

The Influence of Facilities, Competence and Work Motivation on the Performance of Sei Rumbiya Plantation Employees at PT Pp. London Sumatra Indonesia Tbk

Surya Darma ¹✉, Ingan Malem Tarigan ², Mangasi Sinurat ³, Chrisin Natalia Sianipar ⁴

^{1,2} Postgraduate Students of Bina Karya College of Economics,

^{3,4} Bina Karya College of Economics

Abstract

This study seeks to explore the extent to which workplace facilities, employee competence, and motivation influence employee performance at Sei Rumbiya Plantation, PT PP. London Sumatra Indonesia Tbk. Using a quantitative approach, the data were analyzed through multiple linear regression. The findings reveal that, partially, both facility and competence variables do not significantly affect employee performance, as indicated by t-values (0.021 and -2.497, respectively) being lower than the critical value. In contrast, motivation demonstrated a significant positive impact, with a t-value of 3.002. Simultaneously, all three variables collectively exert a significant influence on performance, although their overall contribution remains modest at 13.2%. The remaining 86.8% is attributed to other factors beyond the scope of this study. These results underscore the central role of intrinsic motivation in shaping productive, human-centered work environments and emphasize the need to look beyond physical and technical enablers when managing human resources in labor-intensive sectors.

Keywords: facility, competency, work_motivation, employee_performance

Copyright (c) 2025 Surya Darma

✉ Corresponding author :

Email Address : aminjaya.2011@gmail.com

INTRODUCTION

Every company has the primary goal of achieving high productivity and work efficiency. In the plantation industry, employee performance is a key factor in achieving these goals. Good performance not only impacts the achievement of company targets but also the well-being of employees. Therefore, it is crucial for companies to understand the factors that influence employee performance in order to create a more productive and conducive work environment.

Work facilities are one aspect that significantly impacts employee performance. Adequate facilities, such as good work equipment, a comfortable environment, and supporting infrastructure, can improve employee comfort at work. With adequate facilities, employees can work more efficiently and reduce the risk of fatigue and stress caused by an unsupportive work environment. Conversely, inadequate facilities can reduce employee motivation and performance, ultimately impacting overall company productivity. (Rahmah, 2021)

In addition to work facilities, employee competency is also a crucial factor in determining performance. Competence encompasses the skills, knowledge, and

experience an employee possesses in carrying out their duties. The higher an employee's competency, the greater their ability to complete work effectively and efficiently. Companies that provide training and development to employees can improve their competency, positively impacting both individual and overall organizational performance. (Sianipar et al., 2023)

Work motivation is another factor that influences employee performance. Motivation can originate from various aspects, both within the employee and from the work environment. Internal factors such as a sense of responsibility, job satisfaction, and personal goals can motivate someone to work harder. Meanwhile, external factors such as recognition, competitive salaries, and harmonious working relationships also play a role in boosting employee morale. High work motivation tends to increase employee enthusiasm in completing their work; conversely, low motivation can lead to decreased performance. (Sinurat et al., 2023)

In the pulse of an agribusiness company like PT PP London Sumatra Indonesia Tbk, particularly in its Sei Rumbiya Plantation operational unit, employee performance is the lifeblood that drives productivity and business continuity. Amidst the dynamic challenges of the plantation industry, ranging from market pressures and climate change to the need for operational efficiency, the role of human resources cannot be underestimated. Employees are not merely a means of production, but key actors determining the success of work processes in the field.

However, beneath the seemingly smooth flow of daily activities, a number of managerial concerns began to surface. Employee productivity showed inconsistencies. Several performance indicators were not meeting targets, error rates were increasing, and crop quality was inconsistent. This prompted management to reconsider whether these problems stemmed purely from external pressures, or whether there were internal organizational factors that had been overlooked.

