

Dinamika Bahari

Journal of Maritime Dynamic May 2024 DOI: https://doi.org/10.46484/db.v5i1.504

Volume	:	5
No	:	1
Pages	:	37 - 49
ISSN	:	2087-3050
-ISSN	:	2722-0621

Dwi Prasetyo<sup>1</sup>, Imam Cahyadi<sup>2</sup>, Antarest Erland Prasetyo<sup>8</sup>

The Impact of Individual Characteristics and Training Experience on Performance of Employee Related with Motivation of Work as an **Intermediate Variable** 

Abstract: The research aims to investigate the impact of individual characteristics and training on performance of employee with work motivation as an intermediate variable at the Politeknik Ilmu Pelayaran Semarang. Research on whether individual characteristics and training influence intervention motivation and job characteristics on work capacity took 218 civil servants at the Semarang Shipping Science Polytechnic. The random sampling technique is a technique where the sample is gathered by using the Slovin formula, obtaining 142 respondents. The data was obtained with a questionnaire with data analysis with linear regression technique. Based on the research that has been conducted, individual characteristics and training positively affect work motivation and employee performance at Politeknik Ilmu Pelayaran Semarang. However, work motivation does not mediate between individual characteristics or training and employee performance. These results provide important insights for the development of more effective human resource management strategies in the future at Politeknik Ilmu Pelayaran Semarang

Keywords: employee performance, individual characteristics, Politeknik Ilmu Pelayaran Semarang, training, work motivation.

## **INTRODUCTION**

Organizational individuals will encounter various kinds of obstacles to be able to work well so that their performance can be well received by the organization and society in need. Many factors can influence performance. A crucial aspect for enhancing an employee's productivity is the motivation they possess towards their work. Motivation can make a significant contribution to improving performance. Individual characteristics are an important element in improving performance. Individual traits encompass personal attributes such as biographical details, skills, values, outlooks, temperament, and feelings (Robbins, 2006). Apart from individual characteristics, training is also important to motivate employees to improve their performance. Training prepares employees to do their current jobs (Handoko, 1999). Through training, organizations can equip employees with the skills necessary to thrive, particularly in the face of global competition and the growing complexities of societal needs. Performance is a function of motivation and ability. Abilities, in this case, include individual characteristics. To accomplish tasks and responsibilities, an individual needs a specific level of willingness and competence. However, these attributes are only effective when paired with a clear comprehension and knowledge of the task at

Dwi Prasetyo Politeknik Ilmu Pelayaran Semarang, Indonesia Email: dwiprasetyo@pip-semarang.ac.id

Antarest Erland Prasetyo Universitas Diponegoro, Indonesia Email: antarestprasetyo17@gmail.com Imam Cahyadi Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta, Indonesia Email: imamcahyadi.2018@student.uny.ac.id hand, including how to approach it. (Rivai, 2005). Damayanti's (2006) research demonstrates that personal attributes contribute positively to employee performance. Research conducted by Soetjipto (2007) and Kunartinah Sukoco (2010) states that training has a positive effect on performance. The higher the training, the higher the performance. Research results from Musafir (2009) and Suprapto (2009) indicate that workplace motivation positively influences performance. Increased motivation correlates with higher levels of performance.

The research sample consists of 218 employees working at Politeknik Ilmu Pelayaran Semarang. Employees at Politeknik Ilmu Pelayaran Semarang currently need improvements in activities or work. Several things need to be said here, namely that some of the activities or work that have been carried out at Politeknik Ilmu Pelayaran Semarang are outside the planned time targets. Based on the survey, it is known that six activities at the Semarang Maritime Science Polytechnic were not realized on time, namely 1) Competency Testing, Certification, Accreditation and Standardization, 2) Increasing Workforce Productivity, 3) Procuring Productivity Facilities and Infrastructure, 4) Developing a Data Base Cases, 5) Handling Work Accident and Social Security Cases, and 6) Facilitating the Implementation of Main Administration. From these problems, it is indicated that several factors influence the activity or work not being on time. These factors include, among others, individual employee characteristics, employee training, and employee work motivation . Therefore, it is necessary to carry out further research regarding "The Impact of Individual Characteristics and Training Experience on Employee Performance With Motivation of Work As An Intermediate Variable.

