JOURNAL OF SOCIAL SCIENCE
Printed ISSN: 2720-9938
Electronic ISSN: 2721-5202
jsss.co.id

The Influence of Work Environment, Individual Characteristics, Communication and Work Discipline on Employee Performance at PT. Bank Negara Indonesia (Persero) Tbk. Jakarta City Area

Romalita Andarwati[1], Herry Krisnandi[2], Kumba Digdowiseiso[3*]
[1,2,3*] Program Studi Manajemen Fakultas Ekonomi dan Bisnis, Universitas Nasional, Indonesia
Email: [1]andarwatiromalita@yahoo.co.id, [2]hery_krisnandi@civitas.unas.ac.id, [3*]kumba.digdo@civitas.unas.ac.id

ABSTRACT
The purpose of this study was to determine the effect of work environment, individual characteristics, communication and work discipline on employee performance in PT. Bank Negara Indonesia (Persero) Tbk. Jakarta City Region. With a sample of 120 employees/respondents. Seals are obtained using the Probability Sampling technique, that is, the required information obtained from all elements has the opportunity to be selected as a sample. Hypothesis testing uses multiple linear regression analysis using SPSS version 24.0. The results showed that work environment, individual characteristics, communication and work discipline on employee performance.

Keywords: Work Environment, Individual Characteristics, Communication, Work Discipline, Employee Performance

INTRODUCTION

The success of a company is not always measured by how much money it has, but there are other things that are more important, namely Human Resources (HR) in the company. The better the quality of a company's employees, the higher the company's competitiveness against other companies. This is influenced by several factors, both from inside and outside the company, such as creating a conducive work environment, training individual characteristics, communication, and socializing company regulations.

According to (Mangkunegara, 2013) performance is the result of work in terms of quality and quantity achieved by an employee in carrying out his duties in accordance with the responsibilities he has been given. The work environment in an organization has an important meaning for the individuals who work in it, because this environment will

How to cite: Romalita Andarwati, Herry Krisnandi, Kumba Digdowiseiso (2024) The Influence of Work Environment, Individual Characteristics, Communication and Work Discipline on Employee Performance at PT. Bank Negara Indonesia (Persero) Tbk. Jakarta City Area, (5) 2. Doi:
E-ISSN: 2721-5202
Published by: CV. Syntax Corporation Indonesia

directly or indirectly influence the people within it (Permansari, 2013) . Differences in individual characteristics in companies will create different performance contributions as well, this can be caused by several things, such as according to (Hasibuan, 2011) that individual characteristics are a series of relatively fixed traits and are largely shaped by hereditary, social, cultural and environmental factors. According to Handoko (Wibowo, I

Putu A. H, 2013) said that establishing good communication between employees can lead to better performance thereby reducing the rate of decline in performance of company employees . Discipline is a form of training that seeks to improve and shape employees' knowledge of attitudes and behavior so that these employees voluntarily try to work cooperatively with other employees and improve their work performance (Siagian, 2013) .

The success achieved by PT. Bank Negara Indonesia (Persero) Tbk. In carrying out its main duties and functions, it is certainly greatly influenced by the success of its employees' performance. Whether an employee is successful or not at work will be known if the organization concerned implements a performance appraisal system. The performance appraisal system aims to increase the productivity of employees and companies. Human Resources are the main actors in every organizational activity because humans are always the planners, actors and determinants of achieving organizational goals. The following is the performance indicator data for 2017-2018 PT. Bank Negara Indonesia (Persero) Tbk. Jakarta City area.

Table 1. Employee Performance of PT. Bank Negara Indonesia (Persero) Tbk. Jakarta City Region 2017-2018 Period

No.	Performance Indicators	Target	Realization	
			2017	2018
1.	Performance Standard Achievement Value	100%	90%	85%
2.	Competitive HR Values	100%	80%	70%
3.	Job Performance Value	100%	85%	75%
Total Average			85%	76.67%

Source: PT. Bank Negara Indonesia (Persero) Tbk. Jakarta City area

Based on Table 1, it can be seen that the level of achievement of employee performance realization in 2017 reached 85%, but experienced a decline of 8.33% in 2018. These fluctuations are reflected in the variability of performance achievements, performance standard achievement values, competitive HR values, and achievement values Work. It is estimated that several activities have not been implemented properly according to planning, hampering the implementation of the goals and targets that have been set. Therefore, the aim of this research is to analyze the influence of the work environment, individual characteristics, communication and work discipline on the performance of PT employees. Bank Negara Indonesia (Persero) Tbk. Jakarta City area. This research aims to understand the factors that influence fluctuations in employee

performance and provide deeper insight regarding the influence of the work environment, individual characteristics, communication and work discipline on employee performance in the company.

