

THE EFFECT OF WORK COMPETENCY AND WORK MOTIVATION ON EMPLOYEE PERFORMANCE AT PT TIRTA BANGUNAN SILIWANGI DEPOK WEST JAVA

Kalebi Daeli^{1*}, Oki Iqbal Khair²

Pamulang University, South Tangerang, Indonesia

kalebidaeli97@gmail.com, dosen01801@unpam.ac.id

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study is to determine the Influence of Work Competence and Work Motivation on Employee Performance. This research method uses a quantitative, associative method with the population in this study being 217 employees of PT Tirta Bangunan Suiliwangi Depok. The sampling method is Random Sampling with the Slovin formula and obtained a sample of 68 respondents. The analysis method in data processing is validity and reliability testing, simple linear regression, multiple linear regression, Pearson product moment correlation test, coefficient of determination, hypothesis testing (t test), and hypothesis testing (f test). The results of this study indicate that Work Competence (X1) and Work Motivation (X2) have a significant effect on Employee Performance (Y) with the regression equation $Y = 11.713 + 0.648 X1 + 0.108 X2$. The correlation coefficient value or the level of relationship between the independent variable and the dependent variable is obtained at (1.000) meaning it has a Very Strong relationship. The coefficient of determination or contribution of its simultaneous influence is 0.583 or 58.3%, while the remaining 42.7% is influenced by other factors. The hypothesis test obtained a calculated F value > F table or (45.374 > 3.14). Thus, H0 is rejected and H3 is accepted. This means that there is a significant simultaneous influence of Work Competence and Work Motivation on Employee Performance.

Keywords: Work Competence, Work Motivation, Employee Performance.

INTRODUCTION

In today's era of globalization, competition in Indonesia's retail sector is increasingly fierce, driven by rapid developments in science, technology, human resources, the national economy, and social and cultural factors. Consequently, every individual, willingly or unwillingly, must be ready to adapt to various changes. These changes pose challenges not only for the government but also for state-owned and private companies.

However, companies often forget how much human resources influence the achievement of company goals. Human resources refer to every individual involved in all company activities. The workforce, or employees, are one of the company's assets and play a significant role in achieving company goals.

The ability to prioritize human resources is a crucial factor in determining an organization's survival in achieving its stated goals. A company's success in achieving its goals depends on the success of its individual employees in carrying out their duties and achieving their performance.

According to Mangkunegara in Suryani, et al., (2020:2) Employee performance (work achievement) is defined as the quality and quantity of work results achieved by

an employee in carrying out their duties in accordance with the responsibilities given to them. Meanwhile, according to Rivai & Basri in Mulyono, (2021) Performance is the level of individual success or overall results in a certain period to carry out tasks, according to work result standards, targets or targets and criteria that have been determined and mutually agreed upon. At PT Tirta Bangunan Siliwangi Depok, several factors that are suspected to have a significant influence on employee performance are work competence and work motivation.

According to Wibowo in Pasihul, ddk., (2024:124) "Competence is the ability to carry out or perform a job or task based on skills and knowledge and supported by the work attitude required by the job."

According to Diwyarthi, ddk., (2022:127) "Motivation is a desire that exists within every human being or individual that can be influenced from within the human being himself or comes from a number of external forces, which can influence the results of his performance either positively or negatively, depending on the situation and conditions faced by the human/individual concerned."

Based on the results of a pre-survey conducted on employee performance at PT Tirta Bangunan Siliwangi Depok, the authors found that there was a downward trend in achieving work quantity targets from 2020 to 2024. Although the number of employees increased from 162 in 2020 to 217 in 2024, the percentage of employees achieving work quantity targets actually decreased from 52% to 43%.

