

## Continuous Learning for Employee Capacity Developing in Personal Mastery at Bank Indonesia

Iffah Budiningsih<sup>1</sup>, Tjiptogoro Dinarjo Soehari<sup>2</sup>, Eko Supriyanto<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Faculty of Teaching and Educational Sciences, Universitas Islam As-Syafi'iyah, Indonesia

<sup>2</sup>Management Post Graduate, Universitas Mercu Buana Jakarta, Indonesia

<sup>3</sup>Bank Indonesia, Indonesia

DOI: 10.23917/ijolae.v5i1.19792

Received: October 7<sup>th</sup>, 2022. Revised: December 6<sup>th</sup>, 2022. Accepted: December 9<sup>th</sup>, 2022

Available Online: December 16<sup>th</sup>, 2022. Published Regularly: January 1<sup>st</sup>, 2023

### Abstract

The purpose of this research is to discover the impact of continuous learning through strengthening competence, and innovation literacy on the improvement of performance. The research method used is a quantitative explorative technique with surveys with respondents being employees of the money management department at Bank Indonesia. The study samples are 160 out of the 272 total population, which were selected using simple random sampling. The data collection process was employed using a questionnaire. Subsequently, the data analysis process used descriptive statistical analysis and multiple regression, and before the regression analysis, requirement analysis was conducted using tests of normality, heteroscedasticity, autocorrelation & multicollinearity. The findings in this study are: a) competence and innovation literacy affect the level of achievement of employee performance in Institution X; b) the correlation between competence and innovation literacy on the performance of Institution X employees shows 'positive' and 'strong'; c) competence and innovation literacy contribute to the achievement of Institution X's employee performance by 52.8%, and the remaining 47.2% by other factors; d) innovation literacy has a higher level of sensitivity in achieving Institution X employee performance compared to competence; e) the results of this study imply the need to strengthen competence and innovation literacy through a decent & effective continuous learning in organizational, and the learning model of Technological Pedagogical Content Knowledge (TPCK) can be used as a continuous learning model in organizations/Institutions.

**Keywords:** continuous learning, innovation literacy, technological pedagogical content knowledge (TPCK)

### Corresponding Author:

Iffah Budiningsih, Faculty of Teaching and Educational Sciences, Universitas Islam Ass-Syafi'iyah, Indonesia

Email: [iffah\\_budiningsih@uia.ac.id](mailto:iffah_budiningsih@uia.ac.id)

### 1. Introduction

Fundamentally, learning is considered an activity performed intentionally to achieve a positive change in knowledge, skills, attitudes, and values. Human incapable of learning was expected to struggle to adapt to breakthroughs in science and technology that result from human thought processes. The need to conform to an ever-changing environment is a requirement for human life from birth to death; hence, learning is a requirement for human life (lifelong learning). Based on its qualities, lifelong

learning can be classified into two categories: learning for adults (andragogy) and learning for children (pedagogy).

Characteristics of learning in adults are different from those of children, where the former is generally related to life goals, social roles (profession/work) in society, life experiences, the operation of sensory functions, etc., which resulted in different approaches and strategies in terms of learning process between adults and children. Learning is children's primary task, and the product of children's learning outcomes

(pedagogy) is frequently referred to as learning outcomes or learning successes. On the other hand, working is the primary task of adults, and the result of adult work (andragogy) is sometimes referred to as work performance. According to Uno et al (2012) for a human to survive, learning outcomes and work performance results should constantly be enhanced; hence every human must continuously learn (lifelong learning). Furthermore, according to Taşçı and Titrek (2020), the concept of lifelong learning has emerged to adapt to rapidly evolving and changing social and cultural life and has become an important indicator of the level of education and employment conditions in developed and developing countries

Romisowzki notes in Prawiradilaga & Chaerumen (2018) that learning for an organization's employees has two forms: non-formal and formal learning or training. This implies that training is not the only solution to close the accomplishment gap of work performance since numerous approaches can encourage employees to learn about things related to their professional demands. Since the world of business and industry evolves quicker than educational and learning theories, training in business and industry is sometimes deemed insufficient to address the requirement of quality improvement regarding employees' performance. In addition, Prawiradilaga and Chaerumen (2018) explain that learning is an

approach to enhancing performance by imitating another person's behavior or performance; this type of learning is commonly known as non-formal learning. It is also explained that establishing continuous learning for employees of an institution is considerably challenging, as many believe that after completing an undergraduate or postgraduate degree and being employed, there is no need to study again. This belief results in the failure of continuous learning to develop the said culture in an institution/organization (Prawiradilaga & Chaerumen, 2018).