RESEARCH METHOD

This research examines the performance of PT employees. Bank Negara Indonesia (Persero) Tbk. The Jakarta City area is influenced by the work environment, individual characteristics, communication and work discipline. Data was obtained through distributing questionnaires with a focus on these variables (Sugiyono, 2013) . The research uses descriptive analysis methods to describe the level of perception, as well as inferential analysis to analyze the relationship between variables (Umar, 2013) . Instrument testing involves validity and reliability testing using SPSS 23 (Sarjono, Haryadi., 2011) . Operational definition of variables and measurements (Priyanto, 2010) . Methods of analysis and hypothesis testing include multiple linear regression analysis, model feasibility testing with the coefficient of determination (R2) and F Annova test, as well as hypothesis testing with the t test. Classic assumption tests such as normality, autocorrelation, heteroscedasticity and multicollinearity were also carried out. The research results are expected to provide insight into the influence of work environment variables, individual characteristics, communication and work discipline on employee performance at PT. Bank Negara Indonesia (Persero) Tbk. Jakarta City area (Ghozali, 2011) .

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Research result

This section presents research results, starting from instrument test results, classical assumption tests, model feasibility tests, to hypothesis tests. **1. Instrument Test**

a. Validity test

On the occasion of this research, validity and reliability tests were carried out on a sample of 120 respondents. The validity test was carried out to test whether the proposed questionnaire items were suitable for use as an instrument in this research. In determining whether the proposed questionnaire is valid or not, the researcher uses the formulary criteria explained in the method in chapter III previously.

1) Work Environment (X1)

Below are the calculation results of the instrument validity test which consists of 6 (six) Work Environment variable questions (X1) using the SPSS 24.0 program. As a tool, for a sample of 120 respondents. So the following results are obtained:

Table 2. Validity Test Results for Work Environment Variable Instruments (X1)

Questionnaire	Rcount	Table	Information
Statement 1_X1	,306	0.179	Valid
Statement 2_X1	,786	0.179	Valid
Statement 3_X1	,770	0.179	Valid
Statement 4_X1	,779	0.179	Valid
Statement 5_X1	,644	0.179	Valid
Statement 6_X1	,444	0.179	Valid

Source: Primary Data spss 24 Output Item-Total Statistics. Processed 2020

Looking at the results of table 2 above, it can be explained that the output from data processing input into the SPSS 24.0 program as a calculation tool states that all the questionnaire items submitted have a Corrected Item Total Correlation value that is greater when compared to the r table in the N 120 sample, namely 0.179, which means that the overall rcount>rtable. From the output of the Validity Test, the largest coefficient value of the Work Environment Instrument (X1) is found in the second statement, namely 0.786 and the smallest value is found in the first statement, namely 0.306.

From the overall output results of the Instrument Validity Test on the Work Environment variable (X1), all the statement items submitted are declared valid, so that all statement items from the Work Environment variable (X1) can be submitted at the next stage, namely the Reliability Test, and can also be used to research on the entire sample of this study.

2) Individual Characteristics (X2)

The following are the results of the calculation of the instrument validity test which consists of 8 (eight) statement items for the Individual Characteristics variable (X2) using the SPSS 24.0 program on an initial sample or small sample of 120 respondents, so the following results were obtained.

Table 3. Instrument Validity Test Results for Individual Characteristic Variables (X2)

Questionnaire	Rcount	Table	Information
Statement 1_X2	,672	0.179	Valid
Statement 2_X2	,734	0.179	Valid
Statement 3_X2	,665	0.179	Valid
Statement 4_X2	,663	0.179	Valid
Statement 5_X2	,808	0.179	Valid
Statement 6_X2	,806	0.179	Valid
Statement 7_X2	,811	0.179	Valid
Statement 8_X2	,795	0.179	Valid

Source: Primary Data spss 24 Output Item-Total Statistics. Processed 2020

Looking at the results of table 3 above, it can be explained that the output from data processing inputted into the spss 24.0 program is that all the questionnaire items submitted have a Corrected Item Total Correlation that is greater when compared to the r table in the 120th N sample, namely 0.179, which means that whole rcount>rtable. From the output of the Validity Test, the largest coefficient value of the Individual Characteristics Variable Instrument (X2) is found in the fifth statement, namely 0.808. From the overall output results of the Instrument Validity Test on the Individual Characteristic Variable (X2), all of the submitted statement items are declared valid, so that all items from the Individual Characteristic Variable (X2) can be continued at the next stage, namely Reliability, and can also be used to research the entire sample. this research.

3) Communication

The following are the results of the calculation of the Instrument Validity Test which consists of 10 (ten) Communication Variable Statements (X3) using the SPSS 24.0 program, on a small sample of 120 respondents. So the following results are obtained.

