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Abstract: This research aimed to find out the effect of social capital on the employee performance, to find out the effect of training on employee performance, to find out the effect of competence on employee performance, and to find out the effect of work experience on employee performance. This study was conducted in healthcare facilities of Regional General Hospital Dr. Sayidiman Magetan. The populations in this study were nurses at the Inpatient Dr Sayidiman Magetan Hospital totaling 519 people. The sampling technique employed in this research was proportionate stratified random sampling with the sample consisting of 115 employees, it’s obtained from the sample size (n) = number of indicators (23) x 5. Techniques of collecting data used in this research were documentation, observation and questionnaire. Technique of analyzing data used was chi-square analysis. The result of research showed that social capital affected significantly the employee performance. Training education affected significantly the employee performance. Competence affected significantly the employee performance in. Job experience affected significantly employee performance.
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Until now, development in the field of health services in Indonesia is not only in the physical form such as hospital buildings and other infrastructure, but also in non-physical form such as quality improvement of health personnel resources (Nakes). Hospital is a health service institution for society with its own characteristic, which is influenced by the development of health science, technology advances, and socio-economic life of society and has to be able to improve its service to be more qualified and reachable by society in order to realize healthy society. Advances in a hospital cannot be separated from the human resources of a hospital. Every hospital that offers services always strives to manage its human resource in a professional way to improve the employee performance. In an effort to improve the performance of hospital, the presence of employees who have social capital, had training, competence, and good work experience are needed.
In addition to human resources, the existence of social capital of employees is very important because it affects the performance of employees, which in turn will affect the performance of the organization (Akdere, 2005). According to Bell and Kilpatrick (2000), social capital is one form of capital because there are resources or assets that can be invested and in the future are expected to produce something, which can be used for various purposes.

Social capital is very useful because it will support the work processes. Social capital is an access to a wider source of information that will improve the quality, relevance, and timeliness of information needed by employees to support their work. Employees who have good social capital will have access to a very wide relationship. Extensive access to relationships makes it easier for someone to get support from their colleagues, which allows them to get the necessary information or resources from their colleagues to support the implementation of their duties (Prayogo, 2008).

Social capital can be discussed in the context of a strong community, solid social society, as well as a person’s identity. Social capital including elements such as trust, cohesiveness, altruism, mutual cooperation, network, and social collaboration has a profound effect on employee performance. Social capital forms influence, control, and power in the people who own it. An employee who has good interaction with his coworkers will certainly be trusted, so that his colleagues will receive each of his suggestion or opinion well. Even his co-workers will be happy to do his favor.

Performance is an activity of processing organizational resources to achieve organizational goals. The goals are about direction in general, which are broad, without time constraints and not related to particular achievements within a certain period of time. Goal is an aspiration. Performance is the responsibility of every person to work, help organization define performance expectation, seek a framework for supervisors and workers to communicate with each other. The goal of performance is to adjust individual performance expectations to organizational goals (Sinambela, 2012).

An employee or employee can be said to have a high performance if the established workload is achieved and if the realization of work is higher than what is set by the company. The demands that cannot be controlled by any employees will lead employee to be tense and if it cannot be overcome then the employee will experience a decrease in the spirit of work and work discipline in production process of the company. To achieve great production results, company leaders have to pay attention to the factors that affect employee performance.

Hospital is one form of organization which is engaged in the field of health service. This health service is always demanded to always get better. This is not easy because there is increasingly fierce competition. One of the key factors of success in improving hospital performance begins with the employee performance of hospital.

Regional General Hospital Dr. Sayidiman Magetan (RSDS) is one of the health centers located in Magetan Regency of East Java, which is a hospital owned by local government. RSDS is C-Class Hospital. RSDS is also a Secondary Health Service Center (PPK II) for BPJS (Social Security Provider) which is the reference of PPK II in Magetan Regency and surrounding areas. Human resource is the main focus that must be managed by RSDS in addition to other infrastructure facilities, in an effort to improve the quality of services to the society.

