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***ABSTRACT***

In the scope of rubber plantations, the benchmark of tappers' performance can be seen from the acquisition of the Dry Rubber Content / Kadar Karet Kering (K3) value and the amount of dry rubber production produced. Referring to the data of K3 for the 2021-2023 periods, the cause of the low performance of tappers in Afdeling Zeelandia is suspected to be the habit of rubber tapping employees mixing latex with water and the incomplete tapping process. Based on this background, the researcher chose the variables of incentives, work environment and leadership style to measure their influence on performance. This study involved 95 samples of tapping employees by distributing questionnaires whose results were then analyzed using the SPSS version 25 application. It was found that partially incentives had no significant effect while the work environment and leadership style had a significant effect on the performance of tapping employees. Meanwhile, incentives, work environment and leadership style simultaneously have a significant effect on the performance of employees. The conclusions from the results above include that the low amount of incentives makes its influence cannot be felt by tappers, the work environment has the most dominant influence indicating that the cleanliness of rubber plantation land and maintenance of production roads that are routinely carried out are very needed and the finally a good relationship between leaders and employees is considered capable of improving employee performance. In this case the democratic leadership style needs to be developed further.
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**INTRODUCTION**

In any organization, the quality of human resources determines the success of organizational performance. The meaning of performance not only emphasizes the results of work, but also the work process that takes place. Armstrong and Baron (1998) point out that performance is the result of work that is closely related to the company's strategic goals, customer satisfaction, and economic contribution. Therefore, organizations should monitor, evaluate, and review the performance of their employees in the implementation process so that they can see whether the company's goals can be achieved.

PTPN I Regional 5, previously known as PTPN XII Kebun Zeelandia, is a company engaged in plantations that manages rubber commodities into semi-finished raw materials for the domestic and foreign rubber industry. The phenomenon that occurs in Kebun Zeelandia, Afdeling Zeelandia is the existence of bad habits of rubber tappers that mixing latex with water, causing the Dry Rubber Content (K3) to decrease. This action also has the further effect that the latex that is in the process of being sent to the factory becomes vulnerable to damage before it is received so that the use of ammonia as a clumping delay and the use of ant acid in the factory increase. This habit occurs because of the tendency of tappers to judge the good quality of latex measured by the amount of latex, so that the habit of mixing water is still being carried out for generations.

Data on the acquisition of K3 from 2021-2023 rubber tappers in Afdeling Zeelandia, can be seen in the table below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|

|  |
| --- |
| Table 1. Comparison of K3 of Tappers in 2021-2023 |

 |
| **No** | **Planting Years** | **Areal** | **K3** |
| **2021** | **2022** | **2023** |
| 1 | 1995 | 83,00 | 19,50 | 18,50 | 23,10 |
| 2 | 1996 | 47,84 | 20,40 | 20,10 | 23,80 |
| 3 | 1999 | 79,50 | 20,90 | 20,80 | 26,20 |
| 4 | 2009 | 20,00 | 20,10 | 19,90 | 23,40 |
| 5 | 2010 | 49,94 | 21,60 | 21,50 | 24,90 |
| **Total** | **280,28** | **20,70** | **20,40** | **24,40** |

Source: Afdeling Zeelandia, data processed in 2023

Refer to the data of the target and realization of rubber production based on the target of the Company's Work Plan and Budget for 2021-2023, the target K3 value obtained is at least 21%. However, in 2021 to 2022 this target cannot be achieved due to the habit of employees mixing latex with water. This can be seen from the acquisition of K3 which is less than 21%. Meanwhile, in 2023 there was an increase in the K3 value. This is an indication of the increasing performance of employees due to the reduction of the habit of mixing latex with water in the plantation. Based on the reasons described above, this study aims to test and analyze the influence of incentives, work environment and style on the performance of tapping employees at Adfeling Zeelandia.

**OVERVIEW**

**Performance**

According to Whitmore quoted by Hamzah & Nina (2014), performance is when someone carries out the task functions required of him. According to Whitmore, the work given to a person, no matter how small, must produce results. Therefore, Whitmore expressed the view that a person's performance represents the status of his responsibility for the success of his work. Employee performance is an important factor for an organization because good employee performance will bring success to the organization (Muchal, 2014).

**Incentives**

According to Nizemito (1996), incentives are additional income given to an employee whose performance is within a certain target. According to Pangabean (2002), incentives are rewards that link salary and productivity. Incentives are monetary rewards given to people who perform above set standards.

