$), with (df) $n-1$ or $50-1=49$. Then obtained t table 2.009

a. Effect of work discipline on employee performance

It can be seen that the t count for the work discipline coefficient is $1.592 > t$ table 2.009. So the hypothesis that says there is a significant influence between work discipline on employee performance, is accepted (H_a is accepted and H_0 is rejected), meaning that partially there is a significant influence between

Analysis That Influences The Performance Of Home Industrial Employees In Durungbedug Village, Sidoarjo District, Sidoarjo District. Indira Shofia Maulida, et.al

work discipline on employee performance. The results of this study support research conducted by Riga Putra Kurniawan (2016) and Vicky Sofyan Rachmadani (2018) who found that work discipline has a positive effect and has direct significance on employee performance.

b. The effect of motivation on employee performance

It can be seen that the t count for the motivation coefficient is $0.856 < t$ table 2.009. So the hypothesis that says there is no significant influence between motivation on employee performance, is rejected (H_a is rejected and H_o is accepted), meaning that partially there is no significant influence between motivation on employee performance.

c. The influence of leadership style on employee performance

It can be seen that the t count for the leadership style coefficient is $2.815 > t$ table 2.009. So the hypothesis that says there is a significant influence between leadership style on employee performance, is accepted (H_a is accepted and H_o is rejected), meaning that partially there is a significant influence between leadership style on employee performance. The results of this study also support research conducted by Vicky Sofyan Rachmadani (2018) who found that leadership style has a positive effect and has direct significance on employee performance.

Test F

The coefficient value of the F statistical test results was obtained from ANOVA and multiple linear regression in the table column F below:

Table 6. Simultaneous Test Results (Test -F)

ANOVA ^a						
Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	1058.137	3	352.712	24.362	.000 ^b
	Residual	512.553	46	13.314		
	Total	1570.690	49			

a. Dependent Variable: EMPLOYEE PERFORMANCE

b. Predictors: (Constant), LEADERSHIP STYLE, MOTIVATION, WORK DISCIPLINE

the results of the F test in table 6 above, it can be seen that the calculated F value is 24.362, while the F table value is used in the statistic attachment table F. Calculate F table with dk numerator = k (number of independent variables) and dk denominator = (n-k-1) with an error rate of 5%, according to Sugiyono (In Rachmadani Vicky Sofyan: 2018). From this formula, the quantifier dk = 3 and the denominator dk $50-3-1 = 46$, with a significance of 0.05, the F table is 2.81

This shows that the value of F count $> F$ table is $24.362 > 2.81$ then H_o is rejected and H_a is accepted, meaning that work discipline, motivation, and leadership style jointly affect employee performance.

4. CONCLUSION

It can be seen that the t count for the work discipline coefficient is $1.592 > t$ table 2.009. So the hypothesis that says there is a significant influence between work discipline on employee performance, is accepted (H_a is accepted and H_o is rejected), meaning that partially there is a significant influence between work discipline on employee performance. It can be seen that the t count for the motivation coefficient is $0.856 < t$ table 2.009. So the hypothesis that says there is no significant influence between motivation on employee performance, is rejected (H_a is rejected and H_o is accepted). It can be seen that the t count for the leadership style coefficient is $2.815 > t$ table 2.009. So the hypothesis that says there is a significant influence between leadership style on employee performance, is accepted (H_a is accepted and H_o is rejected).

It can be seen that the calculated F value is 24.362, while the F table value is used in the statistic attachment table F. Calculating F tables with dk quantifier = k (number of independent variables) and dk denominator = (n-k-1) with an error level of 5%, this is shows that the value of F count $> F$ table is $24.362 > 2.81$ then H_o is rejected and H_a is accepted, meaning that work discipline, motivation, and leadership style jointly affect employee performance.

Based on the equation of the multiple linear regression line, it can be interpreted as follows: The value of the constant (a) indicates the magnitude of the value of employee performance (Y). The variables

of work discipline, motivation, and leadership style are stated to be constant with an employee performance value of 1.608. The coefficient of work discipline variable (X1) is 0.328, it states that there is an influence between work discipline and employee performance. The regression coefficient of motivation variable (X2) is 0.410, it states that there is an influence between motivation and employee performance. The variable coefficient of leadership style (X3) is 0.554 then it states that there is an influence between leadership style and employee performance, if among the variables Work Discipline (X1), Motivation (X2) and Leadership style (X3) are increased by one unit then it will increase by one unit with a positive value.

REFERENCES

- [1] Budiwibowo, Satrijo. 2014. *Pengaruh Gaya Kepemimpinan Transaksional, Transformasional Dan Disiplin Kerja Terhadap Kinerja : Studi Pada Guru (Karyawan) Di Kota Madiun*. Jurnal Premiere Educandum, Volume 4, No.2
- [2] Hasibuan, Malayu S.P. 2016. *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia Edisi Revisi*. Bumi Aksara. Jakarta
- [3] Mangkunegara, Anwar Prabu. 2015. *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia*. Rosdakarya. Bandung
- [4] Rachmadani, Vicky Sofyan. 2018. *Pengaruh Gaya Kepemimpinan, Budaya Organisasi, Dan Disiplin Kerja Terhadap Kinerja Karyawan*. Skripsi. Jakarta: Program Sarjana Universitas Islam Negeri Syarif Hidayatullah
- [5] Sugiyono. 2014. *Metode Penelitian Bisnis*. Cetakan ke-18. Alfabeta. Bandung
- [6] Sugiyono. 2015. *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif, Kualitatif, dan R&D*. Cetakan ke-22. Alfabeta. Bandung