

THE INFLUENCE OF LEADERSHIP AND WORK ENVIRONMENT ON EMPLOYEE PERFORMANCE AT PT. TRIJAYA PRATAMA FUTURES CENTRAL JAKARTA

Andilatul Khoeriah^{1*}, Ibnu Sina²

Pamulang University, South Tangerang

andilatul12@gmail.com, ibnu.sina@unpam.ac.id

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study is to determine the influence of leadership and work environment on employee performance at PT. Trijaya Pratama Futures both partially and simultaneously. The research method used is a quantitative method with an associative approach. The sampling technique used is saturated sampling technique, which uses a sample of 63 respondents from the entire population. Data analysis techniques used are instrument testing, classical assumption testing, linear regression analysis, correlation coefficient analysis, determination coefficient analysis, hypothesis testing. This is evidenced by the results of the leadership hypothesis test obtained a t-value of 7,086 > t-table 1,999 and strengthened by the p value <Sig.0.05 or significance value <0.05 (0.000 <0.05) work environment obtained a t-value of 9,013 > t-table 1,999 and strengthened by the p value <Sig.0.05 or significance value <0.05 (0.000 <0.05). The results of the research on leadership and work environment simultaneously do not have a significant effect on employee performance at PT. Trijaya Pratama Futures are shown by the multiple linear regression equation $Y = 19.557 + 0.427X_1 + 0.3012X_2$. This is proven by the results of the simultaneous hypothesis test obtained the F count value (56.060 > F table 3.15) and is strengthened by a significance value < 0.00 (0.000 < 0.05). The results of the determination coefficient test of the leadership and work environment variables have an influence of 34.9% on employee performance at PT. Trijaya Pratama Futures. Thus, H0 is accepted and H3 is rejected. This means that there is a positive and insignificant influence simultaneously between leadership (X1) work environment (X2) employee performance (Y)

Keywords: Leadership, Work Environment, Employee Performance

INTRODUCTION

PT. Trijaya Pratama Futures is an innovation-oriented company that aims to provide the best trading experience with a variety of top-tier trading products and provide the best service to its clients as a top broker in Indonesia. Trijaya Pratama Futures is an official futures broker regulated by BAPPEBTI and an official member of the Jakarta Futures Exchange (JFX). Officially registered as a regulated broker since 2004, Trijaya Pratama Futures hopes to become a leading pioneer in offering forex, commodity, CFD, and index derivative transactions because its focus is on customer service.

Improving employee performance will lead to progress for an organization, enabling it to survive in competition. Therefore, efforts to improve employee performance represent a major management challenge, as the success of achieving goals and the survival of a company depend on its human resources.

Based on data from HRD at PT. Trijaya Pratama Futures Central Jakarta, several summary data on employee performance assessments were found, which can be seen in Table 1.1.

Table 1. Employee Performance Assessment Data at PT. Trijaya Pratama Futures Central Jakarta in 2022-2024

Employee Performance Assessment	Target	Realization		
		2022	2023	2024
Performance	100%	73.3%	73.7%	65.5%
Discipline	100%	83.6%	78.2%	65.5%
Creativity	100%	80.2%	75.4%	58.0%
Cooperate	100%	82.3%	74.7%	67.0%
Responsibility	100%	85.8%	85.8%	56.0%
Average	100%	81.04%	77.4%	62%
Information	Very good	Very good	Good	Pretty good

Source: PT. Trijaya Pratama Futures Central Jakarta 2025

Note: < 50% = Bad, 51-60% = Not Good, 61-70% = Fair, 71-80 = Good, 81-100% = Very Good (PT. Trijaya Pratama Futures Central Jakarta)

Based on Table 1.1 above, it shows that overall employee performance is in the unsatisfactory criteria. This can be seen from the fact that not a single achievement period has met the company's targets for the past 2 years. That performance assessments from 2022 to 2024 continue to decline in almost all elements, where in 2022 the average realized value was 81.04% which has a very good description which can still be expected in the average value of PT. Trijaya Pratama Futures Central Jakarta, then in 2023 it experienced a decline with an average realized value of 77.4% which has a good description, finally in 2024 it experienced a decline again with an average realized value of 62% which has a fairly good description. Therefore, the company is dissatisfied with employee performance because the presentation of achievements continues to decline.

