



**THE EFFECT OF WORK AWARENESS AND WORK DISCIPLINE ON
EMPLOYEE PERFORMANCE AT PT PP LONDON SUMATRA INDONESIA
TBK PUNGKOL ESTATE**

Priti Anna Legi¹

Politeknik Negeri Manado, Manado, Indonesia

prtilegi58@gmail.com

Daisy Iriany Erny Sundah²

Politeknik Negeri Manado, Manado, Indonesia

sundahdaisy@gmail.com

Mariska Charlota Walean³

Politeknik Negeri Manado, Manado, Indonesia

ikawalea@gmail.com

Jemmry Recy Winokan⁴

Politeknik Negeri Manado, Manado, Indonesia

jemmrywinokan@gmail.com

Abstract

This study aims to analyze the influence of work awareness and work discipline on employee performance at PT PP London Sumatra Indonesia Tbk Pungkol Estate, both partially and simultaneously. The background of this study is based on the phenomenon of late attendance, negligence in carrying out tasks, neglect of the use of personal protective equipment (PPE), and the unachieved work targets of field employees at the company. The study uses a quantitative approach with descriptive methods and field research. The study population was 179 field employees, with a research sample of 31 respondents determined through simple random sampling techniques. Data were collected through a Likert-scale questionnaire and analyzed using validity tests, reliability tests, classical assumption tests, correlation analysis, and multiple linear regression analysis with the help of the SPSS version 26 program. The test results showed that all questionnaire items were declared valid ($r \text{ count} > 0.30$) and reliable (Cronbach's Alpha > 0.90). The results of the regression test produced the equation $Y = 0.009 + 0.475X_1 + 0.527X_2$. The t-test shows that work awareness has a positive and significant effect on employee performance ($t \text{ count } 3.674 > t \text{ table}$).



1.701; Sig. 0.0010), and work discipline has a positive and significant effect on employee performance (t count 4.306 > t table 1.701; Sig. 0.0002). The F-test shows that work awareness and work discipline simultaneously have a positive and significant effect on employee performance (F count 158.922 > F table 3.340; Sig. < 0.0001), with a contribution (R Square) of 91.9%.

Keywords: Work Awareness; Work Discipline; Employee Performance

INTRODUCTION

The success of an organization is essentially the accumulation of employee performance in carrying out daily tasks (Mangkunegara, 2017). In the plantation agribusiness sector, the role of human resources is very important because most work processes are carried out directly in the field, so that production success is highly dependent on individual work behavior (Siagian, 2018). In practice, employee performance is greatly influenced by two aspects of work behavior: work awareness and work discipline. Work awareness relates to employees' voluntary attitude in understanding responsibilities and carrying out tasks without constant supervision (Hasibuan, 2019), while work discipline relates to compliance with regulations, attendance, and work procedures (Sutrisno, 2020).

PT PP London Sumatra Indonesia Tbk Pungkol Estate is a plantation company located in Wawontulap Village, Tenga District, South Minahasa Regency, North Sulawesi Province, with cocoa and coconut as its main commodities. Based on initial observations, several phenomena of suboptimal work behavior were found, including employees arriving late for morning roll call, negligence in carrying out tasks according to procedures, employees leaving before the specified time, neglecting the use of personal protective equipment (PPE), and work that has not reached the target within the specified time. These phenomena indicate that employee work awareness and work discipline have not been running optimally so that they have the potential to reduce employee performance achievements (Rivai & Sagala, 2018; Sedarmayanti, 2017).