One aspect that has begun to come under scrutiny is work facilities. Field workers in Sei Rumbiya generally work in quite challenging conditions. Road access is not always ideal, work transportation is inadequate, and the lack of supporting facilities such as rest rooms, washing facilities, or access to clean water in the plantation area slowly diminishes work enthusiasm. Those working on the front lines, carrying a heavy physical workload, often feel that their basic needs for work comfort are not fully met by the company. This raises an important question: to what extent are the work facilities provided contributing to improved or deteriorating employee performance? (Asnawi, 2019)

On the other hand, the individual competencies of workers are also a key focus. In the modern plantation world, especially those that have adopted data-driven quality and efficiency management systems, relying solely on a diligent workforce is no longer sufficient. Technical understanding, the ability to read agronomic situations, and mastery of tools and work procedures are required. Unfortunately, not all employees have adequate educational background or training to meet the demands of the times. The lack of continuous training and competency evaluation prevents optimal human resource development. This situation presents a classic dilemma in human resource management: is the company investing enough in developing its employees' capacity, or is it demanding too much without providing adequate training? (Cahya & Roostika, 2024)

Another crucial aspect is work motivation. In a demanding work environment like plantations, motivation is a key driving force. Motivation is fueled not only by material incentives but also by psychological factors such as appreciation, recognition, a sense of belonging, and a clear career path. However, reports from the field suggest a psychological void. Some employees feel their efforts are not properly appreciated, or that their contributions are not recognized by the organizational system. A lack of communication between management and workers also contributes to the situation. This is where work motivation becomes fragile and has the potential to undermine the spirit of achievement.

The three factors of facilities, competence, and motivation are not independent entities, but rather intertwined, forming a complete work ecosystem. When one element is compromised, the entire system is affected. For example, highly competent employees working with poor facilities and low motivation will not achieve optimal performance. Conversely, adequate facilities will be of little help if workers are untrained and unmotivated.

The problems encountered at the Sei Rumbiya Plantation illustrate the complexity of the relationships between these variables. It is in this context that this research becomes crucial. It seeks to answer a fundamental question: to what extent do facilities, competency, and work motivation influence employee performance on this plantation? This knowledge will provide the company with a foundation for formulating a more equitable, efficient, and sustainability-oriented human resource management strategy.

PT PP. London Sumatra Indonesia Tbk, specifically the Sei Rumbiya Plantation, is a large-scale plantation company. As a company that relies on its workforce to manage its operations, employee performance is a crucial aspect to consider. In recent years, the company has continuously strived to improve employee productivity through various strategies, including providing better facilities, training to improve competencies, and various programs to motivate employees. However, the effectiveness of these various factors on employee performance still requires in-depth analysis.

Based on this background, this study aims to analyze the influence of facilities, competence, and work motivation on employee performance at the Sei Rumbiya Plantation at PT PP. London Sumatra Indonesia Tbk. The results of this study are expected to provide a clearer picture of the most influential factors and provide recommendations for the company in improving employee performance.

Ranupandjojo and Husnan (in Rifai'i, 2019) state that work facilities are a type of explicit service provided to employees to support performance, satisfy employee needs, and improve work efficiency. (Arita & Agustin, 2022)

Work facilities are everything provided by a company to support the smooth, comfortable, and effective functioning of employees in carrying out their duties. These facilities can range from physical facilities such as workspaces, desks, chairs, computers, and production equipment to non-physical facilities such as flexible work policies, health benefits, and training programs. (M Haqqi An Nazili Lubis, Ahmad Kholil, 2023)

When work facilities are adequate, employees can work more comfortably, focused, and productively. Conversely, inadequate facilities can hinder performance, make work feel more difficult, and even decrease motivation. Therefore, companies

seeking to increase employee productivity need to ensure that the facilities provided meet their needs and support work efficiency. (Khaeruman et al., 2021)

So, work facilities are anything in the form of tools and infrastructure that can help facilitate an activity or task. (Asnawi, 2019)

Competence can be described as a combination of skills, knowledge, and attributes that produce work/tasks to established standards. Competence is a demonstrable set of characteristics and skills that enable and enhance the efficiency of job performance. Competence is not a skill, although similar to learned skills, whereas competence is an inherent quality of an individual. It encompasses skills, knowledge, and abilities. During job interviews and assessments, competencies are used as benchmarks by assessors to evaluate candidates.