Based on the performance data above, several other factors contribute to declining employee performance. For example, the leadership implemented by company leaders can trigger this decline. The following is a pre-survey of 30 employees regarding leadership at PT. Trijaya Pratama Futures, Central Jakarta.

Table 2. Pre-Survey on Leadership PT. Trijaya Pratama Futures Central Jakarta

No	Statement	Yes	%	No	%	Total
EXAMPLE						
1	The leadership always thinks about the rights and obligations of employees fairly.	12	48%	18	72%	30
AUTHORITY						
2	Leaders are able to organize and direct employees to work well	9	36%	21	84%	30
DELEGATION OF TASKS						
3	The leader delegates all his tasks to the employees	18	72%	12	48%	30
DECISION-MAKING						
4	Leaders make decisions after receiving suggestions or proposals from subordinates.	12	48%	18	72%	30

Source: PT. Trijaya Pratama Futures 2025 Employee Pre-Survey Data

Based on the results of a pre-survey with several less than good company management, this is proven by several things, one of which is determining and providing exemplary examples, namely that leaders do not always think about the rights and obligations of employees fairly, and the authority of leaders is not able to organize and direct employees to work well, leaders also delegate and delegate all their tasks to employees and leaders do not make decisions after receiving suggestions or proposals from subordinates.

However, subsequent data showed that the leadership lacked understanding of each employee's feelings, demanding only targets without considering their employees' well-being. Similarly, other evidence emerged that the leadership lacked tact in responding to employee aspirations and suggestions regarding operational issues within the company.

Based on the results of the leadership pre-survey above, several responses to the indicator were still lacking, including leaders' ability to make the best decisions. This clearly indicates a leadership problem at PT. Trijaya Pratama Futures Central Jakarta.

Besides leadership, another factor that influences employee performance is the work environment. The work environment is everything around employees that can influence their ability to carry out assigned tasks. The work environment within a company is crucial for

management to consider.

A conducive work environment provides a sense of security and enables employees to perform optimally. If employees enjoy their work environment, they will feel comfortable in their jobs and carry out their activities, thus utilizing their work time effectively. Conversely, an inadequate work environment can reduce employee performance.

According to Sedarmayanti (2017: 5), the work environment is defined as all the tools and materials encountered, the surrounding environment where a person works, their work methods and how they organize their work both as individuals and in groups.

The following are the results of a pre-survey conducted with 30 employees at PT. Trijaya Pratama Futures Central Jakarta regarding work environment conditions.

Table 3. Pre-Survey Results Regarding the Work Environment at PT. Trijaya Pratama Futures Central Jakarta

NO	Question	Yes	(%)	No	(%)	Criteria
WORKING ATMOSPHERE						
1	The atmosphere of the employee's workplace can provide comfort in working.	13	43%	17	56%	30
RELATIONSHIPS WITH CO-WORKERS						
2	The relationship between employees and fellow coworkers does not help employees in their work.	20	66%	10	33%	30
AVAILABILITY OF WORK FACILITIES						
3	Facilities and infrastructure in the workplace are inadequate and do not support employee work.	21	70%	9	30%	30

Source: 2025 Pre-Survey Data Results

Based on Table 1.3, it can be seen that the work environment of PT. Trijaya Pratama FuturesCentral Jakarta is still said to not be in accordance with expectations, there is still one indicator that is still said to be less than good, namely the relationship with coworkers who are still not good in helping employees in their work. Of the 30 employees, it was stated that there is still a workplace atmosphere that does not provide comfort in working.

METHOD

Based on its nature, there are two types of research: quantitative and qualitative. According to Sugiyono (2020:44), quantitative research is a deductive, objective, and positive research method that incorporates numbers and quantification in data collection and analysis. Qualitative research is an inductive method for observing the behavior of social phenomena to discover the essence of the event. Based on the definition of each type of research, this research is categorized as quantitative research because the conclusions to be drawn are based on quantitative data obtained from measuring research variables using a Likert scale and then analyzed using a type of statistical method.

