

Influence of Competence and Compensation on Job Satisfaction: A Case Study of Ship Crew PT Amas Iscindo Utama

April Gunawan Malau^a, Marihot Simanjuntak^b, Larsen Barasa^c,
^{a,b,c}Sailing College of Science, Jakarta, Indonesia, Jl. Marunda Makmur No.1
Cilincing, North Jakarta. Jakarta 14150,

Every shipping company needs competent and qualified crew members to carry out activities to help the company achieve its goals and job satisfaction. In addition to supporting crew competence, another factor that is also important for job satisfaction is the compensation received by the crew. But in reality, many crew members do not meet the standards and qualifications given by the company, so they do not provide optimal performance. As a result, the opportunity to get a promotion is very low. The solution to this problem is the holding of job training in the field of Human Resources Management (HRM) to form creative and innovative ship crews so that in the future, they can provide optimal performance. The problem with compensation is the low compensation received by the crew, which makes the crew feel unsatisfied. The right way to overcome this is to equate compensation in the form of salary/wages with ITF (International Transport Workers Federation) standards. The purpose of this study is to determine how much influence the competence and compensation on the work satisfaction of PT Amas Iscindo Utama crews with technical data analysis using multiple regression methods. The study found that competence and compensation have a positive and significant effect on crew job satisfaction, both partially and simultaneously.

Keywords: *Competence, Compensation, and Job Satisfaction, Regression*

Introduction

Indonesia is a maritime country consisting of islands that can only be connected by sea between the islands. The voyage that connects the islands is the artery of life and makes Indonesia the World's Maritime Axis as almost commodities for international trade are transported by sea transportation. One of the sea transportation programs launched by the government is the Sea Toll.

Sea Toll is a concept to improve the logistics transportation process in Indonesia so that it is expected that the distribution process of goods in Indonesia will become easier. The price of staples is getting more evenly distributed throughout Indonesia because the distribution lines and prices are not as expensive as before the sea highway program. However, this program has not been able to reduce logistics costs in Indonesia; even the transportation of goods is still concentrated on inland transportation. This is because the sea highway program has not been able to attract logistic companies that have been using land routes (Aida R Ibrahim et al., 2019).

In the development of sea tolls, the government has prepared sea transportation means ships with large capacity and volume. Forward progress of the development of the maritime world in Indonesia, including the sea highway ship program, depends a lot on the competence, performance and dedication of the crew, especially for officers on board. The crew is very important in the process of smooth distribution and safety of ships and goods. Hence, it requires *high-skilled* crew, that is reliable, professional, and competent in operating the ship properly (Rasooli & Abedini, 2017).

Competent ship crew is produced from quality recruitment. This is the main task of a shipping company to produce quality crew members as well. Shipping companies also have a considerable influence on the activities of trade flows, so shipping companies must provide satisfying services for their service users. PT Amas Iscindo Utama is a shipping company in Indonesia and is a *shipowner company*. To the sea toll, PT AIU played an important role by producing reliable crew members for ship operations (Sadri & Tahririan, 2018).

The problem of competence in the company of PT AIU is that crew officers *onboard* cannot yet be fulfilled because the number of crew members on *standby is* still less than the number of crew members required. Competent HR must be able to go through a proper recruitment process under the qualifications given by the company so that the crew can carry out the main tasks or *job desc* on the ship later. Qualifications and basic tasks that have been set on PT AIU vessels, in general, are so that the working crew can provide outstanding performance (Novikova et al., 2018).

Good performance is to follow procedures according to established standards. But the phenomenon is the crew who have the skills as expected but do not provide optimal performance and do not follow work procedures. Good performance can be realised if the crew has high job satisfaction with the ship they occupy. Therefore internal factors, in this case, the competence of the crew must be considered.

Another factor to support job satisfaction is compensation. Compensation is significant to improve the performance of the crew. What often happens at PT AIU is the low compensation provided and the late payment of the crew's salary by the company. As a result, performance will decline and *complain* to shipping companies and the crew will try to find another company. This has a significant influence on the existence of the shipping company PT AIU. Salaries given to crew members are not appropriate when compared with ITF (*International Transport Workers Federation*) standards. So it is natural if there are still crew members whose performance has not been optimal.

PT AIU is aware that competence and appropriate compensation will create job satisfaction for its crew. High job satisfaction will provide optimal performance in accordance with procedures on board so that it will support the company's goals.

The objectives of this research are:

1. to find out and analyse the effect of competence on the work satisfaction of ship crews on the PT Amas Iscindo Utama ship;
2. to find out and analyse the effect of compensation on the work satisfaction of ship crews on the ship PT Amas Iscindo Utama; and,
3. to find out and analyse the effect of competence and compensation together on the work satisfaction of ship crews on PT Amas Iscindo Utama vessels.

