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Abstract—Legislation concerning regional government has logical consequences for the governance process, this is followed by the issuance of Government Regulation Number 38 of 2007 concerning Division of Government Affairs between Provincial Regional Governments and Regency / City Regional Governments followed by Government Regulation Number 41 of 2007 concerning Regional Device Organizations. The Probolinggo District Government responded by establishing Probolinggo District Regulation Number 7 of 2007 concerning the Organization and Work Procedure of the Regional Secretariat and Expert Staff of Probolinggo Regency.

The Procurement Service Section has the task of formulating policies, administration, procurement services, implementation of policies and complaints and the implementation of guidance programs and administrative services in the field of goods/services procurement services within the Regional Government. To carry out its duties, the Procurement Service Section has the following functions:

1. Preparation of policy formulation and administrative services in the field of goods / services procurement services;
2. Formulation of policies in the field of goods / services procurement services;
3. Implementation of coordination with other institutions or agencies in the implementation of activities in the field of goods / services procurement services;
4. Implementation of guidance for administration and apparatus in the field of goods / services procurement services;
5. Control, evaluate and report on the implementation of activities in the field of goods / services procurement services;
6. Compilation, implementation, coordination and evaluation of Standard Operating Procedure (SOP) section activities;
7. Implementation of other functions provided by the Economic and Development Administrative Assistant.

The Procurement Service Section is a work unit that has a very vulnerable task, therefore employees who have good performance and responsibility are needed. Various ways have been taken to improve performance, for example through socialization and training for improving Human Resources (HR) in the Regional Procurement Service Section of Probolinggo Regency.
II. LITERATURE REVIEW

A. In-Service Training

Rycus and Hughes (2000), define this in-service training as training carried out in carrying out one's work. The assessment can be carried out on its own, with the help of supervisors, coaches or mentors. The activities are often informal even though they use instruments used in formal training. In essence, in-service training is a form of on-the-job training that is usually done when there are new employees in a work organization.

B. Functional levels

Functional levels according to Law Number 5 of 2014 (Undang-Undang Nomor 5 Tahun 2014) concerning State Civil Apparatus, functional levels consisting of functional positions of expertise and functional positions of skills. Functional positions of expertise are functional positions that carry out their duties:

1. Requires professional qualifications with education as low as Bachelor's degree (Bachelor-level);
2. Includes activities related to research and development, improvement and application of concepts and theories and operational methods and the application of scientific disciplines that underlie the implementation of the duties and functions of the functional positions concerned;
3. Bound to certain professional ethics determined by the professional ties.

C. Performance

Performance is the result or output of a process (Nurlaila, 2010: 71). According to the behavior approach in management, performance is the quantity or quality of something produced or services provided by someone who does the job (Luthans, 2005: 165).

Performance is work performance, which is a comparison between work results and set standards (Dessler, 2000: 41). Performance is the result of work both in quality and quantity that is achieved by someone in carrying out tasks according to the responsibilities given (Mangkunagara, 2002: 22).

D. Productivity

According to Hasibuan (1996: 126) Productivity is the comparison between output (yield) and input (input). If this increased productivity is only possible by the increase in efficiency (time-material-energy) and the work system, production techniques and the increase in skills of the workforce. According to Riyanto (1986: 22) technically productivity is a comparison between the results achieved (output) and the overall resources needed (input). Productivity contains an understanding of the comparison between the results achieved with the role of labor unity of time.

E. Conceptual Framework


F. Hypothesis

The hypotheses raised in this study are:

H1: There is a significant influence on in-service training on the productivity of the Procurement of Goods and Services working group in the Procurement Service Section

H2: There is a significant influence on in-service training on the performance of the Procurement of Goods and Services working group in the Procurement Service Section

H3: There is a significant influence on the position level on the productivity of the Procurement of Goods and Services working group in the Procurement Service Section

H4: There is a significant influence on the position level on the performance of the Procurement of Goods and Services working group in the Procurement Service Section

H5: There is a significant effect on productivity on the performance of the Procurement of Goods and Services working group in the Procurement Service Section

H6: There is a significant influence on in-service training and the level of office on the productivity of the Procurement of Goods and Services working group in the Procurement Service Section.

