How is the employee's performance in the quality assurance department of pt. peb indonesia?

Sri Langgeng Ratnasari[1], Gandhi Sutjahjo[2], Sulastri Manurung[3]
[1,2,3]Riau Kepulauan University, Batam, Indonesia
[1]Email: sarisucahyo@yahoo.com
[2]Email: gandhi.sucahyo@yahoo.com
[3]Email: lastrimanurung15@gmail.com

Abstract

This study aims to determine the effect of the level of education, work experience, and compensation to the performance of employee through work motivation. This research was conducted at PT. PEB Indonesia with the research population are all employees of the Quality Assurance Department. The sample of this study was 187 employees, using census sampling techniques or saturated sampling techniques. Data collection technique was using questionnaires distributed to respondents. The data analysis technique used SPSS and Structural Equation Modeling. The results of this study are the Education Level has a positive and significant effect on Work Motivation. Work Experience has a positive and significant effect on Work Motivation. Compensation has a positive and significant effect on Work Motivation. Level of Education, Experience, Compensation has a significant effect simultaneously on Work Motivation. Education Level has a significant effect on Employee Performance. Work Experience has a significant effect on Employee Performance. Compensation has a positive and significant effect on Employee Performance. Level of Education, Experience, Compensation simultaneously has a positive and significant effect on Employee Performance. Work motivation has a positive and significant effect on Employee Performance.

Keywords: Education level; job experience; compensation; work motivation; employee's performance

INTRODUCTION

Employee performance is one of the research variables that are widely investigated in human resource management. This is because employee performance will be an organizational performance that makes the organization able to maintain its existence and increase its scale. This study aims to determine the effect of the level of education, work experience, and compensation on employee performance through work motivation.

This research was initiated by the employees' performance at PT. PEB Indonesia that is not optimal, which is indicated by several variables effect, namely, the level of education that is still dominated by graduated senior high school employees, a lack of work experience, compensation that is still unsatisfactory, and employee motivation that is not optimal. Based on this, this research was conducted.

Level of education

According to Sikula (2013) the level of education is a long-term process that uses systematic and organized procedures, in which managerial employees learn conceptual and theoretical knowledge for general purposes. The process is a stage that must be passed in stages. The gradual description of the process was also stated by Hasan (2013) that the level of education is a continuous stage of education, which is determined based on the level of development of students, the complexity of the teaching materials and the methods of presenting teaching materials.

Indonesian Law No. 20 of 2003 describes it as an education level. The level of education is the stage of education that is determined based on the level of students' development, goals to be achieved, and capabilities being developed. (Law of the Republic of Indonesia No. 20 of 2003).

In essence, the level of education is a gradual and continuous education process in the context of developing student competencies.

Work experience

Work experience is the level of a person's knowledge and skills mastery in his work which can be measured from his tenure, the level of knowledge and skills he has, Rofiq (2014). Knowledge and skills here refer to the theory and practice of a job. The indicators are contained in the period of work, knowledge and skills. Robbins (2013) revealed that work experience can be obtained directly through experience or practice or it can be directly, such as from reading.

According to Manulang (2014), what is meant by work experience is the process of forming knowledge or skills about the method of a job because of the involvement of these employees in the implementation of work tasks. According to Cascio (2013) what is meant by work experience is a factor to assess how long a person can know or exchange knowledge with other people to be able to carry out their work effectively.

Khojamli et al. (2014) stated: "Work experience is any experience that a person gains while working in a specific field or occupation, but the expression is widely used to mean a type of volunteer work that is commonly intended for young people — often students — to get a feel for professional working environments. Experience is what items have been tasted, known, worked on and so on. Work is an activity to do something (Ministry of National Education, 2008).

Work experience is a process of formation or skill about the method of a job for employees because of the involvement of these employees in the implementation of their work duties. (Manulang, 2014). Another opinion says: work experience is a measure of the length of time or tenure of someone in understanding the tasks of a job and has done it well (Ranupandojo, 2014). According to Trijoko (2010), work experience is knowledge or skills that have been known and mastered by someone as the result result of actions or work that has been done for some time. The conclusion of the above explanation is that work experience is defined as a knowledge or skill that is obtained after engaging directly in a job.

Compensation

Husnan (2010) defines compensation as compensation for services / remuneration provided by the company to workers, because the employee has given contributions and thoughts for the progress and continuity of the company in order to achieve the stated goals, both in the short term and in the long term. According to Handoko (2014) states that compensation is a reward in the form of money or not money to employees for work that has been done for the organization or company.

