ABSTRACT

The Effect of Delegation Authority, Incentive Compensation and Work Discipline on Work Productivity of PT. Dewi Permata Perkasa

Author : Nurul Hidayah, Faculty of Economics, University of Bhayangkara Jakarta Raya
nurulnurhidayah02@gmail.com

Corresponding Author : Beti Nurbaiti, Faculty of Economics, University of Bhayangkara Jakarta Raya, bettysgit@gmail.com

The purpose of this study was to determine the results of the Effect of Delegation Authority, Incentive Compensation and Work Discipline on Work Productivity of PT. Dewi Permata Perkasa. Employee Productivity is very important to be maintained, but the problems found in PT. Dewi Permata Perkasa is still not achieving the work targets set by the company. This was allegedly due to the lack of good delegation authority, incentive compensation and employee work discipline. To find this out, this study uses the SEM (Structural Equation Modeling) method that examines the structural relationship with the research model partially.

The data used in this study were 200 respondents at PT. Dewi Permata Perkasa. The data obtained is then processed using full Linear Structural Relations (LISREL) 8.8. The results of this study indicate that there is no relationship / significant influence between the latent variable Delegation Authority (DA) on Work Productivity (PK); there is a positive relationship / influence between the latent variable Incentive Compensation (KI) on Work Productivity (PK); and there is no relationship / influence between the latent variable Work Discipline (DK) on Work Productivity (PK).

Keywords: *Delegation Authority, Work Incentive, Discipline Compensation, Work Productivity*

I. INTRODUCTION

Every company is trying to increase employee productivity with the goals set by the company. Work productivity is a comparison between the results achieved (output) with the overall resources (input) used per unit time. If employee productivity decreases, automatically the company's productivity also decreases. Delegation Authority or delegation of authority is the delegation of formal authority and responsibility to someone subordinate to complete certain activities. With the delegation of authority as a form of delegation in decision making and forms of communication can help management in accelerating the process of achieving organizational goals. Problems that the authors encountered while working at PT. Dewi Permata Perkasa is that the employee does not have sufficient authority to carry out her activities or work that has been delegated, of course the employee's responsibility for the task is also lacking. To find out what delegation authority is a barrier to the decline in their work productivity, the authors conducted interviews with several employees at PT. Dewi Permata Perkasa. When employees carry out their duties always await decisions from their superiors, so employees assume that only superiors are responsible for these duties and responsibilities. In determining compensation the company must establish the principle of fairness which means that compensation must be given in accordance with the achievements of employees. With the incentive compensation employees become motivated to compete to improve their work productivity. Unfortunately the company still does not pay special attention to providing incentive compensation to employees who have achievements, resulting in a lack of motivation or enthusiasm to increase work productivity.

To find out what incentive compensation the company provides to employees, the authors conducted interviews with several employees at PT. Dewi Permata Perkasa. Compensation incentives given by the company to employees are usually in the form of cash given at the end of the month if within 1 (one) month the employee does not miss work and is not late for work, as well as employee leave bonuses remaining for a year it will be replaced by the company in cash at the end of the year. Discipline must also be upheld in a company, without the support of discipline from employees it is difficult for the company to realize its goals. The main target of the work discipline is to encourage self-discipline of employees to come not late and minimize absences such as alpha, illness, permits etc. Work discipline can affect work productivity, without discipline in a company will not achieve the desired results and objectives. The problem that occurs is the lack of firmness of the company to provide sanctions and reprimands to employees who are not disciplined. To find out what discipline is applied by PT. Dewi Permata Perkasa, the authors conducted interviews with several employees who have good work discipline. When employees arrive late many times the company does not give strict warnings and sanctions to employees who are late and for employees who have passed the specified leave limit, then only a salary deduction. Even from the existing sanctions, employees do not have a deterrent effect for employees who are not disciplined so that it will influence other employees not to be disciplined as well. Based on the description above, the authors are interested in raising the above mentioned research.