RESEARCH RESULT

Quantitative Test Results and Hypothesis Testing

According to Ghazali (2016:93), "Regression analysis is basically a study of the dependence of a dependent variable on one or more independent variables, with the aim of estimate and or predict the population average or the average value of the dependent variable based on the known value of the independent variable". The purpose of this regression model is to obtain a form of relationship between the variable to be estimated (dependent variable)

and the independent variable (independent variable) and use the model to estimate the value of the variable to be estimated, which can ultimately be seen the influence between work discipline, work environment, and employee performance.

Quantitative Test and t-Test (Partial Test)

a. Results of the t-test (Partial) of the Leadership Variable (X1) on the Employee Performance Variable (Y)

Table 4.18 Results of the t-Test (Partial) of Variable X1 against Y

Coefficients ^a						
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	17,317	2,969		5,833	0,000
	Leadership	0.573	0.081	0.672	7,086	0,000

a. Dependent Variable: Employee Performance

Data source processed by SPSS v.26 2025

Based on table 4.18 above, by using the t distribution table sought at $\alpha = 5\%$ 2-sided test, with df (degree of freedom) $n-2$ or $63-2 = 61$, then obtained for the t-table of 1.295, based on the test results of the X1 variable against Y, the calculated t-value > t-table ($7.086 > 1.999$) and the value (sig) $0.000 < 0.05$ that leadership (X1) partially has a positive and significant effect on employee performance (Y), and the simple linear regression equation $Y = a + b(X1)$ that has been found between leadership (X1) on employee performance (Y) is $Y = 17.317 + 0.573(X1)$.

To determine the magnitude of the influence of X1 on Y, a calculation is carried out using the Coefficient of Determination with the following results:

Table 4.19 Determinant Coefficient of Variable X1 against Y

Model Summary					
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Standard Error of the Estimate	Durbin-Watson
1	0.672a	0.452	0.443	2.63277	1,657

a. Predictors: (Constant), Leadership

b. Dependent Variable: Employee Performance

Data source processed by SPSS v.26 2025

From the calculation results in table 4.19 above, it can be seen that the coefficient of determination (R Square) between variables X1 – Y, which was obtained was 0.452. This means that leadership (X1) has a contribution to employee performance (Y) of 45.2% and the remaining 54.8% is influenced by other factors.

b. Results of the t-test (Partial) of the Work Environment Variable (X2) on the Employee Performance Variable (Y)

Table 4.20 Results of the t-Test (Partial) of Variable X2 against Y

Coefficients ^a						
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	11,135	3,020		3,688	0,000
	Work environment	0.726	0.081	0.756	9,013	0,000

a. Dependent Variable: Employee Performance

Data source processed by SPSS v.26 2025

Based on table 4.20 above, by using the t distribution table searched for $\alpha = 5\%$ 2-sided test, with df (degree of freedom) $n-2$ or $63-2 = 61$, then obtained for the t-table of 1.295, based on the test results of the X2 variable against Y, the calculated t-value > t-table ($9.013 > 1.999$) and the value (sig) $0.000 < 0.05$ that the work environment (X2) partially has a positive and significant effect on employee performance (Y), and the simple linear regression equation $Y =$

a + b (X2) that has been found between the work environment (X2) on employee performance (Y) is $Y = 11.135 + 0.726 (X2)$.

To determine the magnitude of the influence of X2 on Y, a calculation is carried out using the Coefficient of Determination with the following results:

Table 4.21 Determinant Coefficient of Variable X2 against Y

Model Summary					
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Standard Error of the Estimate	Durbin-Watson
1	0.756a	0.571	0.564	2,32810	1,874
a. Predictors: (Constant), Work Environment					
b. Dependent Variable: Employee Performance					

Data source processed by SPSS v.26 2025

From the calculation results in table 4.21 above, it can be seen that the coefficient of determination (R Square) between variables X2 – Y, which was obtained was 0.571. This means that the work environment (X2) has a contribution to employee performance (Y) of 57.1% and the remaining 42.9% is influenced by other factors.