Sedarmayanti (2014) says that compensation is everything that employees receive as a reward for their work. Malayu (2014) says that compensation is all income in the form of money, direct or indirect goods received by employees in return for services provided to companies. Handoko (2014) also said that compensation is everything that is received by employees as a reward for their work, in the sense that compensation is a reward received by individuals for the results of their work in the organization.

According to Mutiara (2014) Compensation is also called appreciation and can be defined as any form of award given to employees as a reward for the contributions they make to the organization.

Suparyadi (2015). Compensation is also an overall reward received by employee as an appreciation for the contribution he gives to the organization, both financial and non-financial. Based on the above definition, it can be concluded, compensation is something we receive as a reward for our contribution to an organization or company.

Work motivation

According to Robbins (2016) Work motivation is the desire to work to achieve a goal, where the desire can stimulate someone to do work or can lead to the emergence of work mobility. Hasibuan (2014) says that work motivation is the result of internal or external process to the individual that causes an attitude of enthusiasm and consistency in doing certain activities. Work motivation is a difficult thing to do because the company does not know exactly what the needs and desires of employees are.

Nawawi (2014) says that work motivation is a condition that encourages or cause someone doing an action. While Ernest (2014) suggests that work motivation is a condition that is influential in generating, directing and maintaining behavior related to the work environment. Based on the explanation above, it can be concluded that work motivation is both internal and external impulses that cause a person to do a job in an organization or company.

Employee performance

According to Rofiq (2014) Performance is the result achieved by employees based on quantity and quality and promptness. According to Mangkunegara (2014) performance is the result of work in the quality and quantity that can be achieved by an employee in carrying out tasks in accordance with the responsibilities given to him.

Supriyono (2010) argues that: "Performance is a result achieved by someone in carrying out the tasks given to him based on skills, experience, and ability and time". Based on the definition above, it can be concluded, employee performance is a result of achievement after carrying out tasks based on targets, standards, and criteria that have been previously set.

METHOD

Validity and reliability

Validity test is used to test the questionnaire to obtain valid data. Valid means that the questionnaire can be used to measure what should be measured. The validity test in this study used the total item corellation method with the formula:

$$\rho = 1 - \frac{6\sum d^2_i}{n(n^2-1)}$$

in which:
n : all items
d : rank deviation
ρ : Coefficient Correlation
an item is valid if r obtained is bigger than 0,3
meanwhile, reliability test used *alpha-cronbach with the following formula:*

$$\alpha = \frac{n}{n-1}\left(1 - \frac{\sum Vi}{Vt}\right)$$

In which:
n : all items
Vi : items variant
Vt : total variants

The variable is reliable if the alpha obtained is more than 0.6. Product moment correlation calculations and Cronbach's Alpha coefficients are performed with SPSS for Windows version 22.0 specifically the Scale sub menu in the Analyze menu. The results of analyzing or calculating the correlation coefficient Corrected Item-Total Correlation and Cronbach's Alpha Coefficient are as follows:

Table 1. Coefficient corrected item-total correlatian
For questions item variable level of education
Item-Total Statistics

	Scale Mean if Item Deleted	Scale Variance if Item Deleted	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted
Edu1	9,90	3,817	,495	,813
Edu2	10,40	2,938	,667	,739
Edu3	10,30	3,941	,717	,724
Edu4	9,90	3,817	,675	,732

Table 2. Coefficient cronbach's for questionnaires variable level of education
Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
,802	4

Table 3. Coefficient corrected item-total correlatian
For question items variable work experience
Item-Total Statistics

	Scale mean if item deleted	Scale variance if item deleted	Corrected item-total correlation	Cronbach's alpha if item deleted
Exp1	13,50	3,776	,631	,592
Exp 2	13,60	4,179	,697	,601
Exp 3	13,60	5,007	,373	,722.0
Exp 4	13,50	3,776	,458	,665
Exp 5	14,20	3,476	,416	,706

Tabel 4. Coeeficient cronbach's for questionnaires variable work experience
Reliability statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
,707	5

Tabel 5. Coefficient corrected item-total correlatian
for question items variable compensation
Item-Total Statistics