After further research, this decline is suspected to be influenced by two factors: suboptimal work competency and low work motivation. This is evidenced by the results of the pre-survey conducted, which showed that 35% of respondents still stated they lacked knowledge and understanding in explaining their work concepts. Furthermore, the results of the motivation pre-survey also showed that 65% of respondents still stated they lacked appreciation, and 55% of respondents stated they had not achieved self-actualization. Therefore, these problems cannot be underestimated as they can impact the company's sustainability and competitiveness.

METHOD

The type of research used is quantitative research. According to Sri Anjarwati (2024:9), quantitative research is a type of research that collects data that can be measured numerically, uses statistical analysis to test hypotheses, and produces findings that can be generalized to a larger population. The population in this study consisted of 217 respondents. Sampling was then conducted using the Slovin formula with a 10% error rate, resulting in a sample size of 68 respondents.

According to Sugiyono in Yuliani and Supriatna (2023:55) Population is a generalization area (a group) consisting of objects or subjects that have certain qualities and characteristics determined by researchers to be studied and then conclusions drawn. While the sample is part of the number and characteristics possessed by the population, samples taken from the population must be truly representative or represent the population being studied.

The data collection techniques used were observation, interviews, and questionnaires. The questionnaire used was a Likert scale. According to Duli (2020:77), the Likert scale is a scale used to measure the attitudes, opinions, and perceptions of an individual or group of people regarding social phenomena. Data analysis

techniques include data instrument testing, classical assumption testing, and hypothesis testing. According to Ulfah et al., (2022:1), data analysis techniques are the process of processing data into new information.

RESEARCH RESULT

Normality Test

In this study, normality testing was performed using the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test, comparing significance values with a threshold of 0.050. The decision-making criteria are as follows:

- If the significance value > 0.050 , the data is considered normally distributed.
- If the significance value is < 0.050 , the data is considered to be non-normally distributed.

Table 1. Normality Test with Kolmogorov Smirnov

One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test		
		Unstandardized Residual
N		68
Normal Parameters ^{a,b}	Mean	.0000000
	Standard Deviation	3.67098813
Most Extreme Differences	Absolute	.104
	Positive	.104
	Negative	-.096
Test Statistics		.104
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)		.065 ^c
a. Test distribution is Normal. b. Calculated from data. c. Lilliefors Significance Correction.		

Source: Data processed by SPSS 26

Based on the test results listed in the table above, the significance value obtained is 0.065, which is greater than the critical limit of 0.05. Thus, the residual distribution assumption in this regression model can be considered normal.

Multicollinearity Test

This test can be performed by examining the Tolerance Value and Variance Inflation Factor (VIF). The prerequisites are as follows:

- If the VIF value is < 10 and the tolerance value is > 0.10 , then there are no symptoms of multicollinearity.
- If the VIF value > 10 and the tolerance value < 0.10 , then multicollinearity symptoms occur.

Table 2. Multicollinearity Test with Collinearity Statistics

Coefficients ^a								
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Collinearity Statistics	
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Tolerance	VIF
1	(Constant)	11.713	3.7330		3.517	.001		

Competence(X1)	.648	.122	.652	5,321	.000	.427	2,342
Motivation (X2)	.108	.095	.139	1,136	.260	.427	2,342
a. Dependent Variable: Performance(Y)							

Source: Data processed by SPSS 26

Based on the results of the multicollinearity test presented in the table above, the tolerance value for the variables of Work Competence and Work Motivation is 0.427 each, greater than the threshold of 0.10. Meanwhile, the Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) for both variables is 2.342, which is still below the general tolerance limit of 10. Thus, it can be concluded that the regression model does not experience multicollinearity problems, so that the relationship between the independent variables does not experience multicollinearity interference.

Autocorrelation Test

The autocorrelation test aims to identify the existence of systematic correlation between residuals in a regression model, especially the deviation of correlation between sample members.

