

THE EFFECT OF TRAINING, LEADERSHIP AND WORK ENVIRONMENT ON EMPLOYEE PERFORMANCE - (STUDY AT THE MANPOWER AND TRANSMIGRATION OFFICE OF WEST JAVA PROVINCE)

Moch. Wahyu Saputra¹⁾ Sunardi Sembiring Brahmana²⁾

^{1,2)} Master of Management Program, Widyatama University, Indonesia

Corresponding author: moch.wahyu@widyatama.ac.id

Abstract

This research is designed to evaluate how training, leadership, and workplace conditions impact employee performance at the West Java Province's Manpower and Transmigration Office. A quantitative methodology employing multiple linear regression analysis techniques has been utilized. The data were gathered via surveys distributed to 100 employees of the agency. The analysis revealed that both training and leadership significantly influenced employee performance, whereas the work conditions did not demonstrate a notable effect. The coefficient of determination (R^2) value of 0.656 reveals that these three independent factors account for 65.6% of the variance in employee performance. This result emphasizes the critical role of well-organized strategies for enhancing training and leadership in boosting the performance of workers in the public sector.

Keywords: Training, Leadership, Work Environment, Employee Performance

Introduction

Employee performance is one of the main indicators in assessing the success of an organization, both in the public and private sectors. Without optimal employee performance, achieving the organization's vision and mission becomes difficult to realize. Therefore, improving employee performance is one of the strategic priorities in modern human resource management (Mangkunegara, 2011). In the context of public sector organizations, such as the West Java Provincial Manpower and Transmigration Office, the challenges in improving employee performance are increasingly complex. Regulatory changes, budget efficiency pressures, and high public service expectations demand reforms in managerial and operational aspects (Sedarmayanti, 2011). One way to answer this challenge is by strengthening factors that can encourage improved performance, such as training, leadership, and the work environment.

Training plays an important role in shaping and developing employee competencies to meet the ever-growing demands of work. According to Abbasi et al. (2019), systematic and continuous training can improve employees' technical and non-technical skills, thereby supporting the creation of quality work output. Well-designed training also encourages employees to be more confident and adaptive in facing task challenges. In addition to training, leadership is also one of the main determining factors in creating a productive work climate. Effective leaders can provide direction, motivation, and role models for their subordinates. Achen et al. (2019) stated that transformational leadership can increase employee morale and leadership. When leadership is carried out strategically and humanely, the level of employee involvement in work and the organization tends to increase.

conducive work environment, both physically and psychologically, also contributes significantly to improving employee performance. A comfortable, safe environment that supports social interaction between employees will create a sense of comfort and loyalty to the organization (Arif & Zaini, 2020). Employees who work in a positive work atmosphere are better able to show optimal performance than those in a stressful work environment. However, although factors such as training, leadership, and work environment have been widely studied individually, there is still a gap in the integration of the three as an integrated approach to driving employee performance. Some organizations still view these factors separately so that they are unable to maximize the synergistic potential that can be generated (Anija, 2022). This is one of the obstacles in implementing a system-based performance improvement strategy.

As part of the public bureaucracy, the Manpower and Transmigration Office of West Java Province faces challenges in building an efficient, adaptive, and competent work culture. Based on December 2024 personnel data, the number of civil servants in this agency reached 327 people, but overall performance has not been fully optimal according to annual performance evaluation indicators. This indicates the need for further identification of internal factors that influence employee productivity.

Using a quantitative approach, this study is directed to empirically test the influence of training, leadership, and work environment on employee performance at the Manpower and Transmigration Office of West Java Province. The analysis model used is multiple linear regression because it is considered appropriate for measuring the relationship between independent variables and dependent variables in a structured and homogeneous sample size (Sugiyono, 2017). This study is important because in addition to providing academic contributions to the literature on public management and human resources, it also has practical benefits in formulating strategic policies for government agencies. The results obtained are expected to be the basis for designing managerial interventions, such as competency-based HR development, leadership training, and comprehensive and sustainable improvement of the work environment. Thus, this study is expected to provide real contributions in efforts to improve the performance of public sector employees through a simultaneous approach that includes training, leadership, and work environment. Focusing on these three factors will not only increase employee productivity, but also strengthen the capacity of institutions in carrying out public service functions more effectively and efficiently.

