



Effect of Technical Training, Work Experience, and Competency on Office Performance Sidrap District Samsat

Firman Ali; Nurnaningsih; Pandi Putra

Faculty of Business Insitut Ilmu Sosial dan Bisnis Andi Sapada Parepare, Indonesia

<http://dx.doi.org/10.18415/ijmmu.v9i12.4318>

Abstract

This research is based on observations made by conducting initial interviews, so information is obtained that based on the superior's assessment, the performance of employees at the SAMSAT office in Sidrap Regency is generally reasonable. However, there are still some employees whose performance has decreased, so it needs to be improved again. Therefore, it is essential to research employee performance at the SAMSAT office in Sidrap Regency. This research is quantitative to determine the effect of technical training, work experience, and competence on employee performance at the SAMSAT Office of Sidrap Regency. The population in this study was all 49 employees of the SAMSAT Sidrap Regency. The sample in this study was all 49 employees of the SAMSAT Sidrap Regency office. The results showed that technical training, work experience, and competence had a significant effect on employee performance at the SAMSAT office in Sidrap Regency where the value of F Count (25.993) > F Table (2.81), which means H_0 is rejected and H_a is accepted. Partially, work experience (X2) and competence (X3) have a significant effect on employee performance (Y), which is indicated by the value of sig < 0.05, which means H_0 is rejected, and H_a is accepted, while the technical training variable (X1) has no significant effect. Partial to employee performance. Specialized training, work experience, and competence contributed 63% to the performance of the Sidrap District SAMSAT Office employees, and 37% were influenced by other variables that were not included in the study.

Keywords: *Technical Training; Work Experience; Competence; Employee Performance*

1. Introduction

The One-Stop One-Stop Administration System Office (SAMSAT) in Sidrap Regency is a series of activities in the implementation of Registration and Identification of Motorized Vehicles (Ranmor), payment of Motor Vehicle Tax (PKB), Motor Vehicle Title Transfer Fee (BBNKB), and amount of Mandatory Contribution of Traffic Accident Funds. And Road Transportation (SWDKLLAJ) in an integrated and coordinated manner within the SAMSAT Joint Office. The purpose of the SAMSAT joint office is to provide registration and identification services for motorized vehicles (Ranmor), payment of taxes on motorized vehicles, and mandatory donations to traffic accident funds and road transportation in an integrated and coordinated manner in a fast, precise, transparent, accountable and informative way.

Given that the role of the SAMSAT office is so important in providing services to the community in various motor vehicle administration interests, it is necessary to have good quality human resources. In other words, the performance of the employees must be good.

The staffing data at the Sidrap Regency SAMSAT office can be presented as follows:

Table 1.1, Number of Employees of SAMSAT Sidrap

Gender	Amount
Man	42
Woman	7
Total	49

Source: SAMSAT Sidrap Regency, 2022

Based on the table, it is known that the total number of employees at the SAMSAT office in Sidrap Regency is 49 people. There are 42 men, and the remaining seven are female employees.

The author took the title because, based on observations made by conducting initial interviews, information was obtained that, based on the superior's assessment, the performance of the employees at the SAMSAT office in Sidrap Regency was generally good. However, there were still some employees whose performance had decreased, so they needed to be improved again. Therefore, it is essential to research employee performance at the SAMSAT office in Sidrap Regency.

The SAMSAT of Sidrap Regency routinely conducts technical training to improve the employees' abilities. However, in reality, there are still employees who still need to experience an increase in knowledge after participating in technical training. According to the information, employees with work experience compared to new ones have good performance. Meanwhile, the competence of employees in the SAMSAT of Sidrap Regency has not been evenly distributed, so their performance is also different between employees.

2.Theory

Harsuko Riniwati (2016:152) Training is an activity or exercise to improve quality, expertise, abilities and skills (carried out after and during a certain position or job).

Sri Larasati (2018:110) "Training is short-term education that uses systematic and organized procedures so that the non-managerial workforce learns technical knowledge and skills for specific purposes.

Marwansayah in Wariati (2014:135), Work experience is a knowledge, skill, that employees have to carry out the responsibilities of their previous job. Indicators of work experience are knowledge, skills and responsibility. According to Malayu S.P Hasibuan (2016: 55) stated that experienced people are prospective employees who are ready to use. The work experience of an applicant should be given primary consideration in the selection process.