Table 3. Autocorrelation Test with Durbin-Watson

Model Summary					
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Standard Error of the Estimate	Durbin-Watson
1	.763a	.583	.570	3,727	2,193
a. Predictors: (Constant), X2, X1					
b. Dependent Variable: Y					

Source: Data processed by SPSS 26

Based on the test results shown in the table above, the Durbin-Watson value is 2.193. This value falls within the range of 1.550 to 2.460, which is the critical value limit for concluding that there is no autocorrelation in the regression model. Therefore, this regression model meets the autocorrelation-free assumption.

Linear Regression

Regression tests were conducted to determine the extent to which the independent variables, Work Competence (X1) and Work Motivation (X2), influence the dependent variable, Employee Performance (Y), both partially and simultaneously.

Table 4. Results of Simple Linear Regression Testing of Work Competence Variable (X1) on Employee Performance (Y)

Coefficients ^a					
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta	
1	(Constant)	11,705	3,338		.001
	Competence	.753	.080	.758	.000
a. Dependent Variable: Performance					

Source: Data processed by SPSS 26

Based on the results of the regression calculations shown in the table above, the regression equation $Y = 11.705 + 0.753 X1$ is obtained. This equation can be explained as follows:

- a. The constant value of 11.705 indicates that if Job Competence (X_1) is zero or has no effect, then the Employee Performance (Y) score is estimated to remain at 11.705 points. This means there is a basic contribution to employee performance that is not influenced by the job competency variable.
- b. The regression coefficient for the Work Competence (X_1) variable of 0.753 indicates that if the Work Motivation (X_2) variable is considered constant or unchanged, then every one unit increase in Work Competence (X_1) will increase Employee Performance (Y) by 0.753 points. This indicates a positive influence between Work Competence and Employee Performance.

Table 5. Results of Simple Linear Regression Testing of Work Motivation Variable (X_2) on Employee Performance (Y)

Coefficients ^a					
Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
1 (Constant)	23,213	3,012		7,706	.000
Motivation	.490	.074	.633	6,646	.000

a. Dependent Variable: Performance

Source: Data processed by SPSS 26

Based on the results of the regression calculations in the table above, the regression equation $Y = 23.213 + 0.490 X_2$ is obtained. This equation can be explained as follows:

- a. The constant value of 23.213 indicates that if Work Motivation (X_2) is zero or has no effect, Employee Performance (Y) remains at 23.213 points. This means that the baseline performance level remains even without the influence of work motivation factors.
- b. The regression coefficient for the Work Motivation variable (X_2) of 0.490 indicates that, assuming the Work Competence variable (X_1) remains constant, every 1 unit increase in Work Motivation (X_2) will increase Employee Performance (Y) by 0.490 points. This indicates that Work Motivation has a positive effect on Employee Performance.

Table 6. Results of Multiple Linear Regression Testing of Work Competence (X_1) and Work Motivation (X_2) Variables on Employee Performance (Y)

Coefficients ^a					
Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
1 (Constant)	11,713	3,330		3,517	.001
Competence	.648	.122	.652	5,321	.000
Motivation	.108	.095	.139	1,136	.260

a. Dependent Variable: Performance

Source: Data processed by SPSS 26

Based on the results of the regression analysis presented in the table above, the regression equation $Y = 11.713 + 0.648 X_1 + 0.108 X_2$ is obtained from this equation, the following conclusions can be drawn:

- a. The constant value of 11.713 indicates that if the variables Work Competence (X_1) and Work Motivation (X_2) are not taken into account (or set to zero), the baseline value of Employee Performance (Y) is estimated at 11.713 points. This reflects a performance contribution that is not influenced by the two independent variables.
- b. The regression coefficient for the Work Competence variable (X_1) of 0.648 indicates that, assuming the Work Motivation variable (X_2) is constant, every 1 unit increase in Work Competence will result in a 0.648 point increase in Employee Performance. This means that Work Competence has a positive influence on Employee Performance.
- c. The regression coefficient of the Work Motivation variable (X_2) of 0.108 indicates that, assuming the Work Competence variable (X_1) remains constant, every 1 unit increase in Work Motivation will increase Employee Performance by 0.108 points. This also indicates a positive influence, although relatively smaller compared to the influence of Work Competence.