	Scale Mean if Item Deleted	Scale Variance if Item Deleted	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted
Comp1	14,50	4,190	,761	,698
Comp2	14,10	6,507	,385	,814
Comp3	14,10	6,714	,513	,789
Comp4	14,00	4,966	,609	,756
Comp5	14,10	5,472	,747	,716

Table 6. Coefficient cronbach's for questionnaires variables compensation
Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
,799	5

Tabel 7. Coefficient corrected item-total correlatian
for question items variable motivation Item-Total Statistics

	Scale Mean if Item Deleted	Scale Variance if Item Deleted	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted
Mot1	21,93	19,306	,354	,858
Mot2	21,57	19,357	,312	,873
Mot3	22.0,27	15,995	,581	,832
Mot4	22.0,53	11,775	,887	,778
Mot5	22.0,37	13,413	,797	,795
Mot6	21,67	15,954	,734	,812
Mot7	21,67	15,954	,734	,812

Table 8. Coefficient cronbach's for questionnaires variable motivation
Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
,849	7

Table 9. Coefficient corrected item-total correlation for question items variable performance
Item-Total Statistics

	Scale Mean if Item Deleted	Scale Variance if Item Deleted	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted
Perf 1	28,80	12,166	,742	,832
Perf 2	29,20	14,855	,317	,869
Perf 3	29,10	11,886	,863	,820
Perf 4	28,90	12,300	,860	,823
Perf 5	29,00	11,172	,857	,817
Perf 6	29,30	13,459	,493	,857
Perf 7	29,50	14,534	,311	,872
Perf 8	29,20	12,579	,684	,838
Perf 9	28,60	15,352	,364	,881

Table 10. Coefficient cronbach's for questionnaires variable performance
Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
,862	9

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

To evaluate normality, a skwenees test and kurtosis test are performed. skwenees test is used to see the skewedness or inclination of the data distribution, while kurtosis is to see the data distribution. According to Suharyadi (2003), data has tingling or skewed distribution when the critical value (c.r.) for large skweness of ± 3.00. The data has a sharp distribution if critical experience (c.r.) for kurtosis > 3.00. According to Ferdinand (2014) data can be expressed as normal spread if the critical value (c.r) for sensitivity and kurtosis is not greater than ± 2.58. In this research used criteria according to Suharyadi (2003).

The normality test is carried out on the data for each indicator of latent variables, namely data on the variables of the level of Education, Experience, Compensation, Motivation and Performance. Based on the results of the Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) program Amos Version 22.0 for Windows on the research data for each latent variable, the results of processing assessment of normality in Amos Version 22.0 were obtained as shown in the table below.

Table 11. Assessment of normality (Group number 1)
Variable level of education

Variable	min	max	skew	c.r.	kurtosis	c.r.
Edu4	1,000	5,000	-,013	-,075	1,240	2,461
Edu 3	1,000	5,000	-,169	-,943	-,465	-1,298
Edu 2	1,000	5,000	-,303	-1,694	,304	,849
Edu 1	1,000	5,000	-,413	-2,308	,651	1,816
Multivariate					2,435	2,403

Table 12. Assessment of normality (group number 1).
Variable experience

Variable	min	max	skew	c.r.	kurtosis	c.r.
Exp1	3,000	5,000	,400	2,235	-1,027	-2,867
Exp 2	3,000	5,000	-,964	-2,384	-,555	-1,549
Exp 3	2,000	5,000	-1,116	-2,230	1,180	3,295
Exp 4	2,000	5,000	-,327	-1,824	-,484	-1,350
Exp 5	2,000	5,000	,110	,612	-,181	-,504
Multivariate					8,002	6,540

Table 13. Assessment of normality (Group number 1)
Variable compensation

Variable	min	max	skew	c.r.	kurtosis	c.r.
Comp1	1,000	5,000	,072	,401	,791	2,209
Comp2	1,000	5,000	-,050	-,280	-,946	-2,640
Comp3	3,000	5,000	,344	1,919	-,664	-1,853
Comp4	2,000	5,000	-,143	-,800	-,400	-1,116
Comp5	2,000	5,000	-,364	-2,033	-,694	-1,938
Multivariate					1,434	1,172