1. F Test (Simultaneous)

The F test is used to test whether all independent variables (work discipline, work environment) together have a significant influence on the dependent variable (employee performance). The basis for making the F test decision is carried out with a significance level of $\alpha = 0.05$, degree of freedom 1 / degree of freedom 1 ($df = k-1$), where k is the number of all variables (independent variables and dependent variables). And degree of freedom 2 / degree of freedom 2 ($df = nk$), where n is the number of samples. The results of degree of freedom 1 / degree of freedom 1 ($df = 4 - 1 = 3$) and degree of freedom 2 / degree of freedom 2 ($df = 63 - 3 = 60$). With Ftable of 75 = 3.12. The conditions for accepting the hypothesis are:

- If $F_{count} > F_{table}$ (α (0.05)) then H_0 is rejected and H_a is accepted.
- If $F_{count} < F_{table}$ (α (0.05)) then H_0 is accepted and H_a is rejected.

The following are the results of data processed by SPSS version 26, F test

Table 4.22 F-Test Results (Simultaneous)

ANOVA						
Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	502,194	2	251,097	56,070	0.000b
	Residual	268,695	60	4,478		
	Total	770,889	62			
a. Dependent Variable: Employee Performance						
b. Predictors: (Constant), Work Environment, Leadership						

Source: Data processed by SPSS v.26 2025

From the table 4.22 above, the calculated F value is greater than the F table of 56,070 with a significance value smaller than the probability value of 0.000 by looking at the F table, namely the degree of $df_1 = k-1$ (3-1) and $df_2 = nk$ (63-3) = 60 at a significance level of 0.05, the calculated F value is $> F_{table}$ or $56,070 > 3.15$ and significant < 0.05 ($0.000 < 0.05$), then H_0 is rejected and H_a is accepted, which means that the leadership variable (X1), work environment (X2) simultaneously has a positive and significant effect on the employee performance variable (Y) at PT. Trijaya Pratama Futures.

To determine the magnitude of the influence of X1, X2 on Y, a calculation is carried out using the Coefficient of Determination with the following results:

Table 4.23 Results of the Determinant Coefficient Test of Variables X1, X2, Against Variable Y

Model Summary					
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Standard Error of the Estimate	Durbin-Watson
1	0.807a	0.651	0.640	2,116	1,741

a. Predictors: (Constant), Work Environment, Leadership

b. Dependent Variable: Employee Performance

Source: Data processed by SPSS v.26 2025

The coefficient of determination (Adjusted R Square) is 0.651 or 65.1%, which means that the independent variables consisting of leadership and work environment can contribute 65.1% of their influence on employee performance, while the remaining 34.9% is influenced by other factors not discussed in this study.

The multiple regression equation for variables X1, X2 against Y, namely work discipline, work environment on employee performance, can be displayed in the following table:

Table 4.24 Multiple Regression Analysis of Variables X1, X2 against Y

Coefficients ^a					
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta	
1	(Constant)	7,590	2,906		0.011
	Leadership	0.298	0.080	0.349	0,000
	Work environment	0.530	0.090	0.551	0,000

a. Dependent Variable: Employee Performance

Source: Data processed by SPSS v.26 2025

Based on the results of table 4.24 above, the following regression equation formulas can be obtained:

$$Y = 19.557 + 0.427 X1 + 0.012 X2$$

The meaning of these numbers is as follows:

- 1) A constant value of 7,590 means that if leadership and work environment remain constant, employee performance will be 7,590.
- 2) The regression coefficient of the leadership variable (X1) is 0.298, meaning that if the leadership variable increases by one unit, employee performance will increase by 0.298 units. Assuming that the other variables remain constant.
- 3) The regression coefficient for the work environment variable (X2) is 0.530, meaning that if the work environment variable increases by one unit, employee performance will increase by 0.530 units, assuming the other variables remain constant.

