

Factors Affecting Employee Performance in North Maluku

Rahmatia Husen¹, Abd. Wahab Hasyim², Marwan³

Khairun University^{1,2,3}

Jl. Pertamina Kampus II Gambesi, Maluku Utara 97719, Indonesia

Corresponding Author: rahmatiahusen19@gmail.com

ARTICLE INFORMATION

Publication information

Research article

HOW TO CITE

Husen, R., Hasyim, A. W., & Marwan, M. (2021). Factors affecting employee performance in North Maluku. *International Journal of Applied Business and International Management*, 9(2), 303-318.

DOI:

<https://doi.org/10.32535/ijabim.v9i2.3465>

Copyright @ 2024 owned by Author(s).

Published by IJABIM



This is an open-access article.

License:

the Creative Commons Attribution-Non Commercial 4.0 International (CC BY-NC-SA 4.0)

Received: 18 June 2024

Accepted: 21 July 2024

Published: 20 August 2024

ABSTRACT

This study investigates the factors that influence employee performance, namely personal factors, leadership, co-worker factors, work facilities, and work environment. This study uses a quantitative explanatory approach with primary data obtained from a survey with a questionnaire. The population in this study were all employees in North Maluku Province. The sample in the study came from two agencies, namely the Communication, Informatics, and Code Agency and the Transportation Agency of North Maluku Province, totaling 103 people. The data analysis technique used multiple regression with the help of SPSS software. The findings indicate that personal factors and leadership positively influence employee performance, with improved individual attributes and effective leadership leading to enhanced performance outcomes. Conversely, the presence of a larger number of co-workers was found to negatively affect performance, potentially due to role ambiguity and reduced accountability. Additionally, work facilities and the work environment did not significantly impact employee performance. The results emphasize the importance of focusing on personal and leadership development to boost employee effectiveness while addressing co-worker dynamics to maintain clear roles and responsibilities. Future research should further investigate these relationships to refine strategies for organizational performance improvement.

Keywords: Co-workers; Employee Performance; Individual Factors; Leadership; Work Environment; Work Facilities

INTRODUCTION

In a dynamic and competitive era like today, employee performance is not only an indicator of productivity but also a main pillar that determines the competitiveness and survival of an organization (Jabid et al., 2023). The success of an organization depends not only on financial and technological aspects but also on the abilities and dedication of the individuals who are its backbone (Buamonabot et al., 2023). Employee performance has a significant impact on various aspects of organizational success (Imam et al., 2022). First of all, optimal performance contributes directly to productivity. In a bureaucratic environment that continues to grow and is competitive, the role of employee performance is not only limited to fulfilling routine tasks, but also determines the quality, productivity, and innovation that support organizational growth (Hasnin et al., 2022). Therefore, understanding the factors that influence employee performance is key to designing an effective management strategy for organizational sustainability (Arilaha et al., 2020).

Armstrong and Baron (1998) said that there are five factors that can affect employee performance, namely personal factors, leadership factors, co-worker factors, work facilities, and environmental factors. The relationship will show effective performance if the interaction between the five factors increases, and vice versa the relationship will show negative performance if the interaction between the five factors decreases. Improving employee performance is the focus of attention in developing quality and professionalism because this is a demand in overcoming various employee problems by improving work capabilities. Employees play a key role in the success of the organization. If employees clearly understand what is expected of them and get the support they need, contributing to the organization efficiently and productively, understanding of goals, motivation, and self-esteem will increase.

However, the reality in the field shows that in answering the problems of the Communication, Informatics, and Cryptography Service and the Transportation Service, including the very low Electronic-Based Government System Index to support bureaucratic reform and the still insufficient number of Regional Government electronic systems that have implemented information security management principles, productive employees are needed. However, in its implementation, there are employees who are less than optimal or tend to be less productive. This can be seen from the existence of several administrative tasks that are not completed on time, such as making letters that are made for two days or more. In fact, if we pay attention to the context of the letter, it should have been made in just two hours or a maximum of one working day. Another reality found is that employees of the communication and information service in particular and the North Maluku provincial government in general with five working days from noon to evening, mostly only on Monday and Wednesday are seen in the office, while on other days they leave the office. Thus, it appears that employee performance can be said to be less than optimal in carrying out employee duties.

In research on factors influencing employee performance, results have been notably inconsistent. Vanjery (2016) and subsequent studies by Qalati et al. (2022) and Tian et al. (2020) indicate a positive effect of leadership style on employee performance. Conversely, Yanti et al. (2022) reported no significant impact of leadership style on performance. Regarding personal factors, Al-Kharabsheh et al. (2022) and Darmawan and Warmika (2016) both found that motivation and other personal attributes significantly influence performance levels.

Research on work facilities and the work environment also presents mixed findings. Anam & Rahardja (2017) and Mbazor (2021) found that both work facilities and the work environment positively impact employee performance. In contrast, Hayati (2014) and

Khan et al. (2011) observed that work facilities either negatively affect or have no significant impact on performance. Similarly, while Arilaha et al. (2020) found a significant positive relationship between the work environment and performance, Norianggono et al. (2014) and Zulher et al. (2022) reported no significant effect. Additionally, peer support is identified as a performance determinant by Prameswari & Evasari (2023), yet Firmansyah and Ariani (2023) did not find confirmation of this relationship. These inconsistencies highlight the need for further investigation to better understand the complex dynamics affecting employee performance.