The research questions are: (1) whether the delegation authority influences the work productivity of PT. Dewi Permata Perkasa? (2) whether incentive compensation affects the work productivity of PT. Dewi Permata Perkasa, and (3) whether work discipline influences the work productivity of PT. Dewi Permata Perkasa? The research questions taken are aligned with the research objectives, namely: (1) to find out and obtain a study of the influence of the delegation authority on the work productivity of PT. Dewi Permata Perkasa; (2) to find out and get a study of the effect of incentive compensation on the work productivity of PT. Dewi

Permata Perkasa and (3) to find out and get a study of the effect of work discipline on the work productivity of PT. Dewi Permata Perkasa.

II. LITERATUR REVIEW

2.1 Delegation Authority

According to Al- Jammal et al, (2014), delegation authority includes two things, namely delegation and authority. Delegation is conceptualized as a process that involves assigning important tasks to subordinates, giving subordinates responsibility for decisions as a form of authority. On the other hand according to Musenze et al, (2014), authority can be defined as giving rights to employees to direct others. But this right is followed by rules and obligations that must be obeyed. The granting of authority by superiors, called the delegation of authority, is the process of delegating tasks in part or in whole with the authority and responsibilities of the leadership to its staff .

The elements in the delegation authority are: (1) Task; that the manager gives as a form of authority to a person or group; (2) Authority; as a form of legal right in issuing instructions that must be achieved and carried out by employees; and (3) responsibilities; employee commitment to carry out certain tasks.

According to Walujan (2016), the delegation authority also has several main principles, namely: (1) The authorized tasks must be clearly defined; (2) Maintaining the effectiveness of communication facilities between employees and employers; (3) Correctly selecting employees (4); Effective authority is given to employees based on their abilities; (5) Criticize employees in an appropriate manner so that employees do not reject authority for additional work; (6) Providing adequate authority to employees to perform tasks, as well as giving the right to make decisions and issue instructions to carry out the tasks assigned and (7) Be aware of the process of job transformation between employees and superiors.

Delegation authority also has advantages, namely: (1) Giving authority will save time at all levels of management, achieve speed in doing managerial work flexibly, develop new ideas and create broader areas of thought in achieving business collectively; (2) Preparing future leaders to motivate authorized employees in objective reasoning and (3) Social justice where authority is one of the factors for achieving justice in elements of democracy (Walujan et al, 2016).

2.2 Incentive Compensation

Rights and responsibilities given to employees will be related to the provision of compensation and affect employee work motivation (Nurbaiti, 2017). In this study, the variable to be investigated is incentive compensation. According to Mangkunegara (2015) incentive compensation is compensation programs that link pay with productivity. Incentives as compensation, in addition to basic wages and salaries that fluctuate according to employee achievement of some standards, such as goals that have been set by benchmarks, individuals or groups or productive organizations.

Incentives can also be defined as considerations of excellent performance with the assumption that salaries are sufficient to make workers appreciate the value of work that also meets their basic needs in life. The main purpose of incentives is to provide responsibilities and encouragement to employees in order to improve the quality and quantity of their work. As for

companies, incentives are a strategy to increase company productivity and efficiency in the face of increasingly fierce competition, namely productivity becomes a very important thing (Muttaqin, 2015).

There are several types of incentives (Huang, 2014), including: (1) Individual Incentives; provided to employees as compensation or effort and individual performance; (2) Group incentives; which is a revenue sharing program where group members who meet certain conditions share the results of groups who meet certain conditions share the results measured from the expected performance. This revenue sharing program focuses on improving quality, reducing labor costs and expected performance.

Factors that influence incentives are: (1) Targets that are clearly defined and well communicated; (2) Successful realistic communication; (3) Knowledge of the value achieved if achieving these goals; (4) The achievement of the value that the company wants to be shared with employees; (5) Feedback system to prevent undesirable things; and (6) Agreement on how to calculate incentives and determine when incentives are paid (Alfandi dan Alkahsawneh, 2014).

2.3 Work Discipline

There are rights and also responsibilities, one of which is employee work discipline. According to Oloke (2017) work discipline can be interpreted as implementing management to reinforce organizational guidelines. Work discipline is a tool used by managers to increase one's awareness and willingness to comply with all company rules and applicable social norms. Discipline is the awareness or ability of a person to comply with all company regulations and applicable social norms. Work discipline as a mental attitude that is reflected in the actions or behavior of individuals, groups or communities in the form of compliance with regulations set by the government or company, norms, ethics and rules that apply in society for specific purposes. Elqadri et al, (2015) also believes that work discipline is a form of employee training that aims to improve and build knowledge of employees' attitudes and knowledge, so that employees voluntarily find work with other employees.