DISCUSSION

1. Leadership (X1)

Based on the partial hypothesis test, leadership (X1) has a significant positive effect on employee performance (Y), with a calculated t-value > t-table (7.086 > 1.999). The influence of leadership (X1) on employee performance (Y) is 45.2% and the remaining 54.8% is influenced by other factors. This is in accordance with the research results. Tarwijo, Isep Amas Priatna, Dini Fatmawati Pamulang University Civilization Journal (2021) Vol. 1 No. 3 which states that leadership has a positive effect on employee performance. The results of this study are that leadership and work environment have a significant effect on employee performance at PT. Victory Chingluh Indonesia Quality Division with the regression equation $Y = 7.374 + 0.230X1 + 0.628X2$. The results of the study were simultaneously known by the hypothesis test obtained the calculated F value > F table or (65.719 > 2.760). Thus H0 is rejected and H3 is accepted.

2. Work Environment (X2)

Based on the partial hypothesis test, the work environment (X2) has a significant positive effect on employee performance (Y), the calculated t-value > t-table (9.013 > 1.999) shows that the influence of the work environment (X2) on employee performance (Y) is 57.1% and the remaining 42.9% is influenced by other factors. This is in accordance with the research results. N Nahrin, Masdar Mas'ud, Mukhlis Sufri, Muslim University of Indonesia (2020) Vol. 1 No. 2 IISN 2722-4961 which states that the work environment has a positive effect on employee performance. The results of the study show that leadership has a significant effect on employee

performance and the work environment has a significant effect on employee performance. Leadership has the most dominant influence on employee performance. This means that both variables have a simultaneous effect on employee performance.

3. Employee Performance (Y)

Based on the hypothesis test that simultaneously leadership (X1), work environment (X2) simultaneously have a significant positive effect on employee performance variables (Y) obtained F-count value > F-table or $56,070 > 3.15$ with a significance value of $0.000 < 0.05$. The magnitude of the simultaneous influence of leadership (X1), work environment (X2), has a contribution to employee performance (Y) of 65.1% and the remaining 34.9% is influenced by other factors. This is in accordance with the research results. Andriani, J., Sularmi, L., & Anggraini, N. (2021). *Arastirma Journal*, Vol.1 No.1. which states that leadership and work environment have a positive effect on employee performance. With the research results Work environment has a significant effect on employee performance with a contribution of 78.3%, Hypothesis test obtained sig. $0.000 < 0.05$.

CONCLUSION

There is a partial influence between the leadership variable (X1) on employee performance (Y), indicated by a simple linear regression equation, namely $Y = 17,317 + 0.573 X1$. This is proven by the calculated t ($7,086 > t$ table 1,999), this is also strengthened by the p value < Sig.0.05 or ($0.000 < 0.05$).

There is a partial influence between the work environment variable (X2) on employee performance (Y), indicated by the simple linear regression equation $Y = 11.135 + 0.726 X2$. This is proven by the calculated t value ($9.013 > t$ table 1.999), this is also strengthened by the p value < Sig.0.05 or ($0.000 < 0.05$).

There is a simultaneous influence between leadership and work environment on employee performance, indicated by the multiple linear regression equation $Y = 7,590 + 0.298X1 + 0.530X2$. The correlation coefficient value of 0.807 means that the independent variable with the dependent variable has a moderate level of relationship with a coefficient of 80.7 or 80.7%. And the hypothesis test obtained F count values ($56,070 > F$ table 3.15), this is also strengthened by the probability of significance ($0.000 < 0.05$). Thus, H_0 is rejected and H_3 is accepted. This means that there is no significant simultaneous influence between leadership (X1) work environment (X2) on employee performance (Y).

REFERENCES

- Afandi, P. (2018). "Human Resource Management (Theory, Concept and Indicators)". Riau: Zanafafa
- Amirullah, Y. (2022). "The Synergy of Competency Strategy of Islamic Education Teachers to Improve the Quality of Education and Character of Students in the Millennial Era". *Educan: Journal of Islamic Education*, 4(1), 135-152.
- Bintoro and Daryanto. (2019). "Employee Performance Assessment Management". 1st edition. Yogyakarta.
- Hamali, AY, & SS, M. (2023). "Understanding human resource management". Caps.
- Hasibuan, Malayu SP (2021). "Management: Basics, Definitions, and Problems." Jakarta: Bumi Aksara.
- Hasibuan, Malayu. (2017). "Human Resource Management". Jakarta: PT Bumi Aksara.
- Hindriari, R. (2018). The Influence of Leadership on Employee Performance at PT. Karya Murni Sentosa Bekasi. *KREATIF: Scientific Journal of Management Study Program*, Pamulang University, 6(3), 1-13.
- Komarudin, K. (2018). The Influence of Work Environment on Employee Performance at PT. Pos Indonesia Depok. *JENIUS (Scientific Journal of Human Resource Management)*, 1(3), 350-364.
- Mangkunegara, AAP, (2019). "HR Performance Evaluation". Bandung: PT. Refika Aditama.
- Meithiana, I., & Ansory, H. (2019). "Human Resource Management".

