

The Influence Of Training And Recruitment On Employee Performance In The Marketing Division Of Pt. Bersama Era Sentosa Tama Lumajang

Adinda Regita Puspitasari¹, Mei Retno Adiwati²

^{1,2} Management Study Program, Faculty of Economics and Business, Universitas Pembangunan Nasional "Veteran" Jawa Timur

Abstract

At PT. Bersama Era Sentosa Tama, a distribution business operating out of Lumajang, East Java, a three-year decline in sales-target achievement raised questions about whether training and recruitment practices in the marketing division were keeping pace with what the job required. This paper sets out to test that link empirically. Fifty marketing-division staff the entire population, surveyed through Google Forms rather than a sample supplied the data behind a quantitative, cause-and-effect analysis processed with SmartPLS under the SEM-PLS framework. Reliability and validity checks cleared every threshold: outer loadings stayed above 0.70, AVE above 0.50, and Composite Reliability above 0.70 across all constructs. Where the two predictors diverged was in their statistical weight. Training moved the needle on performance in a way that held up under testing (path coefficient 0.529, $t = 2.900$, $p = 0.004$); recruitment pointed the same direction but fell short of significance (path coefficient 0.201, $t = 0.878$, $p = 0.381$). Combined, training and recruitment account for just under half the variance observed in performance ($R^2 = 0.499$). The practical takeaway: training carries more weight than recruitment in moving marketing-division performance, so recruitment gains are best treated as a starting point rather than an endpoint, with ongoing development picking up where hiring leaves off.

Keyword : *Training; Recruitment; Employee Performance; SEM-PLS*

Copyright (c) 2026 Sudirman

✉ Corresponding author :

Email Address : inhopadecengi@gmail.com

INTRODUCTION

No organization outruns the quality of the people running it. Capital, technology, and raw materials still matter, of course, but in a market where every competitor has access to roughly the same tools, what separates one company from another increasingly comes down to how well its workforce performs whether employees are skilled enough, consistent enough, and adaptable enough to keep the business moving forward as conditions shift. Rivai (2020) frames performance simply as work output measured against assigned targets over a set period, and that output rarely just happens on its own. It's the product of several things working together an employee's raw ability, their motivation to apply it, and whether the surrounding HR system actually supports

good work rather than getting in its way. Getting organizational goals met, and staying competitive while doing so, depends on all three lining up.

Training is one of the clearer levers here. Haris et al. (2020) describe it as company-run activity meant to build employees' skill and knowledge until they're genuinely proficient at their work. And because technology and working methods keep shifting, training isn't really a box to check once it has to keep happening. Done well, it pays off in more than one way at once: output climbs, mistakes drop, people report being more satisfied with their jobs, and the workforce is simply better prepared for whatever comes next.

Recruitment matters just as much, though its role sits earlier in the chain it's the point where a company either does or doesn't bring in people capable of performing well in the first place. Nasution et al. (2021) define it as the activity of sourcing new employees to fill open roles within a company unit. Get it right, and the candidates who come through tend to check both boxes: they're technically qualified, and they fit how the company operates. Get it wrong, and the fallout shows up later higher turnover, weaker output, and training budgets spent on people who were never going to be a good match to begin with.

PT. Bersama Era Sentosa Tama competes in a distribution market that doesn't leave much room for error, and as the company has grown, it has leaned on the idea that its people are what will carry its vision and mission forward. The marketing division sits at the center of that effort selling to customers, growing the distribution footprint, keeping client relationships intact, watching stock levels, hitting sales numbers, and reading the market as it moves.

Yet the numbers tell a less encouraging story. Sales-target achievement has fallen for three straight years 101% in 2023, down to 98% in 2024, then 96% in 2025 and the pattern points squarely at the marketing division as the source of the problem. Two things stand out as likely contributors. Training completion sits at just 77.78% overall, dragged down by the technical-competence and leadership categories, both stuck at 66.67%. Recruitment hasn't fared much better: the company came up three employees short of its hiring targets in both 2023 and 2025.