Table 4. Validity Test Results for Communication Variable Instruments (X3)
Item-Total Statistics

Questionnaire	Rcount	Table	Information
Statement 1_X3	,875	0.179	Valid
Statement 2_X3	,837	0.179	Valid
Statement 3_X3	,854	0.179	Valid
Statement 4_X3	,860	0.179	Valid
Statement 5_X3	,755	0.179	Valid
Statement 6_X3	,681	0.179	Valid
Statement 7_X3	,709	0.179	Valid
Statement 8_X3	,718	0.179	Valid
Statement 9_X3	,769	0.179	Valid
Statement 10_X3	,760	0.179	Valid

Source: Primary Data spss 24 Output Item-Total Statistics. Processed 2020

Looking at the results of table 4 above, it can be explained that the output from data processing inputted into the spss 24.0 program is that all of the questionnaire items submitted have a Corrected Item Total Correlation that is greater when compared to the rtable in the 120th N sample, namely 0.179, which means that whole rcount>rtable. From the output of the Validity Test, the largest coefficient value of the Communication Variable Instrument (X3) is found in the first statement, namely 0.875 .

From the overall output results of the Instrument Validity Test on the Communication Variable (X3), all items of the statement submitted were declared valid, so that all items from the Communication Variable (X3) can be continued at the next stage, namely Reliability, and can also be used to research the entire sample of this research .

4) Work Discipline (X4)

The following are the results of the calculation of the Instrument Validity Test which consists of 8 (eight) Work Discipline variable statements (X4) using the SPSS 24.0 program, on a small sample of 120 respondents. So the following results are obtained.

Table 5. Validity Test Results of the Work Discipline Variable Instrument (X4)
Item-Total Statistics

Questionnaire	Rcount	Table	Information
Statement 1_X4	,820	0.179	Valid
Statement 2_X4	,856	0.179	Valid
Statement 3_X4	,847	0.179	Valid
Statement 4_X4	,869	0.179	Valid
Statement 5_X4	,763	0.179	Valid
Statement 6_X4	,808	0.179	Valid
Statement 7_X4	,467	0.179	Valid
Statement 8_X4	,350	0.179	Valid

Source: Primary Data spss 24 Output Item-Total Statistics. Processed 2020

Looking at the results of table 5 above, it can be explained that the output from data processing inputted into the SPSS 24.0 program is that all of the questionnaire items submitted have a Corrected Item Total Correlation that is greater when compared to

the r table in the 120th N sample, namely 0.179, which means that whole rcount>rtable. From the output of the Validity Test, the largest coefficient value of the Work Discipline Variable Instrument (X4) is found in the fourth statement, namely 0.869.

From the overall output results of the Instrument Validity Test on the Work Discipline Variable (X4), all the statement items submitted were declared valid, so that all items from the Work Discipline Variable (X4) can be continued at the next stage, namely Reliability, and can also be used to research the entire sample. this research.

5) Employee Performance (Y)

The following are the results of the calculation of the Instrument Validity Test which consists of 8 (eight) Employee Performance (Y) variable statements using the SPSS 24.0 program, on a small sample of 120 respondents. So the following results are obtained.

Table 6. Employee Performance Variable Instrument Validity Test Results (Y) Item-Total Statistics

Questionnaire	Rcount	Table	Information
Statement 1_Y	,646	0.179	Valid
Statement 2_Y	,730	0.179	Valid
Statement 3_Y	,580	0.179	Valid
Statement 4_Y	,627	0.179	Valid
Statement 5_Y	,843	0.179	Valid
Statement 6_Y	,820	0.179	Valid
Statement 7_Y	,748	0.179	Valid
Statement 8_Y	,784	0.179	Valid

Source: Primary Data spss 24 Output Item-Total Statistics. Processed 2020

Looking at the results of table 6 above, it can be explained that the output from data processing inputted into the spss 24.0 program is that all the questionnaire items submitted have a Corrected Item Total Correlation that is greater when compared to the rtable in the 120th N sample, namely 0.179, which means that whole rcount>rtable. From the output of the Validity Test, the largest coefficient value of the Employee Performance Variable Instrument (X4) is found in the sixth statement, namely 0.829 . From the overall output results of the Instrument Validity Test on the Employee Performance Variable (X4), all of the submitted statement items are declared valid, so that all items from the Employee Performance Variable (X4) can be continued at the next stage, namely Reliability, and can also be used to research the entire sample. this research.

b. Reliability Test

The reliability test is used to determine the consistency of the measuring instrument, whether the measuring instrument can be relied on for further use. After carrying out the Validity Test and obtaining valid statement items, a reliability test was then carried out. In this study, the questionnaire was said to be reliable if the Cronbach Alpha coefficient value was >0.6 or more. The results of the Reliability Test are presented in the table below.

Table 7 Instrument Reliability Test Results for Each Variable

No.	Variable	Reability	Alpha	Information
1.	Work Environment (X1)	0.904	0.6	Reliable

2.	Individual Characteristics (X2)	0.854	0.6	Reliable
3.	Communication (X3)	0.905	0.6	Reliable
4.	Work Discipline (X4)	0.872	0.6	Reliable
5.	Employee Performance (Y)	0.853	0.6	Reliable

Source: SPSS Data 24. Output Reliability. Processed 2020

From the output of data processing carried out with the SPSS 24.0 program as a calculation tool, the values shown in table 7 above, it can be said that all the questionnaire items used to measure all the variables in this research are said to be Valid and Reliable. What is shown in the Cronbach's alpha value is that all variables have a value level above good, namely above 0.8. This means that all variable values are said to be good and acceptable because they are above the poor level and even the results are good, which is shown in the Reliability statistical output, where all Cronbach's alpha values for all variables are above the good level.