This research variable, namely competence, continuous learning, performance, and innovation literacy, is required to investigate whether continuous learning through competence enhancement and innovation literacy may enhance employee performance. Using the In Deep Interview (IDI) instrument, a preliminary survey was undertaken at one of the money management departments at Bank Indonesia in Jakarta, to bolster this claim. To improve the performance (performance) of its employees, the goal of the pre-research survey is to determine how well the money management department of Bank Indonesia's employees understand the necessity of competence and innovation literacy. The In Deep Interview (IDI) results of the preliminary research are shown in Table 1 below.

**Table 1. Results of In Deep Interviews (IDI) on 30 Employees of the Money Management Department at Bank Indonesia**

Statement	Factor	Answer (People)	
		Yes (%)	No (%)
I am aware of all the regulations and internal and external Circular Letters of Institution X stipulations.	Competence (skill)	9 (29%)	21 (71%)
I am constantly innovating to get the job done more quickly.	Innovation Literacy	8 (37%)	22 (63%)
I consistently contribute more to my work.	Performance	8 (37)	22 (63%)
The accomplishment of the In-House Training enhanced my understanding.	Competence (Cognitive)	18 (51%)	12 (49%)

Statement	Factor	Answer (People)	
		Yes (%)	No (%)
The institution's work equipment makes it easier for me to work efficiently.	Innovation Literacy	25 (84%)	5 (16%)
I always come to the office on time.	Competence (Behavior)	25 (84%)	5 (16%)
I constantly follow office regulations.	Competence (Behavior)	30 (100%)	0 (0%)

From the results of the pre-research survey presented in Table 1, it can be concluded that the predominant characteristics of the money management department at Bank Indonesia's employees are as follows: a) 71% of the total employees do not fully comprehend all the regulations that apply to the institution; b) 63% of the total employees of the Institute have less innovation literacy, and c) 63% of employees do not provide more (less than optimal) performance output. Based on the findings of a preliminary survey with a sample of 30 individuals with Strata 1 and Strata 2 education levels, it is necessary to conduct an additional study to determine: (1) Do competencies and innovation literacy have relevance with performance; (2) Competence and innovation literacy as a pair: a significant factor in performance improvement initiatives; (3) How does the mathematical model improve performance through Lifelong learning by enhancing competency and innovation literacy.

#### a. Continuous Learning

Taşç and Titrek (2020) claimed that the idea of lifelong learning or continuous learning in the current digital era emphasizes knowledge, skills, and talents that are relevant to technological and information breakthroughs. Furthermore, Aksoy, in Taşç and Titrek (2020), argues that continuous learning is crucial for adults in terms of providing opportunities for individuals to participate in all areas of life regardless of age

actively, gender, social, or economic status, and the implicit assumption is that it is necessary to strengthen competencies and positive character traits through continuous quality learning by following requirements of the global era. This claim is further supported by Muhamad's study in Ismail (2013) which states that quality in education/learning is crucial in the era of globalization, as it is believed that a decent education/learning system has the capability of producing workers that possess superior personal characteristics, such as innovative, productive, skilled, competitive, challenging, and creative. Cerdon (2018) states that employees must continually update and develop their skills and abilities; hence, Lifelong learning will be encountered at all stages of human life. Muhamad explains in Ismail (2013) that quality in education/learning is necessary for the age of globalization since it is believed that a quality education/learning system can produce a workforce with superior personal characteristics, such as innovative, productive, skilled, competitive, challenging, and creative. Moreover, Budiningsih and Soehari (2022g) argue that learning in institutions/organizations/ companies in the upcoming years will likely lead to teaching organizations that can anticipate changes and diversity of knowledge, skills, and abilities of human resources, thereby enhancing the performance of the institution.

## b. Performances

An institution's employees' performance is evaluated based on the degree to which they are successful in achieving the institution's objectives, whether in individual or group activities or within the scope of the institution's interests. Performance is the accomplishment of employees' jobs about their behavior in carrying out the tasks within a specified time frame, which eventually influences an institution's quality. The more an institution's employees demonstrate performance, the greater the institution's growth will inevitably be.