Spencer & Spencer, as stated by Ruky (2003), define competence as "an underlying characteristic of an individual that is casually related to criterion-referenced effective and/or superior performance in a job or situation." (Maswanto et al., 2022)

A person can be considered competent if they possess five skills synergistically and comprehensively: task skills, task management skills, contingency skills, job/role environment skills, and transferable skills. Understanding the components and dimensions of competency as outlined above is crucial, particularly in relation to the design and implementation of competency-based training and competency certification. (Maswanto et al., 2022)

Motivation is the primary driving force that drives individuals to take action and achieve their goals. In the business world, motivation plays a crucial role in organizational success. (Dianti, 2017)

Motivation is a phenomenon involved in stimulating action toward a specific goal after there was previously little or no movement toward it. Motivation is the effort to increase or initiate movement toward a specific goal. (Dewi, 2023)

Motivation is a desire within an individual that stimulates them to take action. (Noviarita, 2016)

Thus, motivation in this study is a strong desire to achieve success in work, characterized by self-actualization efforts, a concern for excellence, and optimal task execution based on rational calculations. Indicators of self-actualization are dedication, responsibility, independence, self-confidence, and personal satisfaction.

The term "performance" is a translation of the English word "work performance" or "job performance," but in English it is often shortened to simply "performance." (Ahiri et al., 2023)

The work results achieved by an individual in fulfilling their responsibilities constitute the definition of performance. The level of success an individual achieves in carrying out their overall tasks over a specific period is also referred to as performance. The completion of tasks and responsibilities by a group of people within an organization can also be referred to as performance (Silaen et al., 2021) . Employee performance is defined as the quality and quantity of obligations completed responsibly. (Kinerja et al., 2022)

According to Riniwati (2016), performance is the process of a person's behavior in carrying out work that produces an idea or product in achieving the goals they are working on (Rivaldo, 2022) . According to Mangkunegara (2013:67), performance is

the work results in terms of quality and quantity achieved by an employee in carrying out their duties according to the responsibilities given to them. (Sianipar et al., 2022)

So, performance is a process where human resources/individuals carry out work that can produce a product, whether goods or services, to achieve a goal.

METHODOLOGY

This study employed a quantitative research method, aiming to determine the influence between the independent and dependent variables. Data were collected through questionnaires distributed to employees of PT PP London Sumatra Indonesia Tbk. This method was used because it is suitable for testing causal relationships between the variables studied.

The population in this study was all 1,246 employees working at PT PP. London Sumatra Indonesia Tbk. The sampling technique used in this study was random sampling. Thus, the sample in this study consisted of 93 employees. The data analysis used in this study was quantitative analysis using the SPSS method. Hypothesis testing used in this study was multiple linear regression analysis, partial test (t-test), simultaneous test (F-test), and coefficient of determination (R^2).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Multiple Linear Regression Analysis

The results of the multiple linear regression analysis can be seen in the table below:

Table 1
Coefficients^a

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	41,237	9,049		4,557	,000
	Facility	,003	,134	,002	,021	,983
	Competence	-,354	,142	-,258	-2,497	,014
	Motivation	,412	,137	,300	3,002	,003

a. *Dependent Variable: Performance*

The multiple linear regression equation obtained is as follows:

$$Y = 41.237 + 0.003 X_1 - 0.354 X_2 + 0.412 X_3$$

1. Constant (a) = 41.237 shows a constant value, where if the independent variable = 0 then the dependent variable = 41.237, meaning that if facilities, competence and motivation do not exist then performance will still have a value of 41.237.
2. The regression coefficient of the facility variable (X_1) = 0.003 shows that facilities have a positive effect on performance, so that if facilities are increased by 1 unit, performance will increase by 0.003.
3. The regression coefficient of the competency variable (X_2) = -0.354 shows that price has a negative effect on performance, so that if competency is increased by 1 unit, performance will decrease by 0.354.