Research on the influence of work awareness and work discipline on employee performance has been widely conducted, but most of them focus on the office sector or service industry, while research that specifically examines employees in the plantation sector is still relatively limited. Based on the description, this study aims to analyze the influence of work awareness and work discipline on employee performance at PT PP London Sumatra Indonesia Tbk Pungkol Estate, both partially and simultaneously, while also providing scientific



contributions to the development of human resource management studies in the plantation agribusiness sector.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Human Resource Management

Human Resource Management (HRM) is the science and art of managing relationships and the roles of the workforce effectively and efficiently, helping to achieve the goals of the company, employees, and society (Hasibuan, 2019). Effective HRM implementation will foster employee work awareness and discipline through directive and control functions, enabling employees to carry out their duties according to established rules and responsibilities (Mangkunegara, 2020).

Work Awareness

Work awareness is an employee's internal willingness to understand their role, obey rules, and carry out work independently and responsibly to support the achievement of organizational goals (Hasibuan, 2012; Permana, 2017; Fuady & Komalasari, 2022). According to Mangkunegara (2020), indicators of work awareness include: (1) sincerity in work, (2) self-discipline, (3) responsible attitude, (4) work consistency, and (5) commitment.

Work Discipline

Work discipline is a person's awareness and willingness to comply with all company regulations and applicable social norms (Hasibuan, 2006; Afandi, 2021). The better an employee's level of discipline, the higher their work performance (Hasibuan, 2017). According to Hasibuan (2013), indicators of work discipline include: (1) punctuality, (2) compliance with regulations, (3) adherence to work procedures, and (4) consistency in task execution.

Employee Performance

Employee performance is the work results achieved both individually and in groups according to their respective responsibilities and authorities within a certain period of time (Wartono, 2017; Sedarmayanti, 2017). According to Sutrisno (2016), employee performance indicators include: (1) work results, (2) job knowledge, (3) initiative, (4) attitude, and (5) time and attendance discipline.

Previous Research

Several previous studies serve as references in this study, including the study by Fiitri & Aprianti (2022) which found that work awareness has a positive and significant effect on employee work effectiveness, the study by Zamani et al. (2025) which proved that work discipline has a positive and significant effect on



hospital employee performance (Sig. 0.002), and the study by Muhid et al. (2024) which showed that work culture and work discipline have a positive and significant effect on employee performance both partially and simultaneously. The difference between this study and previous studies lies in the simultaneous combination of work awareness and work discipline variables in plantation companies, which have been relatively limited in previous literature.

Research Hypothesis

H1: Work awareness has a positive and significant partial effect on employee performance.

H2: Work discipline has a positive and significant partial effect on employee performance.

H3: Work awareness and work discipline have a positive and significant simultaneous effect on employee performance.

RESEARCH METHOD

This study uses a quantitative approach with descriptive methods and field research, supported by a literature review. The study was conducted at PT PP London Sumatra Indonesia Tbk Pungkol Estate, Wawontulap Village, Tenga District, South Minahasa Regency, North Sulawesi. There are two independent variables in this study, namely Work Awareness (X1) and Work Discipline (X2), and one dependent variable, namely Employee Performance (Y).

The study population consisted of 179 field employees. The sample size was determined using a simple random sampling technique, with 31 respondents. Primary data were collected through a Likert-scale questionnaire (Strongly Disagree to Strongly Agree) structured based on the indicators of each variable, supported by secondary data in the form of a company overview.

Data analysis was carried out with the help of the SPSS version 26 program, including descriptive statistics, validity tests (Pearson Product Moment, valid criteria r count > 0.30), reliability tests (Cronbach's Alpha, reliable criteria > 0.60), classical assumption tests (Kolmogorov-Smirnov normality, multicollinearity Tolerance/VIF, heteroscedasticity Glejser test), simple and multiple correlation analysis, multiple linear regression analysis with the equation $Y = a + b_1X_1 + b_2X_2$, as well as hypothesis testing through the t test (partial) and F test (simultaneous) at a significance level of 5%.



RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

1. Descriptive Statistics

The results of data processing on 31 respondents showed a total average score of the Work Awareness (X1) variable of 37.90, Work Discipline (X2) of 38.32, and Employee Performance (Y) of 38.23 from a scale range of 10-50. If expressed as a percentage of achievement against the ideal maximum score, the achievement of X1 was 75.81%, X2 of 76.65%, and Y of 76.45%, all of which are in the high category. This shows that in general employees perceive work awareness, work discipline, and their own performance to be quite good, although there is still room for improvement.