2. Inferential Analysis

Inferential analysis is an analysis that emphasizes the influence of independent variables and dependent variables by conducting hypothesis tests and concluding hypothesis results.

a. Multiple Linear Regression Analysis

Multiple linear regression analysis is a form of analysis that discusses the influence of the independent variable (X) on the dependent variable (Y). Where the independent variables are Work Environment (X1), Individual Characteristics (X2), Communication (X3), and Work Discipline (X4) and the dependent variable is Employee Performance (Y).

In calculating the regression coefficient in this study, the SPSS program was used. The output results are Table 10 as follows.

Table 8. Multiple Linear Regression Output on Work Environment, Individual Characteristics, Communication, and Work Discipline on Employee Performance

Coefficients [a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients B	Unstandardized Coefficients Std. Error	Standardized Coefficients Beta	t	Sig.
1	(Constant)	6,147	1,378		4,462	,000
	X1	,308	.071	,207	4,321	,000
	X2	,316	,044	,457	7,167	,000
	X3	,086	,029	.138	2,937	,004
	X4	,201	,043	,255	4,638	,000

a. Dependent Variable: Y

Source: SPSS Output 24. Coefficients, linear regression. Processed 2020

From the output of table 8 above, the multiple linear regression coefficients are output . Based on the linear regression equation, it is:

Y=6.147 + 0.308 (X1) + 0.316 (X2) + 0.086 (X3) + 0.201 (X4)

Information: Y= Employee Performance
X1= Work Environment
X2= Individual Characteristics
X3= Communication
X4= Work Discipline

Based on the equation above, the researcher explains that. (Constant) = 6.147 explains that if the Work Environment, Individual Characteristics, Communication and Work Discipline have a constant value, then the Employee Performance value is 6.147. **The Work Environment regression coefficient** (β1X1) = 0.308 explains, if Individual Characteristics, Communication and Work Discipline are assumed to be constant, then every 1 point increase in the Work Environment will affect Employee Performance by 0.308.

The coefficient of work environment and employee performance is positive 0.308. This means that the influence is positive even though the value is not too big, if the percentage is 30.8 %. Because every 1 point increase in the work environment will definitely have an impact on employee performance.

Individual Characteristics regression coefficient (β2X2) = 0.316 means, if Communication, Work Discipline and Work Environment are assumed to be constant values, then every 1 point increase in Individual Characteristics will affect Employee Performance by 0.316.

The coefficient of individual characteristics and employee performance is positive 0.316. This means that even though the influence is positive, it is only of small value, if the percentage is only 31.6 %. Because every 1 point increase in the Individual Characteristics variable will have an impact on Employee Performance. Amounting to 31.6 %.

The Communication regression coefficient (β3X3) = 0.086 explains that, if Work Discipline, Work Environment and Individual Characteristics are assumed to be constant, then every 1 point increase in Communication will affect Employee Performance by 0.086.

The Communication Coefficient with Employee Performance is positive 0.086. This means that it does have a positive effect even though it only has a small value, and as a percentage it is only 8.6 % . Because every 1 point increase in the Communication variable will have an automatic impact on employee performance of 8.6 % .

Work Discipline regression coefficient (β4X4) = 0.201 means, if the Work Environment, Individual Characteristics, and Communication are assumed to be constant, then every 1 point increase in Work Discipline will affect Employee Performance by 0.201.

The coefficient of work discipline and employee performance is positive 0.201. This means that the positive effect is quite large compared to the Communication variable, and if the percentage is 20.1 %. Because every 1 point increase in the Work Discipline variable will have a regression impact of 20.1 %.

Of all the existing Independent variables, namely Individual Characteristics, Communication, and Work Discipline, they have a positive influence on Employee Performance. This means that if Individual Characteristics, Communication and Work Discipline change even by only 1 point, it will have an impact on any changes in the value of Employee Performance. And the biggest influence is found in the Individual Characteristics variable (X2) amounting to 31.6 %. **3. Classic Assumption Deviation Test**

a. Normality test

One Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test, or Normality Test is used to determine the population distribution, whether it follows a theoretical distribution (normal, Poisson, or uniform). Which aims to test whether in the regression model, the dependent variable and the independent variable both have a normal distribution. Distribution data is said to be normal if the level of significance value is > 0.05 and if the opposite is < 0.05 then it is said to be abnormal. Below is a table of results from the Normality Test in this study.

Table 9. One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test

		Unstandardized Residuals
N		120
Normal Parameters [a, b]	Mean	.0000000
	Std. Deviation	1.42003473
Most Extreme Differences	Absolute	,046
	Positive	,046
	Negative	-.041
Statistical Tests		,046
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)		,200

a. Test distribution is Normal.

b. Calculated from data.

c . Lilliefors Significance Correction.

d. This is a lower bound of the true significance.