The benefits of this research are:

1. The benefit of the theoretical aspects of this research is to enrich theoretically improve job satisfaction supported by competence variables and compensation variables that serve as literacy in the development of human resources in the maritime industry, both in the shipping and port sectors.
2. The benefits of the practical aspects of this research are as a reference in analysing the development of human resources as seen from job satisfaction which is influenced by work competence and compensation obtained by human resources.

Research Method

The study was conducted at PT Amas Iscindo Utama starting on July 27, 2018 until August 1st, 2018.

In this research, the approach used is a quantitative approach with descriptive statistical analysis which is a method relating to the presentation of data to provide useful information. This method is carried out to get answers from the influence of competence and compensation to the work satisfaction of ship crews at PT Amas Iscindo Utama.

Regarding data collection, researchers used data collection techniques of a questionnaire that was filled in by the crew on board the ship PT Amas Iscindo Utama.

The research subjects in this study were a total of 36 officer officers working onboard PT AIU's ships totalling three ships, namely MV Sawu Sea, MV Flores Sea and MV Copper Sea.

Based on the population, which is relatively small, the researchers used a saturated sample technique. Namely, the technique of determining the sample if all members of the population are used as samples. Then the samples taken to be given questionnaires were 36 respondents of crew officers.

Data Analysis Technique

a. Descriptive Data Analysis

Descriptive statistical analysis is a statistic used to analyse data by recording research or attaching data that has been collected as it is without intending to make conclusions that apply to the public or generalisation. In this study, researchers used a descriptive analysis of the independent and dependent variables, which were then classified into the total score of the questionnaire obtained from respondents.

b. Vericative Analysis

Verification analysis is used to answer research questions that reveal the relationship and influence between the variables studied using statistical calculations. The verification tool used is the SPSS program.

c. Test Instrument

1) Validity Test

Validity test is intended to measure the extent to which the gauge measures specific characteristics that you want to calculate. Measurement is intended to show the validity of the measuring instrument in the ability to be measured.

The significance test is done by comparing the value of r arithmetic with r table for a degree of freedom (df) = n-2, in this case, n is the number of samples.

2) Reliability Test

The reliability test was carried out to determine the consistency of the respondents' answers from time to time obtained by calculating alpha coefficients using Cronbach's alpha method. With these test criteria, if the results $\sigma_t^2 > \alpha$ (Alfa Cronbach $\alpha = 0.60$) then the measuring instrument is declared reliable, and vice versa if the results $\sigma_t^2 < \alpha$ (Alfa Cronbach $\alpha = 0.60$) then the measuring instrument is not reliable (not reliable). The reliability test in this study was carried out using the SPSS Ver program 25.00 for windows.

d. Data analysis

1) Analysis of Linear Regression Data

Simple regression analysis is used to determine whether there is the linearity of the effect of independent variables on the dependent variable. This test uses a linear regression formula :

$$\hat{Y} = a + bX$$

2) Analysis of Multiple Regression Data

Multiple regression analysis is used by researchers because there are independent variables with one dependent variable which in this case is to measure the magnitude of the relationship or the effect of competence and compensation on job satisfaction of PT. Amas Iscindo Utama.

The regression equation for the two predictors is:

$$Y = a + b_1 X_1 + b_2 X_2$$

e. Coefficient of Determination

The coefficient of determination (r^2) or the coefficient of determination (KP) is used to find out how much influence or the impact of changes in the independent variable (X) on the dependent (Y) used the calculation of the coefficient of determination, namely:

$$R^2 = (r)^2 \times 100\%$$

f. Hypothesis testing

This analysis uses two tests, namely the simultaneous significance test (F statistical test), and the individual parameter significant test (t statistical test) will be explained as follows:

1) Individual Parameter Significance Test (Significance Test-t)

T statistical test shows how far the influence of one explanatory/independent variable individually in explaining the variation of the dependent variable (Ghozali, 2013, p.98). This

test is done by comparing the level of significance of t from the test results with the alpha value (α) used in this study that is equal to 5% (0.05). The testing criteria are as follows:

(a) Comparing between $t_{\text{arithmetic}}$ With t_{table}

If $t_{\text{arithmetic}} > T_{\text{table}}$, then the independent variable (X) individually influences the dependent variable (Y)

If $t_{\text{arithmetic}} < t_{\text{table}}$, the independent variable (X) individually has no effect on the dependent variable (Y).

(b) Based on Probabilities

If the probability of $\text{sig} < 0.05$ (α), then the independent variable (X) individually influences the dependent variable (Y).

If the probability of $\text{sig} > 0.05$ (α), then the independent variable (X) individually has no effect on the dependent variable (Y).