III.METHODOLOGY

This study uses a causal research design approach, which is a study that aims to explain the causal relationship between variables through hypothesis testing. According to Sugiyono (2013: 37), the main purpose of causal research is to prove a causal relationship between variables and compare the effect of several variables on a variable so that the variable that has the dominant influence on a variable can be known. The population and sample in this study were all employees, men and women in the Procurement Service Section of the Probolinggo Regency Regional Secretariat, which numbered 87 people. Path analysis techniques are used in this study to find out the direct and indirect effects of independent variables on the dependent variable.

Definition Operational Variables

a. Variable In-Service Training (X1): Is a training carried out in the implementation of one's work.
Indicators of In-Service Training include: Knowledge, and experience

b. Variable Position Level (X2): A group of positions containing functions and tasks related to functional services based on specific skills and skills. Indicators from the Position Level include: Education, Science Discipline, and Professional Ethics.

c. Productivity variable (Z1): A comparison between the results achieved (output) and the overall resources needed (input). Indicators of Productivity include: labor and working hours.

d. Performance Variable (Y1): Work results in quality and quantity achieved by an employee in carrying out their functions in accordance with the responsibilities given to him. Indicators of competencies include: Quantity, Quality, Reliability, and Presence.

IV. RESULT

A. Test Validity and Reliability

Test the validity of the data aims to determine the extent to which the validity of the questions from the distribution of questionnaires. Test data validity is done by using the product moment correlation method (Pearson correlation).

**TABLE 1. VALIDITY OF RESEARCH INSTRUMENTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>r table</th>
<th>Correlation Coefficient</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In-service Training</td>
<td>X11</td>
<td>0.213</td>
<td>0.718</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>X12</td>
<td>0.213</td>
<td>0.876</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>X13</td>
<td>0.213</td>
<td>0.844</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>X14</td>
<td>0.213</td>
<td>0.500</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>X15</td>
<td>0.213</td>
<td>0.421</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>X16</td>
<td>0.213</td>
<td>0.497</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position Level</td>
<td>X21</td>
<td>0.213</td>
<td>0.783</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>X22</td>
<td>0.213</td>
<td>0.774</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>X23</td>
<td>0.213</td>
<td>0.864</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>X24</td>
<td>0.213</td>
<td>0.870</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>X25</td>
<td>0.213</td>
<td>0.630</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>X26</td>
<td>0.213</td>
<td>0.714</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>X27</td>
<td>0.213</td>
<td>0.489</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Productivity</td>
<td>Y11</td>
<td>0.213</td>
<td>0.865</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Y12</td>
<td>0.213</td>
<td>0.773</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Y13</td>
<td>0.213</td>
<td>0.865</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Y14</td>
<td>0.213</td>
<td>0.557</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Y15</td>
<td>0.213</td>
<td>0.517</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Y16</td>
<td>0.213</td>
<td>0.417</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Y17</td>
<td>0.213</td>
<td>0.677</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Y18</td>
<td>0.213</td>
<td>0.557</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>Y21</td>
<td>0.213</td>
<td>0.699</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Y22</td>
<td>0.213</td>
<td>0.754</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Y23</td>
<td>0.213</td>
<td>0.842</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>Y24</td>
<td>0.213</td>
<td>0.535</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Data is processed by researchers, 2017)

TABLE 1. VALIDITY OF RESEARCH INSTRUMENTS

Based on the reliability test results, it shows that all the measuring instruments used are reliable, as shown by Cronbach's Alpha which generally moves from 0.600 to 0.800.

**TABLE 2. RELIABILITY OF RESEARCH INSTRUMENTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha</th>
<th>Reliability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In-service Training</td>
<td>0.740</td>
<td>Reliable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position Level</td>
<td>0.858</td>
<td>Reliable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Productivity</td>
<td>0.820</td>
<td>Reliable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>0.674</td>
<td>Reliable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Data is processed by researchers, 2017)

B. Auto Correlation Test

Autocorrelation testing aims to test and find out whether there is a correlation between the data in the research variable on a linear model of simple regression. If there is a correlation, the regression model is not feasible so that the good is if the regression is free from autocorrelation. The method used to determine the existence of autocorrelation is one way to use the Durbin-Watson (D-W) method. According to Tony Wijaya (2009) if the DW value: 1 <DW <3 then autocorrelation does not occur. The results of the Durbin-Watson test using SPSS in this study are:

**TABLE 3. AUTO CORRELATION TEST RESULTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regression Equation</th>
<th>Durbin-Watson</th>
<th>Conclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First</td>
<td>1.709</td>
<td>There is no Autocorrelation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second</td>
<td>1.636</td>
<td>There is no Autocorrelation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. Normality Test

The results of the normality test indicate that the number of Kolmornov-Smirnov In-service Training value data is 0.228 with a significant probability of 0.214, Kolmornov-Smirnov value for Position Level 0.229 with a significance probability of 0.324, Kolmornov-Smirnov value for Productivity 0.273 with a probability value of 0.502, Kolmornov-value Smirnov Performance 0.252 with a significance probability value of 0.258 and Kolmornov-Smirnov value. The probability value of each variable is far greater than the real level of 0.05. So it can be concluded that all research data are normally distributed.

D. Path Analysis Results

1) Effect of in-service training and Position Level on Productivity

This analysis is used to determine the level of influence of a causal relationship conducted from the results of questionnaires. Path coefficient calculation in this study uses standardize regression analysis.
TABLE 4. THE PATH COEFFICIENT TEST RESULTS INFLUENCE INSERVICE TRAINING & JOB LEVELS ON PRODUCTIVITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>T hitung</th>
<th>PV/Prob</th>
<th>Sig T</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In-service training</td>
<td>0.687</td>
<td>8.460</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position Level</td>
<td>0.430</td>
<td>7.120</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R = 0.880  
R Square = 0.774  
F = 131.898  
Sig. F = 0.000

So the regression equation for this study are:

Y1 = ß1 X1 + ß2 X2  
Y1 = 0.687 X1 + 0.430 X2

From the multiple linear regression equation, it can be described as follows:

a. The magnitude of the regression coefficient of In-service training variable of 0.687 indicates that the In-service training variable has a positive influence on Productivity.

b. The magnitude of the Position Level variable regression coefficient of 0.430 indicates that the Position Level variable has a positive influence on Productivity.

2) Effect of In-service Training, Position Level, Productivity on Performance.

Standardize regression test results Effect of In-service Training, Position Level, and Productivity on Performance are as follows:

TABLE 5. TEST RESULTS OF THE PATH COEFFICIENT OF THE EFFECT OF INSERVICE TRAINING, POSITION LEVEL, ON PERFORMANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>T hitung</th>
<th>PV/Prob</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In-service training</td>
<td>0.222</td>
<td>3.754</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position Level</td>
<td>0.620</td>
<td>1.519</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Productivity</td>
<td>0.305</td>
<td>5.104</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R = 0.898  
R Square = 0.806  
F = 105.505  
Sig. F = 0.000

So that the regression equation is obtained for the variables analyzed in this study, namely:

Y2 = ß1 X1 + ß2 X2  
Y2 = -0.222 X1 + 0.620 X2 + 0.305 Y2

From the multiple linear regression equation, it can be described as follows:

a. The magnitude of the regression coefficient of In-service training variable of 0.222 indicates that the In-service training variable has a positive influence on performance.

b. The magnitude of the Position Level variable regression coefficient of 0.620 shows that the Position Level variable has a positive influence on performance.

c. The magnitude of the regression coefficient Productivity variable of 0.305 indicates that the Productivity variable has a positive influence on performance.

The summary of the path coefficients modeled in this study can be seen as follows:

TABLE 6. SUMMARY OF PATH COEFFICIENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Freely</th>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Beta coefficient</th>
<th>P-value</th>
<th>Conclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In-service</td>
<td>Training</td>
<td>Productivity</td>
<td>0.222</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Level</td>
<td>Productivity</td>
<td>0.620</td>
<td>0.135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-service</td>
<td>Training</td>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>0.687</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Level</td>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>0.430</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Productivity</td>
<td></td>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>0.305</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

E. Hypothesis Test Results

1) The hypothesis states that there is a significant effect between the in-service training variable on productivity.

The results showed that the in-service training variable had a t-count of 8,460 with a probability of 0.000 (0.000 < 0.05). Then the in-service training variable is declared to have a significant effect on productivity. In other words based on the results of the study it can be stated that the hypothesis 1 which mentions in-service training has a significant effect on productivity can be proven.