Table 1.

Descriptive Statistics and Total Score per Variable

Variables	N	Sum	Mean	Std. Dev	Achievement (%)	Category
Work Awareness (X1)	31	1175	37.90	7,617	75.81	Tall
Work Discipline (X2)	31	1188	38.32	8,039	76.65	Tall
Employee Performance (Y)	31	1185	38.23	7,990	76.45	Tall

2. Validity and Reliability Test

The results of the validity test using the Pearson Product Moment technique showed that all 30 statement items in the three variables had calculated r values above 0.30 (ranging from 0.425 to 0.866), so that all items were declared valid and worthy of being maintained as research instruments. Item X1_8 in the Work Awareness variable had the lowest r value (0.425); although still valid, this item can be a concern if the instrument is to be further refined. The results of the reliability test using the Cronbach's Alpha method showed that all three variables obtained values above 0.90 (very reliable category), so that the instrument was declared worthy of use for data collection on a larger sample.

Table 2.

Summary of Validity and Reliability Test Results

Variables	Number of Items	Range of r count	Cronbach's Alpha	Information
Work Awareness (X1)	10	0.425 - 0.851	0.912	Valid & Reliable
Work Discipline (X2)	10	0.677 - 0.866	0.924	Valid & Reliable



Variables	Number of Items	Range of r count	Cronbach's Alpha	Information
Employee Performance (Y)	10	0.609 - 0.840	0.912	Valid & Reliable

3. Classical Assumption Test

The normality test with Kolmogorov-Smirnov yielded an Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed) value of 0.824 (> 0.05), so that the residual model was declared normally distributed. The multicollinearity test showed a Tolerance value of 0.190 (> 0.10) and a VIF of 5.252 (< 10.00) for both independent variables, so that the model was declared free from serious multicollinearity formally. However, the correlation between Work Awareness and Work Discipline was very high ($r = 0.900$), which indicates conceptual overlap between the two variables and needs to be noted in the discussion.

The heteroscedasticity test using the Glejser method shows that the Work Discipline variable does not indicate heteroscedasticity (Sig. 0.285 > 0.05), but the Work Awareness variable indicates mild heteroscedasticity (Sig. 0.037 < 0.05), so the interpretation of the influence of the Work Awareness variable on Employee Performance needs to be read with a little caution.

Table 3. Results of the Classical Assumption Test

Table 3.
Results of the Classical Assumption Test

Assumption Test	Mark	Criteria	Information
Normality (KS)	Sig. = 0.824	Sig. > 0.05	Normal
Multicollinearity X1	Toll 0.190 / VIF 5.252	Toll > 0.10 / VIF < 10	Multicollinearity Free
Multicollinearity X2	Toll 0.190 / VIF 5.252	Toll > 0.10 / VIF < 10	Multicollinearity Free
Heteroscedasticity X1	Sig. = 0.037	Sig. > 0.05	Indicated (mild)
Heteroscedasticity X2	Sig. = 0.285	Sig. > 0.05	There isn't any

4. Correlation Analysis

The results of the correlation analysis show that the relationship between Work Awareness and Employee Performance ($r = 0.930$) and Work Discipline and Employee Performance ($r = 0.938$) is in the very strong and unidirectional (positive) category. The multiple correlation (R) between Work Awareness and



Work Discipline together on Employee Performance is 0.959, also classified as very strong.