Source: Classic Assumption Test output data. Processed 2020

Looking at the results of table 9 above, it can be seen that the value of Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed) is 0.200. What is interpreted in exploring the hypothesis in this research: if Sig < 0.05, then Ho is rejected, if Sig > 0.05, then Ho is accepted.

Based on this hypothesis, it can be said that the results of the Asymp Normality Test. Sig. (2-tailed) = 0.200 > 0.05. So Ho is accepted, which means that the population distribution or employee performance results originating from the work environment, individual characteristics, communication and work discipline are normally distributed, at a significance level of 0.05. **b. Autocorrelation Test**

In the autocorrelation test in this research, the aim is to see whether in this model there is a problem of deviation in autocorrelation, namely a strong correlation in an observation between one observation and another. Because a regression model is said to be good if there are no problems in autocorrelation, if there are problems in autocorrelation then the model is not good for use in research. In determining whether the model is good or not through the autocorrelation test, the researcher uses formulated criteria as explained in the previous research method. Below is a table of results from the autocorrelation test research in the research.

Table 10. Durbin Watson output

Durbin-Watson
1,906

a. Predictors: (Constant), X4, X1, X2, X3

b. Dependent Variable: Y

Source: SPSS 24 Output. Processed 2020

Judging from the results of table 10 above, it is known that the Durbin-Watson value is 1.906, which is in the area of no autocorrelation. Because based on the theoretical formulation used in this research, in the DW table the sig level is 0.05, in this research the N value is 120 with the (K) value being 4, so the DL table value is 1.6339. And the DU value is 1.7715 and the value (4 – DL) = 2.3661. And the value (4 – DU) = 2.2285.

Based on the formulation criteria that have been explained in the research method, which is used in this research to conclude the results of the autocorrelation test. The DW value obtained is 1.728. So the DW value lies in DU and (4 – DU), = 1 .7715 < 1.906 < 2.2285.

So in this research the Regression Model is declared good because it does not exist or is in the Autocorrelation area in the model. **c. Heteroscedasticity Test**

In a good Heteroscedasticity Regression Test, heteroscedasticity should not occur, and it also aims to test whether in the regression model there is an inequality of variance from the residuals of one observation to another fixed observation, then it is called homoscedasticity and if it is different it is called heteroscedasticity. A good regression model is one that is homoscedastic, or does not have heteroscedasticity. In this study, researchers used the Heteroscedasticity Test with the Spearman's rho correlation coefficient test.

The results of heteroscedasticity testing with Spearman's rho will be presented below.

Table 11. Heteroscedasticity Test

Correlations

		Work environment	Individual Characteristics	Communication	Work Discipline	Unstandardized Residuals
Spearman's rho	Work environment	Correlation Coefficient 1,000	,660	,501	,529	.026
		Sig. (2-tailed) .	,000	,000	,000	,778
		N 120	120	120	120	120
	Individual Characteristics	Correlation Coefficient ,660	1,000	,598	,754	-.004
		Sig. (2-tailed) ,000	.	,000	,000	,965
		N 120	120	120	120	120
	Communication	Correlation Coefficient ,501	,598	1,000	,519	-.041
		Sig. (2-tailed) ,000	,000	.	,000	,658
		N 120	120	120	120	120
	Work Discipline	Correlation Coefficient ,529	754	,519	1,000	-.046
		Sig. (2-tailed) ,000	,002	,000	.	,619
		N 120	120	120	120	120
	Unstandardized Residuals	Correlation Coefficient .026	-.004	-.041	-.046	1,000
		Sig. (2-tailed) ,778	,965	,685	,619	.
		N 120	120	120	120	120

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Source: SPSS 24 Heteroscedasticity output data. Processed 2020

Based on table 11 above, it can be explained that the correlation between Environmental variables and Unstandardized Residual gives a significance figure of more than 0.05, namely 0.778. Meanwhile, the correlation between the Individual Characteristics variable and the Understandable Residual gives a significance figure of

more than 0.05, namely at the level of 0.965. The correlation between Communication and Understandable Residual gives a significance figure of more than 0.658. And the correlation between Work Discipline and Understandable Residual gives a significance figure which is also more than 0.05 , namely at the level of 0.619.

Based on the description of the results above. Because the correlation between all independent variables with residual significance is more than α (0.05), it can be concluded that there is no heteroscedasticity problem. **d. Multicollinearity Test**

Multicollinearity is a situation where between two or more independent variables in a regression model there is a perfect or near perfect linear relationship. The multicollinearity test aims to test whether in the regression model a correlation is found between the independent variables.

A good regression model should be free of multicollinearity or no correlation between independent variables. The impacts caused by multicollinearity are:

To find out whether multicollinearity occurs, you can see the size of the VIF number as shown in table 12.

Table 12. Multicollinearity Test Output

Coefficients [a]

Model		Collinearity Statistics	
		Tolerance	**VIF**
1	(Constant)		
	Work environment	,499	2,006
	Individual Characteristics	,282	3,544
	Communication	,523	1,913
	Work Discipline	,379	2,641

a. Dependent Variable: Y

Source: Multicollinearity output data. Processed 2020

Based on table 12 Coefficient above, it can be seen that the variance inflation factor (VIF) is below the number 10 for all variables X1, X2, X3, and X4.

