

## THE INFLUENCE OF TRAINING AND CAREER DEVELOPMENT ON EMPLOYEE PERFORMANCE WITH EMPLOYEE ENGAGEMENT AS AN INTERVENING VARIABLE

Aulia Putri<sup>1</sup>; Sri Harini<sup>2</sup>; Ismartaya<sup>3</sup>

Universitas Djuanda, Bogor, Indonesia<sup>1,2,3</sup>

Email : aulia.putri2020@unida.ac.id<sup>1</sup>; sri.harini@unida.ac.id<sup>2</sup>; ismartaya@unida.ac.id<sup>3</sup>

### ABSTRACT

A company can be said to be successful when the performance of the company's employees is good. Factors that influence employee performance are training, career development and employee engagement. This research aims to determine the influence and response to training, career development, employee engagement and employee performance. This research method is quantitative research with a simple random sampling technique. Data were collected through distributing questionnaires which were tested through validity, reliability, multicollinearity, heteroscedasticity, coefficient of determination, t test, and Sobel tests. The results of this research are that employee performance and employee involvement are in the quite high category, training and career development are in the quite good category. In addition, training and career development have a direct effect on employee engagement and have an indirect effect on employee performance through employee engagement.

Keywords : Training; Career Development; Employee Performance; Employee Engagement

### ABSTRAK

*Suatu perusahaan dapat dikatakan sukses apabila kinerja karyawan perusahaan tersebut baik. Faktor yang mempengaruhi kinerja pegawai adalah pelatihan, pengembangan karir dan keterikatan pegawai. Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk mengetahui pengaruh dan respon terhadap pelatihan, pengembangan karir, keterikatan karyawan dan kinerja karyawan. Metode penelitian ini adalah penelitian kuantitatif dengan teknik simple random sampling. Pengumpulan data dilakukan melalui penyebaran kuesioner yang diuji melalui validitas, reliabilitas, multikolinearitas, heteroskedastisitas, koefisien determinasi, uji t, dan uji Sobel. Hasil penelitian ini adalah kinerja pegawai dan keterlibatan pegawai berada pada kategori cukup tinggi, pelatihan dan pengembangan karir berada pada kategori cukup baik. Selain itu, pelatihan dan pengembangan karir berpengaruh langsung terhadap keterikatan karyawan dan berpengaruh tidak langsung terhadap kinerja karyawan melalui keterikatan karyawan.*

*Kata Kunci : Pelatihan; Pengembangan Karir; Keterlibatan Karyawan; Kinerja Karyawan*

### INTRODUCTION

In the current era of globalization, companies are very aware that human assets are very important to improve the quality of their employees. Human resources determine progress and development in an organization. Therefore, companies that want to

progress must pay attention to human resources and manage them well in order to achieve company goals.

One of the factors for successful human resources management in an organization is employee performance. Improving employee performance cannot be separated from positive efforts as a form of achieving the goals and success of a company. Employee performance problems are a big challenge for all companies, both large and small.

The factors contained in employee performance are as follows: 1) Internal factors: 2) External factors, (Hasibuan, 2018). In addition, factors that influence employee performance include: 1) Individual Characteristics: 2) Psychological Characteristics: 3) Organizational Characteristics, (Gibson et al., 1987). External factors that influence employee performance, namely training and career development, (Hasibuan, 2018). Furthermore, employee engagement is included in individual characteristics (Gibson et al., 1987). Therefore, training, career development and employee engagement are among the factors that influence employee performance.

Based on the explanation above regarding employee performance factors, namely training, career development and employee engagement, they play an important role in improving employee performance in the company. If this is relatively low, employee and organizational performance will be impacted, this can be seen from the high volume of customer complaints at PT.XYZ. The following can be seen in Table 1.1 regarding PT.XYZ customer complaint data in 2022.

Based on Table 1.1 above is data on PT.XYZ customer complaints in 2022, it can be seen that the average customer complaint is 1.83%, which has a difference of 0.83% exceeding the tolerance limit The company determined it to be 1%, so that companies must act to pay attention to the performance of PT.XYZ employees who do not meet expectations in order to reduce the number of customer complaints each year.