Based on the description and previous research above, a graphic model can be created as follows:



Figure 1. Framework Theory

#### **METHODS**

- 1. Literature Review
  - The following are several theories in this research
  - a. Employee Performance

Performance refers to the measure of accomplishment in executing activities, programs, or policies towards achieving the goals, objectives, mission, and vision of an organization. According to Hasibuan (2002), enhancing human resource performance involves enhancing employees' technical, theoretical, conceptual, and ethical capabilities to meet job or position requirements through education and training.

#### Dinamika Bahari: Journal of Maritime Dynamic - May 2024, 5(1), 37 - 49

Mathis and Jackson (2002) argue that performance evaluation involves assessing employees' effectiveness in carrying out their tasks relative to predetermined benchmarks, and subsequently conveying this assessment. Employee performance appraisals have two common uses in organizations, and the two can be potentially conflicting. One use is to measure performance to provide rewards or, in other words, to make this difficult for managers to do. Zweig, in Prawirosentono (1999), stated that performance appraisal is a procedure for evaluating work outcomes, intended for management's utilization in furnishing individual employees with feedback regarding the quality of their work outcomes from the standpoint of the company's interests.

b. Individual Characteristics

According to Maslow in Gibson et. al. (2000) and Arikunto, S. (2007), describes the characteristics of individuals who are defined as people who are self-actualized regarding: (1) The ability to perceive people and events accurately, (2) The ability to free oneself from the chaos of life, (3) Task problem orientation, (4) The ability to gain personal satisfaction from personal development in doing something valuable, (5) The capacity to love and experience life in a very deep way, (6) Interest in what goals they are working on, (7) High creativity in work.

c. Training

Training is a practice aimed at enhancing and refining employees' attitudes, behaviors, skills, and knowledge in alignment with the organization's objectives. Therefore, the scope of training isn't solely focused on skill development. It's regarded as an investment in human resource development within the context of national development during this reform era. Numerous changes have unfolded across various facets of national development, notably a shift in the paradigm of regional government systems towards emphasizing decentralization principles (Musafir, 2009)The Influence of Individual Characteristics on Work Motivation.

Robbins (2006) said that motivation is a process that produces intensity, direction, and individual persistence to achieve a goal. A need means a physical or psychological deficiency that makes a particular outcome seem attractive. Furthermore, it is said that a need that is not met will create tension so that it will stimulate drive within the individual. Subyantoro's (2009) research results show that personal characteristics have a direct influence on work motivation.

d. The Effect of Training on Work Motivation

The training given to employees also often encourages or motivates employees to work hard. This is because employees who know their duties and responsibilities well will try their best to achieve a high level of work morale (Erfina, 2009). Research results from Wahyuddin (2008) and Erfina (2009) state that training has a positive influence on employee work motivation. The higher the training received, the higher the work motivation.

e. The Influence of Individual Characteristics on Employee Performance

Performance relies on both motivation and ability. Abilities encompass individual traits. To accomplish tasks effectively, an individual needs a specific level of willingness and ability. However, without a clear understanding or knowledge of the task and how to approach it, an individual's willingness and skills may not be sufficient (Rivai, 2005).

f. The Effect of Training on Employee Performance

Training will be beneficial for an organization, especially in improving performance, if training needs are analyzed at the right time and at the right time (Irianto, 2001) because training is only useful in situations when employees lack skills and knowledge at work (Gomes, 2000).

g. The Influence of Work Motivation to The Employee Performance

Providing motivation has the aim and purpose of encouraging a person or employee to do something. Work motivation is one of the variables that can improve employee performance. If employees are motivated at work, their morale will increase, and this will affect improving organizational performance (Suprapto, 2009). H1: It is suspected that there is a positive effect between individual characteristics on employee work motivation at Politeknik Ilmu Pelayaran Semarang.

H2: It is suspected that there is a positive influence between training on employee work motivation at Politeknik Ilmu Pelayaran Semarang.

H3: It is suspected that there is a positive effect between individual characteristics on employee performance at Politeknik Ilmu Pelayaran Semarang.

H4: It is suspected that there is a positive effect between training on employee performance at Politeknik Ilmu Pelayaran Semarang.

H5: It is suspected that there is a positive effect between work motivation on employee performance at Politeknik Ilmu Pelayaran Semarang.

The focus of this study encompasses two data sources: primary data acquired through questionnaires and secondary data sourced from reports or office documents at Politeknik Ilmu Pelayaran Semarang. The study population comprises all employees at Politeknik Ilmu Pelayaran Semarang, totaling 218 individuals. A random sampling method was employed, ensuring equal opportunity for all population members to be selected. Specifically, Proportionate Stratified Random Sampling was utilized, considering strata within the population. Sample size determination accounted for each stratum proportionally to ensure representation. Sampling was conducted across 32 units, drawing from each unit.