Correlation Coefficient Analysis

Correlation coefficient analysis aims to determine the strength and direction of the relationship between independent variables and dependent variables.

Table 7. Results of Pearson Correlation Coefficient Testing of Work Competence (X_1) on Employee Performance (Y) Partially.

Correlations		Competence	Performance
Competence	Pearson Correlation	1	.758**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	68	68
Performance	Pearson Correlation	.758**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	68	68

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

Source: Data processed by SPSS 26

Based on the test results presented in the table above, the correlation coefficient is 0.758. This value falls within the range of 0.600 to 0.799, indicating a strong relationship between the two variables analyzed.

Table 8. Results of Pearson Correlation Coefficient Testing of Work Motivation (X_2) on Employee Performance (Y) Partially.

Correlations		Motivation	Performance
Motivation	Pearson Correlation	1	.633**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	68	68
Performance	Pearson Correlation	.633**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	68	68

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

Source: Data processed by SPSS 26

Based on the test results presented in the table above, the correlation coefficient is 0.633. This value falls within the range of 0.600 to 0.799, indicating a strong relationship between the two variables analyzed.

Table 9. Results of Testing the Coefficient of Work Competence (X1) and Work Motivation (X2) on Employee Performance (Y) Simultaneously.

		Correlations		
		Competence	Motivation	Performance
Competence	Pearson Correlation	1	.757**	.758**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.000
	N	68	68	68
Motivation	Pearson Correlation	.757**	1	.633**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.000
	N	68	68	68
Performance	Pearson Correlation	.758**	.633**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	
	N	68	68	68

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

Source: Data processed by SPSS 26

Based on the test results presented in the table above, a correlation coefficient of 1.000 was obtained. This value is in the range of 0.800 to 1.000, which indicates a very strong relationship between the variables of Work Competence and Work Motivation simultaneously on Employee Performance.

Analysis of the Coefficient of Determination

The analysis of the coefficient of determination is intended to determine the percentage of the strength of the influence between the independent variables on the dependent variables, both partially and simultaneously.

Table 10. Results of Partial Determination Coefficient Testing of Work Competence (X1) on Employee Performance (Y)

Model Summary				
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Standard Error of the Estimate
1	.758a	.574	.568	3,735

a. Predictors: (Constant), Competence

Source: Data processed by SPSS 26

Based on the test results presented in the table above, the coefficient of determination (R^2) was obtained at 0.574. This indicates that the Work Competence variable (X_1) contributes 57.4% to Employee Performance (Y), while the remaining 42.6% is influenced by other factors not included in this research model.

Table 11. Results of Partial Determination Coefficient Test of Work Motivation (X2) on Employee Performance (Y)

Model Summary				
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Standard Error of the Estimate

1	.633a	.401	.392	4,432
a. Predictors: (Constant), Motivation				

Based on the test results presented in the table above, the coefficient of determination (R^2) was obtained at 0.401. This indicates that the Work Competence variable (X_2) contributes 40.1% to Employee Performance (Y), while the remaining 59.9% is influenced by other factors not included in this research model.

Table 12. Results of Simultaneous Testing of the Determination Coefficient of Work Competence (X_1) and Work Motivation (X_2) on Employee Performance (Y)

Model Summary				
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Standard Error of the Estimate
1	.763a	.583	.570	3,727
a. Predictors: (Constant), Motivation, Competence				

Source: Data processed by SPSS 26

Based on the test results in the table above, the coefficient of determination obtained is 0.583. This indicates that the variables of Work Competence (X_1) and Work Motivation (X_2) together contribute an influence on the variable of Employee Performance (Y) of 58.3%. Meanwhile, 41.7% of the variation in Employee Performance is influenced by other factors not included in this research model.