Table 14. Assessment of normality (Group number 1)
Variable Motivation

Variable	min	max	skew	c.r.	kurtosis	c.r.
Mot7	1,000	5,000	-,575	-2,212	,560	1,562
Mot6	2,000	5,000	,395	2,206	-,850	-2,374
Mot5	1,000	5,000	-,048	-,269	-,540	-1,509
Mot4	1,000	5,000	-1,282	-2,158	2,588	2,224
Mot3	1,000	5,000	-,765	-2,269	1,787	2,988
Mot2	2,000	5,000	-,712	-2,974	1,661	2,635
Mot1	1,000	5,000	-1,247	-2,962	,664	1,852
Multivariate					13,804	8,408

Table 15. Assessment of normality (Group number 1)
Variable Performance

Variable	min	max	skew	c.r.	kurtosis	c.r.
Per9	1,000	5,000	-1,031	-2,757	4,444	2,406
Per 8	1,000	5,000	-,847	-2,729	1,015	2,832
Per 7	1,000	5,000	,739	2,128	2,338	2,526
Per 6	1,000	5,000	-,563	-2,143	,467	1,304
Per 5	1,000	5,000	-,955	-2,331	1,495	4,173
Per 4	2,000	5,000	-,492	-2,748	,418	1,166
Per 3	2,000	5,000	-,938	-2,239	,820	2,290
Per 2	1,000	5,000	-,826	-2,612	1,384	2,864
Per 1	1,000	5,000	-,365	-2,035	-,023	-,064
Multivariate					39,719	19,300

Table 16. Standarized regression weight (lamda) indicator level of education, experience, compensation, motivation and performance

			Estimate
Motivation	<---	Education	1,793
Motivation	<---	Experience	,527
Motivation	<---	Compensation	,864
Performance	<---	Motivation	5,124
Performance	<---	Education	10,198
Performance	<---	Experience	1,478

			Estimate
Performance	<---	Compensation	4,245
Edu1	<---	Education	,507
Edu 2	<---	Education	,648
Edu 3	<---	Education	,516
Edu 4	<---	Education	,535
Exp5	<---	Experience	,547
Exp 4	<---	Experience	,523
Exp 3	<---	Experience	,570
Exp 2	<---	Experience	,500
Exp 1	<---	Experience	,598
Comp5	<---	Compensation	,575
Comp4	<---	Compensation	,575
Comp3	<---	Compensation	,685
Comp2	<---	Compensation	,585
Comp1	<---	Compensation	,639
Mot1	<---	Motivation	,506
Mot2	<---	Motivation	,570
Mot3	<---	Motivation	,634
Mot4	<---	Motivation	,923
Mot5	<---	Motivation	,544
Mot6	<---	Motivation	,566
Mot7	<---	Motivation	,663
Perf1	<---	Performance	,574
Perf 2	<---	Performance	,555
Perf 3	<---	Performance	,558
Perf 4	<---	Performance	,568
Perf 5	<---	Performance	,526
Perf 6	<---	Performance	,576
Perf 7	<---	Performance	,571
Perf 8	<---	Performance	,556
Perf 9	<---	Performance	,527

Table 17. Regression weight (lamda) indicator level of education, experience, compensation, motivation and performance

			Estimate	S.E.	C.R.	P	Label
Motivation	<---	Education	1,041	,739	2,409	,049	
Motivation	<---	Experience	,316	,298	2,059	,040	
Motivation	<---	Compensation	,380	,455	2,835	,004	
Performance	<---	Motivation	11,043	65,342	2,169	,006	
Performance	<---	Education	12,762	74,637	2,171	,004	
Performance	<---	Experience	3,075	19,817	2,155	,007	
Performance	<---	Compensation	4,019	29,705	2,135	,002	
Edu 1	<---	Education	1,000				
Edu 2	<---	Education	1,570	,379	4,143	***	
Edu 3	<---	Education	,936	,373	2,507	,012	
Edu4	<---	Education	,975	,297	3,279	,001	
Exp 5	<---	Experience	1,000				
Exp 4	<---	Experience	1,708	,504	3,385	***	
Exp 3	<---	Experience	,855	,273	3,134	,002	
Exp 2	<---	Experience	1,126	,309	3,643	***	
Exp1	<---	Experience	2,279	,592	3,846	***	
Comp5	<---	Compensation	1,000				
Comp4	<---	Compensation	,625	,171	3,650	***	