- Muizu, WOZ, Kaltum, U., & Sule, ET (2019). The influence of leadership on employee performance. *Perwira-Journal of Indonesian Entrepreneurship Education*, 2(1), 70-78.
- Nitisemito, AS (2020) *Personnel Management*. Jakarta: Ghalia
- Nuraeni, N. (2018). "Application of the Simple Additive Weighting (SAW) Method in the Selection of Prospective Employees". *Swabumi*, 6(1), 63.
- Nuraini, s. (2021). The influence of work environment and work discipline on the performance of lecturers at Binaniaga Indonesia University during the Covid-19 pandemic/sisca nuraini/s1-0217152/supervisor I: Rizki Ahmad Fauzi/supervisor II: Kamilah Sa'diah.
- Nursam, N. (2017). *Performance management*. Kelola: *Journal of Islamic Education Management*, 2(2).
- Priansa, DJ, (2019). *Secretarial Affairs*. Bandung: Alfabeta
- Sedarmayanti. (2017). "Human Resource Management, Bureaucratic Reform and Civil Servant Management". Bandung: Refika Aditama
- Siagian, SP (2019). *Human Resource Management*. Jakarta: BumiAksara
- Sidanti, H. (2020). "Analysis of the Relationship Between Rates, Services and Room Facilities on the Level of Satisfaction of Inpatients at Mojowarno Christian Hospital, Jombang". *Jurnal Ekomaks*, 2(2).
- Simamora, Henry. (2020). "Human Resource Management". Fifth edition. STIE YKPN
- Sinambela, LP (2021). "Human Resource Management: Building a solid work team to improve performance." Bumi Aksara.
- Sofyan, DK (2013). The influence of the work environment on the work performance of Bappeda employees. *Industrial Engineering Journal*, 2(1).
- Sugiyono. (2020). "Qualitative, Quantitative, and R&D Research Methods". Bandung CV Alfabeta.
- Sukarna, RH, Januriana, AM, & Hilman, M. (2023). "Implementation of Encryption Algorithms in Desktop-Based Helpdesk Management Information Systems". *Journal of Informatics and Research*, 1(2), 31-39.
- Suryani, NL (2019). The influence of compensation and work environment on employee performance at PT. Indo Tekhnoplus. *Scientific Journal, Human Resource Management*, 2(2), 260-277.
- Sutikno, MS (2021). "Learning Strategy". Adab Publisher.
- Sutrisno, Edy. (2020). "Human Resource Management." Jakarta: Kencana Prenada Media Group
- Suwatno, & Priansa Donni Juni.(2018). "Human Resource Management in Public and Business Organizations (6th ed.)". Alfabeta Bandung.
- Terry, G.R. (2022). *Principles of management*.
- Wahyudi, B. (2018). *National Leadership in Strategic Environmental Development*. PALAR (Pakuan Law Review), 4(2).
- Wahyuningsih, S. (2018). The influence of the work environment on work productivity. *Warta Dharmawangsa*, (57).
- Wibowo .(2016). "Performance Management". Fifth Edition. PT. Raja Grafindo Persada Jakarta-14240.
- Widodo, ZD, Wijastuti, S., Adiyani, R., & Zailani, A. (2022, July). Analysis of the influence of leadership, training, and organizational culture on employee performance in the manual screen printing creative industry at PT. XYZ. In *Proceedings of the National Seminar on the Anniversary of UTP Surakarta* (Vol. 2, No. 1, pp. 83-88).