Table 4.
Correlation Analysis Results

Relationship between variables	r / R	Interpretation
Work Awareness (X1) - Employee Performance (Y)	0.930	Very strong
Work Discipline (X2) - Employee Performance (Y)	0.938	Very strong
Work Awareness (X1) - Work Discipline (X2)	0.900	Very strong
Multiple Correlation (X1, X2 - Y)	0.959	Very strong

5. Multiple Linear Regression Analysis

The results of the multiple linear regression analysis produce the equation $Y = 0.009 + 0.475X_1 + 0.527X_2$. The constant value of 0.009 indicates that if work awareness and work discipline are valued at 0, employee performance is predicted to be close to 0 (this value is practically less meaningful because it is outside the questionnaire scale range). The regression coefficient of Work Awareness ($b_1 = 0.475$) indicates that every 1 point increase in the work awareness score will increase the employee performance score by 0.475 points, assuming work discipline remains constant. The regression coefficient of Work Discipline ($b_2 = 0.527$) indicates that every 1 point increase in the work discipline score will increase the employee performance score by 0.527 points, assuming work awareness remains constant. The slightly larger coefficient of Work Discipline indicates that work discipline contributes relatively more to improving employee performance than work awareness.

The coefficient of determination (R Square) value of 0.919 indicates that 91.9% of the variation in employee performance can be explained jointly by work awareness and work discipline, while the remaining 8.1% is explained by other factors outside the model, such as compensation, leadership, and work environment. The Adjusted R Square value of 0.913 confirms this, indicating that the regression model has excellent explanatory power.



Table 5.

Results of Multiple Linear Regression Analysis (R Square = 0.919; Adjusted R Square = 0.913)

Model	B	Std. Error	t count	Sig.
(Constant)	0.009	2,198	0.004	0.997
Work Awareness (X1)	0.475	0.129	3,674	0.0010
Work Discipline (X2)	0.527	0.122	4,306	0.0002

6. Hypothesis Testing

The t-test on the Work Awareness variable produces a calculated t of 3.674 greater than the t-table of 1.701 with Sig. 0.0010 (<0.05), so H_0 is rejected and H_1 is accepted; work awareness has a positive and significant partial effect on employee performance. The t-test on the Work Discipline variable produces a calculated t of 4.306 greater than the t-table of 1.701 with Sig. 0.0002 (<0.05), so H_0 is rejected and H_2 is accepted; work discipline has a positive and significant partial effect on employee performance, with a calculated t value greater than work awareness, indicating a relatively stronger influence statistically.

The F test produced a calculated F of 158.922, which is greater than the F table of 3.340 with Sig. <0.0001 (<0.05), so H_0 is rejected and H_3 is accepted; work awareness and work discipline simultaneously have a positive and significant effect on employee performance.

Table 6.

Summary of Hypothesis Testing Results

Hypothesis	Test	Calculated Value	Table Values	Sig.	Decision
H1	t (partial X1)	3,674	1,701	0.0010	Accepted
H2	t (partial X2)	4,306	1,701	0.0002	Accepted
H3	F (simultaneous)	158,922	3,340	<0.0001	Accepted

7. Discussion

The results of the study prove that work awareness has a positive and significant effect on employee performance (H_1 is accepted), in line with the opinion of Hasibuan (2012) who stated that work awareness is reflected in the willingness of employees to obey rules and carry out tasks without pressure from other parties, and is reinforced by Permana (2017) and Salam (2021) who



emphasized that employees with high work awareness tend to work more independently and do not always wait for instructions. This finding is also in line with the results of research by Fiitri & Aprianti (2022) which shows that work awareness has a positive effect on employee work effectiveness in government agencies. When associated with the five indicators of work awareness according to Mangkunegara (2020) seriousness in work, self-discipline, responsible attitude, work consistency, and commitment, this finding indicates that employees who have high sincerity and responsibility towards their work tend to be able to produce better quality and quantity of work even without close supervision. In the context of PT PP London Sumatra Indonesia Tbk Pungkol Estate, this is relevant to the initial phenomenon of the study, namely that there are still employees who are negligent in carrying out their duties and work waiting for instructions from their superiors; These results confirm that strengthening work awareness has the potential to directly improve these conditions, because employees with high work awareness tend to work more independently, on time, and take the initiative in solving problems in the field without having to wait for directions from superiors.