			Estimate	S.E.	C.R.	P	Label
Comp3	<---	Compensation	1,213	,257	4,725	***	
Comp2	<---	Compensation	,822	,269	3,059	,002	
Comp1	<---	Compensation	1,106	,239	4,627	***	
Mot1	<---	Motivation	1,000				
Mot2	<---	Motivation	,601	,350	2,716	,006	
Mot3	<---	Motivation	1,679	,722	2,325	,020	
Mot4	<---	Motivation	4,202	1,577	2,665	,008	
Mot5	<---	Motivation	3,285	1,277	2,573	,010	
Mot6	<---	Motivation	1,704	,792	2,151	,031	
Mot7	<---	Motivation	3,666	1,393	2,631	,009	
Perf 1	<---	Performance	1,000				
Perf 2	<---	Performance	,102	,104	2,984	,025	
Perf 3	<---	Performance	,548	,141	3,880	***	
Perf 4	<---	Performance	,575	,144	3,993	***	
Perf 5	<---	Performance	,572	,162	3,528	***	
Perf 6	<---	Performance	,645	,158	4,068	***	
Perf 7	<---	Performance	,828	,170	4,882	***	
Perf 8	<---	Performance	,345	,132	2,605	,009	
Perf 9	<---	Performance	,052	,107	2,487	,026	

From the two tables above, it can be seen that all latent variable indicators have standardized estimate (regression weight) in the form of loading factor or lamda ()i)> 0.50, critical experience CR> 2,000 and have a probability smaller than 0.05 (** *). Thus it can be said that all indicators of the latent variable are valid / significant.

Analysis of Structural Equation Model

Equation Strutural Level of Education (X_1), Experience (X_2), Compensation (X_3), Motivation (Y) dan Performance (Z) as equation below:

H_1 : $Y = \gamma_{y.x1}X_1 + e_1$, → Direct Effects X_1towards Y,

H_2 : $Y = \gamma_{y.x2}X_2 + e_1$, →Direct Effects X_2 towards Y,

H_3 : $Y = \gamma_{y.x3}X_3 + e_1$, →Direct Effects X_3 towards Y,

H_4 : $Y = \gamma_{yx1}X_1 + \gamma_{yx2}X_1 + \gamma_{yx3}X_3 + e_1$, → X_1, X_2, X_3 towards p Y,

H_5 : $Z = \gamma_{z.x1}X_1 + e_2$, → Direct Effects X_1 towards Z,

H_6 : $Z = \gamma_{z.x2}X_2 + e_2$, → Direct Effects X_2 towards Z,

H_7 : $Z = \gamma_{z.x3}X_3 + e_2$, → Direct Effects X_3 towards Z,

H_8 : $Z = \gamma_{z.x1}X_1 + \gamma_{z.x2}X_2 + \gamma_{z.x3}X_3 + e_2$, → X_1, X_2, X_3 towards Z,

H_9 : $Z = \beta_{zy}Y_1 + e_2$, → Direct Effects Y towards Z

Model testing is done using regression coefficients for Education Level variables (X1), Experience (X2), Compensation (X3), Motivation (Y) and Performance (Z) through the output table of the sub menu view / set as shown in Appendix 14 (continued). Based on the results of the calculation of the regression coefficient (regression weight) which can be seen in Appendix 14 (continued) an output table can be made as presented in the following Table 18.

Table 18. Standardized direct effects (group number 1 - default model) level of education, experience, compensation, motivation and performance

	Compensation	Expereince	Education	Motivation	Performance
Motivationi	,380	,316	1,041	,000	,000
Performance	,175	,410	1,263	11,043	,000

Tabel 19. *Standarized regression weight* level of education, experience, compensation, motivation and performance

			Estimate	S.E.	C.R.	P	Label
Motivation	<---	Education	1,041	,739	2,409	,049	
Motivation	<---	Experience	,316	,298	2,059	,040	
Motivation	<---	Compensation	,380	,455	2,835	,004	

			Estimate	S.E.	C.R.	P	Label
Performance	<---	Motivation	11,043	65,342	2,169	,006	
Performance	<---	Education	12,762	74,637	2,171	,004	
Performance	<---	Experience	3,075	19,817	2,155	,007	
Performance	<---	Compensation	4,019	29,705	2,135	,002	

CONCLUSIONS

From the discussions carried out, there are several conclusions can be drawn:
Level of Education has a positive and significant effect on Work Motivation.
Work Experience has a positive and significant effect on Work Motivation.
Compensation has a positive and significant effect on Work Motivation.
Level of Education, Experience, Compensation have a positive and significant effect simultaneously on Work Motivation.
Education Level has a positive and significant effect on Employee Performance.
Work Experience has a positive and significant effect on Employee Performance.
Compensation has a positive and significant effect on Employee Performance.
Level of Education, Experience, Compensation simultaneously have a positive and significant effect on Employee Performance.
Work motivation has a positive and significant effect on Employee Performance.