Competition among hospitals, both government hospital and private hospital as well as foreign hospital will be increasingly hard to seize the open market. The demands of rapid hospital development need to be supported by professional human resources (HR). Human resource becomes the main focus in developing hospital services because human resources are the main assets that must be managed by hospital in order to improve its performance. This is also faced by Regional General Hospital Dr. Sayidiman Magetan.

Employee performance problems at Regional General Hospital Dr. Sayidiman Magetan are still often found. It is clear that there are factors that degrade its employee performance.

In this case, the researchers want to know employee performance, whether it is influenced by...
Contribution of Social Capital, Training, Competence, and Work Experience to Employee Performance

To achieve high performance in serving the society well and satisfactorily, the employees at Regional General Public Hospital Dr. Sayidiman Magetan must have an education that is appropriate to the field of work given in the hospital, because a job done by a person whose education is not in accordance with the field of work will not be good and successful. Employee education and training are human resource development activities to increase knowledge, ability and skill of employee, and improve employee performance. Education and training seek to develop the intellectual and personal skills of employees. Every organization that wants to develop should really pay attention to the education and training of employees, so that employee performance will improve.

The research which was conducted by Rezita (2014) obtained a result that education and training have a positive and significant impact on employee performance and its influence is in the moderate category. The coefficient of determination ($r^2$) of 0.555 means that 55.5% of employee performance is influenced by education and training of employees, while the rest (44.5%) is influenced by other variables that are not examined in this research.

Competence also greatly determines the performance of employees. Competence of performance can be interpreted as behaviors which are shown by those who perform perfectly, more consistently and effectively, than those with average performance. According to Cira and Benjamin (1998), by evaluating the competence of a person, we will be able to predict the person’s performance. Competence can be used as the main criterion for determining one’s work.

The results of the research which was conducted by Yunus (2009) show that communication skill, ability in group cooperation, leadership skill, decision making ability, which are indicators of competence, simultaneously have a significant effect on performance, which means the higher employee competency level, the higher employee performance.

Work experience is the mastery level of knowledge and skills owned by employees in working, which can be measured from the work period and the type of work that has been done by employees during a certain period. This is in line with the theory stated by Robbins and Timothy (2008) that work experience is based on the knowledge and skills owned by employees. Work results, work process, and work attitude. If an employee has a lot of work experience, then his/her competence will be in accordance with the demands of work, so that he/she will be more motivated in working and able to achieve high performance.

The research which was conducted by Aristarini et al. (2014) found that there is a positive influence of work experience on employee performance. The result of this study is in line with the theory stated by Robbins and Timothy (2008) that work experience is mastery level of knowledge and skills of a person in working, that seems to be a good approximation of employee performance.

Based on the background above, the researchers are interested in doing this research. The purposes of this research are: (1) to know the influence of social capital on employee performance; (2) to know the effect of training on employee performance; (3) to know the effect of competence on employee performance; (4) to know the effect of work experience on employee performance.

Based on the review of existing theories and problems, the hypothesis to be tested in this study are as follows: (H1) Social capital has a positive effect on employee performance; (H2) Training has a positive effect on employee performance; (H3) Competence has a positive effect on employee performance; (H4) Work experience has a positive effect on employee performance.

RESEARCH METHOD
Research design

This research is an explanatory research by using quantitative approach with survey method which aims to know the effect of social capital (X1), training (X2), competence (X3), and work experience (X4) on employee performance (Y). The variables in this study include:
The populations in this study were employees at Inpatient Installation of RSUD Dr. Sayidiman Magetan, amounted to 519 people. The sampling technique used in this study is proportionate stratified random sampling, with 115 employees as research samples.

This study used primary data obtained from questionnaires spread to employees as respondents as well as secondary data from the documentation.

Data collection techniques used in this research were documentation, observation and questionnaires.

The analysis used was quantitative analysis with chi square analysis for hypothesis test. All statistical calculations in this study were done by using SPSS 17.0 software; chi square analysis, which was formulated in the form of the equation as follows:

\[ X^2 = \sum_{i=1}^{k} \frac{(f_0 - f_h)^2}{fh} \]

Information:
- \( f_0 \) = number of observation
- \( f_h \) = number of expected observation

(Priyatno, 2008).