1) The calculated VIF value for the Work Environment variable (X1) has a VIF of 2.006 which is below the number 10.
2) The calculated VIF value for the Individual Characteristics variable (X2) has a VIF of 3.544 which is below the number 10.
3) Meanwhile, the calculated VIF value for the Communication variable (X3) has a VIF of 1.913, which is below number 10.
4) And in the Work Discipline variable (X4), the VIF value is also at 2.641.

As well as for tolerance

1) Work Environment Variable (X1) = 0.499 > 0.10
2) In the Individual Characteristics variable (X2) = 0.282 > 0.10
3) Meanwhile, the Communication variable (X3) = 0.523 > 0.10
4) And for the Work Discipline variable (X4) = 0.379 > 0.10

After looking at the results above, it can be concluded that the regression equation model between the independent variables does not contain multicollinearity and can be used in this research.

4. Model Feasibility Test a. Test of the Coefficient of Determination R2

The coefficient of determination to analyze how strong the relationship and influence of the variables in this study is shown in the table below.

Table 13. Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	,932 [a]	,868	,864	1,444

a. Predictors: (Constant), X4, X1, X2, X3

b. Dependent Variable: Employee Performance

Source: Output data for the coefficient of determination R2. Processed 2020

Analysis of the Model Summary table, the resulting value shown in column R is 0.932, which means that the relationship between variables is still far from the strong criteria because it is still far from the number 1.

Meanwhile, in the Adjusted R Square, the value obtained is 0.868, which is translated into a percentage of 86.8 %. Which means that the influence on Employee Performance that is influenced by the variables examined in this research, namely Work Environment, Individual Characteristics, Communication and Work Discipline, is only 86.8%, while the remaining 13.2% is influenced by many factors in other variables which are not examined in this study.

b. F Test Model Feasibility Test

This analysis aims to determine whether or not the influence of the independent variables Work Environment (X1), Individual Characteristics (X2), Communication (X3), and Work Discipline (X4) is strong on the dependent variable Employee Performance (Y), and is able to explain any variation in changes on the dependent variable. Or to test whether the model created is significant or not. If it is significant then the model can be used to predict or predict. The model feasibility test in this study was analyzed by looking at the significant results in the ANOVA output.

The F test uses Anova analysis with SPSS processing, the following data is obtained:

Table 14. ANOVA

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	1580,628	4	395.157	189,375	,000 [b]
	Residual	239,963	115	2,087		
	Total	1820,592	119			

a. Dependent Variable: Y

b. Predictors: (Constant), X4, X1, X2, X3

Source: ANOVA output; SPSS 24. Processed 2020

As shown in the Anova table output table presented in table 16 above. It was found that the calculated F value was 189.375 with a significance level of 0.000.

Based on the results of calculations assisted by the SPSS 24 program, a value of Sig = (0.000) was obtained, which is smaller than the alpha probability limit or the allowable error limit, namely 5% (0.05). The meaning of the Sig value in the Anova table is that the model is said to be significant because it is below the specified alpha value limit of 0.000 < 0.05.

So it can be said that in this research the model is said to be suitable for predicting the Dependent variable. So the model is suitable for use in this research based on the

Sig value obtained, that all independent variables can explain any changes in the value of the dependent variable because they have a significant influence.

5. Research Hypothesis Testing T test

This test is used to determine the significance of the influence of independent variables partially or individually on the dependent variable. This influence can be estimated with the significant value and Tcount obtained. To find out whether the Work Environment (X1), Individual Characteristics (X2), Communication (X3), and Work Discipline (X4) have a significant effect on Employee Performance (Y).

Researchers carried out tests using a significance level of 0.05 and 2 sides which are presented in the table below:

Table 15. Coefficients [a]

Model		Standardized Coefficients Beta	t	Sig.
1	(Constant)		4,462	,000
	Work environment	,207	4,321	,000
	Individual Characteristics	,457	7,167	,004
	Communication	.138	2,937	,000
	Work Discipline	,255	4,638	,000

a. Dependent Variable: Y

Source: Linear Regression Output Data. Processed 2020

From the output presented in the table above, the explanation of the hypothesis in this research is:

a. Partial Hypothesis Work Environment Variable Coefficient (X1):

The results of table 15 can be explained that the influence of the Work Environment variable on Employee Performance as seen from the significance is 0.000. (0.000 < 0.05) then it is partially interpreted that the work environment does not have a positive and significant effect on PT employee performance. Bank Negara Indonesia (Persero) Tbk. Jakarta City area.

b. Partial Hypothesis Individual Characteristic Variable Coefficient (X2)