Based on data from the performance assessment results of PT.XYZ employees in 2020-2022, employee performance is classified as low because it is less than optimal, which can be seen from the performance assessment standards set by the company, namely 80. The average value of the employee assessment is 75. The highest average is for responsibility, namely 75.35 and the lowest average is for cooperation, namely 74.81. This performance assessment shows that there are still problems faced by the company related to employee performance at the company.

Based on the employee engagement pre-survey questionnaire, statements were made in accordance with indicators according to (Schaufeli & Bakker, 2003) it can be seen that employee engagement is still low at PT.XYZ with an average of 57% answering the question "no". Low employee engagement can impact employee performance and can be detrimental to the company as a whole.

Based on the career development pre-survey questionnaire, statements were made in accordance with indicators according to (Siagian, 2015) with an average of 64% of employees answering the question "no" it is stated that career development is still low at PT.XYZ. Career development is important because it encourages employees to improve their performance with the abilities and skills they have.

Based on PT.XYZ training participant data, it shows that the average number of trainees taking part in training in 2022 is 11%. This shows that the training carried out during 2022 has not been attended by all employees from various divisions such as the general division and technical division at PT.XYZ. The training carried out by companies to improve employee performance is still relatively low and it is hoped that next year the number of training participants can be increased to improve employee performance in the company.

## LITERATURE REVIEW AND HYPOTHESIS DEVELOPMENT

### Employee Performance

Employee performance is evaluated based on the quality and quantity of work completed to complete the tasks assigned to them, (Mangkunegara, 2017). Consisting of 2 factors that influence employee performance, they are as follows: 1) Internal Factors: 2) External Factors, (Hasibuan, 2018). In addition, factors that influence employee performance include: 1) Individual Characteristics: 2) Psychological Characteristics: 3) Organizational Characteristics, (Gibson et al., 1987). Measuring employee performance can be done through 4 indicators, namely work quality, work quantity, implementation of duties and responsibilities, (Mangkunegara, 2017). Many factors affect the performance of individual workers, including ability, motivation, support received, the existence of the work they do, rewards or incentives, their relationship with the organization and many other factors. (Zulkarnaen, W., & Suwarna, A., 2017:38)

### **Employee Engagement**

Employee engagement is a positive attitude towards one's work combined with a willingness to provide skills and energy. This attitude is demonstrated by the behavior of individuals who feel involved, are able to focus on their work, are intense at work and are very enthusiastic at work, (Schaufeli & Bakker, 2003). Factors that influence employee engagement, namely training and career development, work environment, team and co-worker, procedures, organizational policies, structures and systems, compensation, leadership style and workplace well-being, (Handoyo, 2017). Indicators of employee engagement consist of vigor, dedication and absorption, (Schaufeli & Bakker, 2003).

### **Career Development**

Conforming to one's career plans is called career development. Factors that influence career development are recognition from others, mentors and sponsors, commitment to the organization, support from subordinates, opportunities for advancement and resignation. Career development indicators consist of fair treatment in a career, attention from direct superiors, interest in being promoted, information about various promotion opportunities and level of satisfaction, (Siagian, 2015).

### **Training**

Training is process of acquiring the skills and knowledge needed by employees to carry out tasks. Training is carried out in the company's work environment to increase work productivity and achieve organizational goals, (Dessler, 2015). Factors that influence training are, support from top management, commitment of specialists and generalists in HR management, technological developments, organizational complexity, learning styles, performance of other HR management functions, (Marwansyah, 2016). Training indicators consist of instructors, training participants, training methods, training materials and training objectives, (Dessler, 2015).

### **Hypothesis Development**

Hypotheses that can be proposed as temporary conjectures in this research are as follows:

H<sub>1</sub>: Training has a direct effect on Employee Engagement.

H<sub>2</sub>: Career Development has a direct effect on Employee Engagement.

H<sub>3</sub>: Training has a direct effect on Employee Performance.

H<sub>4</sub>: Career Development has a direct effect on Employee Performance.