Prior work in this space doesn't agree on much. Rizky et al. (2023) found recruitment and training both moving performance in a positive, significant way, but they folded career development into the same model, so it's hard to say how much of that effect belongs to training and recruitment alone. Situmorang and Tinambunan (2025) studied a bank rather than a distribution firm and found training carrying the most weight (path coefficient 0.481) but their model included an incentive variable that this study doesn't, and the industry context differs substantially. What's missing, in short, is a study that looks at training and recruitment on their own, without extra variables muddying the picture, and one set specifically in East Java's distribution sector a gap this research tries to fill.

With that gap in mind, this study asks a direct question: how much do training and recruitment actually move the needle on marketing-division performance at PT. Bersama Era Sentosa Tama? The answer, it's hoped, will feed back into both the academic conversation on HR management and the company's own efforts to sharpen how it trains and hires.

Research Hypotheses

H1: Training has a positive effect on the performance of marketing-division employees at PT. Bersama Era Sentosa Tama in Lumajang.

H2: Recruitment has a positive effect on the performance of marketing-division employees at PT. Bersama Era Sentosa Tama in Lumajang.

METHODOLOGY

This study leans on numbers rather than narratives to answer its question, working from the positivist tradition Sugiyono (2021) describes and structured around cause-and-effect logic in the sense Djaali (2020) lays out here, checking whether training (X1) and recruitment (X2) push employee performance (Y) in a measurable direction.

Rather than draw a sample, the study worked with everyone: all 50 marketing-division employees at PT. Bersama Era Sentosa Tama were included, a choice that made sense given how small and contained the population already was, and one meant to keep the resulting picture as close to the real situation as possible.

Two streams of data fed into the analysis. Primary data came straight from the 50 employees through a Google Forms questionnaire; secondary data came from books, journal articles, internal company reports, and other supporting material. Responses across every variable ran on a five-point Likert scale, from 1 (strongly disagree) up to 5 (strongly agree).

Training (X1) was captured through five indicators borrowed from Haris et al. (2020) what type of training was applied, the method used to deliver it, its stated objectives, how the material actually landed with participants, and whether participants were qualified to begin with. Recruitment (X2) ran on three indicators from Sari, Haziroh, and Pramadanti (2021): the basis on which recruitment decisions were made, where candidates were sourced from, and the method used to recruit them. Performance (Y) drew on five indicators from Haziroh and Budiantoro (2021): timeliness, independence, quality of output, quantity of output, and overall effectiveness.

SmartPLS handled the number-crunching, using Partial Least Square structural equation modeling. The choice made sense for a few reasons Hair et al. (2022) point to: PLS-SEM doesn't require the data to follow a particular distribution, it copes fine with a modest sample, and it's built to handle models carrying several indicators per construct at once. In practice, that meant working through the model in stages first laying out the inner (structural) model based on the hypotheses, then the outer (measurement) model, then the path diagram itself; estimating parameters; running the outer-model checks (convergent validity, discriminant validity, composite reliability, Cronbach's alpha); reading the inner model through R^2 ; and finally bootstrapping the data to pull out t-statistics and p-values for each hypothesis.

A few thresholds anchored the validity and reliability checks. Outer loadings needed to clear 0.70; AVE needed to clear 0.50 for convergent validity to hold. On the reliability side, Composite Reliability had to sit above 0.70 and Cronbach's Alpha above 0.60. For R^2 , this study followed the bands Hair et al. (2022) set out 0.75 and up counts as strong, 0.50 and up as moderate, and 0.25 and up as weak. As for the hypotheses themselves, acceptance required a t-statistic past 1.96 alongside a p-value under 0.05, the standard 5% cutoff.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Respondent Characteristics

Age-wise, the 50 respondents skewed young: 48% were 20–25, another 38% fell in the 26–30 bracket, and the rest split between 31–35 (8%) and 36–41 (6%) in other words, most sit squarely in their prime working years. Tenure told a complementary story: 54% had logged more than a year on the job, 16% exactly a year, and only 30% less than a year, which suggests most respondents had enough on-the-job experience to judge training, recruitment, and performance with some objectivity.