Crosstab table model used in chi square test in this study was 3x3 table. The test used a two-tailed test with a significance level of \( a = 5\% \).

The test criteria are as follows:
1. \( H0 \) is rejected if \( X^2 \) count > \( X^2 \) table
2. \( H0 \) is accepted if \( X^2 \) count < \( X^2 \) table

\( X^2 \) table can be seen in table of \( X^2 \) by using confidence level of 95\%, \( a=5\% \), \( df = (\text{number of rows}-1) \times (\text{number of columns}-1) = (3-1) \times (3-1) = 2 \times 2 = 4 \).
FINDINGS

(1) Hypothesis 1 Testing

The results of hypothesis 1 (H1) testing stating that “social capital has a positive effect on employee performance” which was done by using chi square test are as follows:

The relationship between social capital and employee performance can be presented in the following crosstab table.

Table 2  Relationship between social capital and employee performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Social Capital</th>
<th>Employee Performance</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Data processed by SPSS

The table above shows that there are 4 respondents (28.6%) who assume that they have low social capital and low performance, there is 1 respondent (2.5%) who considers himself/herself to have low social capital and moderate performance, there are 2 respondents (3.3%) who assume that they have low social capital and high performance.

The table above shows that there are 7 respondents (50%) who assume that they have moderate social capital and low performance, there are 33 respondents (82.5%) who assume that they have moderate social capital and moderate performance, there are 43 respondents (70.5%) who assume that they have moderate social capital and high performance.

The table above shows that there are 3 respondents (21.4%) who assume that they have high social capital and low performance, there are 6 respondents (15%) who assume that they have high social capital and moderate performance, there are 16 respondents (26.2%) who assume that they have high social capital and high performance.

Hypothesis 1 testing can be seen in the following table.

Table 3  Results of Chi Square Test of Hypothesis 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chi-Square Tests</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>16.234</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>11.244</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear-by-Linear Association</td>
<td>4.091</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Valid Cases</td>
<td>115</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. 4 cells (44.4%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .85.

Source: Results of SPSS 17 Test

In the table above, it can be seen that the value of Pearson Chi-Square (X² count) of 16.234 and value of X² table of 9.488, obtained from a = 5%; df = 4 (see appendix 9 of chi square table). These results mean X² count > X² table (16.234 > 9.488), which means that H0 is rejected and H1 is accepted or social capital has a positive effect on employee performance.
(2) Hypothesis 2 Testing

The results of hypothesis 2 (H2) testing stating that “training has positive effect on employee performance” which was done by using chi square test are as follows:

The relationship between training and employee performance can be presented in the following crosstab table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Training</th>
<th>Employee Performance</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>42.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>35.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Data processed by SPSS

Table 4 Relationship between training and employee performance

The table above shows that there are 6 respondents (42.9%) who assume that they had low training and low performance, there are 2 respondents (5%) who assume that they had low training and moderate performance, and there is 1 respondent (1.6%) who considers himself/herself to have low training and high performance.

The table above shows that there are 3 respondents (21.4%) who assume that they had moderate training and low performance, there are 26 respondents (65%) who assume that they had moderate training and moderate performance, and there are 16 respondents (26.2%) who assume that they had moderate training and high performance.

The table above shows that there are 5 respondents (35.7%) who assume that they had good training and low performance, there are 12 respondents (30%) who assume that they had good training and moderate performance, and there are 44 respondents (72.1%) who assume that they had good training and high performance.

Hypothesis 2 testing can be seen in the following table.

Table 5 Results of Chi Square Test of Hypothesis 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chi-Square Tests</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>44.888</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>34.878</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear-by-Linear Association</td>
<td>22.745</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Valid Cases</td>
<td>115</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. 3 cells (33.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.10.

Source: Results of SPSS 17 Test

In the table above, it can be seen that the value of Pearson Chi-Square ($X^2$ count) of 44.888 and value of $X^2$ table of 9.488, obtained from $\alpha = 5\%$; df = 4 (see appendix 9 of chi square table). It means
that $X^2_{\text{count}} > X^2_{\text{table}} (44,888 > 9,488)$, which means that H0 is rejected and H2 is accepted or training has a positive effect on employee performance.