In response to the identified gaps and inconsistencies in the existing literature, the researcher is motivated to investigate the factors that influence employee performance within the Communication, Informatics, and Cryptography Service and the Transportation Service of North Maluku Province. This research draws on the framework proposed by Armstrong and Baron (1998), which provides a comprehensive perspective on performance management and its key determinants. Armstrong and Baron's model offers valuable insights into how various factors, including leadership, personal attributes, work environment, and facilities, influence employee performance. By applying this framework, the researcher aims to address the specific challenges faced by these services and contribute to a more nuanced understanding of employee performance dynamics in these contexts.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Performance

According to Wibowo (2016), performance is the implementation of a plan that has been prepared which is carried out by human resources who have the ability. Soeprihanto (2000) said that the performance or achievement of an employee is basically the result of an employee's work during a certain period of time compared to various possibilities such as standards/targets or criteria that have been determined and agreed upon in advance. Prawirosentono (1999) emphasized that performance is the result of work that can be achieved by a person or group of people in an organization in accordance with their respective authorities and responsibilities in an effort to achieve the goals of the organization concerned legally, without violating the law and in accordance with morals and ethics. In this regard, employee performance is the extent to which an employee is able to make objective, independent assessments and is able to provide constructive follow-up suggestions for programs/activities/sub-activities for the implementation of government (Zuama et al., 2023).

Personal Factors

Personal factors can be interpreted as efforts that encompass various aspects of a person's personality (Yadewani, 2023). These factors are intrinsic to individuals and differentiate one person from another in their work performance (Mangkunegara, 2011). According to Sumarwan (2011), personal factors include characteristics originating from within the employee, such as motivation, hereditary influences, basic individual skills, and other influencing factors. Additionally, Lamb et al. (2019) describe personal factors as a means of collecting and grouping the consistency of an individual's reactions to situations, highlighting how these characteristics impact employee behavior and lead to differences between individuals. Robbins and Judge (2012) further define personal characteristics as a way of perceiving and interpreting attributes such as age, gender, and education level. Understanding individual differences, including attitudes, perceptions, and abilities, helps managers explain variations in performance levels. Each individual is distinct, possessing a unique identity (Wikantiyoso et al., 2021), and continuously engages in self-actualization to discover and develop their identity.

Leadership

Leadership can be interpreted as the ability or intelligence to encourage, lead, and direct a number of people or two or more people to work together in carrying out activities that are directed at common goals, in terms of fostering, directing, and moving (Fahri et al., 2021). The leadership factor plays an important role in boosting employee performance (Hermawan et al., 2022). Employees can work well if the leader can provide guidance and instructions on good work procedures to employees. Leaders can give awards to employees who excel and establish good relationships between leaders and employees, both official relationships and personal relationships, and the existence of leadership supervision of employees who are working. Pfiffner (2013) defines leadership as the art of coordinating and encouraging individuals or groups to achieve the desired goals. Another opinion about that was put forward by Robbins and Judge (2017) who define it as an update of various temperaments that enable someone to encourage others to complete their tasks.

Co-worker

Co-worker support is generally defined as the willingness and actions of employees to assist each other, including being empathetic, caring, friendly, appreciative, respectful, supportive, and cooperative, and helping with work-related tasks (Attiq et al., 2017; Delali et al., 2024). Akgunduz and Eryilmaz (2018) further describe co-worker support as the willingness of colleagues to help one another with tasks, characterized by caring, friendliness, warmth, empathy, cooperation, avoiding gossip, appreciation, respect, and support in both daily tasks and challenging work situations. Co-worker support is considered a valuable resource that enhances employees' psychological resilience, competence levels, and facilitates frequent social interactions, contributing to positive attitudes toward work (Rastogi, 2019). In a supportive work environment, employees assist one another, fostering feelings of loyalty and belonging that promote affective commitment (Limpanitgul et al., 2017). Co-workers shape the workplace environment and significantly impact employees' attitudes and well-being (De Clercq et al., 2020).

Work Facilities

Work facilities are a crucial factor in supporting employee performance. According to Sedarmayanti (2014), work facilities include all tools and materials used, the environment in which someone works, work methods, and both individual and group work arrangements. In agreement with Sedarmayanti, Jamaluddin (2024) also explains that work facilities encompass the means and infrastructure needed to help employees complete their tasks more efficiently, thereby improving their performance. Munawirsyah (2017) further defines work facilities as everything used, worn, occupied, and enjoyed by employees, both directly related to their work and necessary for its smooth execution. Siagian (2017) emphasizes that adequate work facilities and infrastructure are essential for achieving high work performance, which cannot be realized without proper facilities and infrastructure. Good equipment should be sufficient in quantity and should be efficient, effective, and practical in its use (Bastian, 2001). Equipment is considered sufficient if it matches the work volume or the number of workers (Nurlaila et al., 2024). Therefore, in this study, work facilities refer specifically to equipment directly related to operations, such as office equipment and office buildings.

Work Environment

The success of government organizations in running the government is highly dependent on how much environmental support they receive. Robbins and Judge (2012) define the environment as everything outside the boundaries of the organization. A positive work environment has many benefits for both employees and employers (Tripathi & Kalia, 2024). For employees, it means going to work every day where well-being and performance count. It entails having managers who take the time to help employees with

their personal and professional development. It promotes loyalty and good working relationships in a safe and enjoyable environment (Kundu & Lata, 2017). The organizational environment consists of the forces or institutions that surround an organization and impact its performance, operations, and resources. It includes all elements that exist outside the boundaries of the organization and have the potential to affect part or all of the organization (Ladwig, 2022). The environment includes the immediate work environment, namely the attitudes and actions of colleagues and supervisors and the climate they create. The immediate environment, especially supervisors, greatly influences employee motivation and performance by being role models and instructions through rewards and sanctions ranging from praise, wage increases, promotions, criticism, demotions, and dismissals (Stoner, 1982).