- The regression coefficient of the motivation variable (X_3) = 0.412 shows that motivation has a positive effect on performance, so that if motivation is increased by 1 unit, performance will increase by 0.412.

Partial Hypothesis Test (t-Test)

In the *Coefficients a table*, the calculated t value is also obtained. The calculated t value is then compared with the t table value at $\alpha = 0.1$. The t table value in df (nk) where n is the number of samples and k is the number of variables, both independent and dependent variables, then $93-4 = 89$. In df 89 with $\alpha = 0.1$ the t table value is 1.662.

The calculated t value of the facility variable (X_1) is 0.021, thus the calculated $t < t$ table, so H_0 is accepted and H_1 is rejected, which means that the facility variable (X_1) does not have a significant influence on performance.

The calculated t value of the competency variable (X_2) is -2.497, thus the calculated $t < t$ table, so H_0 is accepted and H_1 is rejected, which means that the competency variable (X_2) does not have a significant influence on performance.

The calculated t value of the motivation variable (X_3) is 3.002, thus the calculated $t > t$ table, so H_0 is rejected and H_1 is accepted, which means that the motivation variable (X_3) has a significant influence on performance.

Simultaneous Test (F Test)

ANOVA, or analysis of variance, is a test of regression coefficients simultaneously (F-test) to test the significance of the influence of several independent variables on the dependent variable. The results of the F-test can be seen in the following table:

Table 2

		ANOVA ^b				
Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	200,463	3	66,821	4,520	,005 ^b
	Residual	1315,860	89	14,785		
	Total	1516,323	92			

a. Predictors: (Constant), Facilities, Competence, Motivation

b. Dependent Variable: Performance

In the Anova^b table, the calculated F value was 4.520, while the F table value was 4.84. Thus, the calculated $F > F$ table means that the variables of motivation, facilities and competence together have a positive and significant effect on performance.

Coefficient of Determination Test (R^2)

The coefficient of determination (R^2) of the regression results can be seen in the table below:

Table 3

Model Summary^b

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Standard Error of the Estimate
1	0.364 ^a	0.132	0.103	3,845

- a. *Predictors: (Constant), Facilities, Competence, and Motivation*
- b. *Dependent Variable : Performance*

The coefficient of determination (R^2) value of the regression results is 0.132, meaning that the variables of facilities, competence and motivation contribute to the influence on performance. of 13.2%. This result is the result of ($R^2 \times 100\%$), while the remaining 86.8% is influenced by other variables not examined in this study.

CONCLUSION

From the research results that have been discussed by processing and questionnaires and using several tests, the following conclusions can be drawn: Partially, the calculated t value of the facility variable (X_1) is 0.021, thus $t_{count} < t_{table}$, then H_0 is accepted and H_1 is rejected which means that the facility variable (X_1) does not have a significant influence on performance. The calculated t value of the competency variable (X_2) is -2.497, thus $t_{count} < t_{table}$, then H_0 is accepted and H_1 is rejected which means that the competency variable (X_2) does not have a significant influence on performance. While the calculated t value of the motivation variable (X_3) is 3.002, thus $t_{count} > t_{table}$, then H_0 is rejected and H_1 is accepted which means that the motivation variable (X_3) has a significant influence on performance. Simultaneously, the facility variable (X_1), competency variable (X_2), and motivation variable (X_3) have a significant influence on performance. This means that the hypothesis in this study is accepted, as evidenced by the calculated F value $> F_{table}$ ($4.520 > 4.84$). The facility variable (X_1), competency variable (X_2), and motivation variable (X_3) contributed 13.2% to the influence on performance, while the remaining 86.8% was influenced by other variables not examined in this study.