(3) Hypothesis 3 Testing

The results of hypothesis 3 (H3) testing stating that “competence has positive effect on employee performance” which was done by using chi square test are as follows:

The relationship between competence and employee performance can be presented in the following crosstab table.

### Table 6 Relationship between competence and employee performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Competence</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>85.7</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>95.0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>50.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>83.6</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>46.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Data processed by SPSS

The table above shows that there is 1 respondent (7.1%) who considers himself/herself to have low level of competence and low performance, there is 1 respondent (2.5%) who considers himself/herself to have low level of competence and moderate performance, and there are 2 respondents (3.3%) who assume that they have low level of competence and high performance.

The table above shows that there are 12 respondents (85.7%) who considers himself/herself to have moderate competence and low performance, there are 38 respondents (95%) who assume that they have moderate competence and moderate performance, and there are 8 respondents (13.1%) who assume that they have moderate competence and high performance.

The table above shows that there is 1 respondent (7.1%) who considers himself/herself to have high level of competence and low performance, there is 1 respondent (2.5%) who considers himself/herself to have high level of competence and moderate performance, and there are 51 respondents (83.6%) who assume that they have high level of competence and high performance.

Hypothesis 3 testing can be seen in the following table.

### Table 7 Results of Chi Square Test of Hypothesis 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chi-Square Tests</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>76.438</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>91.035</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear-by-Linear Association</td>
<td>47.488</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Valid Cases</td>
<td>115</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a. 3 cells (33.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 49.*

Source: Results of SPSS 17 Test
In the above table, it can be seen that the value of Pearson Chi-Square (X² count) of 76.438 and value of X² table of 9.488, obtained from α = 5%; df = 4 (see appendix 9 of chi square table). It means that X² count > X² table (76.438 > 9.488), which means that H0 is rejected and H3 is accepted or competence had a positive effect on employee performance.

(4) Hypothesis 4 Testing

The results of hypothesis 4 (H4) testing stating that “work experience has positive effect on employee performance”, which was done by using chi square test are as follows:

The relationship between work experience and employee performance can be presented in the following crosstab table.

### Table 8 Relationship between work experience and employee performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Work experience</th>
<th>Employee Performance</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Data processed by SPSS

The table above shows that there are 11 respondents (78.6%) who assume that they have low work experience and low performance, there is 1 respondent (2.5%) who considers himself/herself to have low work experience and moderate performance, there is 1 respondent (1.6%) who considers himself/herself to have low work experience and high performance.

The table above shows that there are 2 respondents (14.3%) who assume that they have moderate work experience and low performance, there are 38 respondents (95%) who assume that they have moderate work experience and moderate performance, there is 1 respondent (7.1%) who considers himself/herself to have high work experience and low performance, there is 1 respondent (2.5%) who considers himself/herself to have high work experience and moderate performance, there are 58 respondents (95.1%) who assume that they have high work experience and high performance.

Hypothesis 4 testing can be seen in the following table.

### Table 9 Results of Chi Square Test of Hypothesis 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chi-Square Tests</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>167.514*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>154.596</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear-by-Linear Association</td>
<td>86.761</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Valid Cases</td>
<td>115</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. 2 cells (22.2%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.58.

Source: Results of SPSS 17 Test
In the table above, it can be seen that the value of Pearson Chi-Square ($X^2$ count) of 167.514 and value of $X^2$ table of 9.488, obtained from $a = 5$%; df = 4 (see appendix 9 of chi square table). It means that $X^2$ count $> X^2$ table (167.514 $> 9.488$), which means that $H_0$ is rejected and $H_4$ is accepted or work experience has a positive effect on employee performance.

DISCUSSIONS
The Effect of Social Capital on Employee Performance

The results of this study indicate that social capital has a significant effect on employee performance. This means that increasing social capital will lead to improved employee performance.

This shows that the existence of social capital of employees is important because it affects the employee performance, which in turn will affect the performance of the organization (Akdere, 2005).

In this case, social capital is an aggregate of actual or potential resources that are bound to realize a long-term (durable) network to institutionalize the mutual friendship (acquaintance) among employees, so that employee performance is getting better because of good social relationship among employees.