Methods

Theoretical Framework

Training is an important element in developing employee competencies, which aims to improve the effectiveness of implementing organizational tasks. Noe (2010) stated that training is a systematic effort by an organization to facilitate relevant job learning for employees. Through training, employees gain technical skills, interpersonal skills, and new insights that support the achievement of work targets. According to Abbasi et al. (2019), structured and ongoing training can strengthen employee readiness to face the dynamics of a rapidly changing work environment, especially in the public sector which experiences many policy changes.

Training designed based on the real needs of the organization and employees will have a positive impact on individual and collective performance. Zivkovic and Hogan (2007) added that effective training not only increases technical skills but also increases employee confidence in completing tasks independently. Employees who feel cared for through training tend to be more motivated and loyal to their organization, which ultimately has implications for achieving higher performance. In addition to training, leadership has a central role in directing, motivating, and influencing employees in carrying out their duties. Leadership can be understood as a person's ability to influence others to achieve organizational goals (Robbins & Judge, 2017). Effective leaders are able to inspire and facilitate their subordinates. In the context of public organizations, Achen et al. (2019) emphasized that transformational leadership that is able to instill strong organizational values and vision can raise employee morale and create loyalty to the institution.

Leadership that is open to communication, able to provide clear direction, and provide space for participation, will create a positive work climate. This will encourage employees to be more emotionally and intellectually involved in their work. Conversely, authoritarian or unresponsive leadership will actually weaken work enthusiasm and reduce employee productivity. Therefore, leaders who have good interpersonal skills and managerial abilities are needed so that employee performance can develop optimally. The work environment is also an important factor that contributes to employee performance. The work environment includes physical conditions such as workspace, lighting, and temperature, as well as psychological aspects such as social relationships, emotional security, and role clarity (Sedarmayanti, 2011). A positive work environment can increase employee concentration and work comfort. According to Arif and Zaini (2020), a comfortable and supportive work environment allows employees to work without excessive pressure and build healthy social relationships, thereby increasing productivity.

Avey et al. (2009) added that when employees feel physically and psychologically safe in the workplace, the tendency to focus and complete tasks with optimal results will increase. A good work environment also creates a collaborative atmosphere and strengthens emotional bonds between employees. Conversely, a stressful and conflict-filled environment can cause stress, disrupt performance, and even increase absenteeism and turnover rates. Therefore, organizations need to ensure that working conditions support the welfare and efficiency of their employees. Employee performance itself is the result of individual work in carrying out tasks according to the responsibilities given. Mangkunegara (2011) defines performance as the result of work in terms of quality and quantity achieved by an employee in carrying out his role. Employee performance is a benchmark for achieving organizational effectiveness and efficiency. Sedarmayanti (2011) also explains that performance is a concrete manifestation of the implementation of tasks that can be measured objectively through certain standards.

Employee performance is influenced by various internal and external factors. Internally, training and individual skills play a major role, while externally, superior support and the work environment are significant determinants. If training is carried out properly, leadership is carried out effectively, and the work environment is created well, then a work system will be formed that is able to encourage the achievement of optimal performance. Therefore, an integrative approach to these three factors is key in human resource management.

The relationship between training, leadership, and work environment on employee performance is mutually supportive and does not stand alone. Training strengthens technical and non-technical competencies, leadership shapes work direction and motivation, while the work environment creates comfort and work stability. All three, if developed simultaneously, will produce a synergistic effect that strengthens the quality of employee performance in terms of productivity, efficiency, and loyalty to the organization. Thus, this study aims to empirically test the influence of the three independent variables namely training, leadership, and work environment on the dependent variable, namely employee performance. This study is also expected to contribute to the development of human resource management theory, especially in the context of the public sector which demands high performance but is faced with limited resources and bureaucracy.

Research Hypothesis

The hypothesis proposed in this study is:

H1: Training has a significant impact on employee performance.

H2: Leadership has a significant influence on employee performance.

H3: The work environment has a significant influence on employee performance.

Research Variable

This study utilizes two primary variables:

- Independent variable (X): Training (X1), Leadership (X2) and work environment (X3)
- Dependent variable (Y): Employee Performance.

Data Collection Techniques

The type of data used is primary data obtained through a questionnaire with a Likert scale of 1–5. The research respondents were 100 employees selected using the purposive sampling method. The questionnaire was designed based on theoretical indicators for each variable and has been tested for validity and reliability before being used.

Data Analysis Techniques

Data were analyzed using multiple linear regression analysis with the help of SPSS software. Classical assumption tests were conducted first, including normality, multicollinearity, and heteroscedasticity tests.