**Work Environment**

Yantika, Herlambang, & Rozzaid, (2018) explain that the work environment has a significant influence on employee performance. Creating a quality environment shows that an organization is successful. A poor work environment can cause a lack of enthusiasm at work, which in turn can lead to low employee performance.

**Leadership Style**

Setiana (2022) states that leadership style reflects the philosophy, skills, and attitudes of a leader in politics. Leadership style is a pattern of behavior that aims to combine organizational and personal goals to achieve certain goals. Apriyanto (2020) states that an effective leadership style is successful when the leader is able to apply a situational leadership style and is willing to respond selectively to the wishes of his subordinates and that it is possible and accountable. As described in the introduction, the framework can be described as follows:

H1

H2

H3

H4

Figure 1. Conceptual Framework Chart

**RESEARCH METHODS**

The type of research is quantitative research. It is used to search for data or information from the reality of existing problems with reference to proving concepts or theories and it also used to determine the relationship between research variables.

This research is located in Afdeling Zeelandia, Zeelandia Plantation, PT Perkebunan Nusantara I Regional 5 which is located in Suko Barat, Kramat Sukoharjo, Tanggul District, Jember Regency, East Java. This research was conducted in March-April 2024.

The population in this study was all employees of Afdeling Zeelandia tappers totaling 95 people. The sampling technique used is a saturated sample. According to Sugiyono (2017), saturated sampling method is a sampling method that uses all members of the population as samples.

The influence variables are incentives, work environment and leadership style while the variables that can be influenced are the performance of employees. Measurement of the variables studied using a Likert scale, with a measure of strongly disagree to strongly agree, scored 1-5 and all analysis using SPSS tools.

**RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

**Instrument Test**

**Validity Test**

Table 1. Validation Test

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Variables** | **No Item** | **rcount** | **rtable 5% (20)** | **Sig** | **Creteria** |
| Incentives (X1) | 1 | 0,667 | 0,2017 | 0,000 | Valid |
|  | 2 | 0,508 | 0,2017 | 0,000 | Valid |
|  | 3 | 0,392 | 0,2017 | 0,000 | Valid |
|  | 4 | 0,665 | 0,2017 | 0,000 | Valid |
|  | 5 | 0,345 | 0,2017 | 0,001 | Valid |
|  | 6 | 0,489 | 0,2017 | 0,000 | Valid |
|  | 7 | 0,539 | 0,2017 | 0,000 | Valid |
|  | 8 | 0,561 | 0,2017 | 0,000 | Valid |
|   |   |   |   |   |   |
| Work Environment (X2) | 1 | 0,643 | 0,2017 | 0,000 | Valid |
|  | 2 | 0,636 | 0,2017 | 0,000 | Valid |
|  | 3 | 0,658 | 0,2017 | 0,000 | Valid |
|  | 4 | 0,56 | 0,2017 | 0,000 | Valid |
|  | 5 | 0,595 | 0,2017 | 0,000 | Valid |
|  | 6 | 0,614 | 0,2017 | 0,000 | Valid |
|   |   |   |   |   |   |
| Leadership Style (X3) | 1 | 0,547 | 0,2017 | 0,000 | Valid |
|  | 2 | 0,719 | 0,2017 | 0,000 | Valid |
|  | 3 | 0,661 | 0,2017 | 0,000 | Valid |
|  | 4 | 0,581 | 0,2017 | 0,000 | Valid |
|  | 5 | 0,52 | 0,2017 | 0,000 | Valid |
|  | 6 | 0,526 | 0,2017 | 0,000 | Valid |
|  | 7 | 0,665 | 0,2017 | 0,000 | Valid |
|  | 8 | 0,665 | 0,2017 | 0,000 | Valid |
|  | 9 | 0,664 | 0,2017 | 0,000 | Valid |
|  | 10 | 0,319 | 0,2017 | 0,000 | Valid |
|   |   |   |   |   |   |
| Performance (Y) | 1 | 0,697 | 0,2017 | 0,000 | Valid |
|  | 2 | 0,69 | 0,2017 | 0,000 | Valid |
|  | 3 | 0,761 | 0,2017 | 0,000 | Valid |
|  | 4 | 0,726 | 0,2017 | 0,000 | Valid |
|  | 5 | 0,693 | 0,2017 | 0,000 | Valid |
|  | 6 | 0,618 | 0,2017 | 0,000 | Valid |
|  | 7 | 0,645 | 0,2017 | 0,000 | Valid |
|  | 8 | 0,618 | 0,2017 | 0,000 | Valid |

Sorce: Data processing 2024

Based on table 1, it is known that the value of r count of all research instruments exceeds the r table. This shows that the instrument used as a measuring tool meets the data validity requirements.