REFERENCES

Andraeni, Ni Nyoman Novitasari. 2006. Pengaruh Stress Kerja Terhadap Motivasi Kerja dan Kinerja Karyawan PT. HM Sampoerna Tbk.. Tesis. Surabaya: Universitas Airlangga.

Asri, Marwan. 2006. *Pengelolaan Karyawan*. BPFE : Yogyakarta.

Ath-Thora, Sa'ud. 2014. Pengaruh Tingkat Pendidikan Dan Kesehatan Terhadap PDRB Per Kapita Di Kota Surabaya. Tesis. Tidak dipublikasikan. Surakarta: Universitas Sebelas Maret.

Basari, Indra. 2015. Disiplin Kerja Dan Pengalaman Kerja Terhadap Kinerja Karyawan Pada PT.Centra Multi Karya Bandung. Jurnal. Bandung: Universitas Komputer Indonesia.

Cascio, Wayne F. (2013). Managing Human Resources. New York: The McGrawHill Companies.

Depdiknas RI. 2008. *Kamus Besar Bahasa Indonesia*. Jakarta.

Ferdinan, Augusty. 2014. *Structural Equation Modeling*. Undip Press: Semarang.

Foster, Bill. 2011. *Pembinaan untuk Peningkatan Kinerja Karyawan*. PPM : Jakarta.

Gomes, Faustino Cardoso. 2012. *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia*. Yogyakarta: Andi.

Handoko, T. Hani. 2014. *Manajemen Edisi 2*. BPFE: Yogyakarta.

Haryani, Sagita Sukma. 2015. Pengaruh Kompensasi Terhadap Motivasi Kerja Dan Kinerja (Studi Pada Karyawan PT. Telekomunikasi Indonesia, Tbk Malang). Jurnal. Malang: Universitas Brawijaya.

Hasibuan, Malayu. 2013. *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia*. Cetakan Kesembilan. Jakarta: PT. Bumi Aksara

Ihsan, Fuad. 2013. *Dasar-Dasar Kependidikan*. Jakarta:Rineka Cipta.

Khojamli, Mansour, Habibi, Mansoureh, Maziar dan Kazemiyan, Mehraneh. 2014. *The Relationship Between Work Experience, Motivation, Training And Stress With Labor Productivity*. Jurnal. Iran: Mazandaran University of Medical Sciences.

Larasati, Sindi. 2014. *Pengaruh Motivasi Kerja terhadap Kinerja Karyawan Wilayah Telkom Jabar Barat Utara (Witel Bekasi)*. Jurnal. Bandung: Universitas Telkom.

Leonardo, Edrick. 2014. Pengaruh Pemberian Kompensasi Terhadap Kinerja Karyawan Pada PT. Kopanitia. Jurnal. Surabaya: Universitas Kristen Petra.

Manulang, M. 2014. *Manajemen Personalia*. Ghalia Indonesia : Jakarta.

Mulyadi dan Setiawan, Johny. 2011. *Sistem Perencanaan dan Pengendalian Manajemen*. Edisi Kedua. Jakarta: Salemba Empat.

Muzahid, Mukhlisul. 2013. Pengaruh Tingkat Pendidikan, Kualitas Pelatihan, Dan Lama Pengalaman Kerja Pegawai Terhadap Kualitas Laporan Keuangan Satuan Kerja Perangkat Daerah (SKPD) Di Kabupaten Aceh Utara. Jurnal. Lhokseumawe: Politeknik Negeri Lhokseumawe.

Nastiti, Anugraheni Dyah. 2013. Pengaruh Pendidikan, Pelatihan dan Pengalaman Kerja terhadap Kualitas Penyajian Informasi Akuntansi (Studi Kasus pada PT. Bank Rakyat Indonesia di Kota Magelang). Jurnal Fakultas Ekonomi. Semarang: Universitas Dian Nuswantoro.

Nirmalasari, Leli. 2014. Pengaruh Kepemimpinan Transformasional, Budaya Organisasi, Dan Kompensasi Terhadap Kepuasan Kerja Karyawan Pada PT Kautsar Utama Bandung. Jurnal. Bandung: STIE STEMBI.