H<sub>5</sub>: Employee Engagement has a direct effect on Employee Performance.

H<sub>6</sub>: Training has an indirect effect on Employee Performance through Employee Engagement.

H<sub>7</sub>: Career Development has an indirect effect on Employee Performance through Employee Engagement.

### METHOD

This research uses descriptive methods and verification methods. In this study there were 415 permanent employees as the population. This research was conducted using probability sampling. 104 permanent employees were randomly selected as research samples using the simple random sampling method. There are 3 types of variables, including: employee performance (Y) is the endogenous variable, employee engagement (Z) is the intervening variable, training (X<sub>1</sub>) and career development (X<sub>2</sub>) are the exogenous variables.

In this research, primary and secondary data sources are used together with quantitative data as the data type. The methods used in this research to obtain data are: literature study and field study, including interviews, observation and questionnaires. This research uses data testing methods with validity and reliability tests as well as classic assumption tests assisted by the SPSS software program. Furthermore, this research uses path analysis and Sobel test.

Employee performance variable (Y) in the validity test has results showing that the 8 instruments in this research questionnaire are declared valid. The validity test of the employee engagement variable results (Z) show that 5 instruments in this research questionnaire were declared valid and 1 instrument in this research questionnaire was declared invalid. In this study, invalid items were replaced with new statements. After being replaced with new ones, it showed that the 6 questionnaire instruments were declared valid. It can be seen from the calculated  $r_{\text{value}}$  for each item that is greater than the  $r_{\text{table}}$  for the employee performance (Y) and employee engagement (Z) variables. This means that all items in the employee performance (Y) and employee engagement variable statement (Z) are declared valid.

Furthermore, the career development variable (X<sub>2</sub>) results from validity testing show that the 10 instruments in this research questionnaire were declared valid. Finally, the

training variable ( $X_1$ ) has validity test results which show that the 10 instruments in this research questionnaire are declared valid. It can be seen from the calculated  $r_{value}$  for each item that is greater than the  $r_{table}$  for the career development ( $X_2$ ) and training ( $X_1$ ) variables. All career development variabel ( $X_2$ ) and training variable ( $X_1$ ) statement items were declared valid.

The reliability of each variable getting results, employee performance (0.719), employee engagement (0,750), career development (0,816) and training (0,811), The results of each variable show a cronbach alpha value greater than or equal to 0.60. It was concluded that all instruments in this research variable were declared reliable.

### **Classic Assumption Test**

#### **1. Normality Test**

The following are the results of the one sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov test in the first equation, shows that the research has a sig value of 0.200, meaning the sigvalue is greater than 0.05, it is concluded that this research has a normal distribution. Based on the results of the one sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov test in the second equation, shows that it is normally distributed with a significance value of 0.200, meaning the significance value is greater than 0.05.

#### **2. Multicollinearity Test**

In the first equation, the results of the multicollinearity test show that the VIF value of the training variable is  $1.116 < 5$  and the tolerance value is  $0.896 > 0.05$ , career development is  $1.116 < 5$  and the tolerance value is  $0.896 > 0.05$ , Furthermore, in this second equation the results show the VIF value of the training variable is  $1.174 < 5$  and the tolerance value is  $0.852 > 0.05$ , career development is  $1.015 < 5$  and the tolerance value is  $0.985 > 0.05$ , employee engagement is  $1.162 < 5$  and the tolerance value is  $0.861 > 0.05$ . We may conclude that there is no multicollinearity issue with the first and second equations.

#### **3. Heteroscedasticity Test**

The results of the heteroscedasticity test carried out obtained, the points on the Scatterplot graph are scattered and there is an unclear pattern at point Y at the number 0. So it can be concluded that initially and in the second equation there was no heteroscedasticity and was suitable for predict each variable in this study.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### Employee Characteristics

Based on Table 2 regarding the recapitulation of employee characteristics, it can be seen that in this study the majority of employees were male, aged 20 – 30 years, had a bachelor's degree level of education and have worked for 1 – 5 years. This is because PT.XYZ requires the main and general, namely employees with a minimum of S1 education, while for sections engineering, namely young male employees for operational activities.