Measurement Model (Outer Model) Evaluation

Convergent validity starts with the outer loadings, and Table 1 lays out those figures alongside each indicator's t-statistic and p-value.

Table 1. Outer Loading Results

Indikator	Outer Loading	T-Statistic	P-Value
Y1 <- Employee Performance	0.877	17.343	0.000
Y2 <- Employee Performance	0.914	26.650	0.000
Y3 <- Employee Performance	0.940	38.931	0.000
Y4 <- Employee Performance	0.950	61.523	0.000
Y5 <- Employee Performance	0.866	16.290	0.000
X1.1 <- Training	0.814	10.186	0.000
X1.2 <- Training	0.862	10.997	0.000
X1.3 <- Training	0.772	9.996	0.000
X1.4 <- Training	0.831	16.006	0.000
X1.5 <- Training	0.715	9.984	0.000
X2.1 <- Recruitment	0.918	32.202	0.000
X2.2 <- Recruitment	0.913	28.730	0.000
X2.3 <- Recruitment	0.882	27.443	0.000

Source: SmartPLS data processing, 2026

None of the 13 indicators fell below 0.70 X1.5 came closest at 0.715, while Y4 topped the list at 0.950 and every t-statistic cleared 1.96 by a wide margin, with p-values flat at 0.000 across the board. In short, each indicator does what it's supposed to: it reflects its underlying construct reliably enough to pass convergent validity.

A cross-loading check followed for discriminant validity, and the pattern held up each indicator loaded more heavily onto its own construct than onto any other, which means Training, Recruitment, and Employee Performance stay cleanly separated in the model.

Table 2. Average Variance Extracted (AVE)

Variable	AVE
Employee Performance (Y)	0.828
Training (X1)	0.640
Recruitment (X2)	0.818

Source: SmartPLS data processing, 2026

All three AVE scores in Table 2 clear 0.50, which means each construct captures more than half the variance sitting in its own indicators. Employee Performance and Recruitment both sit north of 0.80; Training comes in lower at 0.640 but still stays safely above the cutoff, so convergent validity checks out across the board.

Table 3. Composite Reliability and Cronbach's Alpha

Variable	Cronbach's Alpha	rho_A	Composite Reliability
Employee Performance (Y)	0.948	0.949	0.960
Training (X1)	0.858	0.862	0.899
Recruitment (X2)	0.889	0.891	0.931

Source: SmartPLS data processing, 2026

Reliability tells a similarly clean story: every variable in Table 3 sits comfortably past the 0.70 mark on both Composite Reliability and Cronbach's Alpha, which points to solid internal consistency among indicators and confirms the instrument measured Training, Recruitment, and Employee Performance in a stable, dependable way.

Structural Model (Inner Model) Evaluation

Table 4. Coefficient of Determination (R²)

Variable	R Square	R Square Adjusted
Employee Performance (Y)	0.499	0.478

Source: SmartPLS data processing, 2026

Together, Training and Recruitment explain roughly half of what happens to Employee Performance an R² of 0.499, leaving the other 50.1% down to things the model doesn't capture, whether that's work discipline, ongoing development, or the work environment itself. That figure lands just under the 0.50 mark Hair et al. (2022) treat as the moderate cutoff, which puts this model's explanatory reach in reasonably solid, if not exceptional, territory.

Table 5. Hypothesis Testing Results

Relationship	Path Coefficient	T-Statistic	P-Value	Conclusion
Training -> Employee Performance	0.529	2.900	0.004	Significant

Relationship	Path Coefficient	T-Statistic	P-Value	Conclusion
Recruitment -> Employee Performance	0.201	0.878	0.381	Not Significant

Source: SmartPLS data processing, 2026

Table 5 settles the two hypotheses. Training's numbers path coefficient 0.529, $t = 2.900$, $p = 0.004$ clear both the 1.96 and 0.05 bars comfortably, so H1 stands. Recruitment doesn't fare as well: a path coefficient of 0.201 sounds positive enough, but its t-statistic of 0.878 falls well short of 1.96 and its p-value of 0.381 sits nowhere near 0.05. The direction is right; the statistics aren't there. H2 is rejected.