2) Simultaneous Significance Test (F-Significance Test)

The F statistical test shows whether all independent or independent variables included in the model have a joint influence on the dependent variable (Ghozali, 2013, p.98). This test is carried out by comparing the significance level F of the test results with the alpha value (α) used in this study that is equal to 5% (0.05). The testing criteria are as follows:

(a) Compares $F_{\text{arithmetic}}$ with F_{table}

If $F_{\text{arithmetic}} > F_{\text{table}}$, the independent variables simultaneously affect the dependent variable.

If $F_{\text{arithmetic}} < F_{\text{table}}$, the independent variables simultaneously have no effect on the dependent variable

(b) Based on Probabilities

If the probability of $\text{sig} < 0.05$ (α), then the independent variable influences the dependent variable.

If the probability of $\text{sig} > 0.05$ (α), then the independent variable has no effect on the dependent variable.

Results and Discussion

Competency Data

Following data on the latest educational competencies of the crew officers:

Table 1: Last Education Ship Crew Competency

No.	Last Education	Number of (people)	Percentage (%)
1.	ANT I	6	17 %
2.	ANT II	4	11 %
3.	ANT III	8	22 %
4.	ATT I	6	17 %
5.	ATT II	8	22 %
6.	ATT III	4	11 %
	Total	36	100

Based on the data in Table 1, there are 36 crew members who have a *Certificate of Competency*. But there are still crew members who have certificates that do not match their position. That is because there is a promotion from the company and there is also a position because there is no position in accordance with the certificate, so the crew must wait until there is a position in accordance with the certificate they have. Even inadequate experience becomes an obstacle for a crew member to get an education certificate of seafarers' expertise with a higher level.

Data on Number of Crews Required by the Company:

Table 2: The number of crew required and *stand by* at PT AIU

No.	Position	Amount Required	The number of Standby
1.	C/O	7 orang	5 orang
2.	2/O	7 orang	5 orang
3.	3/O	7 orang	5 orang
4.	CE	7 orang	5 orang
5.	2/E	7 orang	5 orang
6.	3/E	7 orang	5 orang

Based on Table 2 above, it can be seen that the amount required by the company for *onboard* crew and replacement crew is still not fulfilled because the number of crew members on *stand-by* ships is still insufficient compared to the number of crew members required.

Compensation Data

The following is the salary/wage data received by the crew based on their position:

Table 3: Salary/Wages of Ship Crew Officers per month

No.	Position	Compensation Amount
1.	C/O	Rp 40,000,000
2.	2/O	Rp 22,000,000
3.	3/O	Rp 20,000,000
4.	CE	Rp 51,000,000
5.	2/E	Rp 40,000,000
6.	3/E	Rp 22,000,000

No.	Position	Compensation Amount
1.	C/O	Rp 40.000.000
2.	2/O	Rp 22.000.000
3.	3/O	Rp 20.000.000
4.	CE	Rp 51.000.000
5.	2/E	Rp 40.000.000
6.	3/E	Rp 22.000.000

Based on the data in Table 3 we can find out the amount of salary/wages received by the crew based on their positions. The nominal salary/wage is a fair and exact nominal determined by the company's ship management, namely Wallem Ship Management.

The following is a comparison between crew salary and ITF standards.

Table 4: Data Comparison of PT AIU Salaries with ITF Standards per month

No	Position	Name	Total Salary	ITF Standars
1	C/O	Arifin Kaufua	Rp 40,000,000	Rp 47 – 60,000,000
2	2/O	Khoriul Anam	Rp 22,000,000	Rp 25 – 50,000,000
3	3/O	Dhira Dharma	Rp 20,000,000	Rp 24 – 45,000,000
4	C/E	Marsudi	Rp 51,000,000	Rp 55 – 70,000,000
5	2/E	Roy Setya	Rp 40,000,000	Rp 47 – 60,000,000
6	3/E	Septrianto	Rp 22,000,000	Rp 25 – 50,000,000

No	Position	Name	Total Salary	ITF Standars
1	C/O	Arifin Kaufua	Rp 40.000.000	Rp 47 – 60.000.000
2	2/O	Khoriul Anam	Rp 22.000.000	Rp 25 – 50.000.000
3	3/O	Dhira Dharma	Rp 20.000.000	Rp 24 – 45.000.000

4	C/E	Marsudi	Rp 51.000.000	Rp 55 – 70.000.000
5	2/E	Roy Setya	Rp 40.000.000	Rp 47 – 60.000.000
6	3/E	Septrianto	Rp 22.000.000	Rp 25 – 50.000.000

From the results of the salary table above shows that the salary given to the crew is not appropriate when compared with ITF (*International Transport Workers Federation*) standards.