### Employee Response

Employee performance variable (Y), it can be seen that the average employee response is in the quite high category with a value of 3.32. This shows that employees have produced quite good performance in carrying out their work. Strategies that companies can implement to improve employee performance include providing education and training, supporting knowledge and skills, (Hamali, 2016). Apart from that, it provides work motivation, (Kasmir, 2019).

The results of employee responses to the employee engagement variable (Z), as can be seen, the average value falls into the quite high category at 3.27. This shows that employees have quite high involvement in the company to carry out their work. Therefore, companies must find strategies to increase employee engagement. The strategy that can be implemented by the company is that the company ensures the psychological safety of employees, freedom in expressing views and making decisions, mutual respect and understanding, and growing or developing employee skills, (Sharma, et al 2019).

Next, Based on the results of employee responses to career development variable ( $X_2$ ), an average value of 3.31 was obtained and was included in the quite good category. This shows that the career development provided is in quite good condition. Therefore, companies must look for strategies to achieve career advancement, so that they can continue to create and achieve the career goals desired by employees in the company. Strategies that can be carried out by companies are education and training, position promotions and transfers, (Sugiharjo, 2017).

The results of employee responses to the training variable ( $X_1$ ) are included in the quite good category with an average value of 3.31. This shows that the training provided

by the company is in the quite good category. Therefore, companies must find strategies to improve training within the company. The strategy that can be implemented by companies is through training methods such as on the job training which is carried out at the workplace and carried out while working, off the job training which is carried out in a separate workplace or outside the workplace, (Sedarmayanti, 2016).

### Path Analysis

The first equation model is as follows:

$$Y = 0,236X_1 + 0,281X_2 + \varepsilon_1$$

From the t test results obtained in Table 3, the first equation can be concluded following:

1. The training variable ( $X_1$ ) obtained a sig of  $0.015 < 0.05$  and the  $t_{\text{value}}$  was greater than  $t_{\text{table}}$  ( $2.480 > 1.660$ ), this means that training has a direct effect on employee engagement with  $H_a$  is accepted and  $H_0$  is rejected. This research is in line with previous research conducted by Kosali (2023), Primadini & Karneli (2022) dan Bhardwaj & Naaz (2023).
2. It was obtained that  $t_{\text{value}}$  was greater than  $t_{\text{table}}$  ( $2.954 > 1.660$ ) and sig was  $0.004 < 0.05$  for the career development variable ( $X_2$ ), which means career development has a direct effect on employee engagement. The decision  $H_a$  is accepted and  $H_0$  is rejected. This research is supported by previous research conducted by Kosali (2023), Tiong, et al (2023) and Primadini & Karneli (2022).

The following is the second equation model:

$$Z = 0,267X_1 + 0,177X_2 + 0,247Z + \varepsilon_2$$

Table 4 is the result of the second equation, which is followed:

1. The training variable ( $X_1$ ) obtained a sig of  $0.006 < 0.05$  and the  $t_{\text{value}}$  greater than  $t_{\text{table}}$  ( $2.825 > 1.660$ ), this means that training has a direct effect on employee performance.  $H_a$  is accepted and  $H_0$  is rejected. This research is in line with Andaryansu (2022), Salim, et al (2023) and Kurniawan, et al (2023) as previous researchers.
2. The career development variable ( $X_2$ ) obtains a  $t_{\text{value}}$  greater than  $t_{\text{table}}$  ( $1.996 > 1.660$ ) and a sig of  $0.049 < 0.05$ , this means that career development has a direct effect on employee performance with  $H_a$  is accepted and  $H_0$  is rejected. Previous research conducted by Kosali (2023), Marzuki, et al (2022) and Iis, et al (2022) is in line with this research.



3. The employee engagement variable (Z) obtained a value of (2.595 > 1.660) which means  $t_{\text{value}}$  is greater than  $t_{\text{table}}$  with a sig of  $0.011 < 0.05$ ,  $H_a$  is accepted and  $H_0$  is rejected. This means that employee performance directly influences employee engagement. This research is the same as previous research conducted by Fahrizal, et al (2020), Nugroho & Ratnawati (2021) and Riyanto, et al (2021).