According to Mangkunegara (2015) there are 2 types of work discipline, namely: (1) Preventive Discipline; move employees to follow and comply with work guidelines, rules that have been outlined and obey the company rules; and (2) Corrective Discipline; as an effort to move employees in uniting a regulation and directing it to continue to comply with the rules in accordance with the guidelines and sanctions that apply to the company.

Work discipline functions to: (1) Organize a life together; (2) Building personality; (3) Practicing personality; (4) Punishment; and (5) Creating a conducive environment. There are several factors that affect work discipline, including: (1) The size of the compensation; (2) Whether there is leadership model in the company; (3) Whether there are definite rules that can be used as a guide; (4) Courage of the leadership in taking action; (5) The presence or absence of leadership supervision; (6) Whether there is any concern for employees; and (7) The creation of habits that support the establishment of discipline with mutual respect for each other (Idris, 2018).

Indicators of the creation of work discipline are related to the following matters: (1) The purpose and ability of the company to provide compensation; (2) Leadership Examples that provide examples of work discipline; (3) Fair compensation; (4) Supervision is inherent as a discipline control system in the company; (5) Sanctions and penalties; (6) Leadership firmness; (7) Humanitarian relations both vertically and horizontally consisting of direct single

relationships, direct group relationships, and cross relationships should be harmonious (Rahmawati, 2013).

2.4 Work Productivity

According to Dunggio (2013), work productivity is a computational comparison between the amount produced and the amount of each source (land, raw materials and auxiliary materials, factories, machinery, tools and labor) used during production. However, other than that work productivity is a behavior that is displayed by individuals or groups in terms of behavior, a person's personality often places himself in various forms of attitudes, ways of thinking and ways of acting that affect a person's personality / organization as reflected in his behavior which in turn will effect on performance. According to Hartati (2014) productivity is the comparison between the results achieved (output) with the overall resources used (input).

Factors affecting work productivity include: (1) interesting work; (2) good wages; (3) security and protection at work; (4) work ethic and environment or good work facilities; (5) self promotion and development in line with company development; (6) feel involved in organizational activities; (7) understanding and sympathy for personal matters; (8) leadership loyalty to employees; and (9) hard work discipline (Kadarisman, 2018).

Factors affecting work productivity include: (1) The mental attitude of employees and leaders in terms of motivation, discipline and work ethics; (2) Education and training; (3) Skills; (4) Management; (5) Good industrial relations with various parties; (6) Level of income; (7) Nutrition and health; (8) Enabling environment and work climate; (9) Adequate production facilities; (10) Social security provided by the company; and (11) Opportunities for achievement (Yani, 2014).

To measure work productivity, several indicators are needed such as: (1) An employee's ability to carry out tasks; (2) Striving to improve the results achieved; (3) High morale and work ethic; (4) Personal development according to the challenges and expectations encountered; (5) The quality of work results of good quality employees, and (6) Efficiency that can be done as a comparison between that achieved with the overall resources used. Input and output are aspects of productivity that have a significant influence on employees (Hanaysha, 2016).

III. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This research was conducted on March 5, 2019 to May 31, 2019 at PT. Dewi Permata Perkasa, located on Jln. Toyogiri No. 31 Dusun Legon, Kel. Jatimulya, Kab. Bekasi 17510. The population in this study were all employees of PT. Dewi Permata Perkasa which numbered 200 respondents. The number of samples taken is equal to the total population of 200 respondents, often called the saturated sampling method (Echdar, 2017).

The design of this study uses a quantitative approach, containing exogenous latent variables and endogenous latent variables. According to (Echdar, 2017) the quantitative approach is a scientific method because this method has fulfilled scientific principles, namely concrete, empirical, objective, measurable, rational and systematic. In addition to using the theoretical basis in the previous chapter II, initial observations were also made by the researcher as material for preparing the questionnaire as a research instrument. This research instrument is also complemented by interviews with a number of staff recounting experiences that have been experienced while working on phenomena in work productivity influenced by delegation authority, compensation incentives and work discipline at PT. Dewi Permata Perkasa. The relationship between variables can be seen in the conceptual model of the study below:

Figure 3.1 Conceptual Model (Source : made by the author , 2019)

Hypothesis 1: There is an relationship / significant influence of the Delegation Authority on Work Productivity

Hypothesis 2: There is an relationship / significant influence of Incentive Compensation on Work Productivity

Hypothesis 3: There is an relationship / significant influence of Work Discipline on Work Productivity

Operationalization of variables can be seen in the table below:

Table 3.1 Endogenous Latent Variables in Work Productivity (PK) and Measurement Indicators

Variable	Indicators	Measurement
Work Productivity (PK)	1. Ability 2. Trying to improve the results achieved 3. Spirit at work 4. Self development 5. Quality 6. Efficiency	Likert Scale

Source : Sutrisno (2016)

Table 3.2 Exogenous Latent Delegation Authority (DA) Variable and Measurement Indicator

Variable	Indicator	Measurement
<i>Delegation Authority</i> (DA)	1. Task 2. Responsibility 3. Division of work	Likert Scale

Source : Waluyan et all (2016)

Table 3.3 Exogenous Latent Variation of Incentive Compensation (KI) and Measurement Indicators

Variable	Indicator	Measurement
Incentive Compensation (KI)	1. Social security 2. Bonus 3. Awarding 4. Promotion	Likert Scale

Source : Yani (2014)

Table 3.4 Exogenous Latent Variables in Work Discipline (DK) and Measurement Indicators

Variable	Indicator	Measurement
Work Discipline (DK)	1. Purpose and ability 2. Exemplary leader 3. Pay back 4. Justice 5. Supervision attached 6. Sanction of punishment 7. Assertiveness 8. Humanitarian relations	Likert Scale

Source : Musenze et all (2014)

Table 3.5 Value weight based on Likert Scale

Choices	Information	Scores
SS	Strongly agree	4
S	Agree	3
TS	Disagree	2
STS	Strongly disagree	1

The data processing method used is based on the analysis of the relationship between variables using the Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) method that tests the structural relationships of the conceptual framework proposed in the research model simultaneously with the full version 8.8 Linear Structural Relations (LISREL) software in this research. The two main analytical methods in this study, namely (a) confirmatory factor analysis and latent variable scores, and (b) compatibility test, both the overall model fit, the measurement model fit and the structural model fit. To get the best model, through CFA the selection of valid latent variable indicators with the standardized loading factor ≥ 0.50 is selected. Furthermore, the model compatibility test was performed through 9 GOFI / Goodness Of Fit Index indicators for

good compatibility, and also there was a perfect fit (Wijanto, 2008). The details of the 9 GOFI indicators are as follows:

Table 3.6 Goodness of Fit Index (GOFI) Indicators

Indicators	Remarks GOFI Indicator	Standard Values for Good Match
RMSEA	Root Mean Square Error of Approximation	≤ 0.08
NFI	Normed Fit Index	≥ 0.90
NNFI	Non-Normed Fit Index	≥ 0.90
CFI	Comparative Fit Index	≥ 0.90
IFI	Incremental Fix Index	≥ 0.90
RFI	Relative Fit Index	≥ 0.90
Std. RMR	Standardized Root Mean Square Residun	≤ 0.05
GFI	Goodness of Fit Index	≥ 0.90
AGFI	Adjusted Goodness of Fit Index	≥ 0.90

A variable has good validity to the construct or latent variable if the value of Standardized Loading Factor (SLF) ≥ 0.50 . Reliability measurement can be done with a composite / construct reliability measure (variance extracted measure) using a formula whose value is calculated from the Lisrel output. Good construct reliability is if the value of construct reliability ≥ 0.70 and the extracted variance value ≥ 0.50 (Wijanto, 2008). The formula used is as follows:

$$CR = \frac{(\sum \text{Standardized Loading})^2}{(\sum \text{Standardized Loading})^2 + \sum \text{Error}}$$

$$VE = \frac{\sum \text{standardized Loading}^2}{N}$$

where N is many observable variables

And the final test is the model fit / structural model test, with a significance level of 0.05, then the t value of the structural equation must be ≥ 1.96 . The hypothesis is accepted if the absolute value of t (t-value) ≥ 1.96 , and the coefficient of the t value (either positive or negative) matches the relationship between the variables listed in the research hypothesis.

IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This research was conducted at PT. Dewi Permata Perkasa which is engaged in mechanical, electrical and general Supplier services. This company has a vision to become a

superior and trusted company in the electricity sector. The company's mission includes: providing quality services at competitive prices, providing goods and services to the existing electricity needs, making repairs and regular maintenance on electrical installations, as well as providing satisfaction to electricity consumers with 24-hour service in one day. The company is located at No. Toyogiri Street 31 Hamlet Legon RT.04 / RW.03 Kec. Jatimulya, Kab. Bekasi - West Java.

Based on sex, the frequency distribution of respondents can be seen as follows:

Figure 4.1 Respondent Data by Sex

**Table 4.1
Respondent Data by Sex**

No	Sex	Frequency	Percentage %
1	Male	153	76%
2	Female	47	24%
Total		200	100%

Source : Primary Data

Based on age, the frequency distribution of respondents can be seen as follows:

Figure 4.2 Respondent Data By Age

Table 4.2 Respondent Data By Age

No	Age	Frequency	Percentage %
1	< 20	26	13%
2	20 - 30	89	45%
3	> 30	85	42%
Total		200	100%

Source : Primary Data

Based on recent education, the frequency distribution of respondents can be seen as follows:

Figure 4.3 Respondent Data By Recent Education

Table 4.3 Respondent Data By Recent Education

No	Recent Education	Frequency	Percentage %
1	Junior High School	33	16%
2	Senior High School	128	64%
3	Diploma	26	13%
4	Bachelor	13	7%
Total		200	100%

Source : Primary Data

Figure 4.4 Respondent Data By Work Period

Table 4.4 Respondent Data By Work Period

No	Work Period	Frequency	Percentage %
1	< 1 year	58	26%
2	1 – 5 years	116	62%
3	> 5 years	26	12%
Total		200	100%

Source : Primary Data

The figure of the DA model latent variable measurement result can be seen in figure below :

Figure 4.5 DA Model Latent Variable Measurement Result

Chi-Square=0.00, df=0, P-value=1.00000, RMSEA=0.000

For latent DA variables, out of 10 valid DA observed variables (DA1-DA10) there are 2 observed variables, DA2 and DA9 with Standardized Loading Factor (SLF) values ≥ 0.50 . From the output of SEM it can be seen that the DA latent variable has the Chi-value Square = 0. df = 0. P-value = 1. RMSEA = 0.00. which means it shows a very good match, the model is saturated = perfect fit. So it can be concluded that the data strongly support the model for latent DA variables. The reliability value of the latent DA variable to the observable variable can be seen in the table below:

Table 4.5
Validity and Reliability of DA (Delegation Authority)

Observed Variables	SLF score*) ≥ 0.50	Error	CR Score**) ≥ 0.70	VE Score***) ≥ 0.50	Conclusion Calculation
DA			0.86	0.76	Good Reliability
DA2	0.83	0.31			Good Validity
DA9	0.58	0.67			Good Validity

*)SLF = *Standardized Loading Factor*; where is good SLF ≥ 0.50

**) CR = *Construct Reliability*; where is good CR ≥ 0.70

***) VE = *Variance Extracted*; where is good VE ≥ 0.50

The figure of the KI model latent variable measurement result can be seen in figure below :

Figure 4.6 KI Model Latent Variable Measurement Result

Chi-Square=0.00, df=0, P-value=1.00000, RMSEA=0.000

For the latent variable KI, consisting of 10 valid observed variables KI (KI1 - KI10) there is 1 observed variable, namely KI7 with Standardized Loading Factor (SLF) value ≥ 0.50 , the rest does not represent the perception of respondents / invalid. Goodness Of Fit Index (GOFI) values indicate that the model is perfect fit. Validity and reliability values of KI can be seen in the table below:

Table 4.6 Validity and Reliability of KI (*Incentive Compensation*)

Observed Variables	SLF score*) ≥ 0.50	Error	CR Score**) ≥ 0.70	VE Score***) ≥ 0.50	Conclusion Calculation
KI			0.97	0.97	Good Reliability
KI7	0.98	0.03			Good Validity