Data Analysis

a. Validity test

The significant test is done by comparing the value of r_{count} with the value of r_{table} for n , in this case, the number of saturated samples, with a significance level of 5%. A statement is declared valid if the r_{count} value, which is the value of the *corrected item-total correlation* (in SPSS 25) is greater than r_{table} .

Table 5: Competency Variable Validity Test Results (X_1)

The validity of Items of Competency Questionnaire Statement			
No. Item	Corrected Item Total Correlation (r_{count})	r_{table}	Validity
1	0.794	0.329	Valid
2	0.806	0.329	Valid
3	0.835	0.329	Valid
4	0.794	0.329	Valid
5	0.632	0.329	Valid
6	0.756	0.329	Valid
7	0.703	0.329	Valid
8	0.627	0.329	Valid
9	0.821	0.329	Valid
10	0.762	0.329	Valid

Competency Variable Validity Test Results (X_1)

Table 6: Compensation Variable Validity Test Results (X_2)

The validity of Items of Competency Questionnaire Statement			
No. Item	Corrected Item Total Correlation (r_{count})	r_{table}	Validity
1	0.676	0.329	Valid
2	0.664	0.329	Valid
3	0.711	0.329	Valid
4	0.792	0.329	Valid
5	0.842	0.329	Valid
6	0.802	0.329	Valid
7	0.728	0.329	Valid

8	0.607	0.329	Valid
9	0.693	0.329	Valid
10	0.545	0.329	Valid

Table 7: Test Results of Validity of Job Satisfaction Variables (Y)

The validity of Items of Competency Questionnaire Statement			
No. Item	Corrected Item Total Correlation (r_{count})	r_{table}	Validity
1	0.739	0.329	Valid
2	0.646	0.329	Valid
3	0.640	0.329	Valid
4	0.752	0.329	Valid
5	0.594	0.329	Valid
6	0.740	0.329	Valid
7	0.637	0.329	Valid
8	0.680	0.329	Valid
9	0.658	0.329	Valid
10	0.781	0.329	Valid

b. Reliability Test

The variables were tested using the SPSS 25.00 computer program with the *Cronbach's alpha* formula to determine the reliability of the question points.

Table 8: Competency Variable Reliability Test Results (X_1)

Reliability Statistics	
Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
0.890	10

Based on Table 8 above, it can be concluded that the *Cronbach Alpha* value of $0.890 > 0.60$, the questionnaire is declared reliable.

Table 9: Compensation Variable Reliability Test Results (X_2)

Reliability Statistics	
Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
0.885	10

Based on Table 9 above, it can be concluded that the *Cronbach Alpha* value of $0.885 > 0.60$, the questionnaire is declared reliable.

Table 10: Job Satisfaction Variability Test Results (Y)

Reliability Statistics	
Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
0.871	10

Based on Table 10 above, it can be concluded that the *Cronbach Alpha* value of $0.871 > 0.60$, the questionnaire is declared reliable.

c. Statistical Data Analysis

In this study, researchers used three variables, namely the competency variable (X_1), the Compensation Variable (X_2) and the Job Satisfaction Variable (Y). In analysing research data, researchers use the method of collecting data through questionnaires given to respondents.

d. Linear Regression Analysis

1. Regression X_1 against Y (simple)

Table 11: X_1 Regression of Y (Linear)

Coefficients ^a						
Model		Unstandardised Coefficients		Standardised Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	15.762	3.969		3.971	0.000
	Competence	0.518	.105	0.645	4.922	0.000

Dependent Variable: Job Satisfaction

Based on the results of the calculations carried out obtained a for 15.762 and b for 0.518, the form of a simple linear regression equation as follows:

$$\hat{Y} = 15.762 + 0.518X_1$$

From the regression equation, it can be seen that the effect of competence on crew work satisfaction is unidirectional (positive), this is indicated in the regression coefficient or value of b which shows a positive number of 0.518 which means that every 1 unit competency increase will be followed by an increase in crew job satisfaction vessels of 0.518 units. And vice versa, if the competence has decreased by 1 unit, the crew job satisfaction will tend to decrease by 0.518 units. And the value of the coefficient an (*intercept*) is 15.762, which means that if there is no competence ($X = 0$), it is estimated that crew work satisfaction is 15.762 units.