This study involves three types of variables: the dependent variable, which is employee performance; the independent variables, consisting of individual characteristics and training; and the mediating variable, which is work motivation. Data collection methods employed in this study include questionnaires and documentation studies. The analysis techniques utilized encompass six phases: testing the research instrument, assessing classical assumptions, examining model feasibility, conducting multiple linear regression analysis, hypothesis testing, and testing for mediation or intervening effects.

## **RESULT AND DISCUSSION**

1. Description of Respondent Data

The data description regarding the profile of respondents in this study consists of gender, age, education level, and section. The following will explain each of these data.

Table 1. Gender				
Gender	Frequency	Percentage (%)		
Male	85	60		
Female	56	40		
Amount	141	100		

The table above shows that there were 85 male respondents (60%), while there were 56 female respondents (40%). This shows the picture that men dominate employees at Politeknik Ilmu Pelayaran Semarang.

	Table 2. Age					
Age	Frequency	Percentage (%)				
25-27	6	4				
28-31	24	17				
32-35	43	30				
36-39	12	9				
40-43	20	14				
44-47	28	20				
48-51	6	4				
52-55	2	2				
Amount	141	100				

From the table above, it can be seen that 4% of the employees working at Politeknik Ilmu Pelayaran Semarang are aged between 25-27 years, 17% are aged between 28-31 years, 30% are aged between 32-35 years, 9% are aged between 36-39 years, 14% are between 40-43 years old, 20% are between 44-47 years old, 4% are between 48-51 years old, and only 2% are between 52-55 years old. This illustrates that most of the employees at Politeknik Ilmu Pelayaran Semarang are still young, so they are still very productive at work.

	Table 3. Education	on
Education	Frequency	Percentage (%)
High School	24	17
Diploma 3 (D3)	7	5
Bachelor (S1)	79	56
Master (S2)	31	22
Amount	141	100

From the table above, it shows that 24 respondents had a high school level education (17%), seven people had a Diploma 3 level (5%), 79 people had a bachelor's level education (56%), and 31 people had a master's level education (22%). This can be illustrated that academically, most of the employees at Politeknik Ilmu Pelayaran Semarang have bachelor's and master's degrees.

Table 4. Unit

Unit	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Internal Audit Unit	6	4
Quality Management	5	2
Administration Sub Division	21	10
Finance Sub-Section	34	16
Department of Nauticals, Engineering, KALK	13	6
Supporting Elements	62	26
РЗКМ	5	2
Mental, Moral and Equity Development Center Unit (P2M2K)	24	11
Development Division	6	3
Lecturer	42	20
Amount	141	100

The table above shows that 4% of Politeknik Ilmu Pelayaran Semarang employees are in the internal audit unit, 2% of employees are in the quality management unit, and 10% of employees are in the sub-division unit. Administration, 16% of employees are in Sub Division units. Finance, 6% of employees are in the Department unit, 26% of employees are in the Supporting Elements unit, 2% of employees are in the P3KM unit, 11% of employees are in the Mental, Moral and Equity Development Center unit, 3% of employees are in the Development Division unit, and 20% of employees are in lecturer/teaching units. This shows that the majority of employees at Politeknik Ilmu Pelayaran Semarang are the supporting elements and lecturers.

# 2. Instrument Validity Test Results

An instrument is said to be valid if  $\alpha = 0.05$ , then: the results of r count > r table = valid, results of r count  $\leq$  r table = invalid. Thus, to find out the results of the validity test of these instruments are as follows: Table 5. Instrument Validity Test Results for Individual Characteristic Variables

Number	Item Code	r Count		r Table	Information
1	Al	0,796	>	0,138	Valid
2	A2	0,704	>	0,138	Valid
3	<b>A</b> 3	0,591	>	0,138	Valid
4	A4	0,786	>	0,138	Valid
5	A5	0,583	>	0,138	Valid
6	A6	0,602	>	0,138	Valid

Based on the results of the instrument validity test for the individual characteristic variables above, it can be concluded that the calculated r for instruments 1-6 is greater than the r table (n=141) of 0.138, so all instruments for these variables are considered valid.