2) The hypothesis states that there is a significant effect between the in-service training variable on performance.

The results showed that the in-service training variable had a t-count of 0.222 with a probability of 0.000 (0.000 < 0.05). Then the in-service training variable is declared to have a significant effect on Performance. In other words, based on the results of the study, it can be stated that hypothesis 2 which mentions in-service training has a significant effect on productivity can be proven.

3) The hypothesis states that there is a significant influence between the Position Level variables on Productivity.

The results showed that the Position Level variable had a t-count of 0.430 with a probability of 0.000 (0.000 < 0.05). Then the Position Level variable is stated to have a significant effect on Productivity. In other words based on the results of the study it can be stated that hypothesis 3 which states the Position Level has a significant effect on Productivity can be proven.
4) **The hypothesis states that there is a significant influence between the Position Level variables on performance.**

The results of the hypothesis test state that the Position Level has a significant effect on Performance. The results showed that the Position Level variable had a t-count of 0.620 with a probability of 0.135 (0.135 > 0.05). Then the Position Level variable is stated to have no significant effect on Performance. In other words, based on the results of the study, it can be stated that the hypothesis that the Position Level has a significant effect on Performance cannot be proven.

5) **The hypothesis states that there is a significant effect between Productivity variables on performance.**

The results showed that the Productivity variable has a value of t-count of 0.305 with a probability of 0.000 (0.000 < 0.05). Then the productivity variable is stated to have a significant effect on performance. In other words based on the results of the study it can be stated that hypothesis 5 which states that productivity has a significant effect on performance can be proven.

6) **The hypothesis states that there is a significant influence between the in-service training variable and the position level on productivity.**

The results showed that the training in-service variable had a t-count of 8.460 with a probability of 0.000 (0.000 < 0.05). Then the training in-service variable is declared to have a significant effect on productivity. In other words based on the results of the study it can be stated that the hypothesis 1 which mentions in-service training has a significant effect on productivity can be proven. The results showed that the Position Level variable had a t-count of 0.430 with a probability of 0.000 (0.000 < 0.05). Then the Position Level variable is stated to have a significant effect on Productivity. In other words based on the results of the study it can be stated that hypothesis 3 which states that the Position Level has a significant effect on Productivity can be proven.

**F. Discussion**

Based on table 4, it can be concluded that simultaneously the independent variables of the effect of in-service training & position level (X1, X2) have a significant influence on the dependent variable productivity (Y1) indicated by the value of Sig. F 0.000 > 0.005. While the t test or partial test shows that the variables X1 and X2 significantly influence Y1. This is indicated by the magnitude of the Sig. Each of them is 0.000 and 0.000 > 0.005. Whereas for variable X2 has a significant effect on Y1. This is indicated by the Sig. equal to 0.000, each smaller than the Alpha value of 5%. In addition, the results of multiple linear regression analysis that has been done show the coefficient of determination (R Squared) of 0.774. These results state that the independent variables (In-service training and Position) are able to explain the changes that occur in the dependent variable (Productivity) of 77.4%. While the remaining 22.6% is explained by other variables not included in the regression model in this study.

Based on Table 5 it can be concluded that simultaneously the independent variables (X1, and Y1) have a significant influence on the dependent variable indicated by the value of Sig. F 0.000 > 0.005. While the t test or partial test shows that the variables and X2 do not significantly influence Y2. This is indicated by the magnitude of the Sig. each of them is 0.620 and 0.135 > 0.005. While for variables X2 and Y1 significantly influence Y2. This is indicated by the Sig. F each of them is 0.430, and 0.000, each of which is smaller than the Alpha value of 5%. In addition, the results of multiple linear regression analysis that has been done shows the coefficient of determination (R Squared) of 0.806. This result states that the independent variables (In-service training and Position and Productivity) are able to explain the changes that occur in the dependent variable (Performance) by 80.6%. While the remaining 19.4% is explained by other variables not included in the regression model in this study.

**V. CONCLUSION**

Partially in-service training and position levels have a significant effect on employee performance at the Regional Secretariat. Together, in-service training and position levels have a significant effect on employee performance at the Regional Secretariat.

In-service variable training and position level regression coefficients are positive (+) indicating a unidirectional relationship, in other words, in-service training and position levels will improve employee performance at the Regional Secretariat.
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