2. X_2 Regression of Y (Simplified)

Table 12: Regression X₂ to Y (Linear)

Coefficients ^a						
Model		Unstandardised Coefficients		Standardised Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	4.990	1.629		3.064	0.000
	Compensation	0.868	0.046	.955	18.673	0.000

Based on the results of calculations performed a 4.990 and b of 0.866, a simple linear regression equation is formed as follows:

$$\hat{Y} = 4.990 + 0.866X_2$$

From the regression equation, it can be seen that the effect of compensation on crew job satisfaction is unidirectional (positive), this is indicated in the regression coefficient or value of b which shows a positive number of 0.866 which means that every 1 unit compensation increase will be followed by an increase in crew job satisfaction vessels of 0.866 units. Vice versa, if compensation has decreased by 1 unit, the crew job satisfaction will tend to decrease by 0.866 units. And the value of the coefficient an (*intercept*) is 4.990, which means that if there is no compensation (X = 0), it is estimated that crew work satisfaction is 4.990 units.

3. Regression X₁ and X₂ to Y (doubles)

Table 13: X₁ and X₂ Regression of Y (double)

Coefficients ^a						
Model		Unstandardised Coefficients		Standardised Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	3.736	1.715		2.179	0.037
	Competence	0.091	0.050	.114	2.845	0.000
	Compensation	.804	0.056	.886	14.363	0.000

Based on the results of calculations carried out obtained an amount of 3.736; b₁ of 0.091 and b₂ of 0.804 forms the linear regression equation doubled as follows:

$$\hat{Y} = 3.736 + 0.091X_1 + 0.804X_2$$

- (a) From the regression equation, it can be seen that the effect of competence on crew work satisfaction is unidirectional (positive). This is indicated in the regression coefficient or b_1 value indicates a positive number of 0.091 which means that each increase in 1 unit of competence will be followed by an increase crew work satisfaction of 0.091 units. Vice versa, if the competence has decreased by 1 unit, the crew job satisfaction will tend to decrease by 0.091 units.
- (b) From the regression equation shows that the influence of compensation on job satisfaction of the crew is the same direction (positive), it is shown in the regression coefficient or value b_2 showed a positive figure of 0.804 which implies that any compensation increase by 1 unit will be followed by an increase in crew work satisfaction by 0.804 units. Vice versa, if the compensation has decreased by 1 unit, the crew job satisfaction will tend to fall by 0.804 units.
- (c) And the coefficient an (*intercept*) value is 3.736 which means that if there is no competence and compensation (X_1 and $X_2 = 0$), it is estimated that the work satisfaction of the crew is 3.736 units.

e. Determination Coefficient Test

1. Coefficient of Determination X_1 Against Y

Table 14: Coefficient of Determination X_1 Against Y

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. The error of the Estimate
1	0.923 ^a	.851	0.843	2.690

By looking at the calculation results above where R Square is 0.851 or 85.1%. This shows the magnitude of the positive influence of competence on crew work satisfaction by 85.1%, while the remaining 14.9% is the influence of other factors.

Table 15:

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. The error of the Estimate
1	0.955 ^a	0.911	0.909	1.536

2. Coefficient of Determination X_2 Against Y

By looking at the results of calculations where R square of 0.911 or 91.1%. This shows the magnitude of the positive effect of compensation on crew job satisfaction by 91.1%, while the remaining 8.9% is the influence of other factors.

3. Coefficient Determination of X_1 and X_2 on Y

Table 16: Coefficient of Determination X_1 and X_2 with respect to Y (double)

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. The error of the Estimate
1	.959 ^a	0.919	0.915	1.484

By looking at the calculation results above where R square of 0.919 or 91.9%. This shows the magnitude of the positive influence of competence and compensation for crew work satisfaction of 91.9% while the remaining 8.1% is the influence of other factors.

f. Hypothesis testing

1. Test t Calculate

Table 17: T Test Results Calculate

Coefficients ^a						
Model		Unstandardised Coefficients		Standardised Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	3.736	1.715		2.179	0.037
	Competence	0.091	0.050	0.114	2.845	0.000
	Compensation	0.804	0.056	0.886	14.363	0.000

Dependent Variable: Job Satisfaction

While the results of t_{table} are:

$$t_{table} = t(a/2; nk-1)$$

$$= t(0.025; 33)$$

$$t_{table} = 2.035$$

- a) If the value of $\text{sig} < 0.05$, or $t_{\text{arithmetic}} > t_{\text{table}}$ then there is the influence of Variable X on Variable Y.
- b) If the value of $\text{sig} > 0.05$, or $t_{\text{arithmetic}} < t_{\text{table}}$ then there is no effect of Variable X on Variable Y.

The results of data processing in the above table are:

- a) The sig value for the influence of competence (X_1) on job satisfaction (Y) is 0.000 < 0.05 and $t_{\text{count}} > t_{\text{table}} 2.845 > 2.035$. So it can be concluded that the hypothesis is accepted because there is a positive effect of competence on crew work satisfaction.
- b) The sig value for the effect of compensation (X_2) on job satisfaction (Y) is found to be 0,000 < 0.05 and the value of $t_{\text{count}} > t_{\text{table}} 14.336 > 2.035$. So it can be concluded that the hypothesis is accepted because there is an effect of compensation on crew work satisfaction.