Hypothesis Testing

This test aims to determine whether each independent variable has a significant influence individually or simultaneously on the dependent variable.

Table 13. Results of Hypothesis Test (t-Test) of Work Competence Variable (X_1) on Employee Performance (Y).

Coefficients ^a						
Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	
	B	Std. Error	Beta			
1 (Constant)	11,705	3,338		3,507	.001	
Competence	.753	.080	.758	9,437	.000	
a. Dependent Variable: Performance						

Source: Data processed by SPSS 26

Based on the test results presented in the table above, the calculated t value obtained is 9.437, greater than the t table value of 0.283. In addition, the p value of 0.000 is smaller than the significance level of 0.050. Thus, it can be concluded that H_0 is rejected and H_1 is accepted, which means there is a significant influence between Work Competence (X_1) on Employee Performance (Y).

Table 14. Results of Hypothesis Test (t-Test) of Work Motivation Variable (X_2) on Employee Performance (Y).

Coefficients ^a						
Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	
	B	Std. Error	Beta			
1 (Constant)	23,213	3,012		7,706	.000	

Motivation	.490	.074	.633	6,646	.000
a. Dependent Variable: Performance					

Source: Data processed by SPSS 26

Based on the test results presented in the table above, the calculated t value obtained is 6.646, greater than the t table value of 0.283. This result is also supported by the p value of 0.000, which is smaller than the significance level of 0.050. Thus, it can be concluded that H_0 is rejected and H_1 is accepted, which means there is a significant influence between Work Motivation (X2) on Employee Performance (Y).

Table 15. Hypothesis Results (F Test) Simultaneous Effect of Work Competence (X1) and Work Motivation (X2) on Employee Performance (Y)

ANOVA					
Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1 Regression	1260,568	2	630,284	45,374	.000b
Residual	902.902	65	13,891		
Total	2163.471	67			
a. Dependent Variable: Performance					
b. Predictors: (Constant), Motivation, Competence					

Source: Data processed by SPSS 26

Based on the test results displayed in the table above, the calculated F value of 45.374 is greater than the F table of 3.14. In addition, the p value of 0.000 is smaller than the significance level of 0.050. This finding indicates that H_0 is rejected and H_3 is accepted, so it can be concluded that there is a significant simultaneous influence between Work Competence and Work Motivation on Employee Performance.

DISCUSSION

1. The Influence of Work Competence (X1) on Employee Performance (Y)

Based on the results of the regression analysis, the equation $Y = 11.705 + 0.753 X_1$ was obtained. The correlation coefficient value of 0.758 indicates that there is a strong relationship between the variables of Work Competence and Employee Performance. Meanwhile, the determination coefficient value of 0.574 or 57.4% indicates that work competence contributes 57.4% to employee performance, while the remaining 42.6% is influenced by other factors outside the model. The results of the hypothesis test show that the calculated t value (9.437) > t table (0.238), so it can be concluded that H_0 is rejected and H_1 is accepted, which means there is a significant influence between Work Competence and Employee Performance.

2. The Influence of Work Motivation (X2) on Employee Performance (Y)

Based on the test results, the regression equation $Y = 23.213 + 0.490 X_2$ was obtained. The correlation coefficient value of 0.633 indicates a strong relationship between Work Motivation and Employee Performance. The determination coefficient value of 0.401 or 40.1% indicates that Work Motivation contributes to Employee Performance by 40.1%, while the remaining 59.9% is influenced by other factors. Based on the hypothesis test, the calculated t value (6.646) > t table (0.238), so it can be concluded that H_0 is rejected and H_2 is accepted, which means there is a significant influence between Work Motivation and Employee Performance.