Whitford & Coetsee in Hidayat (2020) explained that the achievement of an institution's performance depends on how performance is managed, and the philosophical implication is the need to effectively manage human behavior to facilitate and support the practicability of the institution's goals and the individual character of employees, to produce optimal institutional performance. In an era of global competitiveness, an institution's performance is defined by how quickly it adapts to its industrial/business surroundings.

According to Afandi, Wahyuningsih, and Mayasari (2021), performance is a collection of behaviors related to motivating factors and the capacity to fulfill personal or organizational objectives. Mathis and Jackson clarify in Soehari et al. (2017a) that employee performance includes: (a) the quantity of work; (b) the quality of the work; (c) the timeliness with which work is completed; (d) the employee's presence; and (e) the employee's capacity to collaborate. Numerous experts have proposed various formulations of the concept of performance, but in essence, performance is related to the process and achievement of work outcomes. Afandi et al. (2021) claim that performance is a collection of behaviors associated with

driving variables and the capacity to attain personal or organizational objectives.

According to Khan et al. (2020), people frequently conflate the terms of performance and productivity. However, they can be distinguished as follows: productivity refers to the amount of work completed in a given amount of time, whereas performance is a broader term that can include: a) consistency, b) productivity and c) quality. According to Mangkunegara in Budiningsih et al. (2017a), employee performance can be determined based on the following:

1. Quality of work: demonstrating tidiness, accuracy, and connectivity of work outputs without sacrificing the quantity of work; Decent work can eliminate errors and contribute to the institution's development.
2. Quantity of work: indicates the number of different sorts of work completed in a certain period so that the institution's objectives can be met efficiently and effectively.
3. Responsibility: demonstrates the degree to which employees embrace and carry out their work responsibilities, including their work conduct, work results, and use of facilities and infrastructure.
4. Cooperation: employees' capacity to collaborate vertically and horizontally within and outside the workplace.
5. Initiative: the initiative of members of an organization to perform tasks and address problems without waiting for instructions.

Hidayat (2020) argues that an organization's performance is one of the essential structures that could be used as a management solution to enhance the quality of decision-making, and accountability, encourage the achievement of organizational

goals and provide input for initiatives to strengthen sustainable performance. It is relevant Hersey et al. (1996) who stated that improving the performance of an institution's employees is influenced by many factors, including (a) clear and measurable goals of the institution; (b) performance standards; (c) feedback (evaluation); (d) supporting tools or work facilities; (e) adequate employee competence; (f) motivations, and (g) opportunities. Additional research results. According to Vann et al. (2018), EQ is the most significant predictor of effective leadership performance in the workplace. Several other studies have demonstrated a correlation between the emotional intelligence (EQ) of an organization's leaders and employees and their performance. In a recent piece for the Harvard Business Review, Goleman argued that it is crucial for leaders/employees must have a high EQ to be successful; however, this does not mean that IQ and technical skills are unimportant since they are also prerequisites for doing well.

The performance of employees of institutions/organizations/companies in this study refers to a set of employee behaviors/capabilities that result from the driving factors to achieve optimal work processes. The driving factors include, among others: (a) clear and measurable institutional goals; (b) performance standards; (c) evaluation; (d) supporting tools; (e) employee competence; (f) motives; and (g) organizational culture.

### c. Competence

Article 1 (10) of the Law of the Republic of Indonesia No. 13/2003 on Manpower defines competence as the functional ability of each individual, which encompasses knowledge, skills, and works attitudes in compliance with the established criteria. Noe (2015) suggests that professional human

resource (HR) competence is the ability to apply HR management principles to contribute to business success; this includes: (a) the capacity to manage interactions with other parties; (b) the ability to provide solutions when faced with problems; (c) the ability to take the initiative; (d) the ability to provide effective feedback; (e) the ability to work effectively with all groups; (f) the ability to integrate company values into work, and (g) the ability to integrate company values into work. Budiningsih (2017b) defines competence as a skill attained through formal or non-formal/informal education, internship experience, courses, expert assistance, continual practice, etc. According to Michael and Taylor (2014), competence refers to the characteristics that underpin an individual's successful or outstanding performance.

Soehari et al. (2017b) explain that competence has been the most critical human capital aspect for producing optimally performing employees and that increasing employee competence can be accomplished by:

1. Increasing one's level of concern for his work so that he is motivated to work better or above expectations;
2. Increased employee initiative by encouraging them to go above and beyond what is required and act independently.
3. Increased concern towards others and willingness to assist others at all times;
4. Improved interpersonal understanding and cooperation with other employees based on mutual trust.
5. Increasing the effectiveness of personal competence, namely integrity, excellent and correct behavior based on a code of ethics and moral principles.