Hypotheses Development

The Influence of Individual Factors on Employee Performance

Humans, as a combination of body and soul, constitute a whole entity known as an individual (Nawawi & Hadari, 2006). Each person possesses a unique identity, which differentiates them from others. Psychologically, a well-functioning individual is characterized by a high level of integrity between their mental and physical functions. This high level of integrity facilitates strong self-concentration and focus on tasks (Mangkunegara, 2011). When individuals lack concentration, it becomes challenging for leaders to expect them to work productively toward achieving organizational goals.

The ability to concentrate at work is significantly influenced by personal attributes such as skills, motivation, and commitment to the organization. Research by Darmawan and Warmika (2016) supports this view, showing that personal factors have a substantial impact on employee performance. Given these insights, it is essential to consider how individual characteristics shape work outcomes. Thus, the following hypothesis is formulated:

H1: The better the personal factor, the better the employee performance.

The Influence of Leadership on Employee Performance

Pfiffner (2013) defined leadership as the art of coordinating and inspiring individuals or groups to achieve set goals. Effective leadership involves not only directing and organizing but also motivating subordinates through quality encouragement, guidance, and support. A leader who possesses both authority and the ability to influence behavior plays a crucial role in fostering a work environment where employees are more likely to exhibit spontaneous obedience and commitment. This ability to motivate and guide is essential for enhancing employee performance and achieving organizational objectives.

Supporting this view, research by Qalati et al. (2022), Tian et al. (2020), and Vanjery (2016) underscores the importance of leadership in determining employee performance. Their studies reveal that strong leadership is a key factor in influencing employee productivity and engagement. Leaders who effectively communicate expectations, provide support, and recognize achievements contribute significantly to improved performance outcomes.

Based on these insights, it is clear that leadership is a dominant factor in shaping employee performance and fostering a positive work environment. Therefore, the following hypothesis is proposed:

H2: The better the leadership, the better the employee performance.

The Influence of Co-workers on Employee Performance

In today's dynamic work environment, the demand for high-quality output has never been more pronounced. This trend places increasing pressure on employees to enhance their performance and fosters a greater need for effective teamwork to achieve superior results in both service delivery and production. A work team, or task force, is defined as a group of individuals with specialized skills who collaborate and interact toward achieving shared goals (Ilyas, 2003). The concept of work teams is integral in modern organizational structures, where synergy and collective effort are critical for success.

Research by Prameswari and Evasari (2023) supports the notion that positive and significant relationships between co-workers are crucial for improving employee performance. Their study highlights that effective teamwork can lead to increased job satisfaction, enhanced problem-solving abilities, and greater overall productivity. Moreover, when team members support one another and work cohesively, it creates a more harmonious and productive work environment. This collaborative approach not only boosts individual performance but also contributes to achieving organizational goals more efficiently.

Additionally, studies have shown that a supportive work environment and strong interpersonal relationships among team members can lead to better communication, reduced conflict, and increased morale, all of which are essential for maintaining high-performance levels. Therefore, fostering a culture of collaboration and mutual support within work teams is vital for organizations aiming to improve employee performance and achieve operational excellence. Based on this comprehensive understanding, the following hypothesis is proposed:

H3: The better the team factor, the better the employee performance.

The Influence of Work Facilities on Employee Performance

Work facilities are vital in enhancing employee performance (Nurlaila et al., 2024). When employees are not performing at their full potential, it is crucial to assess whether their work facilities are adequate. This assessment should verify that employees have access to the necessary tools, equipment, materials, and supplies required to perform their tasks effectively. According to Bastian (2001), effective work facilities must be sufficient in quantity and also meet criteria of efficiency, effectiveness, and practicality in their usage.

Further supporting this, research by Anam & Rahardja (2017) and Mbazor (2021) highlights that both work facilities and the overall work environment positively impact employee performance. These studies demonstrate that well-maintained and appropriately provided work facilities contribute significantly to employee productivity and effectiveness. Building on these findings, the following hypothesis is proposed:

H4: The better the work facilities, the better the employee performance.

The Influence of the Work Environment on Employee Performance

Research by Stahlhofen et al. (2024) underscores the significant impact of the work environment on relationships among co-workers, emphasizing that a positive work environment fosters peace and satisfaction at work. Conversely, disharmony and inconsistency within the work environment can lead to discomfort, thereby diminishing overall job satisfaction and performance. Discrepancies in character, nature, and behavior among employees often create a discordant work environment, which can substantially hinder both employee performance and productivity. This view is further corroborated by Arilaha et al. (2020), who similarly found that the work environment has

a substantial effect on employee performance. Building on these findings, the following hypothesis is proposed:

H5: The better the work environment factors, the better the employee performance.

RESEARCH METHOD

This study uses a quantitative explanatory approach with primary data obtained from distributing questionnaires. The population in this study were all employees at the Communication, Informatics, and Cryptography Service and the Transportation Service of North Maluku Province with a total of 103 respondents. Validity testing uses product-moment correlation \geq with a significance value of 0.05, while reliability testing uses Cronbach alpha \geq 0.06 (Ghozali, 2018; Jabid et al., 2021). The data analysis technique uses multiple regression with the help of SPSS software.

The research questionnaire used in this study was sourced from previous studies, such as personal and leadership factors adopted from Darmawan & Warmika (2016) and Susanti & Siahaan (2017) with the number of questions from the two variables being 10 and 13 items. Furthermore, co-workers and work facilities are adapted from research by Anggara (2021) and Faisal (2005) with a total number of questions from both variables amounting to 6 questions each. Finally, the work environment and performance are sourced from Islam et al. (2024) with a total number of questions measuring both variables amounting to 4 and 10 questions.