Work discipline is also proven to have a positive and significant effect on employee performance (H2 is accepted), even with a relatively larger t-value and regression coefficient compared to work awareness ($b_2 = 0.527$ compared to $b_1 = 0.475$). This finding strengthens Hasibuan's (2017) opinion which emphasizes that discipline is the most important operative function of human resource management, and is consistent with the research results of Zamani et al. (2025) at Nur Hidayah Bantul Hospital, Muhid et al. (2024) at the PPU Regency Manpower and Transmigration Office, research on PT Bangun Cakra Mandiri (2025) and PT Tri Samudra Ambon (2024), and Setyawati (2024) which recorded the contribution of work discipline to employee performance by 74.8%. The greater influence of work discipline compared to work awareness in this study can be understood from the nature of the indicators which according to Hasibuan (2013) include punctuality, compliance with regulations, compliance with work procedures, and consistency in carrying out tasks, aspects that are more concrete, measurable, and directly related to field phenomena identified at the beginning of the study, such as lateness in morning roll call, employees who go home early, and neglecting the use of personal protective equipment (PPE). In other words, in plantation companies that demand consistency in physical work in the field, compliance with working hours, SOPs, and K3 procedures appears to be more



decisive in achieving work results than mere willingness to work voluntarily, although both remain complementary.

Simultaneously, work awareness and work discipline have a significant effect on employee performance (H3 is accepted) with a contribution (R Square) of 91.9%, which indicates that these two variables are dominant factors in explaining variations in employee performance in this research object. This contribution value is relatively higher compared to several similar studies, for example the literature study on Employee Performance Determination (2025) which uses three independent variables (motivation, work discipline, and job satisfaction), thus indicating that in the context of plantation field employees, the combination of work awareness and work discipline alone is able to explain most of the variations in employee performance. The high correlation between the independent variables ($r = 0.900$) indicates that work awareness and work discipline are conceptually closely related in this context: work awareness acts as a foundation for internal attitudes that encourage the willingness to work responsibly, while work discipline functions as a mechanism for enforcing such behavior so that it runs regularly and consistently according to company regulations. Both are complementary, not substitutes for each other, so they need to be fostered simultaneously by the company.

In terms of practical implications, these findings suggest that the management of PT PP London Sumatra Indonesia Tbk Pungkol Estate should not only rely on a supervisory system and administrative sanctions to enforce discipline, but also build work awareness internally, for example through morning briefings that emphasize work responsibilities and objectives, reward programs for employee initiatives, and ongoing socialization regarding the importance of compliance with OHS procedures. This combined approach is in line with Rivai's (2015) view that organizational success is the accumulation of contributions from individual employee behavior, so that coaching that only touches one aspect (awareness or discipline alone) risks being less than optimal in encouraging the achievement of overall production targets.

In terms of theoretical implications, these results enrich the study of Human Resource Management which has so far focused more on work awareness and work discipline separately or in the office and service sectors, as reflected in most previous studies. By placing both variables simultaneously on the object of a plantation company, this study provides additional empirical evidence that the theoretical framework of work awareness and work discipline remains relevant to be applied to the agribusiness sector whose work characteristics are highly dependent on the consistency of the field workforce, while also opening up space



for further research to test other variables outside the model, considering that there is still 8.1% of the variation in employee performance that has not been explained.

CONCLUSION

1. Work awareness has a positive and significant partial effect on employee performance at PT PP London Sumatra Indonesia Tbk Pungkol Estate.
2. Work discipline has a positive and significant partial effect on employee performance at PT PP London Sumatra Indonesia Tbk Pungkol Estate, with a relatively greater contribution than work awareness.
3. Work awareness and work discipline simultaneously have a positive and significant effect on employee performance, with a contribution (R Square) of 91.9%, while the remainder is influenced by other factors outside the research model.