In Uno et al. (2012), Sudjana divides competence into three areas: a) competence



in the cognitive domain, b) competence in the attitudinal area, and c) competence in the psychomotor area, all of which are interdependent or inseparable from one another. Moreover, Budiningsih et al. (2017b) clarify that competence is an individual's ability that consists of aspects of knowledge, skills, and attitudes that describe motivations, personal characteristics, self-concept, and values that apply to a variety of situations and persist for an extended period to produce superior work performance. According to Palan (2007), competence is a person's fundamental character that suggests a way of behaving or thinking that describes the motivations, personal qualities, self-concept, beliefs, knowledge, and skills/skills that apply to a wide variety of situations and are durable that demonstrates superior performance relative to other employees.

From the preceding explanation, it can be concluded that competence refers to the ability possessed by each individual, which includes aspects of knowledge, skills, and work attitudes that describe: (a) personal characteristics; (b) self-concept; (c) positive values/attitudes; (d) knowledge; (e) expertise/skills; and (f) motivations.

#### **d. Innovation Literacy**

Eisner states in Yunus et al. (2017) that multiliteracy or literacy is the ability to read and write, which is viewed as a means of deciphering and making sense of the numerous forms of presentation around us. Literacy is directly related to the capacity to communicate or comprehend, as defined by Budiningsih et al. (2021e) (cognitive skills). In addition, the Oslo Manual cited by Loaiza-Aguirre et al. (2017) defines innovation as introducing new items or significant changes (to goods or services), processes, or marketing strategies. According to Loaiza-Aguirre et al. (2017), the term innovation is

currently employed in various situations to introduce something new or effect change. Innovation, as defined by Fauzia et al. (2017), is an individual action aimed at generating, introducing, or applying new findings in the form of ideas or profitable solutions at every level of an organization, as indicated by the following efforts: generating ideas, seeking opportunities, finding assistance, fighting for ideas, and implementing ideas. Susetyo et al (2022) explained that an innovative attitude is the ability and potential to always think creatively and develop new ideas related to opportunity identification, resource exploitation and problem solving.

Budiningsih & Soehari (2022) suggest that in a tumultuous environment, innovation becomes crucial, and that the emergence of innovation is prompted by the capacity to recognize and exploit opportunities. Innovation encompasses the creation of new products and the opening of new markets, and the development of communication and collaboration that give new methods to serve, build, and expand the organization/institution/business. A leader of an organization/institution/company has to be able to motivate and inspire his subordinates for his organization/institution/company to continue to function, be productive, and remain competitive. According to Johannessen (2014), when a volatile organizational environment evolves owing to technological advancements and new values, the advent of sustainable innovation can give sustainability advantages or produce profits for the firm. Taneo et al. (2013) emphasize that innovation does not always succeed in its early stages but that by working diligently, attempting, and continuously reviewing, it will finally achieve the desired performance.

Innovation, as explained by Ireland et al. (2011), is the process of creating commercial items through innovations or the act of developing new products or processes. This demonstrates that innovation is a characteristic of entrepreneurship that can be applied to institutions, organizations, firms, and individual/group entrepreneurs. Moreover, Robbins & Coutler (2012) concur with Ireland et al. assertion. 's that innovation is the process of doing something differently, exploring new potential, and taking calculated risks. Innovation is not just associated with high technology or complex technology but also with efforts that differ from others.

In Barrand et al. (2012), Carmeli & Spreitzer explained that the formation of innovative behavior involves three stages: a) the first stage: recognizing problems and finding solutions; b) the second stage: promoting the solutions or ideas found to build legitimacy and support; and c) the third stage: implementing the idea or solution at work. Moreover, Carmeli and Spreitzer in Budiningsih et al. (2018c) claim that individual innovative behavior in the workplace is the foundation for achieving high performance in the organization because it plays a significant role in increasing organizational competitiveness and encouraging behavior to do better, albeit with limitations. Thus, innovative behavior strives to use existing restrictions to be optimized by new ideas to develop a valued product or service. In Robbins and Coulter (2012), Woodman et al. suggest that fostering innovative behavior in an institution/organization/company requires not only a group of creative organizational members managed by creative people but also a work environment that stimulates new product development.