References :

- Ahiri, H., Hajjali, I., Serang, S., & Nurhayati Azis, S. (2023). The Influence of Locus of Control, Self-Esteem, and Job Satisfaction on the Performance of Employees at the Regional Office of the Directorate General of Taxes in South, West, and Southeast Sulawesi. *YUME : Journal of Management* , 6 (1), 575–598.
- Arita, S., & Agustin, F. (2022). The Influence of Work Facilities and Workload on Employee Work Motivation. *EcoGen* , 5 (4), 544–554. <http://ejournal.unp.ac.id/students/index.php/pek/index>
- Asnawi. (2019). *Employee Performance of Limited Liability Companies: A Case Study of the Influence of Work Facilities and Job Characteristics* (pp. 1–63).
- Cahya, FAD, & Roostika, RRR (2024). SALES AND CUSTOMER ENGAGEMENT AT JIMEA | *MEA Scientific Journal (Management, Economics, and Accounting)* . 8 (1), 2321–2345.
- Dewi, NS (2023). *Motivation Theory* . January .
- Dianti, Y. (2017). Management and Motivation. In *Angewandte Chemie International Edition*, 6(11), 951–952. (Issue May 2024). <http://repo.iain-tulungagung.ac.id/5510/5/BAB2.pdf>
- Khaeruman, Marnisasah, L., Idrus, S., Irawati, L., Farradia, Y., Erwantiningsih, E., Hartatik, Supatmin, Yuliana, Aisyah, N., Natan, N., Widayanto, Mutinda Teguh, & Ismawati. (2021). Improving Human Resource Performance Concepts & Case Studies. In *Bookchapter Performance*, M., Sari, DP, Sianipar, CN, Irene, E., & Tampubolon, S. (2022). *At KSP CU. Prosper Together* . 1 , 22–28.
- M Haqqi An Nazili Lubis, Ahmad Kholil, Awn (2023). *Studia Economica : Studia Economica Journal of Islamic Economics : Journal of Islamic Economics*. *Studia Economica : Journal of Islamic Economics* , 9 (2), 124–136.

- Maswanto, Suhendar, S., Prayitno, I., & Ahmad, G. (2022). *Human Resource Management* . 1-122.
- Noviarita, H. (2016). Motivation and Work Discipline. In *Research Report* (Issue May, pp. 31-48). <http://etd.lib.metu.edu.tr/upload/12620012/index.pdf>
- Rahmah, E. (2021). *Collection Management Textbook* .
- Rivaldo, Y. (2022). Improving Employee Performance. *Eureka Media Aksara* , 1-90.
- Sianipar, CN, Nursaimatussaddiya, N., & Suhadinda, D. (2023). Analysis of Employee Performance Assessment Implementation at PT Deco 100 Supermarket Indrapura. *Economic Development Progress* , 2 (2), 109-114. <https://doi.org/10.70021/edp.v2i2.92>
- Sianipar, CN, Tampubolon, EIS, & Bersama, M. (2022). Effect of Communication, Discipline, and Work Environment on Employee Performance at Ksp Cu. Makmur Bersama. *JOEL :Journal of Educational and Language Research* , 8721 , 1041-1050.
- Silaen, NR, Syamsuriansyah, S., Chairunnisah, R., Sari, MR, Mahriani, E., Tanjung, R., Triwardhani, D., Haerany, A., Masyruoh, A., & Satriawan, DG (2021). *Employee Performance* .
- Sinurat, H., Sihombing, NS, Sinaga, S., Gaol, JL, & Sinurat, M. (2023). The Effect of Democratic Leadership Style, Work Status, Compensation, and Work Environment on Employee Performance. *International Journal of Advances in Social Sciences and Humanities* , 2 (1), 58-64. <https://doi.org/10.56225/ijassh.v2i1.155>