Results and Discussions

Respondent Characteristics

The description of respondents in this study is seen in order to provide a general description of the research sample with the following results.

Table 1.
Respondent Characteristics

Id	Characteristics	Total	(%)
Gender			
1.	Male	50	50 %
2.	Female	50	50 %
Age			
1.	20-35 years	69	69 %
2.	36-45 years	31	31 %
Position			
1.	Staff	85	85 %

2.	Supervisor	15	15 %
Length of work			
1.	1-5 years	51	51 %
2.	6-10 years	49	49 %

Source : Data Processing Result, 2025

Table 1 above illustrates that the gender characteristics of male and female respondents are the same. Of the total 100 respondents, 50 (50%) are male and the remaining 50 (50%) are female. Regarding the characteristics of respondents based on age, 69% (99%) of respondents are between 20 and 35 years old. Based on position, 85 people hold staff positions, representing 85% of respondents. When viewed from the length of service of respondents, as many as 51 people (51%) have worked in the company for 1-5 years.

Classical Assumption Tests

Normality Test

The normality test was conducted using the Kolmogorov-Smirnov method on the unstandardized residuals.

Table 2 Result of Normality Test

Unstandardized Residual	Sig.
Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test	0,067

Source : Data Processing Result, 2025

The normality test in the study used the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test (Gujarati, 2004). The SPSS Output results in this study for the Kolmogorov-Smirnov residual normality test were 0.067, greater than the significance level of 0.05 or $p\text{-value} > 0.05$. Therefore, the residual value follows a normal distribution, and the assumptions of the normality test are met.

Heteroscedasticity Test

The Glejser test was used to detect heteroscedasticity by examining the significance of the independent variable in predicting the absolute residuals.

Table 3 Result of Heteroscedasticity Test

Model	t	Sig.
(Constant)	0.114	0.909
Training	0.948	0.345
Leadership	0.52	0.604
Work Environment	0.55	0.583

Source : Data Processing Result, 2025

The results of the heteroscedasticity test obtained a p-value (Sig.) for the independent variable which has a sig value greater than 0.05, so H_0 is accepted, meaning that at a significance level of 0.05 there are no symptoms of heteroscedasticity.

Multicollinearity Test

Multicollinearity is a condition that indicates a correlation between independent variables. The assumption that is expected so that the analysis can be continued is that there is no multicollinearity (non-multicollinearity), if there are symptoms of multicollinearity, the data must be handled.

Table 4 Result of Multicollinearity Test

Model	Tolerance	VIF
Training	.745	1,342
Leadership	.744	1,344
Work Environment	.996	1,004

Hypothesis Testing: t-test and Simple Linear Regression Analysis

Table 5 Result of t-test and Simple Linear Regression Analysis

Table 5
Hasil Analisa Regresi Berganda

Model	Unstandardized Beta	Std. Error	Standardized Coefficients Beta	t	Sig.
(Constant)	12.600	3.969		3.426	.001
Training	.204	.120	.244	2.545	.013
Leadership	.392	.067	.419	4.370	.000
Work Environment	.056	.029	.128	1.547	.125

Dependent Variable : Kinerja Karyawan

Source : Data Processing Result, 2025

The output of the results of the multiple regression analysis can be formed into the following equation:

As for the linear regression equation that has been created, the following information can be obtained:

- The constant of 12.6 indicates that if the value of the training, leadership and work environment variables is zero or 0, then the employee performance variable will have a value of 12.6.
- The Training coefficient value of 0.204 indicates that if there is an additional unit of Training, the Employee Performance value increases by 0.304. A positive value indicates that the relationship between the Training variable and the employee performance variable is directly proportional, namely if Training increases, employee performance also increases.
- The Leadership coefficient value of 0.392 states that if there is an additional one unit of Leadership, the employee performance value increases by 0.392. A positive value indicates that the relationship between the Leadership variable and the employee performance variable is directly proportional, namely if Leadership increases, Employee performance also increases.
- The political coefficient value of 0.056 states that if there is an additional one unit of Work Environment, the employee performance value increases by 0.056. A positive value indicates that the relationship between the Work Environment variable and the employee performance variable is directly proportional, namely if the Work Environment increases, employee performance also increases.