Manulang (2011:15) Work experience is the process of forming or skills about the methods of a job due to the involvement of the employee in carrying out job duties. The level of mastery of knowledge and skills of a person in his work that can be measured from the length of service and from the level of knowledge and skills he has.

Competence According to Dessler (2017:408) competence is a personal characteristic that can be demonstrated such as knowledge, skills and personal behavior such as leadership.

Edison, Anwar and Komariyah (2016: 142) Competence is the ability of individuals to carry out a job correctly and have advantages that are based on matters related to knowledge, skills, and attitudes

3. Research Method

Data analysis

The analytical technique used is multiple linear regression. The application program *Statistical Package for the Social Sciences* (SPSS) version 21 is used to assist in analyzing the data used in this study.

1. Descriptive Analysis

Descriptive analysis is a statistic used to analyze data by describing or describing the data that has been collected as it is without intending to make conclusions that apply to the public or generalizations. The questionnaire used in this study used a Likert scale to measure the variables of technical training, work experience, competence, and employee performance with the following conditions:

- a. The answer strongly agrees; the weight score is 5
- b. Answer agrees, weight score 4
- c. The neutral solution, a weighted score of 3
- d. The response does not agree; the weight score is 2
- e. Disagree answer, weight score 1

2. Validity test

A validity test is used to show the extent to which the measuring instrument used in a measure is what is being measured. A validity test is used to measure the validity or validity of a questionnaire; the other side of the notion of validity is the aspect of the accuracy of measurement. The rule of testing the validity test is to compare the r table with the calculated r obtained from SPSS analysis. If r count $>$ r table, it can be said that the questionnaire used is valid, but if r count $<$ r table, then the questionnaire used is invalid.

3. Reliability Test

A reliability test is a test to ascertain whether the research questionnaire used to collect research variable data is reliable. The questionnaire is said to be reliable. If the questionnaire is re-measured, it will get the same results. It can be seen from the alpha value to find out whether the data is reliable. The data will be reliable if the alpha value exceeds the R table value.

4. Multiple Linear Regression Analysis

In this study, the analytical method used is a multiple regression analysis models. This study will explain the effect of the independent variable (dependent) on the dependent variable (independent). The regression model used in this study is as follows:

$$Y = a + bx_1 + bx_2 + bx_3 + e$$

Information:

Y: Employee Performance
 X₁: Technical Training
 X₂: Work Experience
 X₃: Competence
 b: Coefficient of Change
 a: Constant
 e: Error

5. Model Test**a. t-test (Partial)**

The t-test was used to determine the significance of the effect of the independent variable partially on the dependent variable. The t-test can be seen with the probability and compared with the error level (α) used, which is 10 percent or 0.1. If the likelihood is $<$ error level, it can be said that the independent variable partially affects the dependent variable. And vice versa, if the probability $>$ error level, it can be said that the independent variable has no partial effect on the dependent variable.

b. F Test (Simultaneous)

The F test is used to determine the significance of the effect of the independent variables simultaneously on the dependent variable. Hypothesis testing is carried out by comparing the calculated F and F table with the following criteria:

If $F_{\text{count}} < F_{\text{table}}$, then H_0 is accepted and H_a is rejected

If $F_{\text{count}} > F_{\text{table}}$, then H_0 is rejected, and H_a is accepted

6. Coefficient of Determination (R^2)

The coefficient of determination test is used to measure how far the model can explain the dependent variable's variation. The value of the coefficient of determination, which is getting closer to 100%, means that the independent variables provide almost all the information needed to predict the dependent variable. The formula used is:

$$KD = r^2 \times 100\%$$

4. Research Results and Discussion**Validity test**

A validity test is used to show the extent to which the measuring instrument used in a measure is what is being measured. A validity test is used to measure the validity or validity of a questionnaire; the other side of the notion of validity is the aspect of the accuracy of measurement.

The rule of testing the validity test is to compare the r table with the calculated r obtained from the SPSS analysis. If $r_{\text{count}} > r_{\text{table}}$, it can be said that the questionnaire used is valid, but if $r_{\text{count}} < r_{\text{table}}$, the questionnaire used is declared invalid.