RESULTS

The results of the questionnaire distribution revealed that out of 114 questionnaires distributed, 107 were returned, resulting in a response rate of 93.86%. Of these, 103 questionnaires were deemed valid and eligible for analysis, representing 90.35% of the total distributed. These valid responses were used to test the hypotheses of the study.

Table 1. Respondents' Demographic Profile

Item	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Gender		
Male	69	67
Female	34	33
Age		
21-30	2	1.9
31-40	38	36.9
41-50	41	39.8
> 51	22	21.4
Length of Work		
< 5	12	11.7
6-10	16	15.5
11-15	26	25.2
16-20	15	14.6
>20	34	33
Total	103	100

Source: Processed Data (2024)

The characteristics analyzed in the questionnaire for this study include gender, age, and length of service. The results indicate that the majority of respondents were male, comprising 67% of the sample. The average age group of respondents was between 41 and 50 years, accounting for 39.8% of the participants. Additionally, 33% of the

respondents had over 20 years of work experience. These demographic details are summarized in Table 1.

Table 2. Descriptive Statistics Example (N =103)

Construct	Min.	Max.	M	SD
Leadership	1.89	5.00	3.74	0.65
Personal Factor	2.86	5.00	4.07	0.40
Work Environment	3.00	4.75	4.32	0.58
Work Colleague	3.00	4.67	3.72	0.45
Work Facilities	2.33	5.00	3.98	0.51
Performance	2.00	5.00	4.08	0.54

Note. M = Mean, SD = Standard Deviation.

Table 2 presents the average scores for various variables affecting employee performance. The leadership variable has a high average score of 3.74, indicating that respondents generally agree that effective leadership significantly enhances employee performance. The personal factors variable also shows a high average score of 4.07, suggesting that respondents believe individual attributes such as ability, skills, motivation, and commitment substantially impact their work concentration and overall performance. Similarly, the work environment variable has a high average score of 4.32, reflecting the consensus among respondents that a supportive work environment is crucial for optimal performance. The work facilities variable also scores relatively high at 3.98, indicating that adequate work facilities are recognized as an important factor in supporting employee performance. The coworker support variable has an average score of 3.72, suggesting that while coworker support is valued, it may have a less pronounced impact compared to other factors. Finally, the performance variable itself shows a high average score of 4.08, indicating that respondents perceive their performance to be strong. These findings collectively highlight the significant role of leadership, personal factors, work environment, and work facilities in enhancing employee performance, while coworker support plays a somewhat lesser but still relevant role.

Table 3. Validity and Reliability Test Results

Variable	Item	Validity		Reliability
		r-count	Sig	Cronbach Alpha
Personal Factor	PFr1.1	0.779	0.000	0.836
	PFr1.2	0.676		
	PFr1.3	0.749		
	PFr1.4	0.769		
	PFr1.5	0.702		
	PFr1.6	0.627		
	PFr1.7	0.749		
Leadership	Lp2.2	0.716	0.000	0.884
	Lp2.3	0.698		
	Lp2.4	0.783		
	Lp2.5	0.733		
	Lp2.6	0.754		
	Lp2.7	0.822		
	Lp2.8	0.645		
	Lp2.9	0.628		
	Lp2.10	0.765		
Co-worker	Cr3.1	0.974	0.000	0.922
	Cr3.2	0.979		
	Cr3.3	0.674		

	Cr3.5	0.941		
	Cr3.6	0.761		
Work Facilities	Wfs4.1	0.754	0.000	0.637
	Wfs4.2	0.814		
	Wfs4.3	0.533		
	Wfs4.4	0.508		
	Wfs4.5	0.531		
Work Environment	WEt5.1	0.974	0.000	0.873
	WEt5.2	0.976		
	WEt5.3	0.714		
	WEt5.4	0.759		
Performance	Kn2	0.673	0.000	0.783
	Kn3	0.632		
	Kn4	0.786		
	Kn5	0.762		
	Kn6	0.733		
	Kn7	0.608		

Source: Processed Data (2024)

Based on the validity and reliability tests presented in Table 3, it is evident that all studied variables—Personal Factors, Leadership, Co-workers, Work Facilities, and Performance—were evaluated in two stages. The work environment variable was tested in only one stage. This approach was necessary because several question items from each variable did not meet the minimum significance threshold of 0.05 and had to be excluded. The specific question items removed include X1.8, X1.9, X1.10, X2.1, X2.11, X2.12, X2.13, X3.4, X4.6, Y1, Y8, Y9, and Y10. Following the removal of these items, the remaining questions for each variable exhibited significance values above 0.05, confirming their validity. Subsequently, the validity of these items was assessed through reliability testing using Cronbach's alpha. The results showed that all variables achieved Cronbach's alpha values exceeding 0.60, indicating satisfactory reliability.