Table 6. Instrument Validity Test Results for Training Variables

Number	Item Code	r Count		r Table	Information
1	B1	0,655	>	0,138	Valid
2	<b>B</b> 2	0,867	>	0,138	Valid
3	<b>B</b> 3	0,763	>	0,138	Valid
4	<b>B</b> 4	0,614	>	0,138	Valid

Based on the results of the instrument validity test for the training variables above, it can be concluded that the calculated r for instruments 1-4 is greater than the r table (n=141) of 0.138, so all instruments for these variables are considered valid.

Number	Item Code	r Count		r Table	Information
1	C1	0,712	>	0,138	Valid
2	C2	0,747	>	0,138	Valid
3	C3	0,816	>	0,138	Valid
4	C4	0,836	>	0,138	Valid
5	C5	0,848	>	0,138	Valid

Table 7. Instrument Validity Test Results for Work Motivation Variables

Based on the results of the instrument validity test for the work motivation variable above, it can be concluded that the calculated r for instruments 1-5 is greater than the r table (n=141) of 0.138, so all instruments for these variables are considered valid.

<u>Dinamika Bahari: Journal of Maritime Dynamic - May 2024, 5(1), 37 - 49</u> Table 8 Instrument Validity Test Results for Employee Performance Variables

Number	Item Code	r Count		r Table	Information
1	D1	0,638	>	0,138	Valid
2	D2	0,765	>	0,138	Valid
3	<b>D</b> 3	0,808	>	0,138	Valid
4	D4	0,837	>	0,138	Valid
5	<b>D</b> 5	0,885	>	0,138	Valid

Based on the results of the instrument validity test for the performance variables above, it can be concluded that the calculated r for instruments 1-5 is greater than the r table (n=141) of 0.138, so all instruments for these variables are considered valid.

# 3. Instrument Reliability Test Results

An instrument can be said to be reliable if: results  $\alpha > 0.60$  = reliable, results  $\alpha < 0.60$  = not reliable

	Table 9. Instrument Reliability Test Results						
Variable	$\alpha$ Cronbach Value	The Specified α Value	Information				
Individual Characteristics	0,770	0,60	Reliable				
Training	0,706	0,60	Reliable				
Work Motivation	0,852	0,60	Reliable				
Performance	0,849	0,60	Reliable				

Based on the results of the reliability test calculations, as seen in the table above, show that all the variables studied, namely individual characteristics, training, work motivation and performance, have a Cronbach Alpha coefficient above 0.60, so it is concluded that all instruments for the variables in this study are reliable.

### 4. Classic Assumption Test Results

a. Normality test results

Data can be said to be normal if the Kolmogrov-Smirnov value is greater than Alpha = 0.05 then the data is said to be normal. The results of this normality test can be seen in the following table which shows that the data is normally distributed.

		Unstandardized Residual
N		141
Normal Damas atoma	Mean	0.0000000
Normal Parameters	Std. Deviation	1.77934235
	Absolute	0.115
Most Extreme Differences	Positive	0.115
	Negative	-0.076
Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z		1.366
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)		0.048

Table 10. One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test

From the K-S table, it can be seen that the Kolmogorov-Smirnov value is 1.366, which is greater than Alpha = 0.05, so the data is normal.

#### b. Multicollinearity Test Results

In this research, multicollinearity is seen through (1) tolerance values and (2) variance inflation factor (VIF) values which can be seen from the following table: If the Tolerance number is above/greater (>) 0.1, then there is no multicollinearity

	Table 11 Coefficients*							
Model		Unstandardized Standardized Coefficients Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Collinearity Statistics	
		В	Std. Error	Beta		_	Tolerance	VIF
	(Constant)	3.157	0.952		3.314	0.001		
1	Individual Characteristics	0.495	0.076	0.533	6.469	0.000	0.351	2.852
	Training	0.389	0.098	0.327	3.974	0.000	0.351	2.852

If the VIF value is below/smaller ( $\leq$ ) 10, then there is no multicollinearity

# c. Dependent Variable: Motivation

The calculated Tolerance values indicate that all independent variables surpass the threshold of 0.10, signifying that there's no correlation between independent variables exceeding 95%. Similarly, the VIF results reveal that all independent variables have VIF values below 10. Therefore, there's no evidence of multicollinearity among the independent variables in the regression model.

d. Test Results of Heteroscedasticity

In this study, the heteroscedasticity test was conducted by examining the plotted graph depicting the predicted values of the dependent variable, denoted as ZPRED, against the residual SRESID. The outcomes are illustrated in the graph plot presented below:

Scatterplot

#### Dependent Variable: Performance



Figure 2. Scatterplot

The scatterplot graph indicates that the points are dispersed randomly and are distributed both above and below the 0 mark on the Y-axis. This suggests that there is no presence of heteroscedasticity in the regression model, indicating its suitability for use

5. Model Feasibility Test Results

The following table is the results of the Coefficient of Determination test

a. First Coefficient of Determination (R2)

Table 12 Model Summary<sup>b</sup>

	<u>Dinamika</u> I	Bahari: Journal	of Maritime Dyn	<u>amic – May 2024, s</u>
			Adjusted R	Std. Error of the
Model	R R Square		Square	Estimate
1	0.820ª	0.672	0.667	1.79219

a) Predictors: (Constant), Training, Individual Characteristics

b) Dependent Variable: Motivation

From the table above, the R2 is 0.672, while the Adjusted R2 is 0.667. This means that the adjusted R2 is close to 1 (one), so the stronger the model is in explaining variations in the independent variable over the dependent variable. Alternatively, in other words, work motivation can be explained by variations from individual characteristics, and training amounted to 66.7%. At the same time, the remainder (100% - 66.7% = 33.3%) is explained by other causes outside the model.

#### b. First F Test Results

		I aple	13 ANOVA	1			
Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	
	Regression	907.787	2	453.894	141.314	$0.000^{\circ}$	
1	Residual	443.248	138	3.212			
	Total	1351.035	140				

TIL 19 ANOVA

a) Predictors: (Constant), Training, Individual Characteristics

b) Dependent Variable: Motivation

From the F test, there is an F count value of 141.314 > F table of 3.06 with a significance of 0.000 < 0.05, so the regression model is feasible or can be used in this research. In other words, because the significance value is much smaller than 0.05, the regression model can be used to predict the dependent variable, namely the work motivation variable.

### c. Second Coefficient of Determination (R2) results

Table 14 Model Summary"							
Model	R	<b>R</b> Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate			
1	$0.854^{\circ}$	0.729	0.723	1.97960			

a) Predictors: (Constant), Motivation, Training, Individual Characteristics

b) Dependent Variable: Performance

From the table above, the R2 is 0.729, while the Adjusted R2 is 0.723. This means that the adjusted R2 is close to 1 (one), so it can be said that the stronger the model is in explaining variations in the independent variable relative to the dependent variable. In other words, performance can be explained by variations in individual characteristics, training, and work motivation by 72.3%. In comparison, the remainder (100% - 72.3% = 27.7%) is explained by other causes outside the model.

### d. Second F Test Results

Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	
	Regression	1442.995	3	480.998	122.741	0.000ª	
1	Residual	536.878	137	3.919			
	Total	1979.872	140				

Table 15 ANOVA<sup>b</sup>

a. Predictors: (Constant), Motivation, Training, Individual Characteristics

b. Dependent Variable: Performance

From the F test, there is an F count value of 122.741 > F table of 2.67 with a significance of 0.000 < 0.05, so the regression model is feasible or can be used in this research. In other words, because the significance value is much smaller than 0.05, the regression model can be used to predict the dependent variable, namely the performance variable.

	Table 16 Coefficients							
	Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.		
		В	Std. Error	Beta				
	(Constant)	3.157	0.952		3.314	0.001		
1	Individual Characteristics	0.495	0.076	0.533	6.469	0.000		
	Training	0.389	0.098	0.327	3.974	0.000		

C	D	A		D = 1 + -
0.	Kegressic	on Ana	IVS1S	Results
			~	

a. Results of The First Regression Analysis

From the two independent variables included in the regression model, the regression equation can be written:

Y1 = 0.533 X1 + 0.327 X2

B1 = 0.533 (positive), meaning that there is a positive influence between individual characteristic variables on work motivation. The higher the individual characteristics, the higher the work motivation.

B2 = 0.327 (positive), meaning that there is a positive influence between the training variables on work motivation. The higher the training, the higher the work motivation.