Table 5 is the result of path analysis:

1. Training ( $X_1$ ) has an effect both directly on employee performance (Y) and through employee engagement (Z). This can be seen from the magnitude of the direct influence, namely 0.267 or 26.7% and the indirect influence of 0.483 or 48.3%. Meanwhile, the total effect of t training ( $X_1$ ) through employee engagement (Z) on employee performance (Y) 0.750 or 75%.
2. The influence of career development ( $X_2$ ) both directly on employee performance (Y) and through employee engagement (Z). The direct influence, namely 0.177 or 17.7% and the indirect influence of 0.528 or 52.8%. Meanwhile, the total influence is 0.705 or 70.5% for career development ( $X_2$ ) through employee engagement (Z) on employee performance (Y).

The Sobel test results in Table 6 can be explained as follows:

1. The  $Z_{\text{value}}$  means it is greater than  $Z_{\text{tabel}}$  ( $1.79 > 1.64$ ), proving that employee engagement (Z) can mediate the effect of training ( $X_1$ ) on employee performance (Y).
2. The  $Z_{\text{value}}$  means it is greater than  $Z_{\text{tabel}}$  ( $1.94 > 1.64$ ), that employee engagement (Z) can mediate the influence of career development ( $X_2$ ) on employee performance (Y).

## CONCLUSIONS

The results of research and hypothesis testing are as follows:

1. Employee responses regarding training variable and career development variable are in the quite good category. And the employee engagement variable and employee performance variable are in the quite high category.
2. Training has a direct effect on Employee Engagement.
3. Career Development has a direct effect on Employee Engagement.
4. Training has a direct effect on Employee Performance.
5. Career Development has a direct effect on Employee Performance.
6. Employee Engagement has a direct effect on Employee Performance.

7. Employee Engagement is able to mediate the influence of career development on employee performance and the influence of training on employee performance.

#### REFERENCES

- Andaryansu, P., et al. (2022) The Effect of Career Development and Training On Employee Performance With Compensation As An Intervening Variable At PT. Nagari Bank. Eduvest – *Journal of Universal Studies*. Vol 2(12). Hal 2553-2571. DOI : <http://dx.doi.org/10.36418/eduvest.v2i12.671>
- Bhardwaj, & Naaz. (2023). Impact of Training and Development on Employee Engagement and Satisfaction in It Industry. *European Economic Letters (EEL)*, Vol 13(3), Hal 23–27. DOI : <https://doi.org/10.52783/eel.v13i3.201>
- Dessler, G. (2015). *Human Resources Management* (Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia) Edisi Empat Belas Bahasa Indonesia. Jakarta: Indeks.
- Fahrizal, V., et al. (2020). Pengaruh Keterlibatan Kerja dan Kepuasan Kerja terhadap Kinerja Karyawan. *Jurnal Universitas Pendidikan Ganesha*, Vol 8(2) Hal 121-127.
- Gibson, J., et al. (1987) *Organisasi Dan Manajemen: Perilaku, Struktur, Proses*. Binarupa Aksara, Jakarta.
- Hamali. (2016). *Pemahaman Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia*. Yogyakarta: Center for Academic Publishing Servive.
- Handoyo, M. (2017). *Perilaku Organisasi*. Yogyakarta: Gadjah Mada University Press
- Hasibuan, M. (2019). *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia*. Jakarta: Bumi Aksara.
- Iis, E., et al. (2022) The Effect Of Career Development and Work Environment on Employee Performance with Work Motivation as Intervening Variable at The Office of Agriculture and Livestock In Aceh. *IJEBAS (International Journal of Economy, Business, Accounting, Agriculture Management and Sharia Administration)*. Vol 2(2). Hal 227-236. DOI : <https://doi.org/10.54443/ijebas.v2i2.191>
- Kasmir. (2019). *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia (Teori dan Praktik)*. Depok: PT. Rajagrafindo Persada.
- Kurniawan, I., et al. (2023) The Influence of Leadership, Training and Work Discipline with Work Motivation As An Intervening Variable on The Performance of Employees of The Pekanbaru City Branch of BPJS Employess. *IJEBAS (International Journal of Economy, Business, Accounting, Agriculture Management and Sharia Administration)*. Vol 3(6). Hal 1926-1936. DOI : <https://doi.org/10.54443/ijebas.v3i6.1262>
- Kosali, A. (2023). Pengaruh Pelatihan dan Pengembangan Karir terhadap Kinerja Karyawan dengan Employee Engagement sebagai Variabel Intervening (Studi Kasus Pada Karyawan Lembaga Sinergi Sriwijaya Peduli). *Jurnal Inspirasi Ekonomi*, Vol 5(1) Hal 11-25. DOI : <https://doi.org/10.32938/ie.v5i1.4188>
- Marzuki, A., et al. (2022) Dampak Pengembangan Karir dan Kepemimpinan Terhadap Kinerja Karyawan dengan Loyalitas Kerja sebagai Variabel Intervening Pada PT American Standards Indonesia. *Jurnal Manajemen dan Sains*. Vol 7(2) Hal 1364-1373 DOI : [10.33087/jmas.v7i2.704](https://doi.org/10.33087/jmas.v7i2.704)
- Mangkunegara. (2017). *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia Perusahaan*. Bandung: Remaja Rosdakarya.
- Nugroho, & Ratnawati. (2021). Pengaruh Keterlibatan Karyawan Terhadap Kinerja Karyawan dengan Voice Behaviour sebagai Variabel Intervening (Studi pada PT