Table 4.6, Validity Test X₁ (Technical Training)

No Item	r count	r table	Information
Technical Training Variable Questionnaire (X ₁)			
1	0.812	0.2816	Valid
2	0.674	0.2816	Valid
3	0.802	0.2816	Valid
4	0.907	0.2816	Valid
5	0.877	0.2816	Valid

Based on the table shows the results of the analysis of the validity of the research instrument used; the r count is obtained from the SPSS output, while the r table is obtained based on the r distribution table with the help of excel with the amount of data (N) = 49, the amount of df $49-2 = 47$ and the level of 5% significance or $\alpha = 0.05$ so that the obtained r table of 0.2816.

One variable in the research questionnaire showed that all question items had a value of r count > r table, so it could be concluded that the research instrument in the form of the X₁ variable questionnaire used in this study was declared valid.

Table 4.7, Validity Test X₂ (Work Experience)

No Item	r count	r table	Information
Work Experience Variable Questionnaire (X ₂)			
1	0.743	0.2816	Valid
2	0.811	0.2816	Valid
3	0.789	0.2816	Valid
4	0.816	0.2816	Valid
5	0.802	0.2816	Valid

Based on the table shows the results of the analysis of the validity of the research instrument used, the r count is obtained from the SPSS output, while the r table is obtained based on the r distribution table with the help of excel with the amount of data (N) = 49, the amount of df $49-2 = 47$ and the level of 5% significance or $\alpha = 0.05$ so that the obtained r table of 0.2816.

The results of the analysis of the validity test on the question items for the variable X₂ on the research questionnaire showed that all question items had a value of r count > r table, so it could be concluded that the research instrument in the form of a questionnaire variable X₂ used in this study was declared valid.

Table 4.8, Test Validity X_3 (Competence)

No Item	r count	r table	Information
Competency Variable Questionnaire (X_3)			
1	0.767	0.2816	Valid
2	0.823	0.2816	Valid
3	0.777	0.2816	Valid
4	0.807	0.2816	Valid
5	0.784	0.2816	Valid

Based on the table shows the results of the analysis of the validity of the research instrument used; the r count is obtained from the SPSS output, while the r table is obtained based on the r distribution table with the help of excel with the amount of data (N) = 49, the amount of df $49-2 = 47$ and the level of 5% significance or $\alpha = 0.05$ so that the obtained r table of 0.2816.

The results of the analysis of the validity test on the question items for the X_3 variable on the research questionnaire showed that all of the question items had a value of r count $>$ r table so that it could be concluded that the research instrument in the form of the X_3 variable questionnaire used in this study was declared valid.

Table 4.9, Y Validity Test (Employee Performance)

No Item	r count	r table	Information
Employee Performance Variable Questionnaire (Y)			
1	0.733	0.2816	Valid
2	0.766	0.2816	Valid
3	0.683	0.2816	Valid
4	0.803	0.2816	Valid
5	0.700	0.2816	Valid

Based on the table shows the results of the analysis of the validity of the research instrument used, the r count is obtained from the SPSS output, while the r table is obtained based on the r distribution table with the help of excel with the amount of data (N) = 49, the amount of df $49-2 = 47$ and the level of 5% significance or $\alpha = 0.05$ so that the obtained r table of 0.2816.

The results of the analysis of the validity of the questions on the Y variable in the research questionnaire showed that all of the question items had a value of r count $>$ r table, so it could be concluded that the research instrument in the form of the Y variable questionnaire used in this study was declared valid.

4.1 Reliability Test

A reliability test is a test to ascertain whether the research questionnaire used to collect research variable data is reliable. The questionnaire is said to be reliable. If the questionnaire is re-measured, it will

get the same results. It can be seen from the alpha value to find out whether the data is reliable. The data will be reliable if the alpha value exceeds the r table value.