		Tabl	e 17 Coefficients <sup>b</sup>			
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		В	Std. Error	Beta		_
	(Constant)	-2.111	1.093		-1.932	0.055
1	Individual Characteristics	0.282	0.096	0.251	2.930	0.004
	Training	0.442	0.114	0.307	3.871	0.000
	Motivation	0.440	0.094	0.364	4.684	0.000

### b. Results of the second regression analysis

From the independent variables entered into the regression model, the regression equation can be written:

Y2= 0.251 X1+ 0.307 X2 + 0.364 Y1

- B3 = 0.251 (positive), meaning that there is a positive influence between individual characteristic variables on performance. The higher the individual characteristics, the higher the performance.
- B4 = 0.307 (positive), meaning that there is a positive influence between the training variables on performance. The higher the training, the higher the performance.
- B5 = 0.364 (positive), meaning that there is a positive influence between work motivation variables on performance. The higher the work motivation, the higher the performance.

## 7. t-Test Results

The t-test is used to determine how far one independent variable partially influences the variation in the dependent variable. From Table 4.16, the calculated t value of the individual characteristic variable is 6.469 > t table of 1.656 with a significance of 0.000,

meaning that there is a significant influence between individual characteristics on work motivation. Thus, hypothesis 1 is accepted. Likewise, the calculated t value of the training variable is 3.974 > t table of 1.656 with a significance of 0.000, meaning that there is a significant influence between training and work motivation. Thus, hypothesis 2 is accepted. Furthermore, from Table 4.17, the calculated t value of the individual characteristic variable is 2.930 > t table of 1.656 with a significance of 0.004, meaning that there is a significant influence between individual characteristics on performance.

Thus, hypothesis 3 is accepted. Likewise, the calculated t value of the training variable is 3.871 > t table of 1.656 with a significance of 0.000, meaning that there is a significant influence between training and performance, so hypothesis 4 is accepted. Then, the calculated t value of the work motivation variable is 4.684 > t table of 1.656 with a significance of 0.000, meaning that there is a significant influence between work motivation and performance. Thus, hypothesis 5 is also accepted.

- 8. Mediation/Intervening Test Results
  - Mediation/intervening conditions: If indirect influence > direct influence b1 = 0.533 b2 = 0.327 b3 = 0.251 b4 = 0.307 b5 = 0.364 (b1 x b5) = (0.533 x 0.364) = 0.194 < b3 = 0.251 (b2 x b5) = (0.327 x 0.364) = 0.119 < b4 = 0.307

# 9. Results

The first hypothesis test, which states that there is a positive influence between individual characteristic variables on work motivation, is accepted. This result is proven by the regression coefficient level of 0.533, which has a positive sign, and the significance level is 0.000 < 0.05, so it can be concluded that individual characteristics influence work motivation. These results support the results of research conducted by Subyantoro (2009), which shows that individual characteristics have a direct influence on work motivation. The results of the second hypothesis test also prove that there is a positive influence between training and work motivation. This result is proven by the regression coefficient level of 0.327, which is positive, and the significance level of 0.000 is still far below 0.05 (0.000 < 0.05), so it can be concluded that work motivation is also proven to be influenced by training. This is to the research results of Wahyuddin (2008) and Erfina (2009), which stated that training has a positive influence on employee work motivation. The higher the training received, the higher the work motivation.

Furthermore, the results of the third hypothesis, which states that there is a positive influence between individual characteristics on employee performance, are also accepted. This can be seen from the regression coefficient level of 0.251, which is positive, and the significance level of 0.004 is smaller than 0.05 (0.004 < 0.05), so it can be concluded that individual characteristics have a positive influence on employee performance, so the third hypothesis is accepted. The results of this research are the results of research conducted by Damayanti (2006), which shows that individual characteristics have a positive influence between training and employee performance. This can be seen from the regression coefficient level of 0.307, which is positive, and the significance level of 0.000 is smaller than 0.05 (0.000 < 0.05), so it can be concluded that training has a positive influence on performance, so the fourth hypothesis is accepted. These results support the research results of Soetjipto

(2007) and Kunartinah & Sukoco (2010), which stated that training has a positive effect on performance. The higher the training, the higher the performance.

The results of the fifth hypothesis test also prove that there is a positive influence between work motivation and employee performance. This can be seen from the regression coefficient level of 0.364, which is positive, and the significance level of 0.000is smaller than 0.05 (0.000 < 0.05), so it can be concluded that work motivation has a positive influence on performance, so the fifth hypothesis is accepted. The results of this research support the research results of Musafir (2009) and Suprapto (2009), which stated that work motivation has a positive effect on performance. The higher the work motivation, the higher the performance.