Table 4. Multiple Regression Results

Variable	Coefficient Regression	t	Sig.
(Constant)	0.472	0.945	0.347
Personal Factor	0.385	4.847	0.000
Leadership	1.083	16.725	0.000
Co-worker	-0.219	-2.390	0.019
Work Facilities	0.062	1.105	0.272
Work Environment	0.021	0.357	0.722
F		59.742	0.000
R Square	0.755		
Adjust R Square	0.742		

Source: Processed Data (2024)

Based on the results presented in Table 4, the partial t-test outcomes reveal several key findings. Hypothesis 1 is supported, with a significance (Sig) value of 0.000, which is below the 0.05 threshold, indicating a significant effect. Hypothesis 2 is similarly accepted, as the t-test yields a Sig value of 0.000, also below 0.05. In contrast, Hypothesis 3 presents an opposing result. It shows a t-test value of -2.390 with a Sig value below 0.05, suggesting a significant but negative effect. Conversely, Hypothesis 4 is not supported by the data, as the partial t-test reveals a Sig value of 0.272, which exceeds the 0.05 significance level. Hypothesis 5 also fails to be confirmed, with a Sig value of 0.722, which is well above the 0.05 threshold. Finally, the F-test results indicate a value of 59.742 with a probability (Sig) value of 0.000, which is less than 0.05. This

supports the acceptance of the alternative hypothesis (H_a), demonstrating that individual factors, leadership, co-workers, work facilities, and the work environment collectively have a significant impact on employee performance.

Table 5. Results of the Determination Coefficient Test

Model	R	R. Square	Adjust R. Square	Std. Error
1	0.476	0.869	0.742	0.28490

Source: Processed Data (2024)

Based on the results presented in Table 5, the determination test reveals an Adjusted R Square value of 0.742. This indicates that the combined variables of Individual Factors, Leadership, Co-workers, Work Facilities, and Work Environment account for 74.2% of the variance in Employee Performance. The remaining 25.8% of the variance is attributable to other factors not included in this study. This high R Square value underscores the significant influence that the studied variables have on employee performance while acknowledging that additional factors may also contribute to performance outcomes.

DISCUSSION

Personal Factors and Employee Performance

The results of this study indicate that individual factors, also referred to as personal factors, have a positive impact on employee performance. Specifically, as individual factors increase, employee performance also improves, whereas lower individual factors are associated with diminished performance. These findings align with the research of Al-Kharabsheh et al. (2022) and Darmawan & Warmika (2016), which emphasize the significance of individual factors in shaping employee work behavior and performance. The results underscore the importance of understanding and addressing personal factors as they play a crucial role in influencing how employees perform their tasks and contribute to organizational goals. Recognizing and enhancing individual factors can, therefore, be a key strategy for improving overall employee performance.

Leadership and Employee Performance

The results of this study reveal that leadership has a positive effect on employee performance, indicating that higher leadership quality is associated with improved employee performance. This finding aligns with Pfiffner's research (2013), which posits that effective leaders motivate their subordinates, demonstrate rational decision-making, and exhibit initiative, intelligence, and problem-solving abilities—all of which contribute to enhanced performance. Furthermore, the results are consistent with the research of Qalati et al. (2022), Tian et al. (2020), and Vanjery (2016), which highlight the strong connection between leadership and employee performance. These studies reinforce the notion that leadership plays a crucial role in boosting employee performance, emphasizing that effective leadership is essential for achieving organizational success and fostering a productive work environment.

Co-worker and Employee Performance

The results of this study indicate that co-worker factors have a negative impact on employee performance, suggesting that an increase in the number of co-workers is associated with a decrease in individual employee performance. Organizations often use work teams to address various challenges, aiming to reduce work time, cycle time, service errors, and to enhance service quality through collaboration. The quality of employee performance can be influenced by the support and dynamics among co-workers, as team-based support plays a critical role (Ilyas, 2003). These findings are consistent with Hayati (2014) who argues that a larger team size can lead to increased

mutual expectations among team members, potentially resulting in diminished performance. This highlights the complexity of team dynamics and suggests that while collaboration is essential, excessive team size might hinder individual performance due to increased interdependencies and expectations.

Work Facilities and Employee Performance

Based on the results of hypothesis testing in this study, it was found that the work facility variable does not significantly impact employee performance. This suggests that the presence or quality of work facilities alone does not guarantee effective employee performance. The findings align with research by Khan et al. (2011), which demonstrated that office infrastructure does not have a significant empirical effect on performance. However, this conclusion contrasts with the findings of Anam and Rahardja (2017) and Mbazor (2021), who argued that improved office equipment—characterized by adequate quantity, efficiency, effectiveness, and practicality—can enhance employee performance. This discrepancy highlights the need for a nuanced understanding of how different aspects of work facilities influence performance, suggesting that while basic infrastructure may not directly affect performance, the quality and usability of office equipment might still play a role.

Work Environment and Employee Performance

The results of the hypothesis testing in this study indicate that the work environment does not significantly affect employee performance. This suggests that variations in the work environment, whether positive or negative, do not necessarily influence how well employees perform their tasks. These findings are consistent with the research conducted by Norianggono et al. (2014) and Zulher et al. (2022), which also found that the work environment does not significantly improve employee performance. Therefore, it can be concluded that while the work environment encompasses all elements surrounding an organization—both directly and indirectly—it does not play a substantial role in enhancing employee performance or achieving organizational goals. This underscores the importance of focusing on other factors that may more directly impact employee performance.

CONCLUSION

Based on the hypothesis testing related to employee performance at the Communication, Informatics, and Cryptography Service and the Transportation Service of North Maluku Province, the study reveals several important findings. Personal factors have a positive effect on employee performance; as individual attributes and characteristics improve, so does the performance of employees. This underscores the significance of personal qualities in driving effective work outcomes. Similarly, leadership also plays a crucial role in enhancing employee performance. Effective leadership is associated with improved performance, highlighting its importance in motivating and guiding employees.

In contrast, the study found that the presence of co-workers negatively impacts employee performance. An increased number of co-workers in a position appears to correlate with reduced performance, possibly due to factors such as role confusion or diminished personal accountability. Additionally, work facilities and the work environment were found to have no significant effect on employee performance. Variations in the quality or quantity of work facilities and changes in the work environment do not substantially influence employee performance, suggesting that other factors are more critical in determining work outcomes.