**Reliability Test**

Table 2. Reliability Test

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| No Item | Variabel | Cronbach Alpha | Kreteria |
| 1 | Incentives | 0,610 | Reliabel |
| 2 | Work Environment | 0,675 | Reliabel |
| 3 | Leadership Style | 0,792 | Reliabel |
| 4 | Performance | 0,834 | Reliabel |

Sorce: Data processing 2024

From the table above, it can be concluded that the data obtained from the respondent's answer questionnaire relating to all variables are consistent and reliable.

**Classical Assumption Test**

**Normality Test**

|  |
| --- |
| Table 3. Normality Test **One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test** |
|  | Unstandardized Residual |
| N | 95 |
| Normal Parametersa,b | Mean | .0000000 |
| Std. Deviation | 1.57162071 |
| Most Extreme Differences | Absolute | .129 |
| Positive | .121 |
| Negative | -.129 |
| Test Statistic | .129 |
| Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed) | **.001c** |
| a. Test distribution is Normal. |
| b. Calculated from data. |
| c. Lilliefors Significance Correction. |

Based on the table 3, it can be seen that the residual values are not normally distributed. This can be proven by the Asymp, sig value of 0.001 <0.05 sig value. Because the normality test results in this study are not normally distributed, it is necessary to test using the Monte Carlo method. The Monte Carlo test aims to determine whether the residual data is normally distributed or not from a research sample whose data is too extreme. The following are the results of the normality test with the Monte Carlo test.

|  |
| --- |
| Table 4. Monte Carlo Test **One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test** |
|  | Unstandardized Residual |
| N | 95 |
| Normal Parametersa,b | Mean | .0000000 |
| Std. Deviation | 1.57162071 |
| Most Extreme Differences | Absolute | .129 |
| Positive | .121 |
| Negative | -.129 |
| Test Statistic | .129 |
| Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed) | .001c |
| Monte Carlo Sig. (2-tailed) | Sig. | **.080d** |
| 99% Confidence Interval | Lower Bound | .073 |
| Upper Bound | .087 |
| a. Test distribution is Normal. |
| b. Calculated from data. |
| c. Lilliefors Significance Correction. |
| d. Based on 10000 sampled tables with starting seed 299883525. |

After the Monte Carlo test in table 4, it is obtained that the residual value in this study is normally distributed. This can be proven that the significant value which was originally 0.001 after the Monte Carlo test increased to 0.08.

**Multicollinearity Test**

Table 5. Multicollinearity Test

|  |
| --- |
| **Coefficientsa** |
| Model | Unstandardized Coefficients | Standardized Coefficients | t | Sig. | Collinearity Statistics |
| B | Std. Error | Beta | Tolerance | VIF |
| 1 | (Constant) | 1.739 | 3.426 |  | .508 | .613 |  |  |
| Incentives | .006 | .117 | .005 | .055 | .956 | **.555** | **1.801** |
| Work Environment | .778 | .143 | .527 | 5.453 | .000 | **.453** | **2.206** |
| Leadership Style | .291 | .092 | .312 | 3.147 | .002 | **.432** | **2.315** |
| a. Dependent Variable: Performance |

Based on table 5, it can be concluded that the data in this study do not have multicollinearity problems. This can be proven by assessing the Tolerance of each variable greater than the tolerance value of 0.1. And can be reviewed by assessing the VIF of each variable, which is less than the Variance Inflaction Factor (VIF) of 10.

**Autocorrelation Test**

Table 6. Autocorrelation Test

|  |
| --- |
| **Model Summaryb** |
| Model | R | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate | Durbin-Watson |
| 1 | .784a | .614 | .601 | 1.597 | **1.890** |
| a. Predictors: (Constant), Leadership Style, Incentives, Work Environment |
| b. Dependent Variable: Performance |

Table 7. Durbin-Watson Test

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| dw | dl | du | 4-dl | 4-du |
| 1,890 | 1,6015 | 1,7316 | 2,3985 | 2,2684 |

After getting a dw value of 1, 890 from the Durbin-Watson Test, it also gets a dl value of 1.6015 and a du value of 1.7316 from the Durbin Watson table and proves that the du value of 1.7316 is smaller than the dw value of 1.859 which is smaller than the 4-du value of 2.2684, it can be concluded that the data in this study do not have autocorrelation problems where there is no positive and negative autocorrelation.