2. Test f Calculate

The F test is used to determine all independent variables, whether jointly influencing the dependent variable; in this study, the independent variables consist of competence and compensation. If the independent variable has a simultaneous influence on the dependent variable, the regression equation model fits into the fit or *fit* criteria.

Table 18: F Calculate Test Results

ANOVA ^a						
Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	830.253	2	415.127	188.385	0.000 ^b
	Residual	72.719	33	2.204		
	Total	902.972	35			

- a. Dependent Variable: Job Satisfaction
- b. Predictors: (Constant), Compensation, Competence

While the results of the f_{table} are:

$$\begin{aligned}
 f_{table} &= f(k: nk-1) \\
 &= f(2: 36-2-1) \\
 &= f(2: 33)
 \end{aligned}$$

$$f_{table} = 3.28$$

- a) If the value of $\text{sig} < 0.05$, or $F_{count} > F_{table}$, there is the effect of Variable X simultaneously on Variable Y.
- b) If the value of $\text{sig} > 0.05$, or $F_{count} < F_{table}$, there is no simultaneous influence of the X variable on the Y variable.

The results of data processing in the above table it is known that $\text{sig} 0.000 < 0.05$, and $F_{arithmetic}$ amounted to $188.385 > 3.28$, then the hypothesis is accepted. This means that the competence and compensation variables have a positive influence on the crew job satisfaction.

Discussion

a. *Partial Effect of Competence on Crew Job Satisfaction*

Crew competence has a positive and significant effect on job satisfaction with a linear regression coefficient of 0.518. The results of this study indicate that the competency variable has a significance value of $0,000 < 0.05$ and is proven by the magnitude of $t_{arithmetic} > t_{table}$ that is $2.845 > 2.035$, which means that competence has a positive effect on crew job satisfaction.

Competence has an R square value of 85.1%. This means that the amount of the contribution (contribution) of variable competence of the crew on the job satisfaction PT Amas Top Iscindo amounted to 85.1 % while the remaining 14.9 % is the influence of other factors, for example, factors as motivation, recruitment, work environment, leadership, etc.

Besides the respondent's answer on each statement, competence influences the work satisfaction of PT Amas Iscindo Utama's crew because it has the highest average value of 3.89. This value is found in the dimension of knowledge (*knowledge*) with the statement of creative thinking, and innovative in working is something that must be owned by every crew member.

To increase job satisfaction is necessary to increase the competence, which is reflected by the dimensions of knowledge (*knowledge*) with indicators of the idea/ideas and to point declaration crew of the ship can provide ideas/good idea when working both orally and in writing, without neglecting the dimensions of the other.

The first hypothesis in this study examines whether competency partially influences job satisfaction of ship crews. The results of this study indicate that the competency variable has a significance value of $0.000 < 0.05$. This is also evidenced by the magnitude of $t_{\text{count}} 2.845$ greater than $t_{\text{table}} 2.035$, which means that competence has a positive effect on crew work satisfaction so that the first hypothesis is accepted.

b. Partial Effect of Compensation on Crew Work Satisfaction

Crew compensation is a positive and significant effect on job satisfaction with a regression coefficient of 0.866. The results of this study indicate that the compensation variable has a significance value of $0,000 < 0.05$ and is evidenced by the magnitude of $t_{\text{arithmetic}} > t_{\text{table}}$ that is $14.336 > 2.035$, which means that compensation has a positive effect on crew job satisfaction.

Compensation has an R square value of 91.1%. This means that the amount of the contribution (contribution) of variable compensation to job satisfaction of the crew of PT Amas Top Iscindo amounted to 91.1%, while the remaining 8.9 % is the influence of other factors, for example, factors as motivation, recruitment, work environment, leadership, etc.

Besides the respondent's answer on each statement, compensation affects the work satisfaction of PT Amas Iscindo Utama's crew because it has the highest average value of 3.72. This value is found in the award dimension with the item of health insurance statement given by the company to make the crew calm when working.

To improve job satisfaction, it is necessary to increase compensation, which is reflected by the dimensions of rewards/remuneration with salary/wage indicators and with items of salary/wages received sufficient for the welfare of the crew economy, without ignoring the other dimensions.