The implications of this research underscore the critical role of personal factors and leadership in driving employee performance. The findings suggest that investing in the development of personal attributes and leadership skills can significantly enhance employee effectiveness. Organizations should prioritize training and development programs that focus on improving these areas to foster a more productive and motivated workforce.

Conversely, the negative impact of having a large number of co-workers in a position highlights the potential challenges of role clarity and individual accountability. It is important for organizations to address these issues by clearly defining roles and responsibilities, ensuring that employees have a clear understanding of their tasks and the expected contributions to prevent role confusion and enhance performance.

The lack of significant impact from work facilities and the work environment suggests that while these factors are important, they may not be as influential on performance as personal and leadership qualities. Organizations should therefore consider focusing their efforts on strengthening personal and leadership development rather than solely investing in physical resources or changes in the work environment.

Overall, these findings suggest that enhancing personal and leadership capabilities should be a primary focus for improving employee performance, while also addressing co-worker dynamics to maintain accountability and clarity. Future research could explore further the nuanced interactions between these factors and their impact on performance to develop more targeted strategies for organizational improvement.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The authors would like to thank the Postgraduate Program Management, Universitas Khairun for their support in this research.

DECLARATION OF CONFLICTING INTERESTS

The authors declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and or publication of this article.

REFERENCES

- Akgunduz, Y., & Eryilmaz, G. (2018). Does turnover intention mediate the effects of job insecurity and co-worker support on social loafing? *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 68, 41–49. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2017.09.010>
- Al-Kharabsheh, S. A., Attiany, M. S., Alshawabkeh, R. O. K., Hamadneh, S., & Alshurideh, M. T. (2022). The impact of digital HRM on employee performance through employee motivation. *International Journal of Data and Network Science*, 7(1), 275–282.
- Anam, K., & Rahardja, E. (2017). Pengaruh fasilitas kerja, lingkungan kerja non fisik dan kepuasan kerja terhadap kinerja karyawan (studi pada pegawai Dinas Perindustrian dan Perdagangan Provinsi Jawa Tengah) [The influence of work facilities, non-physical work environment and job satisfaction on employee performance (study on employees of the Central Java Province Industry and Trade Service)]. *Diponegoro Journal of Management*, 6(4), 502–512.
- Anggara, M. F. (2021). *Pengaruh Hubungan Kerja dan Motivasi Kerja terhadap Kinerja Karyawan PT. Toba Pulp Lestari* [The Influence of Work Relationship and Work Motivation on Employee Performance at PT. Toba Pulp Lestari] [Undergraduate thesis, Pembangunan Panca Budi University]. https://eprints.pancabudi.ac.id/id/eprint/1031/1/MUHAMMAD_FIQRI.pdf
- Arilaha, M. A., Fahri, J., Jabid, A. W., & Buamonabot, I. (2020, March). Motivation,

- physical work environment, non-physical work environment, and work satisfaction (Study on the Government of Ternate City). In *5th International Conference on Food, Agriculture and Natural Resources (FANRes 2019)* (pp. 419-423). Atlantis Press. <https://doi.org/10.2991/aer.k.200325.084>
- Armstrong, M., & Baron, A. (1998). *Performance Management: The New Realities*. Institute of Personnel and Development.
- Attig, S., Wahid, S., Javaid, N., & Kanwal, M. (2017). The impact of employees' core self-evaluation personality trait, management support, co-worker support on job satisfaction, and innovative work behaviour. *Pakistan Journal of Psychological Research*, 32(1), 247–271.
- Bastian, B. (2001). *Evaluasi Kinerja Sumber Daya Manusia [Human Resources Performance Evaluation]*. Remaja Rosdakarya.
- Buamonabot, I., Rajak, A., & Zulkifli, Z. (2023). Organizational communication as an effort to improve managerial performance, quality of work-life and job satisfaction. *International Journal of Communication and Society*, 5(1), 72–80. <https://doi.org/10.31763/ijcs.v5i1.623>
- Darmawan, I. M. Y., & Warmika, I. G. T. (2016). Pengaruh norma subjektif, personal attitude, perceived behavior control, dan aspek psikologis terhadap minat wirausaha (entrepreneurial intention) [The influence of subjective norms, personal attitudes, perceived behavioral control, and psychological aspects on entrepreneurial intention]. *Jurnal Manajemen Unud*, 5(7), 4660–4689.
- De Clercq, D., Azeem, M. U., Haq, I. U., & Bouckennooghe, D. (2020). The stress-reducing effect of co-worker support on turnover intentions: Moderation by political ineptness and despotic leadership. *Journal of Business Research*, 111, 12–24. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2020.01.064>
- Delali, D. I., Owusu, M. P., Antwi, F. A., & Swanzy-Krah, P. (2024). Co-worker support and affective commitment during a global crisis: evidence from an emerging economy. *Cogent Business & Management*, 11(1), 1–19. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311975.2023.2298225>
- Fahri, J., Alting, H., Syahdan, R., Asril Arilaha, M., & Buamonabot, I. (2021, August). Paternalistic leadership, perceived organizational politics, and job satisfaction: mediation and moderation model. In *Proceedings of the 11th International Conference on Information Communication and Management* (pp. 52-58). <https://doi.org/10.1145/3484399.3484407>
- Faisal, F. (2005). *Pengaruh Insentif dan Fasilitas Kerja terhadap Produktivitas Kerja [The Influence of Incentives and Work Facilities on Work Productivity]*. Universitas Gadjah Mada.
- Firmansyah, M., & Ariani, D. W. (2023). Pengaruh gaya kepemimpinan transformasional, dukungan rekan kerja dan motivasi terhadap kinerja karyawan PT. Gawi Maju Karsa Site Purworejo [The influence of transformational leadership style, co-worker support and motivation on employee performance at PT. Gawi Maju Karsa Site Purworejo]. *Lentera: Multidisciplinary Studies*, 2(1), 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.57096/lentera.v2i1.29>
- Ghozali, I. (2018). *Aplikasi Analisis Multivariete Dengan Program IBM SPSS 23 [Multivariate Analysis Application With IBM SPSS 23 Program]*. Badan Penerbit Universitas Diponegoro.
- Hasnin, M., Muhammad, M., & Buamonabot, I. (2022). Decentralization and managerial performance: Mediated budget participation. *The Winners*, 23(2), 173–180. <https://doi.org/10.21512/tw.v23i2.8164>
- Hayati, W. F. (2014). Pengaruh motivasi, lingkungan kerja dan fasilitas terhadap kinerja karyawan PT. Radio Suara Singgalang Mahimbau (Radio Sushi FM) Padang [The influence of motivation, work environment and facilities on employee performance at PT. Radio Suara Singgalang Mahimbua (Radio Sushi FM) Padang]. *Jurnal Online Universitas Tamansiswa Padang*, 1–13.