The measurement of the reliability test was carried out using the *one-shot method* or one size using the help of the SPSS version 21 application; the results of the reliability test on the questionnaire studied can be presented in the following table:

Table 4.10, Reality Test of the Effect of Technical Training, Work Experience, and Competence on Employee Performance

Alpha Cronbach's	Alpha Cronbach's	Information
Technical Training Variable Questionnaire (X_1)		
0.874	> 0.60	Reliable
Work Experience Variable Questionnaire (X_2)		
0.850	> 0.60	Reliable
Competency Variable Questionnaire (X_3)		
0.849	> 0.60	Reliable
Employee Performance Variable Questionnaire (Y)		
0.790	> 0.60	Reliable

Based on the reliability test table above, the research questionnaire used to measure the technical training variables (X_1), work experience (X_2), competence (X_3), and employee performance (Y) is said to be reliable or reliable because *Cronbach Alpha* obtained technical training (X_1) is 0.874 which means it is more significant than 0.60 ($0.874 > 0.60$). Work experience (X_2) is said to be reliable or reliable because the *Cronbach Alpha* obtained is 0.850, which means it is more significant than 0.60 ($0.850 > 0.60$). Competence (X_3) is said to be reliable or reliable because the *Cronbach Alpha* obtained is 0.849, which means it is more significant than 0.60 ($0.849 > 0.60$). Employee performance (Y) is said to be reliable or reliable because the *Cronbach Alpha* obtained is 0.790, which means it is more significant than 0.60 ($0.790 > 0.60$).

Multiple Linear Regression Analysis

Table 4.11, Multiple Linear Regression Analysis Results

Coefficients^a

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
(Constant)	2,702	2.082		1,298	.201
1 Technical Training	-.041	.150	-.043	-.274	.785
Work experience	.569	.180	.561	3.163	.003
Competence	.347	.144	.324	2,404	.020

a. Dependent Variable: Employee Performance

A regression coefficient is a measuring tool that can also be used to measure and predict changes in the value of the dependent variable if there is a change in the value of the independent variable, in this case the technical training variable, work experience, and competence on the dependent variable, namely employee performance at the Sidrap Regency SAMSAT office.

Coefficients table shows that the multiple regression equation models for estimating employee performance are influenced by the variables of technical training, work experience, and competence as follows:

$$Y = 2.702 - 0.041 X_1 + 0.569 X_2 + 0.347 X_3$$

Based on the results above, it can be explained that:

- The constant value of 2.702 means that when it comes to technical training (X_1), work experience (X_2), and competence (X_3), the value is zero, then the employee's performance is 2.702.
- The technical training variable (X_1) of 0.041 means that if the specialized training increases by 1 unit, the employee's performance will also increase or increase, assuming the other variables are constant or constant.
- The work experience variable (X_2) of 0.569 means that if work experience has an effect or has an increase of 1 unit, then the employee's performance will also increase or increase with the assumption that other variables are constant or constant.

The competency variable (X_3) of 0.347 means that if the competence has an effect or has an increase of 1 unit, then the employee's performance will also increase, assuming the other variables are constant or constant.

Partial Test (t)

Table 4.12, T-Test Results (*Partial*)

Coefficients

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
(Constant)	2,702	2.082		1,298	.201
1 Technical Training	-.041	.150	-.043	-.274	.785
Work experience	.569	.180	.561	3.163	.003
Competence	.347	.144	.324	2,404	.020

a. Dependent Variable: Employee Performance

- The effect of the technical training variable on the employee's performance, the technical training variable (X_1), has no significant impact on the employee's performance at the SAMSAT office in Sidrap Regency. This can be seen from the significance of the technical training variable (X_1) $0.785 > 0.05$, and the $t_{table\ value} = 2.014$ means the $t_{count\ value}$ is smaller than the $t_{table\ value}$ ($-0.274 < 2.014$).
- The effect of the work experience variable on the employee's performance the work experience variable (X_2) has a significant impact on the employee's performance at the SAMSAT office in Sidrap Regency. This can be seen from the significance of the technical training variable (X_2) $0.003 < 0.05$, and the $t_{table\ value} = 2.014$ means the $t_{count\ value}$ is greater than the $t_{table\ value}$ ($3.163 > 2.014$)

3. The influence of the competence variable on the employee performance competency variable (X_3) has a significant effect on employee performance at the SAMSAT office in Sidrap Regency. This can be seen from the significance of the technical training variable (X_3) $0.020 < 0.05$, and the value of $t_{table} = 2.014$ means that the value of t_{count} is smaller than the value of t_{table} ($2.404 > 2.014$)