Suggestion

1. For companies, it is recommended to strengthen coaching and supervision programs related to punctuality, compliance with K3 procedures, and providing appreciation for employee work initiatives to increase awareness and work discipline on an ongoing basis.
2. For further researchers, it is recommended to consider adding other variables such as compensation, leadership, or work environment, considering that there is still 8.1% of employee performance variation that has not been explained by this research model.
3. Considering the high correlation between work awareness and work discipline and the indication of mild heteroscedasticity in the work awareness variable, further research is recommended to consider the Robust Standard Error test or data transformation if these symptoms persist.

REFERENCES

- Afandi, P. (2018). *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia: Teori, Konsep dan Indikator*. Zanafra Publishing.
- Arikunto, S. (2018). *Prosedur Penelitian: Suatu Pendekatan Praktik*. Rineka Cipta.
- Armstrong, M. (2020). *Armstrong's Handbook of Human Resource Management Practice* (15th ed.). Kogan Page.
- Dessler, G. (2020). *Human Resource Management* (16th ed.). Pearson Education.
- Fuady, M., & Komalasari, R. (2022). *Pengaruh Kesadaran Kerja terhadap Kinerja*



- Karyawan. *Jurnal Manajemen dan Bisnis*, 5(1), 45-58.
- Handoko, T. H. (2017). *Manajemen Personalia dan Sumber Daya Manusia* (Edisi ke-2). BPFE Yogyakarta.
- Hasibuan, M. S. P. (2006). *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia* (Edisi Revisi). Bumi Aksara.
- Hasibuan, M. S. P. (2012). *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia* (Edisi Revisi). Bumi Aksara.
- Hasibuan, M. S. P. (2013). *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia* (Edisi Revisi). Bumi Aksara.
- Hasibuan, M. S. P. (2017). *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia* (Edisi Revisi). Bumi Aksara.
- Hasibuan, M. S. P. (2019). *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia* (Edisi Revisi). Bumi Aksara.
- Mangkunegara, A. A. A. P. (2017). *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia Perusahaan*. Remaja Rosdakarya.
- Mangkunegara, A. A. A. P. (2020). *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia Perusahaan*. Remaja Rosdakarya.
- Mathis, R. L., & Jackson, J. H. (2016). *Human Resource Management* (14th ed.). Cengage Learning.
- Permana, R. R. (2017). Pengaruh Budaya Organisasi dan Kesadaran Kerja terhadap Efektivitas Kerja Pegawai pada Kantor KPU Pelalawan. *Jurnal Administrasi Publik*, 4(1), 55-70.
- Rivai, V., & Sagala, E. J. (2018). *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia untuk Perusahaan* (Edisi ke-3). Rajawali Pers.
- Sedarmayanti. (2017). *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia: Reformasi Birokrasi dan Manajemen Pegawai Negeri Sipil*. Refika Aditama.
- Siagian, S. P. (2018). *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia* (Edisi Revisi). Bumi Aksara.
- Sugiyono. (2009). *Metode Penelitian Bisnis*. Alfabeta.
- Sugiyono. (2019). *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif, Kualitatif, dan R&D* (Edisi ke-2). Alfabeta.
- Sutrisno, E. (2016). *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia*. Kencana Prenada Media.
- Sutrisno, E. (2020). *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia* (Edisi Revisi). Kencana Prenada Media.
- Syafitri, L., & Heriyanto, M. (2013). Pengaruh Kesadaran Kerja terhadap Produktivitas Pegawai. *Jurnal Administrasi Pembangunan*, 1(3), 221-230.
- Wartono, T. (2017). Pengaruh Kinerja Karyawan terhadap Produktivitas Kerja pada PT Riau Graindo. *Jurnal Ilmiah Manajemen*, 5(2), 100-112.