The results of this study are in accordance with research which was conducted by Joshua, et al (2013), entitled “The Effect of Social Capital and Organizational Culture on Performance of Medical Personnel in RSUD Talaud Islands Regency”, which found that quantitatively, social capital has a strong influence on the improvement of the performance of medical personnel.

The Effect of Training on Employee Performance

The results of this study indicate that training can have a significant effect on employee performance. This indicates that increased training can lead to improved employee performance. The results of this study indicate that training can have a significant effect on employee performance. This indicates that the increased training education can lead to increased employee performance. The results of this study are in line with the theory stated by Yuniarsih and Suwatno (2011: 133) in human resource management book that education and training are the creation of an environment where employees can acquire or learn attitude, ability, skill, knowledge, and specific behavior related to work. It indicates that training which is followed by employees gives positive benefits to the performance of employees. This is in accordance with the opinion of Sastrohadiwiroyo (2003) in book of Indonesian labor management that some of the benefits of training include: (1) the improvement of labor skill; (2) reduction of work delay, absenteeism, and labor migration; (3) reduction of accidents in work, damage, and improved maintenance of work equipment; (4) improvement of work productivity; and (5) improvement in work skills.

The Effect of Competence on Employee Performance

The results of this study indicate that competence has a significant effect on employee performance. This indicates that increasing competence of employees can lead to improved employee performance. The results of this study are in accordance with the study which was conducted by Yunus (2009), entitled “The Influence of Human Resource Competence on Employee Performance of Supervisory and Service of Customs and Excise (KPPBC) Medium Type at Tanjung Perak Surabaya” indicating that communication skill, teamwork, leadership, and analytical decision making have a significant effect on performance, which means the higher level of competence of employee, then the higher the performance.

These results indicate that improvement of competence is useful in improving employee performance. This indicates the suitability of field data with the view of Spencer (1993); Palan (2007), that competence refers to the underlying characteristics of behaviors that describe the motives, personal characteristics, self-concept/ values, knowledge, and skills brought by a superior performer at work.
The Effect of Work Experience on Employee Performance

The results of this study indicate that work experience has a significant effect on employee performance. This indicates that the increasing work experience can lead to improved employee performance. This is in accordance with the results of research which was conducted by Aristarini et al. (2014) that there is a positive effect of work experience on employee performance. The results of this study are also in line with the theory stated by Robbins and Timothy (2008) that work experience is the mastery level of a person’s knowledge and skill in working, which seems to be a good approximation of employee performance.

These results indicate that increasing work experience will improve employee performance. This means that an employee who has work experience is a person who has physical ability, knowledge, skill to work, and will not harm himself/her in the work, that later can automatically improve his/her performance.

CONCLUSIONS

Based on the results of this study, it can be concluded that social capital has a significant effect on employee performance. This is proven in the results of chi square test $X^2$ (16.234> 9.488). Training has a significant effect on employee performance. This is proven in the results of chi square test $X^2$ (44.888> 9.488). Competence has a significant effect on employee performance. This is proven in the result of chi square test $X^2$ (76.438> 9.488). Work experience has a significant effect on employee performance. This is proven in the results of chi square test $X^2$ (167.514> 9.488).

SUGGESTIONS

Based on the results of this research, it is suggested to improve social capital by adding team cooperation training for employees, for example: outbound, character building, trust building, etc. Training process can be improved by providing a lot of opportunities for employees who will have training. The second one is by adding the budget of training in the business budget plan (RBA) so that more and more number of employees can follow training. Increasing employee competence can be done through workshops and technical training or functional training in accordance with the competence and profession. The work done by employees should be suitable to the work experience of employees, so that the level of mastery and skill owned by employees are in accordance with the demands of work because work experience without employee placement in the right field will not produce maximum performance. Future researchers are expected to be able to add variables, not only use variable of social capital, training, competence, and work experience, but they can use other variables such as leadership style and employee’s motivation. Further research is required with new research models and other analysis.

REFERENCES


Contribution of Social Capital, Training, Competence, and Work Experience to Employee Performance