4.4 F Test (Simultaneous)

Based on the *annova table*, the F test can be carried out to see the significance of the influence of technical training, work experience, and competence variables on employee performance at the SAMSAT office in Sidrap Regency. The indicators in determining the simultaneous Test of variables based on the *ANOVA table* on the SPSS *output* that the authors present are as follows:

Table 4.13, F test results (*simultaneous*)

ANOVA					
Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1 Regression	144,908	3	48.303	25,993	.000 ^b
Residual	83.622	45	1.858		
Total	228,531	48			

a. Dependent Variable: Employee Performance

b. Predictors: (Constant), Competence, Technical Training, Work Experience

Based on table 4.13, it can be explained that there is a significant simultaneous effect between technical training (X_1), work experience (X_2), and competence (X_3) on employee performance variables (Y). The decision has a significant effect simultaneously because the calculated H value is more excellent (25.993). From the above calculation results, it can be seen that $F_{arithmetic} = 25.993 > F_{table} = 2.81$ with a significant probability level of $0.000 < 0.05$, then the regression model can be used to predict performance variables. Employee. It compared with F_{table} (2.81) to conclude that there is a significant simultaneous effect between all X variables on Y variables. The *calculated F value* is obtained from the SPSS output results in the *Anova table* in column F so that the value is 25,993. In contrast, the *F table value* is obtained from the distribution table F with a value of $DF = 3$ and $DF = 45$ so that the matter is 2.81. Meanwhile, the value of sig 0.000 < 0.05 shows that the regression model is significant and can be used to predict employee performance.

Coefficient of Determination (R^2)

Table 4.14, Coefficient of Determination

Model Summary^b

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. The error in the Estimate
1	.796 ^a	.634	.610	1.363

a. Predictors: (Constant), Competence, Technical Training, Work Experience

b. Dependent Variable: Employee Performance

The coefficient of determination test is used to measure how far the model can explain the variation of the dependent variable is. The value of the coefficient of determination, which is getting closer to 100%, means that the independent variables provide almost all the information needed to predict the dependent variable. The coefficient of determination used is the value of *R square*.

Based on the *model summary table*, it can be explained that the simultaneous correlation between technical training variables (X_1), work experience (X_2), and competence (X_3) on employee performance (Y) obtained a value of $r = 0.796$. This value indicates a strong positive relationship simultaneously or simultaneously between the variables of technical training (X_1), work experience (X_2), and competence (X_3) on employee performance (Y). The strong positive meaning here is that there is a unidirectional relationship between the variables of technical training (X_1), work experience (X_2), and competence (X_3) on employee performance (Y). If the value of the three independent variables increases, the employee's performance will also increase.

The contribution or determination given by technical training, work experience, and competence variables to employee performance is $D = (0.796)^2 \times 100\% = 63\%$. This value is obtained using the determination formula, namely $r^2 \times 100$; the value of R^2 is obtained from the *Model Summary* table in the *R Square* column and then multiplied by 100% to get a discount of 63%. On employee performance, the remaining 37% is influenced by factors not included in the study.

This shows that 63% of employee performance at the SAMSAT office in Sidrap Regency is influenced by variations of three independent variables: technical training, work experience, and competence. At the same time, the remaining 37% is influenced by other variables that were not examined.

5. Discussion

Based on the research conducted, the results obtained are entirely satisfactory; the results of data analysis indicate that technical training, work experience, and competence at the Regency SAMSAT office are good. This is indicated by the number of positive responses from the employees who were given a questionnaire.

These results found that the independent variables, namely technical training, work experience, and competence, significantly positively affected employee performance. Good employee performance will cause service activities at the Sidrap Regency SAMSAT office to run effectively.

1. The results showed that based on multiple linear regression analysis, the independent variables, namely work experience (0.569) and competence (0.347), had a positive and significant impact on the dependent variable, in this case, the performance of the employees of the SAMSAT office in Sidrap Regency.
2. Based on the analysis of the partial Test, the results show that the two independent variables, namely work experience and competence, have a partially significant effect on employee performance with a significance value of <0.05 , where the significance value of the work experience and competence variables is 0.003 and 0.020, respectively. At the same time, the technical training variable has no partial effect on employee performance, with a significance value of 0.785.
3. The simultaneous test analysis shows that all independent variables, namely technical training, work experience, and competence, have a significant and positive effect on the dependent variable, in this case, employee performance. The analysis results show that the calculated F value is

greater than the F_{table} , so it is stated that it simultaneously has a significant effect on the dependent variable.