*)SLF = *Standardized Loading Factor*; where is good SLF ≥ 0.50

**) CR = *Construct Reliability*; where is good CR ≥ 0.70

***) VE = *Variance Extracted*; where is good VE ≥ 0.50

The figure of the DK model latent variable measurement result can be seen in figure below :

Figure 4.7 DK Model Latent Variable Measurement Result

Chi-Square=0.00, df=0, P-value=1.000000, RMSEA=0.000

For latent variables DK, consisting of 10 observed variables DK (DK1 - DK10) are valid there are 1 observed variables namely DK4 with a Standardized Loading Factor (SLF) value ≥ 0.50 . From the output of SEM it can be seen that the DK latent variable has the Chi-value Square = 0. df = 0. P-value = 1. RMSEA = 0.00. which means it shows a very good match, the model is saturated = perfect fit. So it can be concluded that the data strongly support the model for latent DK variables. The reliability value of the latent DK variable to the observable variable can be seen in the table below:

Table 4.7 Validity and Reliability of DK (*Work Discipline*)

Observed Variables	SLF score*) ≥ 0.50	Error	CR Score**) ≥ 0.70	VE Score***) ≥ 0.50	Conclusion Calculation
DK			0.96	0.96	Good Reliability
DK4	0.98	0.04			Good Validity

*)SLF = *Standardized Loading Factor*; where is good SLF ≥ 0.50

**) CR = *Construct Reliability*; where is good CR ≥ 0.70

***) VE = *Variance Extracted*; where is good VE ≥ 0.50

The figure of the PK model latent variable measurement result can be seen in figure below :

Figure 4.8 PK Model Latent Variable Measurement Result

Chi-Square=0.00, df=0, P-value=1.00000, RMSEA=0.000

For PK latent variables, consisting of 10 valid observed variables PK (PK1 - PK10) there is 1 observed variable that is PK10 with a Standardized Loading Factor (SLF) value ≥ 0.50 . The latent variable PK represented by the observed variable PK10 has a Standardized Loading Factor (SLF) value ≥ 0.50 which means that the variable has good validity. While other observable variables that are not contained in the data processing results do not represent respondents' perceptions with SLF values ≤ 0.50 . From the output of SEM it can be seen that the PK latent variable has the Chi-value Square = 0. df = 0. P-value = 1. RMSEA = 0.00. which means it shows a very good match, the model is saturated = perfect fit. So it can be concluded that the data strongly support the model for latent PK variables. The reliability value of the latent PK variable to the observable variable can be seen in the table below:

Table 4.8 Validity and Reliability of PK (Work Productivity)

Observed Variables	SLF score*) ≥ 0.50	Error	CR Score**) ≥ 0.70	VE Score***) ≥ 0.50	Conclusion Calculation
PK			0.97	0.97	Good Reliability
PK10	0.98	0.03			Good Validity

*)SLF = Standardized Loading Factor; where is good SLF ≥ 0.50

**) CR = Construct Reliability; where is good CR ≥ 0.70

***) VE = Variance Extracted; where is good VE ≥ 0.50

After all latent variable measurement tests are performed on each of the observable variables, then a Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) Test is performed which aims to reconfirm which latent variables can be further processed simultaneously / simultaneously to the test stage of the structural research model. The image of the CFA test results can be seen in the image below:

Figure 4.9 Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) Measurement Result

From the output of SEM it can be seen that the PK latent variable has the Chi-value Square = 0. df = 0. P-value = 1. RMSEA = 0.00. which means it shows a very good match, the model is saturated = perfect fit. So it can be concluded that the data strongly support the model for latent PK variables. The results of the latent variable measurement model test on the CFA test, appear to have a Standardized Loading Factor (SLF) value nilai 0.50 (good validity). The reliability value is good, where the CR and VE values are also good, which can be seen in the summary table below:

Table 4.9 Validity and Reliability Confirmatory Factor Analysis

Observed Variables	SLF score*) ≥ 0.50	Error	CR Score**) ≥ 0.70	VE Score***) ≥ 0.50	Conclusion Calculation
DA			0.98	0.98	Good Reliability
DAL	0.99	0.01			Good Validity
KI			0.96	0.96	Good Reliability
KIL	0.98	0.04			Good Validity
DK			0.96	0.96	Good Reliability
DKL	0.98	0.04			Good Validity
PK			0.97	0.97	Good Reliability
PKL	0.98	0.03			Good Validity