Koefisien Determinasi R-square

The R^2 value or commonly called the coefficient of determination value is a value that measures how much influence the independent variables, namely Training, Leadership and Work Environment have on the response variable, namely Employee Performance, which is usually in the form of a percentage. In the SPSS calculation results, the coefficient of determination (R Square) value is 0.656 or 65.6%. This shows that the influence of the independent variables Training, Leadership and Work Environment can explain the response variable Employee Performance by 65.6% while the remaining 34.4% of the Employee Performance variable is explained by other variables not included in this study.

Discussion

The results of the study showed that training had a significant influence on employee performance. This is in line with the theory that planned and ongoing training improves employees' technical and non-technical skills, thereby supporting the achievement of organizational targets. Leadership was also found to have the most dominant influence on employee performance with the highest significance value. Transformational leadership implemented by leaders in the agency contributed to increased employee morale, loyalty, and engagement. This strengthens the view of Robbins & Judge (2017) that leaders who are able to inspire and facilitate will encourage employee productivity. However, the work environment did not show a significant influence on employee performance. This may be due to the homogeneity of respondents, most of whom are young staff with short work periods (1–5 years), so they focus more on career development than work environment factors.

Conclusion

Based on the results of data analysis and discussion that have been conducted, it can be concluded that training and leadership have a positive and significant effect on employee performance at the Manpower and Transmigration Office of West Java Province. Effective training has been proven to be able to improve employee competence and productivity, while inspiring and communicative leadership provides strong direction and motivation in carrying out tasks. On the other hand, although the work environment shows a positive relationship with performance, its effect is not significant in this study. This shows that in the context of public bureaucracy, developing the quality of human resources through training and strengthening leadership has a more direct impact on improving performance than work environment factors. Overall, the three variables simultaneously contribute 65.6% to the variation in employee performance, indicating the importance of an integrated managerial approach to achieving optimal organizational performance.

Recommendations

Based on the study findings, several recommendations are proposed:

1. Optimization of training programs: The agency needs to expand the scope of training that is relevant to employee work needs and evaluate its impact periodically.
2. Strengthening transformational leadership style: Leaders need to improve communication, provide motivation, and be role models that can inspire their subordinates.
3. Evaluation of the work environment: Although not significant, the work environment still needs to be considered. Providing more comfortable physical facilities and strengthening social relations between employees can be a focus in the future.
4. Further research: It is recommended to include other variables such as motivation, organizational culture, or reward systems to obtain a more comprehensive picture of employee performance

References

- Abbasi, S. G., Tahir, M. S., Abbas, M., & Shabbir, M. S. (2019). Examining the relationship between training, training design and employee performance: A mediation of motivation. *Business and Economic Review*, 11(1), 1–23.
- Achen, K. E., Newland, B. L., & Newton, M. (2019). Influence of transformational leadership on employee performance in collegiate recreation. *Journal of Leadership Studies*, 13(1), 6–22.
- Ajzen, I. (1991). The theory of planned behavior. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 50(2), 179–211. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0749-5978\(91\)90020-T](https://doi.org/10.1016/0749-5978(91)90020-T)
- Anija, A. F. (2022). Integrasi pelatihan, kepemimpinan dan lingkungan kerja dalam membangun kinerja organisasi. *Jurnal Ilmu Manajemen Terapan*, 9(1), 22–33.
- Arif, M., & Zaini, M. (2020). Pengaruh lingkungan kerja terhadap kinerja pegawai pada instansi pemerintah. *Jurnal Administrasi Publik*, 8(2), 143–152.
- Avey, J. B., Luthans, F., & Jensen, S. M. (2009). Psychological capital: A positive resource for combating employee stress and turnover. *Human Resource Management*, 48(5), 677–693.
- Gujarati, D. N. (2004). *Basic Econometrics* (4th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Mangkunegara, A. P. (2011). *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia Perusahaan*. Bandung: Remaja Rosdakarya.
- Noe, R. A. (2010). *Employee Training and Development* (5th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Robbins, S. P., & Judge, T. A. (2017). *Organizational Behavior* (17th ed.). Harlow: Pearson Education Limited.
- Sedarmayanti. (2011). *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia, Reformasi Birokrasi dan Manajemen Pegawai Negeri Sipil*. Bandung: Refika Aditama.
- Sugiyono. (2017). *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif, Kualitatif dan R&D*. Bandung: Alfabeta.
- Zivkovic, M., & Hogan, R. (2007). The role of training in the development of human resource capacity in the public sector. *Journal of Public Sector Management*, 5(2), 40–56.