The Influence of Training on Employee Performance

So training clearly moves performance in the marketing division at PT. Bersama Era Sentosa Tama, and the mechanism isn't hard to see: get the material right, deliver it in a way people can actually absorb, and put capable instructors in front of the room, and employees walk away better equipped for the job in front of them. For marketing staff specifically, that means sharper sales technique, better negotiating instincts with partners, deeper product knowledge, and steadier handling of customers — all of which translates into a clearer sense of what the job requires and, in turn, better odds of hitting targets.

Two other studies land in the same place. Rizky, Sari, and Pratiwi (2023) and Handayani, Wahyuningsih, and Bonnario (2025) each found training moving performance in a positive, statistically meaningful way, reinforcing the idea that ongoing, well-targeted training genuinely builds employees' knowledge and capability over time. The practical implication follows naturally: training content and delivery need to track what employees and their roles actually require, not just what's convenient to run, if the payoff in effectiveness and productivity is going to materialize.

The Influence of Recruitment on Employee Performance

Recruitment tells a different story. The direction is positive, but the relationship with marketing-division performance at PT. Bersama Era Sentosa Tama doesn't clear the statistical bar. Read differently: tightening up how the company recruits won't, by itself, lift the performance of people already doing the job. Recruitment's real function is upstream it decides who gets hired while everything that happens to someone's performance afterward gets shaped by a different set of forces: training, where they're placed, how much they're asked to carry, the environment they work in, and how well they're supervised.

Siagian, Insan, and Yanti (2026) reached a near-identical conclusion recruitment positive but not significant and pointed to a closer match between candidate competencies and job demands as the missing piece. Applied here, recruitment at PT. Bersama Era Sentosa Tama functions as the mechanism for filling marketing roles and supporting sales-target ambitions, but whether the people hired actually hit those targets comes down to what happens after they start: the coaching, mentoring, and support the company keeps providing. The company's task, then, isn't just tightening recruitment it's pairing that with sustained investment in developing the people it brings on.

CONCLUSION

Two things come out of the PLS-SEM results on training, recruitment, and marketing-division performance at PT. Bersama Era Sentosa Tama. Training clearly matters: sharper material, better delivery, and stronger instructors translate directly into better performance on the floor. Recruitment, on the other hand, doesn't show a measurable effect the company's current hiring process hasn't yet left a visible mark on how existing employees perform, largely because performance gets shaped more by what happens on the job than by how someone got hired in the first place.

A few recommendations follow from this. On training, PT. Bersama Era Sentosa Tama should keep investing in how it delivers training to marketing staff, since delivery method is the indicator carrying the most weight for this variable folding in more on-the-job practice, sales simulations, and mentoring from seasoned staff would make the material land better and stick longer. On recruitment, even without a statistically significant link to performance, the company should still push toward matching candidates' qualifications more precisely to what each role actually demands, rather than optimizing purely for filling seats quickly; that groundwork still matters, even if its payoff depends on the coaching that follows once someone's hired. And because quantity of work carries real weight in how performance gets measured here, the company would do well to keep a regular eye on output volume among marketing staff, stepping in with targeted training or guidance wherever employees are falling short of their targets, so that productivity keeps moving in the right direction overall.