The results of table 15 can be explained that the influence of the Individual Characteristics variable on Employee Performance is seen from the significant value of 0.000. (0.000 < 0.05) then it is partially interpreted that Individual Characteristics do not have a positive and significant effect on PT Employee Performance. Bank Negara Indonesia (Persero) Tbk. Jakarta City Branch.

c. Partial Hypothesis Communication Variable Coefficient (X3)

The results of table 15 can be explained that the influence of the Communication variable on Employee Performance is seen from the significant value of 0.004. (0.004 < 0.05) then it is partially interpreted that Communication has a positive and significant effect on PT Employee Performance. Bank Negara Indonesia (Persero) Tbk. Jakarta City area.

d. Partial Hypothesis Work Discipline Variable Coefficient (X4)

The results of table 15 can be explained that the influence of the Work Discipline variable on Employee Performance is seen from the significant value of 0.000. (0.000 < 0.05) then it is partially interpreted that Work Discipline has a positive and significant

effect on PT Employee Performance. Bank Negara Indonesia (Persero) Tbk. Jakarta City Region.

Discussion

1. There is a positive and significant influence of the work environment on employee performance at PT. Bank Negara Indonesia (Persero) Tbk. Jakarta City area.

Based on the results of hypothesis testing, the analysis found a significant level (0.000 < 0.05), which means that the work environment has a positive and significant effect on employee performance. The findings of this research are similar to the results of previous research. This positive influence means that the work environment is getting better according to the expectations of employees at PT. Bank Negara Indonesia (Persero) Tbk. The Jakarta City area will increasingly influence employee performance. Linking the research results with previous research by (Peoni, 2014) , (Widari, 2016) , and (Novita Citra Nur Aini, 2017) has the same results , stating that the work environment has a significant influence on employee performance.

2. There is a Positive and Significant Influence of Individual Characteristics on Employee Performance at PT. Bank Negara Indonesia (Persero) Tbk. Jakarta City area.

Based on the results of hypothesis testing, the analysis found a significant level (0.000 < 0.05), which means that individual characteristics have a positive and significant effect on employee performance. The findings of this research are similar to the results of previous research. This positive influence means that the individual characteristics are better in line with the expectations of employees at PT. Bank Negara Indonesia (Persero) Tbk. The Jakarta City area will increasingly influence employee performance.

Linking the research results with previous research by (Peoni, 2014) , (Novita Citra Nur Aini, 2017) , (Wayan Sri Wijayanti, 2017) has the same results , stating that individual characteristics have a significant influence on employee performance.

3. There is a positive and significant influence of communication on employee performance at PT. Bank Negara Indonesia (Persero) Tbk. Jakarta City area.

Based on the results of hypothesis testing, the analysis found a significant level (0.004 < 0.05), which means that communication has a positive and significant effect on employee performance. The findings of this research are similar to the results of previous research. This positive influence means that communication is getting better in line with employee expectations at PT. Bank Negara Indonesia (Persero) Tbk. The Jakarta City area will increasingly influence employee performance.

Linking the research results with previous research by (Novita Citra Nur Aini, 2017), (Alam, 2019), and (Dirgantara, 2017) has the same results, stating that individual characteristics have a significant influence on employee performance.

4. There is a positive and significant influence of work discipline on employee performance at PT. Bank Negara Indonesia (Persero) Tbk. Jakarta City area.

Based on the results of hypothesis testing, the analysis found a significant level (0.000 < 0.05), which means that work discipline has a positive and significant effect on employee performance. The findings of this research are similar to the results of previous research. This positive influence means that work discipline is getting better in line with the expectations of employees at PT. Bank Negara Indonesia (Persero) Tbk. The Jakarta City area will increasingly influence employee performance.

According to (Listianto, 2014) Discipline is a form of activity carried out by management, whether in companies, government agencies or the private sector, so that employees can work in accordance with applicable regulations so that their performance is as expected and can achieve the company's goals.

The results of this research also strengthen the results of previous research conducted by (Ibrahim, 2015) , (Widari, 2016) and (Alam, 2014) in their research results stating that work discipline has a positive effect on employee performance. If work discipline is higher, employee performance will increase. So the higher the work discipline, the higher the employee's performance will be.

CONCLUSION

Based on the results of research regarding the Influence of the Work Environment, Individual Characteristics, Communication and Work Discipline on Employee Performance at PT. Bank Negara Indonesia (Persero) Tbk. Jakarta Kota area, it was concluded that the work environment, individual characteristics, communication and work discipline have a positive and significant influence on employee performance. The results of the analysis show that good relationships between employees, individual characteristics including gender, marital status, and length of service, effective communication, and work discipline that involves compliance with regulations, all contribute positively to performance. Suggestions for companies include increasing the comfort of the working environment, employee training and development, special attention to communication, and the application of strict sanctions for disciplinary violations. A thorough evaluation of the variables that influence employee performance is also recommended to achieve maximum performance improvement.

REFERENCES

Alam, S. (2014). The Influence of Communication, Motivation, and Work Discipline on the Performance of Education Quality Assurance Institution Employees. Catalog , 2 (1), 135–145.