- Hermawan, I., Suharnomo, S., Sartono, S., & Hindrawati, G. (2022). Determining the role of leadership on creative performance by implementing synergized-team consolidation. *International Journal of Applied Business and International Management*, 7(2), 14–29. <https://doi.org/10.32535/ijabim.v7i2.1545>
- Ilyas, Y. (2003). *Kiat Sukses Manajemen Tim Kerja [Tips for Successful Work Team Management]*. PT Gramedia Pustaka Utama.
- Imam, M. T., Zulkifli, Z., & Buamonabot, I. (2022). Organizational culture and job satisfaction: Performance as a mediation variable. *Society*, 10(2), 695–705. <https://doi.org/10.33019/society.v10i2.439>
- Islam, M. A., Hack-Polay, D., Rahman, M., Hosen, M., Hunt, A., & Shafique, S. (2024). Work environment, HR practices and millennial employee retention in hospitality and tourism in Bangladesh. *International Journal of Emerging Markets*, 19(4), 846–867. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJOEM-06-2021-0859>
- Jabid, A. W., Buamonabot, I., Fahri, J., & Arilaha, M. A. (2021). Organizational politics and job satisfaction: Mediation and moderation of political skills. *Binus Business Review*, 12(1), 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.21512/bbr.v12i1.6226>
- Jabid, A. W., Syahdan, R., Fahri, J., & Buamonabot, I. (2023). The role of receiving technology on employee performance: Job satisfaction as mediation. *Journal of Indonesian Economy and Business*, 38(3), 229–253.
- Jamaluddin, J. (2024). The influence of work facilities and incentives on employee performance at the Majene Regency Environment and Hygiene Service (DLHK). *Point of View Research Economic Development*, 5(1), 43–50.
- Khan, S. H., Azhar, Z., Parveen, S., Naeem, F., & Sohail, M. M. (2011). Exploring the impact of infrastructure, pay incentives, and workplace environment on employees performance (A case study of Sargodha University). *Asian Journal of Empirical Research*, 2(4), 118–140.
- Kundu, S. C., & Lata, K. (2017). Effects of supportive work environment on employee retention: Mediating role of organizational engagement. *International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, 25(4), 703–722. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJOA-12-2016-1100>
- Ladwig, R. C. (2022). Proposing the safe and brave space for organisational environment: Including trans* and gender diverse employees in institutional gender diversification. *Gender in Management*, 37(6), 751–762. <https://doi.org/10.1108/GM-06-2020-0199>
- Lamb, C. W., Hair, J. F., & McDaniel, C. (2019). *MKTG: Principles of Marketing* (1st ed.). Cengage Learning, Inc.
- Limpanitgul, T., Boonchoo, P., Kulviseachana, S., & Photiyarach, S. (2017). The relationship between empowerment and the three-component model of organisational commitment: An empirical study of Thai employees working in Thai and American airlines. *International Journal of Culture, Tourism and Hospitality Research*, 11(2), 227–242. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJCTHR-07-2015-0069>
- Mangkunegara, A. (2011). *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia [Human Resource Management]*. PT Remaja Rosdakarya.
- Mbazor, D. N. (2021). Influence of office facilities and work place environment on staffs' productivity in the university system. *Annals of the Faculty of Engineering Hunedoara*, 19(1), 43–50.
- Munawirsyah, I. (2017). The influence of job satisfaction and job facilities on work motivation and its impact on performance non-medical employees at Regional General Hospitals Subulussalam City. *Journal of Business Administration*, 6(1), 43–50.
- Nawawi, H., & Hadari, M. M. (2006). *Kepemimpinan yang Efektif [Effective Leadership]* (5th ed.). Gadjah Mada University Press.
- Norianggono, Y. C. P., Hamid, D., & Ruhana, I. (2014). Pengaruh lingkungan kerja fisik dan non fisik terhadap kinerja karyawan (studi pada karyawan PT. Telkomsel