**Heteroscedasticity Test**

Table 8. Heteroscedasticity Test

|  |
| --- |
| **Coefficientsa** |
| Model | Unstandardized Coefficients | Standardized Coefficients | t | Sig. |
| B | Std. Error | Beta |
| 1 | (Constant) | 8.679 | 2.091 |  | 4.151 | **.000** |
| Incentives | .055 | .071 | .097 | .777 | **.439** |
| Work Environment | -.284 | .087 | -.450 | -3.255 | **.002** |
| Leadership Style | -.035 | .056 | -.087 | -.614 | **.541** |

From the results above, the sig. value of the Incentive variable (X1) and the Leadership Style variable (X3) is greater than 0.05, which means that no heteroscedasticity symptoms occur, while the Work Environment variable (X2) is smaller than 0.05, which means that heteroscedasticity symptoms occur. Seeing from these results, to ensure that the work environment variable is free from the hesteroskidacity test, the researchers re-tested using the White Test.

Table 9. White Test

|  |
| --- |
| **Model Summaryb** |
| Model | R | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate |
| 1 | .524a | **.274** | .197 | 3.78530 |
| a. Predictors: (Constant), X2X3, X1\_Kuadrat, Leadership Style, Work Environment, Incentives, X2\_Kuadrat, X3\_Kuadrat, X1X2, X1X3 |
| b. Dependent Variable: U2t |

This test criterion uses a significant level of 5% or 0.05 using the white test with SPSS 25 by finding the calculated c² value and c² table first. For the chi square value, it can be calculated using the formula, c² count = n x R square = 95× 0,274 = 26,03. Meanwhile, the chi square table value is obtained from the calculation, c² table / df = n-1 = 95 – 1 = 94 so that the chi square table value is at a value of 117,631.

The basis for decision making on the white test is if the calculated chi square value 26,03 is smaller (<) than the table chi square value 117,631, then it is certain that there is no heteroscedasticity problem.

**Multiple Linear Analysis**

Table 10. Multiple Linear Regression Test

|  |
| --- |
| **Coefficientsa** |
| Model | Unstandardized Coefficients | Standardized Coefficients | t | Sig. |
| B | Std. Error | Beta |
| 1 | (Constant) | **1.739** | 3.426 |  | .508 | .613 |
| Incentives | **.006** | .117 | .005 | .055 | .956 |
| Work Environment | **.778** | .143 | .527 | 5.453 | .000 |
| Leadership Style | **.291** | .092 | .312 | 3.147 | .002 |
| a. Dependent Variable: Perfomance |

**Y= 1.739 + 0.006 X1 + 0.778 X2 + 0.291 X3**

From the regression equation above, the conclusions that can be explained are as follows:

* + - 1. The constant value is 1.739 which means that without the variable incentives (X1), work environment (X2) and leadership style (X3), the amount of employee performance is positive or good.
			2. The regression coefficient value of the Incentive variable (X1) of 0.006 with a positive sign states that if the level of incentives increases, employee performance will increase assuming other independent variables are constant.
			3. The regression coefficient value of the Work Environment variable (X2) of 0.778 with a positive sign states that if the level of the Work Environment increases, employee performance will increase assuming other independent variables are constant.
			4. The regression coefficient value of the Leadership Style variable (X2) of 0.291 with a positive sign states that if the level of Work Environment increases, employee performance will increase, assuming other independent variables are constant.

**Partial Statistical t test**

Table 11. t Test

|  |
| --- |
| **Coefficientsa** |
| Model | Unstandardized Coefficients | Standardized Coefficients | t | Sig. |
| B | Std. Error | Beta |
| 1 | (Constant) | 1.739 | 3.426 |  | .508 | .613 |
| Incentives | .006 | .117 | .005 | **.055** | **.956** |
| Work Environment | .778 | .143 | .527 | **5.453** | **.000** |
| Leadership Style | .291 | .092 | .312 | **3.147** | **.002** |
| a. Dependent Variable: Performance |

The results obtained on the incentive variable with a calculated t value of 0.055 < 1.986 t table value and a significance of 0.956 > 0.05, it is stated that the incentive has an insignificant effect on employee performance, while the work environment variable obtained a calculated t value of 5.453 > 1.986 t table and a significance of 0.000 < 0.05, it is stated that the work environment has a positive effect on employee performance. Where to find the t table can use the formula, t table = (a/2; n-k-1) = (0,05/2; 95-3-1) = (0,025;91) = 1.986 (see the t table distribution)

From the output above, it can be concluded that the work environment variable is the most influential variable followed by the leadership style variable, while the incentive variable has no effect on employee performance.