- Pelabuhan Indonesia III Persero Regional Jawa Tengah). *Diponegoro Journal of Management*, Vol 10(3) Hal 1-13. DOI : <https://doi.org/10.30988/jmil.v6i1.1033>
- Primadini, & Karneli. (2023). Pengaruh Pelatihan Kerja dan Pengembangan Karir terhadap Employee Engagement pada PT PLN UP3 Pekanbaru. *Jurnal Ilmiah Manajemen dan Bisnis*, Vol 6(2) Hal 727-733. DOI : <https://doi.org/10.37479/jimb.v6i2.19795>
- Riyanto, S., et al. (2021). Effect of work motivation and job satisfaction on employee performance: Mediating role of employee engagement. *Problems and Perspectives in Management*, Vol 19(3), Hal 162-174. DOI : [10.21511/ppm.19\(3\).2021.14](https://doi.org/10.21511/ppm.19(3).2021.14)
- Salim, E., et al. (2022) Analisis Pelatihan dan Kompensasi terhadap Kinerja Karyawan Melalui Kepuasan Kerja Sebagai Variabel Intervening pada PT. Anugrah Harapan Nusantara. *J-MAS (Jurnal Manajemen dan Sains)*. Vol 7(1). Hal 157-164. DOI : [10.33087/jmas.v7i1.383](https://doi.org/10.33087/jmas.v7i1.383)
- Schaufeli, W.B., & Bakker, A.B. (2003). *UWES - Utrecht Work Engagement Scale Preliminary Manual*. Utrecht: Occupational Health Psychology Unit Utrecht University.
- Sedarmayanti, (2016). *Human Resource Management*. Bandung: Refika Aditama.
- Sharma, N., et al. (2019). *Management Techniques for Employee Engagement in Contemporary Organizations. In Advances in Human Resources Management and Organizational Development (AHRMOD)*. Pennsylvania: IGI Global.
- Siagian, S. P. (2015). *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia*. Jakarta: PT Bumi Aksara.
- Sugiharjo, R., & Rustinah. (2017). Pengaruh Perencanaan Karir, Pengembangan Karir Karyawan, dan Kompensasi Terhadap Kinerja Karyawan Pada Jambuluwuk Puncak Resort. *Jurnal Ilmiah Manajemen dan Bisnis*. Vol 3(3). Hal 444-454. DOI : <https://dx.doi.org/10.22441/jimb.v3i3.3864>
- Sugiyono. (2019). *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif, Kualitatif dan R&D*. Bandung: Alfabeta.
- Tiong, P., et al. (2023). Pengaruh Kompetensi dan Pengembangan Karir terhadap Kinerja Karyawan pada PT. Hadji Kalla Cabang Urip Sumohardjo Makassar dengan Employee Engagement sebagai variabel intervening. *Jurnal Metaverse ADPERTISI*, Vol 2(2). Hal 43–51.
- Zulkarnaen, W., & Suwarna, A. (2017). Pengaruh Insentif Terhadap Kinerja Karyawan Di Bagian Mekanik PT. Erlangga Aditya Indramayu. *Jurnal Ilmiah MEA (Manajemen, Ekonomi, & Akuntansi)*, 1(1), 33-52. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31955/mea.vol1.iss1.pp33-52>.