Pemerintah RI. 2003. *Undang-undang Republik Indonesia No. 20 Tahun 2003*.

Pratiwi, Citra Ayu, Effendi, Usman dan Anggraini, Sakunda. 2014. Analisis Pengaruh Pelatihan Dan Pengembangan, Tingkat Pendidikan Serta Pembelajaran Organisasi Terhadap Kompetensi Karyawan Dengan Menggunakan Metode Structural Equation Modelling (SEM) (Studi Kasus Di PT. Petrokimia Gresik). Jurnal Jurusan Teknologi Pertanian. Malang: Universitas Brawijaya.

Ranupandojo. 2014. *Manajemen SDM*. Ghalia Indonesia : Jakarta.

Robbins, Stephen P. 2008. *Perilaku Organisasi (Konsep Kontroversi-Aplikasi). Edisi Bahasa Indonesia*. PT. Prenhallindo Indonesia: Jakarta.

Rofiq, Mutoha. 2014. Pengaruh Tingkat Pedidikan, Pengalaman Kerja Dan Motivasi Terhadap Kinerja Karyawan Kantor Pelayanan Pajak Pratama Pare Kediri 2013. Jurnal. Kediri: Universitas Nusantara Persatuan Guru Republik Indonesia.

Saraswati, Sulistyaningrum Werdi dan Cahyono, Hendry. 2015. Pengaruh Tingkat Pendidikan Dan Kesehatan Terhadap PDRB Per Kapita Di Kota Surabaya. Jurnal. Surabaya: Universitas Negeri Surabaya.

Septiana, Vidya Arty. 2014. Pengaruh Faktor Masa Kerja, Kompensasi Dan Pendidikan Terhadap Motivasi Kerja Pegawai Dinas Bina Marga Provinsi Jawa Tengah Dengan Produktivitas Kerja Sebagai Variabel Intervening. Jurnal. Semarang: Universitas Pandanaran.

Simanjuntak Shanmada, Kohar Farida dan Syuhada Siti. 2013. Hubungan Tingkat Pendidikan Orang Tua Dengan Minat Orang Tua Menyekolahkan Anaknya Ke Perguruan Tinggi Di SMA Xaverius II Kota Jambi. Jurnal Fakultas Ekonomi. Jambi: Universitas Jambi.

Sugiyono. 2014. *Metode Penelitian Manajemen. Bandung*: Penerbit Alfabeta.

Suparyadi. 2015. Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia. Yogyakarta: Penerbit Andi.

Supriyono, Achmad Sani. 2010. Metodologi Riset Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia. Malang : UIN Maliki Press.

Sutanto, Eddy Madiono dan Patty, Ferdian Mario. 2014. Persepsi Akan Gaji, Motivasi Kerja, Dan Kinerja Karyawan PT. Amita Bara Sejahtera. Jurnal. Surabaya: Universitas Kristen Petra.

Trijoko. 2010. *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia*. Ghalia Indonesia : Jakarta.

Vionita, Vevi Gusrini. 2013. Pengaruh Tingkat Pendidikan Dan Motivasi Kerja Terhadap Kinerja Pegawai Tata Usaha SMK Negeri Di Kota Payakumbuh. Jurnal. Padang: UNP.

Wahini, Tri. 2007. Hubungan Tingkat Pendidikan dan Pendapatan Keluarga Dengan Status Gizi pada siswa SD Muhammadiyah 19 Surakarta Tahun Ajaran 2006/2007. Tesis. Tidak dipublikasikan. Surakarta. Universitas Sebelas Maret.

Werther, William B. dan Keith Davis. 2006. Human Resources And Personal Management. International Edition. USA : Mc Graw-Hill, Inc

Wulansih, Hesti. 2014. Analisis Tingkat Pendidikan Dan Pengalaman Kerja Terhadap Produktivitas Keja Karyawan Pada Perusahaan Funiture CV. Mugiharjo Kragilan Boyolali. Jurnal. Surakarta: Universitas Muhammadiyah Surakarta.

Yensy B, Nurul Astuty. 2010. Pengaruh Kompensasi Dan Motivasi Terhadap Kinerja Guru Di SMA Negeri 2 Argamakmur Bengkulu Utara. Jurnal. Bengkulu: Universitas Bengkulu.