- Area III Jawa-Bali Nusra di Surabaya) [The influence of physical and non-physical work environment on employee performance (study on employees of PT. Telkomsel Area III Java-Bali Nusra in Surabaya)]. *Jurnal Administrasi Bisnis*, 8(2), 1–10.
- Nurlaila, N., Asfiah, N., & Dewayani, E. K. U. (2024). The influence of work facilities, work-life balance and work discipline on employee performance with job satisfaction as an intervening. *Jurnal Manajemen, Kepemimpinan, dan Supervisi Pendidikan*, 9(2), 867–881. <https://doi.org/10.31851/jmksp.v9i2.15214>
- Pfiffner, J. P. (2013). The paradox of President Reagan's leadership. *Presidential Studies Quarterly*, 43(1), 81–100. <https://doi.org/10.1111/psq.12004>
- Prameswari, M. C., & Evasari, A. D. (2023). Co-worker support and communication impacting employee work discipline that affects employee performance. *Journal of Academic & Multidicipline Research*, 3(2), 23–30.
- Prawirosentono, S. (1999). *Kebijakan Kinerja Karyawan [Employee Performance Policy]*. BPFE.
- Qalati, S. A., Zafar, Z., Fan, M., Lim, L. S. A., & Khaskheli, M. B. (2022). Employee performance under transformational leadership and organizational citizenship behavior: A mediated model. *Heliyon*, 8(11), 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2022.e11374>
- Rastogi, M. (2019). Determinants of work engagement among nurses in Northeast India. *Journal of Health Management*, 21(4), 559–570. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0972063419868556>
- Robbins, S. P., & Judge, T. A. (2012). *Essentials of Organizational Behavior*. Pearson.
- Robbins, S. P., & Judge, T. A. (2017). *Organizational Behavior* (17th ed.). Pearson.
- Sedarmayanti, S. (2014). *Sumber Daya Manusia dan Produktivitas Kerja [Human Resources and Work Productivity]*. Mandar Maju.
- Siagian, S. P. (2017). *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia [Human Resource Management]*. Bumi Aksara.
- Soeprihanto, J. (2000). *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia II [Human Resource Management II]*. Universitas Terbuka Karunia.
- Stahlhofen, L., Hartung, J., Schilling, O., Wahl, H. W., & Hülür, G. (2024). The relevance of perceived work environment and work activities for personality trajectories in midlife. *Journal of Personality*, 92(1), 278–297. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jopy.12776>
- Stoner, J. F. (1982). *Management*. Prentice-Hall.
- Sumarwan, U. (2011). *Perilaku Konsumen Teori dan Penerapannya dalam Pemasaran [Consumer Behavior Theory and Its Application in Marketing]*. Ghalia Indonesia.
- Susanti, S., & Siahaan, F. B. (2017). Analisa pengaruh gaya kepemimpinan dan komunikasi terhadap kinerja karyawan menggunakan Metode Fuzzy Inference System pada PT. Bhandha Ghara Reksha [Analysis of the influence of leadership style and communication on employee performance using the Fuzzy Inference System Method at PT. Bhandha Ghara Reksha]. *Jurnal Teknik Komputer AMIK BSI*, 3(2), 12–19. <https://doi.org/10.31294/jtk.v3i2.1764>
- Tian, H., Iqbal, S., Akhtar, S., Qalati, S. A., Anwar, F., & Khan, M. A. S. (2020). The impact of transformational leadership on employee retention: mediation and moderation through organizational citizenship behavior and communication., 11, 314. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 11, 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.00314>
- Tripathi, A., & Kalia, P. (2024). Examining the effects of supportive work environment and organisational learning culture on organisational performance in information technology companies: The mediating role of learning agility and organisational innovation. *Innovation*, 26(2), 257–277. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14479338.2022.2116640>
- Vanjery, D. A. (2016). *Pengaruh Motivasi dan Gaya Kepemimpinan Terhadap Kinerja Pegawai Pada Biro Umum Sekretariat Jendral Kementerian Dalam Negeri [The*

Influence of Motivation and Leadership Style on Employee Performance at the General Bureau of the Secretariat General of the Ministry of Home Affairs]. Universitas Prof. Dr. Moestopo.

- Wibowo, W. (2016). *Manajemen Kinerja [Work Management]* (5th ed.). PT Raja Grafindo Persada.
- Wikantiyoso, B., Riyanti, B. P. D., & Suryani, A. O. (2021). A construction of entrepreneurial personality tests: Testing archetype personality inventory in entrepreneurship. *International Journal of Applied Business and International Management*, 6(1), 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.32535/ijabim.v6i1.1085>
- Yadewani, D. (2023). Pengaruh faktor personal dan faktor lingkungan keluarga terhadap minat berwirausaha mahasiswa STIA BNM Pariaman. *Jurnal Ekonomi Dan Bisnis*, 6(2), 116–122. <https://doi.org/10.37600/ekbi.v6i2.781>
- Yanti, R., Fikri, K., & Nofirda, F. A. (2022). Pengaruh gaya kepemimpinan dan kompetensi terhadap kinerja karyawan di PT. Felousa Trimedika Indonesia (studi kasus pada PT. Felousa Trimedika Indonesia) [The influence of leadership style and competence on employee performance at PT. Felousa Trimedika Indonesia (case study at PT. Felousa Trimedika Indonesia)]. *ECOUNTBIS: Economics, Accounting and Business Journal*, 2(2), 377–386.
- Zuama, M., Sudiarditha, I. K. R., & Wolor, C. W. (2023). Leadership Determination and Training Effectiveness on Employee Performance Through Work Motivation Mediation. *International Journal of Applied Business and International Management*, 8(1), 113–127. <https://doi.org/10.32535/ijabim.v8i1.2132>
- Zulher, Z., Norawati, S., Basem, Z., & Azmi, U. (2022). The impact of compensation and work environment on employee performance through job satisfaction. *ECo-Buss*, 5(2), 722–731. <https://doi.org/10.32877/eb.v5i2.613>