The final stage of processing with SEM is a structural model test that tests the research model in which the results are in the form of detailed hypotheses which are accepted and rejected. The hypothesis is accepted if the value of t (T - Value) ≥ 1.96 and the coefficient sign (positive or negative) must be in accordance with the statement of the hypothesis. There are 2 (two) structural model test results, namely: (1) based on the value (T - Value) for the hypothesis test; and (2) based on a standardized value / standardized solution, to see the size of the influence between the latent variables of research on the hypothesis. An image of the results of the structural model tests can be seen below:

Figure 4.10 Structural Model Measurement Result (T-Value)

Figure 4.11 Structural Model Measurement Result (Standard Coefficient)

Table 4.10 Significant Test Results of the Research Hypothesis Based on the Test of Structural Model Research

Relationships / Effects Between Latent Variables	T- Value Score	standard coefficient	The conclusion of the hypothesis significance test results
<i>H1: There is no relationship / influence between the latent variable Delegation Authority (DA) on Work Productivity (PK)</i>	0.27	0.02	H1 is rejected, because the value is less than $t < 1.96$ there is no relationship or influence between DA on PK
<i>H2: There is a positive relationship / influence between the latent variable Incentive Compensation (KI) on Work Productivity (PK)</i>	3.04	0.25	H2 is accepted, t value > 1.96 there is a positive relationship / influence between KI to PK
<i>H3: There is no relationship / influence between the latent variable Work Discipline (DK) on Work Productivity (PK)</i>	1.41	0.10	H3 is rejected, because the value is less than $t < 1.96$ there is no relationship or influence between DK on PK

Source : Research Data Processing Results (2019)

V. DISCUSSION

Delegation Authority (DA) is the delegation and granting of authority and responsibility from the leadership of an organization to someone or other organizational units to carry out certain activities. From the results of data management, researchers get the result that there is no relationship between the latent variable DA against PK. This is in accordance with existing problems in the field where the leader gives authority and duties to employees who are not in accordance with his jobdesk and employees are not given enough authority to complete activities so as to cause a lack of employee responsibility for work that has been given or delegated from the leadership and employees. so lazy when given an assignment from the leader.

Incentive compensation (incentive compensation) are compensation programs that link pay with productivity. From the results of data management, researchers get the result that there is a positive relationship or influence between the latent variables of IC on PK. This can be seen in fact that the company provides incentive compensation in the form of bonuses in the form of money or dining / shopping vouchers to employees who have good work performance. With the incentive compensation, employees feel that if they improve their work performance, they will get a reward commensurate with what they have achieved, so that it will influence and motivate other employees to compete to improve their work performance.

Work Discipline is one's awareness or ability to comply with all company regulations and applicable social norms. From the results of data management, researchers get the result that there is no relationship between the latent variable DK of PK. This is consistent with what is in the field that the company is still lacking in courage and firmness in giving sanctions and warnings to employees who are not disciplined such as employees coming late to work, alpha

absenteeism, sickness, leave etc. and employees become indifferent to the regulations in the company, so that it will social jealousy arises between disciplined employees and undisciplined employees and will influence other employees to be undisciplined and decrease their work productivity.

VI. CONCLUSION

Based on the results of the study, the results of the discussion and conclusions obtained, the managerial implications that can be stated as follows:

1. From the Delegation Authority (DA) results, for PT. Dewi Permata Perkasa can evaluate the delegation between leaders and employees so that employees when given a task by the leader are not lazy, enthusiastic and have a sense of responsibility to complete it so that it will increase their work productivity. If there is no change in the delegation, the employee does not have a high sense of responsibility when given the task by the leadership.
2. From the results of Incentive Compensation (IC), identification of the problem of Incentive Compensation (IC) that occurred at PT. Dewi Permata Perkasa on Work Productivity (PK) where the company has not paid attention to giving incentives to employees who have achievements so that employees are not motivated and are competing to improve their work performance. This will cause a decrease in their work productivity.
3. From the results of the Work Discipline (DK), identification of the Work Discipline (DK) problem that occurred at PT. Dewi Permata Perkasa on PT. Dewi Permata Perkasa where the leader is still not firm enough to give sanski and reprimand to every employee who is not disciplined. This will trigger social jealousy between disciplined employees and undisciplined employees, so that it will cause a decline in work productivity in the company.