3. The Influence of Work Competence (X1) and Work Motivation (X2) on Employee Performance (Y)

The results of the analysis show that Work Competence and Work Motivation simultaneously have a significant effect on Employee Performance. The regression equation obtained is $Y = 11.713 + 0.648 X1 + 0.108 X2$. The correlation coefficient value of 1.000 reflects a very strong level of relationship between the two independent variables and the dependent variable. The determination coefficient value of 0.583 or 58.3% indicates the contribution of both variables to employee performance simultaneously, while the remaining 41.7% is influenced by other factors. The results of the hypothesis test state that the calculated F value (45.374) > F table (3.14), so H_0 is rejected and H_a is accepted, which means there is a significant simultaneous influence between Work Competence and Work Motivation on Employee Performance.

CONCLUSION

The research concluded that both work competence and work motivation have a significant positive impact on employee performance at PT Tirta Bangunan Siliwangi Depok. The analysis showed that work competence alone contributes 57.4% to employee performance, with a strong positive correlation of 0.758, indicating that improvements in employees' work competence are strongly linked to better performance. The statistical test further confirmed this relationship, as the calculated t-value was much greater than the t-table value, leading to the rejection of the null hypothesis.

Similarly, work motivation was also found to influence employee performance positively, contributing 40.1% to the performance outcomes. The correlation between work motivation and performance was 0.633, suggesting a moderate but still significant relationship. The hypothesis test confirmed that work motivation has a statistically significant effect on performance, again rejecting the null hypothesis.

Furthermore, when both work competence and work motivation were analyzed together, the combined influence on employee performance was even more pronounced. The regression equation showed that the two factors together explain 58.3% of the variance in employee performance, with a very strong correlation of 1.000. The results of the simultaneous test confirmed the significant impact of both variables, as the calculated F-value was far greater than the table value, supporting the hypothesis that work competence and work motivation together significantly affect employee performance.

REFERENCES

- Diwyarthi, N. D. M. S., Maftuhah, R. A., Husaini, M., Lasmiatun, K. M. T., Setiawati, P. C., Suandika, M., ... & Fardiansyah, H. (2022). *Teori Psikologi Industri dan Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia*. Penerbit NEM.
- Duli, N. (2020). *Metodologi Penelitian Kuantitatif: Beberapa konsep dasar untuk penulisan skripsi & analisis data dengan SPSS*. Deepublish.
- Haryadi, R. N., Sunarsi, D., Erlangga, H., Nurjaya, N., Hamsinah, H., Haryadi, N., ... & Erlangga, H. (2022). Pengaruh komunikasi dan motivasi terhadap kepuasan

- kerja karyawan PT Timur Jaya Prestasi Cileungsi. *JENIUS (Jurnal Ilmiah Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia)*, 5(3), 702-709.
- Mulyono, J. (2021). Pengaruh Kompetensi dan Lingkungan Kerja terhadap Kinerja Pegawai di Dinas Pengairan Kabupaten Lampung Tengah. *Jurnal Progress Administrasi Publik*, 1(2), 50-60.
- Pasihul Lisan, S.M., Hosniadah, S.E., & Ismail, I., Dra., M.M. (2024). *Manajemen kinerja: Teori dan aplikasi*. Depok: Penerbit Karya Bakti Makmur (KBM) Indonesia.
- Suryani, N. K., Sugianingrat, I. A. P. W., & Laksemini, K. D. I. S. (2020). *Kinerja sumber daya manusia: Teori, aplikasi dan penelitian*. Nilacakra.
- Ulfah, A. K., Razali, R., Rahman, H., Ghofur, A., Bukhory, U., Wahyuningrum, S. R., ... & Muqoddam, F. (2022). *Ragam Analisis Data Penelitian (Sastra, Riset dan Pengembangan)*. IAIN Madura Press.
- Usman, H. M., & Haryadi, R. N. (2023). The effect of transformational leadership and work motivation on teacher performance at Vocational High School Bina Mandiri Cileungsi. *International Journal of Sharia Business Management*, 2(1), 23-29.
- Yuliani, W., & Supriatna, E. (2023). *Metode penelitian bagi pemula*. Penerbit Widina.