**Simultaneous Statistical F Test**

The F test shows whether all independent variables have a joint influence on the dependent variable. To get the value of the F table can be calculated by the formula, F table = F (k; n - k) = F ( 3 ; 95 - 3) = F ( 3 ; 92 ) = 3,095

Table 12. F test

|  |
| --- |
| **ANOVAa** |
| Model | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
| 1 | Regression | 369.568 | 3 | 123.189 | **48.283** | **.000b** |
| Residual | 232.179 | 91 | 2.551 |  |  |
| Total | 601.747 | 94 |  |  |  |
| a. Dependent Variable: Performance |
| b. Predictors: (Constant), Leadership Style, Incentives, Work Environment |

Testing H3 with the F test based on the output above, it is known that the significance value for the effect of Incentives, Work Environment and Leadership Style simultaneously on Employee Performance is 0.000 <0.05 and the calculated F value is 48.283> 3.095, so it can be concluded that testing H3 is accepted which means Incentives, Work Environment and Leadership Style simultaneously on Employee Performance. From the above findings, it can be concluded that the model is accepted and all independent variables simultaneously have a significant impact on the dependent variable, it can also be explained that H3 is accepted.

**Coefficient of Determination (R2)**

Table 13. Results of the Coefficient of Determination

|  |
| --- |
| **Model Summaryb** |
| Model | R | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate |
| 1 | .784a | .614 | **.601** | 1.597 |
| a. Predictors: (Constant), Leadership Style, Incentives, Work Environment |
| b. Dependent Variable: Performance |

From the output above, the adjusted R Square value is 0.601, which means that the selection of incentive variables, work environment and leadership style from the model side is in a good category with the value obtained of 60.1% while the remaining 39.9% is influenced by other variables.

**RESULT AND DISCUSSION**

* + - 1. Based on the test results that have been carried out, the results show that partially incentives have an insignificant effect on employee performance, so H1 is rejected.

The low amount of incentives received has not significantly affected the tappers. One strategy recommendation to overcome this is to reduce the target of obtaining the percentage of the base so that it is expected that the amount of incentives received by tappers will be higher and can increase the motivation of tappers to achieve better work performance. This contradicts the results of research by Novalia (2016) and Fahreza (2020).

1. Based on the test results that have been carried out, the results state that partially the work environment has a positive and significant effect on employee performance, so H2 is accepted.

The work environment has the most dominant influencein this study indicating that the cleanliness of rubber plantation land and maintenance of production roads that are routinely carried out are very needed, so allocating funds to create a safe and comfortable work environment is necessary. The result of this study is in line with the research of Clara et al (2020), Ismail and Idham Cholid (2020), Sanjaya (2016) and Nuraini (2015).

1. Based on the test results that have been carried out, the results state that partially the leadership style has a positive and significant effect on employee performance, so H3 is accepted.

The significant influence of leadership style also proves that the establishment of a good relationship between leaders and employees can ultimately improve their performance. In this case, the democratic leadership style needs to be further developed in order to motivate the company's employees to be more creative so as to further improve their performance, without violating the existing rules in the company environment. The above views are in line with the results of research by Supardi (2022), Meta Clara (2020), Fernando (2020) and Sanjaya (2016).

1. The results of simultaneous hypothesis testing through the F test state that the variables of incentives, work environment and leadership style simultaneously have an influence on the performance of tapping employees in Afdeling Zeelandia, Zeelandia Plantation. Ho is rejected and Ha is accepted.

The company has appreciated every achievement of its employees' performance by giving incentives, paying attention to the comfort of the work environment and offering a leadership style that is able to protect employees both in terms of work and sometimes their personal problems. These results are in line with the results of Damayanto's research (2022).

**CONCLUSIONS**

The purpose of this study was to determine the effect of incentives, work environment and leadership style on employee performance. The overall results proved that all hypotheses were correctly established. Incentives were found to have an insignificant effect partially on employee performance; instead work environment and leadership style were found to have a significant effect partially. However, simultaneously the three variables have an influence on employee performance. In other words, an increase in incentives, work environment and leadership style will increase and improve the level of employee performance.

In addition, this study provides valuable insights to various stakeholders, especially policy makers and organizational leaders, and continues to highlight the policies implemented in the company that help improve the performance of employees. The scope of this study is limited to incentives, work environment and leadership style on employee performance. For further study, we recommend including multiple types of independent and dependent variables to conduct more diverse tests. Another limitation of the study is its focus on only one afdeling, thus limiting the generalizability of the results. Therefore, future surveys can be conducted with a larger number of respondents in a wider range of afdelings or companies to gain more comprehensive knowledge and a broader picture of the phenomenon under study.
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