The second hypothesis in this study examines whether compensation partially influences job satisfaction of ship crews. The results of this study indicate that the compensation variable has a significance value of $0.000 < 0.05$. This is also evidenced by the magnitude of $t_{\text{count}} 14.383$ greater than $t_{\text{table}} 2.035$, which means that compensation has a positive effect on crew work satisfaction, so the second hypothesis is accepted.

c. The Effect of Competency and Compensation Together on Ship Crew Work Satisfaction

Competence and compensation have a positive and significant effect together on job satisfaction with a competency regression coefficient of 0.091 and compensation of 0.804. The results of this study indicate that the competency and compensation variables together have a significant F test value is $0.000 < 0.05$ this is also evidenced by the $F_{\text{calculated}}$ value greater than the F_{table} that is $188.385 > 3.28$ which means that competence and compensation have a positive effect to the crew job satisfaction.

Based on the determination of each variable, it can be seen that the compensation variable has a greater R value when compared to the competency variable, so it can be concluded that compensation is the dominant variable, without ignoring the other variables.

From the information above, it can be interpreted the conditions in the period under study that competence and compensation have a significant positive relationship both individually and jointly with the crew's job satisfaction at PT Amas Iscindo Utama.

This research discusses Competence, Compensation and Job satisfaction. This research in line with previous studies including Purba (2017), Masydzulhak (2016), and Riyanto (2017).

Conclusion

From the test results of the three proposed research hypotheses, it is proven that the competency variable (X_1) and compensation variable (X_2) both individually and jointly have a relationship to the work satisfaction of crew members at PT Amas Iscindo Utama. In full, this conclusion can be described as follows:

a. Competence proved to be positive and significant to the work satisfaction of crew members with a t_{count} of 2.845, greater than t_{table} , 2.035.

Regression equation for the relationship of competence (X_1) to crew job satisfaction (Y) obtained $\hat{Y} = 15.762 + 0.518X_1$ this equation means that any increase or decrease in one unit of competence will be followed by an increase or decrease in crew job satisfaction at PT Amas Iscindo Main. The magnitude of the increase or decrease is on average 16.28 at a constant 15.762. So it can be concluded that the higher the competency with the knowledge dimension (*Knowledge*) possessed by each crew member, it will increase the work satisfaction of the crew at PT Amas Iscindo Utama.

b. Compensation proved to be positive and significant to the work satisfaction of ship crews with a t_{count} of 14.336 greater than t_{table} that is 2.035.

The regression equation for compensation relationship (X_2) to crew job satisfaction (Y) obtained $\hat{Y} = 4.990 + 0.866 X_2$ this equation means that any increase or decrease in one compensation unit will be followed by an increase or decrease in crew work satisfaction at PT Amas Iscindo Main. The magnitude of the increase or decrease is 5.856 on the 4.990 constant. So it can be concluded that the higher the compensation with the award dimension obtained by each crew member, it will increase the work satisfaction of the crew at PT Amas Iscindo Utama.

c. Competency and compensation together proved to be positive and significant to the work satisfaction of ship crews, with a calculated F value of 188.338 greater than the F_{table} of 3.28.

The regression equation for the relationship of competence (X_1) and compensation (X_2) together to the crew work satisfaction (Y) $\hat{Y} = 3.736 + 0.091 X_1 + 0.804 X_2$ this equation implies that each competency increases 1 unit and increases 1 unit compensation will be followed by an increase in crew work satisfaction of 4.631 units at a constant 3.736. Vice versa, if the competence has decreased by 1 unit and compensation has decreased by 1 unit, then the crew job satisfaction will tend to decrease by 4.631 units at a constant 3.736.

From the results of the research discussion and research conclusions as described above, it is suggested as follows:

a. Improve the competency of ship crews by optimising job training

Every company certainly wants human resources; in this case, is a quality crew. Having a qualified and competent crew is a must for the company. Managing crew members based on competence is believed to be more able to guarantee success in reaching the destination. Therefore the company is obliged to improve the crew in the company in order to

achieve maximum competence by developing the skills and abilities of the crew through work education and training. The recommended work training to be followed and optimised by each crew member is on *Human Resources Management* (HRM). HRM is a work training that aims to form creative and innovative boat crews, use them to work optimally based on their position, and be able to position themselves as leaders or subordinates. So that the crew will work without coercion and work can be completed effectively and on time.

b. Increase compensation given to crew members

Providing salaries/wages to the crew on time and in accordance with standards is the responsibility of the shipping company to ensure the welfare of the crew. However, the phenomenon is that salaries are included in the low category; namely, the salary does not meet the standards issued by the ITF (*International Transport Workers Federation*). Provision of salary to the crew on time and in accordance with standards is the responsibility of the shipping company to ensure the welfare of the crew. Compensation provided should be more proportional according to the position and how long the service period of the company. The company also needs to provide ease of compensation in the form of promotion to the crew who excel in work so that the crew will have high morale and professionalism to get the best value *appraisal report*.