**TABLE**

Table 1.1 Data on Customer Complaints from PT.XYZ, 2022

No	Type of Complaint	Number of Customers	Number of Customer Complaints (people)	Number of Customer Complaints (%)
1	Water Not Flowing	172.552	7.885	4,57
2	Persil Leaks	172.552	5.909	3,42
3	Condensing Under Glass	172.552	5.302	3,07
4	Meter Control	172.552	4.876	2,83
5	Jammed Water Meter	172.552	4.223	2,45
6	Opaque Meter	172.552	4.012	2,33
7	Leaking Service Pipe	172.552	3.543	2,05

8	Leaking Approximately Meters	172.552	3.707	2,15
9	Transfer of Meter Location	172.552	2.469	1,43
10	Damaged Stop Cock Valve	172.552	2.045	1,19
11	Small Flowing Water	172.552	7.992	4,63
12	Murky Water	172.552	5.765	3,34
13	Wrong Tariff Class	172.552	1.380	0,80
14	Broken Meter Glass	172.552	850	0,49
15	Broken Water Meter Glass	172.552	761	0,44
16	Missing Meters	172.552	689	0,40
17	Meter Disruption	172.552	455	0,26
18	Excavated Excavations Not Tidy	172.552	263	0,15
19	Number/Stand Meter Reverse	172.552	225	0,13
20	No Seal	172.552	148	0,09
Number of Customer Complaints		3.451.040	63.199	36,63
Average Customer Complaints		172.552	3159,95	1,83

Source : PT.XYZ (2022)

Table 2. Recapitulation of Employee Characteristics

Description	Type Characteristics	Number (people)	Percentage (%)
Position	Public Relations, Customer Service and Production	50	48
Gender	Man	68	65
Age	20 – 30 years	56	54
Education	S1	51	49
Length of work	1 – 5 years	54	52

Source : Primary data is processed (2024)

Table 3. First Equation t Test Results

Model		Coefficients <sup>a</sup>				Sig.
		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	4614	2291		2.014	.047
	Training	.177	.071	.236	2.480	.015
	Career Development	.204	.069	.281	2.954	.004

a. Dependent Variable: Employee Engagement

Source : Primary data is processed (2024)

Table 4. Second Equation t Test Results

Model		Coefficients <sup>a</sup>				Sig.
		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	11406.88	1584.51		7.199	.000
	Training	.096	.034	.267	2.825	.006
	Career Development	.053	.027	.177	1.996	.049
	Employee Engagement	.262	.101	.247	2.595	.011

a. Dependent Variable: Employee Performance

Source : Primary data is processed (2024)

Table 5. Path Analysis Results

Variables	Influence	Employee Engagement	Employee Performance	Total
Training	Direct		0,267	0,267
	Indirect	0,236	0,247	0,483
	Total			0,750
Career Development	Direct		0,177	0,177
	Indirect	0,281	0,247	0,528

---

Total 0,705

---

Source : Primary data is processed (2024)

Table 6. Sobel Test Results

No	Hypothesis	Statistical Test	Conclusion	Decision
1	Employee engagement mediates the effect of training on employee performance.	$1,79 > 1,65$	There is a mediating influence	Influence through mediation
2	Employee engagement mediates the influence of career development on employee performance.	$1,94 > 1,65$	There is a mediating influence	Influence through mediation

---

Source : Primary data is processed (2024)