- The study results indicate that the contribution or determination given by the variables of technical training, work experience, and competence to employee performance is $D = (0.796)^2 \times 100\% = 63\%$. This means that the variables of technical training, work experience, and competence contribute an effect of 63% of employee performance, and the remaining 37% is influenced by other variables not included in the study.

6. Conclusion

Based on the discussion that has been put forward based on the research results, the authors conclude as follows:

- Technical training X_1 has no effect with a value of $-0.274 < 2.014$ because the value of t_{count} is more minor than t_{table} and significant $0.785 > 0.05$ because the value is significantly greater than r_{table} but work experience X_2 and competence X_3 have a significant effect partially because the value of t_{count} is greater than t_{table} $3.163 > 2.014$ for X_2 and $2.404 > 2.014$ for X_3 and a significant value of $0.003 < 0.05$ for X_2 and a significance value of X_3 $0.020 < 0.05$ on the performance of the employees of the SAMSAT office in Sidrap Regency.
- Technical training X_1 , work experience X_2 , and competence X_3 have a simultaneous effect because the calculated F value is greater than F_{table} $25.993 > 2.81$ and has a significance of $0.000 < 0.05$ on the performance of SAMSAT office employees in Sidrap Regency.

References

- AA Anwar Prabu Mangkunegara 2015. **“Company Human Resource Management”**. Rosdakarya Youth. Bandung.
- Alex S. Nitisemito. 2014. **“Personnel Management.”** Indonesian Ghalia. Jakarta.
- Arep Ishak and Hendri Tanjung. 2013. **“Motivation Management”**. Jakarta: PT. Gramedia Widiasarana Indonesia.
- Atmodiwirio. Soebagio. 2011. **“Training Management”**. Ardadizya Jaya: Jakarta.
- Daryanto and Bintoro. 2014. **“Training Management”**. Gava Media: Yogyakarta.
- Fattah, Hussein. 2017. **“Job Satisfaction and Employee Performance.”** Yogyakarta: Elmatara (IKAPI Member).
- Hariandja. Marihot TE 2014. **“Human Resource Management.”** Revised Edition. Grasindo. Jakarta.
- Hasibuan. Julianty K. 2012. **“Management of Education and Training of Medan Religious Education and Training Center”**. Journal of Tabularasa PPS UNIMED Vol.9 No.2.
- Hasibuan. Malay SP 2016. **“Human Resource Management”**. Revised Edition. Publisher PT Bumi Aksara. Jakarta.
- Irfan Fahmi. 2016. **“Human Resource Management”**. Alphabeta Publisher. Bandung.
- Ismainar. Hetty. 2015. **“Work Unit Management”**. Depublish. Yogyakarta.

- Marwansyah. 2016. "**Human Resource Management**". Edition Two. Fourth printing. Alfabeta.CV. Bandung.
- Omar Hussein. 2011. **Research Methods For Business Thesis and Thesis**. Jakarta: Rajawali Persada.
- Pratama AR 2017. "**The Effect of Recruitment, Placement and Training on Employee Performance at PT. Unilever Indonesia, Tbk**". *Journal of Management Branchmark Vol 3 Issue 3*.
- Rivai. 2015. "**Human Resource Management for Companies**". PT. King Grafindo Persada. Jakarta.
- Sedarmayanti. 2014. "**Human Resources and Work Productivity**". CV. Forward Mandar. Bandung.
- Sinambela, Lijan Poltak. 2016. "**Human Resource Management**". PT Bumi Aksara. Jakarta.
- Suparyadi. 2015. "**Human Resource Management**". First Edition. CV. Andi Offset. Yogyakarta.
- Sutrisno. 2016. "**Human Resource Management**". Prenadamedia Group. Jakarta.

Copyrights

Copyright for this article is retained by the author(s), with first publication rights granted to the journal.

This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).