References :

- Ginting, A. Y., Tinambunan, A. P., Purba, B., & Sitohang, H. (2025). Pengaruh Rekrutmen, Pelatihan, dan Lingkungan Kerja terhadap Kinerja Karyawan PT. Expravert Nasuba Cabang Talun Kenas Medan. *Jurnal Ilmu Manajemen dan Bisnis*, 8(1), 45–58. <https://ejournal.ust.ac.id/index.php/SMA/article/view/5678>
- Gulo, Y., & Santoso, A. B. (2024). Pengaruh Rekrutmen dan Pelatihan Kerja terhadap Kinerja Karyawan pada PT Ziben Indonesia Bogor. *Journal of Research and Publication Innovation (JORAPI)*, 2(4), 1–15. <https://jurnal.portalpublikasi.id/index.php/JORAPI/article/download/1257/996>
- Harwina, Y. (2022). *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia dalam Organisasi Modern*. Bandung: Alfabeta.
- Muin, A. (2023). *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif*. Malang: CV. Literasi Nusantara Abadi
- Rafel, H., & Octavianti, S. (2025). Pengaruh Rekrutmen dan Seleksi terhadap Kinerja Karyawan PT ISS Indonesia Cabang Jakarta Selatan. *Jurnal Intelek Insan Cendikia (JIIC)*, 2(3), 1–12. <https://jicnusantara.com/index.php/jiic/article/view/2704>
- Rizky, F., Sari, M., & Pratiwi, D. (2023). Pengaruh Rekrutmen, Pelatihan, dan Pengembangan Karir terhadap Kinerja Pegawai CV. Sumber Baru. *Jurnal Manajemen dan Organisasi*, 10(2), 55–70. <https://journal.stekom.ac.id/index.php/Bisnis/article/download/1252/1036>

- Situmorang, R., & Tinambunan, A. P. (2025). Pengaruh Rekrutmen, Pelatihan dan Insentif terhadap Kinerja Karyawan pada PT. BPR NBP 17 Sunggal. *Jurnal Ekonomi dan Keuangan*, 7(1), 101–115.
<https://ejournal.ust.ac.id/index.php/KUKIMA/article/view/5580>
- Hair, J. F., Hult, G. T. M., Ringle, C. M., & Sarstedt, M. (2022). *A primer on partial least squares structural equation modeling (PLS-SEM)* (3rd ed.). Sage Publications.
- Sarstedt, M., Ringle, C. M., & Hair, J. F. (2021). *Partial least squares structural equation modeling*. In C. Homburg, M. Klarmann, & A. Vomberg (Eds.), *Handbook of market research*. Springer.
- Ringle, C. M., Wende, S., & Becker, J. M. (2023). SmartPLS 4. SmartPLS.
- Rohainiah & Maharani, H. (2024). Pengaruh rekrutmen dan pelatihan terhadap kinerja karyawan di PT. Sinergi Integra Services Jakarta Barat. *JORAPI: Journal of Research and Publication Innovation*, 2(4), 3534–3542.
<http://jurnal.portalpublikasi.id/index.php/JORAPI/article/view/1252>
- Maulana & Andi, D. (2025). Pengaruh proses rekrutmen dan pelatihan terhadap kinerja karyawan di PT. Samadista Karya Jakarta Selatan. *JPTIM: Jurnal Penelitian Terapan Ilmu Multidisiplin*, 1(3), 165–171.
<http://jurnal.portalpublikasi.id/index.php/JPTIM/article/download/1887/1545>
- Tialonawarmi, F. (2024). Pengaruh rekrutmen dan pelatihan terhadap kinerja karyawan PT. Paragon Technology and Innovation di Jambi. *Jurnal Manajemen Universitas Jambi*, 3(2), 323–333.
<https://jurnal.astinamandiri.com/index.php/juria/article/view/187>
- Andayani, T. B. N., & Hirawati, H. (2021). Pengaruh pelatihan dan pengembangan SDM terhadap kinerja karyawan PT Pos Indonesia Cabang Kota Magelang. *Jurnal Ilmiah Manajemen Ubhara*, 3(2), 11–21. <http://jurnal.ubharajaya.ac.id/index.php/manajemen>
- Handayani, F., Wahyuningsih, S., & Bonnario, M. (2025). Pengaruh rekrutmen dan pelatihan terhadap kinerja kurir PT. XXX. *Lensa Ilmiah - Jurnal Manajemen dan Sumberdaya*, 4(3), 112–118.
<http://journal.ainarapress.org/index.php/lms/article/view/1092>