c. Increasing crew work satisfaction

Increased job satisfaction can be done by increasing the variables of competence and compensation, both individually and jointly. In addition, motivating the crew by approaching and improving the welfare of the crew, providing clear and clear regulations regarding work regulations for the crew, the implementation of *reward* and *punishment* or sanctions that will be received by the crew if they violate the rules set can increase job satisfaction too. *The reward is given to the crew who can finish the job well in accordance with the specified time with satisfactory results. Rewards can be in the form of salary increases, bonuses or promotions. Punishment is given to the crew who cannot finish the work under the specified time, do not want to follow the procedures determined by the company, for example, provide strict sanctions such as salary or bonus deductions and threats to terminate the work contract. With this enactment, the crew will always obey the rules and be responsible, so that the crew will be comfortable with the work cycle that they do and feel satisfied with the rewards they have received.*



REFERENCES

- Aida R Ibrahim, R. Z., Saputra, J., Mat Ali, S. N., Mohd Dagang, M., & Abu Bakar, A. (2019). Organizational Justice and Job Satisfaction among Malaysian Workers. *Edición Especial*, 35(89).
- Armstrong, M. (2003). *Managing People a Practical Guide For Line Managers*. Jakarta: PT Bhuana Ilmu Populer.
- Barasa, L. (2018). *Determinants of Job Satisfaction and Its Implications on the Performance of Port Employee Employees in DKI Jakarta*. [Dissertation]. Jakarta (ID): School of Shipping Science.
- Cashmere. (2016). *Human Resource Management (Theory and Practice)*. Depok: PT Raja Grafindo Persada.
- Hamali, A. Y. (2016). *Understanding of Human Resource Management*. Yogyakarta: CAPS.
- Larasati, S. (2018). *Human Resource Management*. Yogyakarta: Deepublish.
- Masydzulhak, A., & Hapzi, L. (2016). The influence of work motivation and job satisfaction on employee performance and organizational commitment as an satisfaction as an intervening variable. *PT. Asian Isuzu Casting Center. Quest Journal of Research in Business and Management*, 4(10), 1-10.
- Nawawi, H. (2016). *Human Resource Management for Competitive Businesses*. Yogyakarta: Gadjah Mada University Press.
- Panggabean, M. S. (2004). *Human Resources Management*. Bogor: Ghalia Indonesia.
- Purba, B., Arzio, C., & Ali, H. (2017). [The Influence of Compensation, Working Environment and Organization Culture on Working Productivity of BPJSpjs \(Workers Social Security Agency\) Employment Staff in Rawamangun ...](#) *Man In India (MII)*, ISSN 0025-1569 Index Scopus Q3. 24.
- Rachmawati, I. K. (2008). *Human Resource Management*. Yogyakarta: ANDI.
- Rasooli, M., & Abedini, M. (2017). The Relationship between Organizational Support and Job Satisfaction of Experts and Managers of Islamic Azad University of Qeshm and Subsidiaries (International Units, Medical, Sama, Hormuz and Khamir). *Dutch Journal of Finance and Management*, 1(2), 42.



- Riyanto, S. (2017). Effect of Motivation and Job Satisfaction on the Performance of Teachers in Mentari School Bintaro (MSB). *Target*, 83, 91.
- Riyanto, S., Adonia, & Ali, H. (2017). Effect of Motivation and Job Satisfaction on the Performance of Teachers in Mentari School Bintaro (MSB). *Scholars Bulletin*, 3(3), 83-91. <http://scholarsbulletin.com/wp-content/uploads/2017/04/SB-3383-91.pdf>
- Sedarmayanti. (2007). *Human Resource Management Bureaucratic Reform and Management of Civil Servants Revised Edition*. Bandung: PT Refika Aditama.
- Sugiyono. (2013). *Business Research Methods*. Bandung: Alfabeta.
- Sulistiyani, A., & Rosidah, T. (2009). *Human Resource Management Concepts, Theories and Development in the Context of Public Organizations*. Yogyakarta: Graha Science.
- Wake up, W. (2012). *Human Resource Management*. Jakarta: Erlangga Publisher.
- Wibowo. (2007). *Performance Management - Fifth Edition*. Depok: PT RajaGrafindo Persada.
- Yusuf, B. (2015). *Human Resource Management in Islamic Financial Institutions*. Jakarta: PT Raja Grafindo Persada.
- Novikova, I. N., Popova, L. G., Shatilova, L. M., Biryukova, E. V., Guseva, A. E., & Khukhuni, G. T. (2018). Lexical and semantic representation of the linguistic and cultural concept "Rest" in the English, German, and Russian languages. *Opción*, 34(85-2), 237-256.
- Sadri, E., & Tahririan, M. (2018). Teacher-Assisted vs. Peer-Assisted Performances and L2 Development: A Mixed Methods Approach. *Research in Applied Linguistics*, 9(1), 3-27.