REFERENCES

- Alfandi A.M, Alkawsawneh M.S. (2014). The Role of Incentives and Reward System in Enhancing Employee's Performance "A Case of Jordania Travel and Tourism Institutions". HRMars. 4(4).
- Al-Jammal, Dkk. (2015). The Impact of Delegation of Authority on Employees' Performance Great Ibid Municipality: Case Studi. Macrothink Institute. 5(3).
- C. Walujan, Brenda, Dkk. (2016). Gaya Kepemimpinan, Delegasi Wewenang dan Komunikasi Terhadap Kinerja Karyawan (Pada PT. Air Manado). Jurnal Emba. 4(5):489-500.
- Dunggio Mardjan. (2013). Semangat dan Disiplin Terhadap Produktivitas Kerja Karyawan pad PT. Jasa Raharja (Persero) Cabang Sulawesi Utara. 1(4): 523-533.
- Echdar Saban. (2017). Metode Penelitian Manajemen dan Bisnis. Penerbit Ghalia, Bogor Indonesia.
- Elqadri Z. M, Dkk. (2015). The Influence of Motivation and Discipline Work against Employee Work Productivity Tona'an Markets. Review of European Studies. 7(12): 1918-7173.

- Firdaus Arifin. (2017). Pengaruh Pemberian Insentif, Kompetensi dan Beban Kerja Terhadap Disiplin Kerja Karyawan Pada PT. Bank Tabungan Pensiun Nasional (BPTN) Cabang Pekan Baru. JOM Fekom. 4(1).
- Hanaysha Jalal. (2016). Work Environment and Organizational Learning as Key Drivers of Employee Productivity: Evidence from Higher Education Sector. Macrothink Institute. 6(2): 2162-3058.
- Hartatik, Indah Puju. (2014). Pengembangan SDM. Penerbit Laksana, Yogyakarta.
- Huang Su-Ming, Dkk. (2014). A Study the Effect of Incentive System on Job Performance-Locus of Control as a Moderator. The Journal International Management Studies. 9(1).
- Idris Muhhamad. (2018). The Impact of Education and Training, Work Dicipline and Organizational Culture on Employee's Performace: The Study of Disaster Management and Fire Departement in Palembang City, Indonesia. Macrothink Institute. 8(3): 2162-3058.
- Kadarisman. M. (2018). Manajemen Kompensasi. Depok: PT. Rajagrafindo Persada
- Mangkunegara A.P. (2015). Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia Perusahaan. Penerbit PT. Remaja Rosdakarya, Bandung.
- Musenze, Dkk. (2014). Delegation and Job Satisfaction: An Evaluation of the Relationship within Uganda's Primary Education Sector. Global Journal of Human-Social Sience: G Linguistics & Education. 14(1).
- Muttaqin, GF. (2015). Pengaruh Pendelegasian Wewenang Terhadap Kinerja Organisasi. Jurnal Riset Akuntansi Terpadu. 11(2): 159-176.
- Nurbaiti, Beti. 1997. Hubungan Antara Gaya Kepemimpinan : Situational Leadership Terhadap Motivasi Kerja Karyawan di Perusahaan Farmasi "X". Tesis. Univesitas Indonesia.
- Oloke.O.C, Dkk. (2017). Incentive Package, Employee's Productivity and Performance of Real Estate Firms in Nigeria. European Scientific Journal. 13(11): 1857-778.1
- Rahmawati Desi. (2013). Pengaruh Motivasi Terhadap Produktivitas Kerja Karyawan PR Fajar Berlian Tulungagung. Jurnal Universitas Tulungaung Bonorowo. 1(1)
- Sutrisno Edy. (2016). Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia. Penerbit Prenadamedia Group, Jakarta.
- Wijanto, S. H. (2008). Structural Equation Modeling dengan LISREL 8.8: Konsep dan Tutorial. Graha Ilmu, Yogyakarta.
- Wiratna Sujarweni. (2015).Metodologi Penelitian Bisnis dan Ekonomi. Penerbit Pustaka Baru Press, Yogyakarta.
- Yani, H.M. (2014). Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia. Penerbit Mitra Wacana Media, Jakarta.