From this discussion, the five hypotheses tested were proven to be accepted, so the results of this research are on the previously formulated hypotheses. Meanwhile, the results of the mediation/intervening test show that work motivation as a mediating/intervening variable, although it has a small influence, is still able to explain the indirect influence between individual characteristics and training on employee performance. This research reveals several relevant findings. First, individual characteristics are proven to have a positive influence on work motivation, as evidenced by a regression coefficient of 0.533 with a significance level of 0.000, in accordance with previous research by Subvantoro (2009). Second, the results show that training also has a positive impact on work motivation, with a regression coefficient of 0.327 and a significance level of 0.000. These results are consistent with research by Wahyuddin (2008) and Erfina (2009). Third, individual characteristics have a positive contribution to employee performance, with a regression coefficient of 0.251 and a significance level of 0.004, which supports the findings by Damayanti (2006). Fourth, training has also been proven to have a positive impact on employee performance, with a regression coefficient of 0.307 and a significance level of 0.000, in line with the research results of Soetjipto (2007) and Kunartinah & Sukoco (2010). Finally, the findings show that work motivation makes a positive contribution to employee performance, indicated by a regression coefficient of 0.364 and a significance level of 0.000, which supports research by Musafir (2009) and Suprapto (2009). In conclusion, individual characteristics, training and work motivation are factors that are interconnected and have a positive influence on employee motivation and performance in an organization.

#### CONCLUSION

Based on the analysis and discussion findings, it can be inferred that individual characteristics positively influence both work motivation and employee performance at Politeknik Ilmu Pelayaran Semarang. Similarly, training also has a positive effect on work motivation and employee performance within the institution. However, the study reveals that work motivation does not serve as a mediator between individual characteristics or training and employee performance at Politeknik Ilmu Pelayaran Semarang. Despite its positive impact on employee performance, work motivation does not act as an intermediary between individual characteristics or training and employee performance. These conclusions shed light on the factors influencing employee motivation and performance at Politeknik Ilmu Pelayaran Semarang, offering valuable insights for developing more effective human resource management strategies in the future.

#### **REFERENCES**

Arikunto, S. (2007). Research procedures: A practice approach. Rineka Cipta.

- Damayanti. (2006). The influence of individual characteristics, job characteristics, and work situation characteristics on employee performance: A study at PT PLN Distribution East Java. Malang.
- Erfina. (2009). The influence of education and training on the work performance of Surakarta Customs & Excise Service and Supervision Office employees. Muhammadiyah Surakarta University Publisher.
- Gibson, J. L., Ivancevich, J. M., & Donnely, J. H., Jr. (2000). Organization and management (D. Wahid, Trans.). Erlangga Publisher.
- Gomes. (2000). Human resource management. Andi Offset.
- Handoko, T. H. (1999). Personnel & human resources management (2nd ed.). BPFE.
- Hasibuan, M. S. P. (2002). Human resource management. Bumi Literacy.
- Irianto, J. (2001). *Main themes of human resource management*. Insan Cendekia.
- Kunartinah, & Sukoco. (2010). The effect of education and training, organizational learning on performance with competence as mediation. *Journal of Business and Economics (JBE)*.
- Mathis, R. L., & Jackson, J. H. (2002). Human resource management. Salemba Empat.
- Musafir. (2009). The effect of training and motivation on the performance of Indonesian Port IV Gorontalo employees. *Ichsan Gorontalo Journal*, 4(2).
- Prawirosentono, S. (1999). Organizational performance analysis. P.T. Rineka Cipta.
- Rivai, V. (2005). Several efforts to increase staff professional work motivation: A survey at Government Banks Bank Mandiri, Bank BRI, and Bank BTN in 2000. *Journal of Corporate Economics, July.*
- Robbins, S. P. (2006). Organizational behavior (Indonesian ed., Vols. I and II). Prinhalindo.
- Soetjipto. (2007). The influence of education, training, motivation, and work experience on performance. *Management Application Journal*, 5(1).
- Subyantoro, A. (2009). Individual characteristics, job characteristics, organizational characteristics, and management job satisfaction mediated by work motivation. *Journal of Management and Entrepreneurship, 11(1).*
- Suprapto. (2009). The influence of competency and motivation on employee performance with job satisfaction as a moderating variable. *Excellent, Vol.1 No.1.*
- Wahyuddin. (2008). The influence of leadership, motivation, and training on organizational climate and employee performance. Muhammadiyah Surakarta University Publisher.