Alex S, N. (2002). Personnel Management . Jakarta: Ghalia Indonesia.

Citra, N., Aini, N., Iman, N., Management, P., Economy, F., Business, D., … Kerja, L. (2017). The Influence of Communication, Individual Characteristics and Work Environment on Employee Performance at PT. Supranusa Indogita Tbk. Sidoarjo . 3 (3), 378–390.

Dirgantara, RF (2017). CV Lancar Jaya Kediri City Journal Effect Of Leadership, Communication, And Motivation To Employee Performance CV Lancar Jaya Kediri City Nusantara University Teachers Association of the Republic of Indonesia Statement Letter . 01 (02).

Ghozali, I. (2011). Multivariate Analysis Application with the IBM SPSS Program . Semarang: Diponegoro University Publishing Agency.

Hasibuan, Malay SP . (2011). Human Resource Management. Jakarta: Bumi Literacy

Hurriyati, R. (2005). Marketing Mix and Consumer Loyalty . Bandung: Alphabeta.

Ibrahim, P. and M. I. (2015). The Influence of Work Discipline on Employee Performance (Case of the Operations Department of PT. Indah Logistik Cargo Cabagn Pekanbaru). 2(2), 37-39.

Listianto, T. and SB (2014). The Influence of Motivation, Satisfaction, and Work Discipline on Employee Performance (Case Study in the Employee Environment of the Surakarta City PDAM Office), 70.

Meilany, P. &, & Mariaty.I. (2015). The Influence of Work Discipline on Employee Performance (Case of the Operations Department of PT. Indah Logistik Cargo, Pekanbaru Branch) . 2 (2), 37–39.

Mangkunegara. (2011). Enterprise Resource Management . Bandung: PT. Rosdakarya Teenager.

Mangkunegara, AAAP (2013). Human Resource Management . Jakarta: Rineka Cipta.
Mangkunegara, AP (2017). Corporate Human Resources Management . Jakarta: PT Teen Rosdakarya.
Mulyana, D. (2013). Effective Communication "A Cross-Cultural Approach." Bandung: PT. Rosdakarya Teenager.
Panggabean and Prasetyo. (2008). Human Resource Management . Bogor: Ghalia Indonesia.
Priansa, DJ (2014). Human Resources Planning and Development . Bandung: Alphabeta.
Priyanto. (2010). Easy and Fast Techniques for Conducting Data Analysis, Research with SPSS . Jakarta: Media Style.
Peoni, H. (2014). The Influence of Individual Characteristics and Work Environment on Employee Performance (Study at PT. Taspen (Persero) Manado Branch) . Journal of Business Administration, 3 (001), 1-15.
Permanasari, R. (2013). The Influence of Motivation and Work Environment on PT Performance. Raharjo Award Semarang . Management Analysis Journal , 2 (2), 1-9.
Rahman, A. (2013). The Influence of Individual Characteristics, Motivation and Work Culture on the Performance of Donggala Regency Employees. Catalog E-Journal , 1 (2), 77.
Rivai, V. and E. J. S. (2013). Human Resource Management for Companies . Jakarta: Rajawali Press.
Sarjono, Haryadi, and WJ (2011). SPSS vc LISREL: An Introduction, Applications to Research . Jakarta: Salemba four.
Sedarmayanti. (2012). Human Resource Management . Jakarta: Refika Aditama Eresco.
Siagian. (2013). Human Resource Management . Jakarta: Bumi Literacy.
Sugiyono. (2013). Quantitative Qualitative Research Methods and R&D . Bandung: CV Alfabeta.
Suranto, A. (2010). Interpersonal Communication . Yogyakarta: Graha Ilmu.
Sutrisno, E. (2011). Organizational culture . Jakarta: Kencana Prenada Media Group.
Sugiarti, G. (1945). The Influence of Work Environment, Organizational Culture and Compensation on Job Satisfaction to Improve Employee Performance (Study at the Faculty of Economics, University of 17 August 1945 Semarang). Scientific Journal , 105 (3), 75.
Susilangsih, N. (2013). The Influence of Leadership, Discipline, Motivation, Supervision, and Work Environment on Employee Performance (Study at the Wonogiri Regency Regional Development Planning Agency). Ecxellent , 1 (2).
Taiwo, AS (2010). The Influence of Work Environment on Work Productivity: A Case of Selected Oil and Gas Industry in Lagos. African Journal of Business Management , 4 (3), 301.
Umar, H. (2013). Research Methods for Theses and Theses . Jakarta: Rajawali.
Wibowo. (2014). Work management . Jakarta: PT Raja Grafindo.
Wibowo, IP (2013). The Influence of Communication, Conflict, and Work Discipline on Employee Performance. , 704.
Widari, T. (2016). The Influence of Work Discipline, Organizational Culture and Work Environment on Employee Performance. Yogyakarta State.
Wijayanti, WS, Sjahruddin, H., & Razak, N. (2017). The Influence of Individual Characteristics and Use of Information Technology on Employee Performance. Journal of Organization and Management , 1 (1), 14–28.