According to Kleysen and Street d (2001), there are five (five) dimensions to

evaluate a person's level of innovation: a) opportunity exploration: paying attention, seeking, recognizing, and gathering information about opportunities; b) focus on positive change: how ideas/solutions, categorizing opportunities (easy or complex) and applying combinations of ideas & information; c) trial: experimenting with ideas/solutions; d) seek support: organize resources, convince, influence, urge, negotiate, take risks; e) Implementation, modification, and familiarization. Furthermore, Budiningsih (2021e) states that innovation behavior is a person's ability to develop, propose, or use new findings in the form of ideas and solutions, as well as beneficial technology in each of his specified activities (businesses). There are the following efforts: a) constantly learning/looking for new things (creating ideas); b) thinking positively about new things; c) seeking opportunities (daring to attempt and make mistakes); d) championing/promoting ideas; e) seeking support for new ideas, and f) implementing the new concept. Furthermore, Tidd and Bessant (2009) explain that there are various types of innovation, including a) product innovation (what products will be offered? ); b) process innovation (how will we build it and offer it? ); c) positional innovation (who is the target offering of goods/services? ); and d) paradigm innovation (how to frame what is being done? ).

From the description above, it can be concluded that innovation literacy in this study refers to a set of abilities and skills a person possesses in reading, writing, speaking, calculating, and problem-solving so that they can find, produce, introduce, and apply a new finding in the form of possible solutions related to the findings of a) new products; b) new processes; c) new position/target; or d) a new paradigm.

## 2. Methods

This study aims to investigate the impact of the competency variable ( $X_1$ ) and innovation literacy variable ( $X_2$ ) on employee performance ( $Y$ ) or to develop a mathematical model for enhancing performance by enhancing competence and innovation literacy. The study approach is a quantitative survey, and the respondent was an employee of the money management department at Bank Indonesia. A total of 160 individuals were randomly selected from the overall population of 272 using simple random sampling. Collecting data via a questionnaire on a 5-point Likert scale, with strongly agree = 5, agree = 4, disagree = 3,

disagree = 2, and severely disagree = 1. Data analyzed used descriptive statistical analysis (mean) and correlation & multiple regression analysis with SPSS; before doing the regression analysis, the analysis prerequisites, namely normality, heteroscedasticity, autocorrelation, and multicollinearity, were examined.

### a. Instrument Validity and Reliability Test

The validity and reliability assessments for each employee performance instrument ( $Y$ ), competency ( $X_1$ ), and innovation literacy ( $X_2$ ) are summarized in Table 2.

Table 2. Test Results of Instrument Validity and Reliability Variable  $Y$ ,  $X_1$ , and  $X_2$

Variable	Valid Statement Items	Value of r-count (Pearson) $r_{hit} > 0.361$	Reliability Coefficient	Description
Performance ( $Y$ )	8	0.561 - 0.800	0.852	Valid & Reliable
Competence ( $X_1$ )	8	0.455 - 0.891	0.844	Valid & Reliable
Innovation Literacy ( $X_2$ )	8	0.509 - 0.847	0.846	Valid & Reliable

## 3. Result and Discussion

### a. Characteristics of Study Respondents

The general characteristics of respondents/research samples are presented in Table 3 below

Table 3. Characteristics of Study Respondents

Characteristics of Respondents	Number of Respondents (person)	Percentage
<b>Age:</b>		
20 – 29	64	40 %
30 – 39	56	35 %
≥ 40	40	25 %
<b>Sex:</b>		
Male	120	75.0 %
Female	40	25.0 %
<b>Educational Level:</b>		
S1	108	67.50 %
S2	52	32.50 %
<b>Years of Work</b>		
1-5 Th	50	31.0 %
6-10 h	50	31.0 %
>10 Th	60	38.0 %

### b. Descriptive Analysis

The descriptive analysis results for the three research variables, employee

performance ( $Y$ ), competence ( $X_1$ ), and innovation literacy ( $X_2$ ), including measures of central tendency and measures of



dispersion (mean, median, mode, standard error of the mean, standard deviation, variance, range, minimum score, and

maximum score). A comprehensive description of the data is provided in Table 4.

**Table 4. Data Description of Performance Variables (Y), Competence (X<sub>1</sub>), and Innovation Literacy (X<sub>2</sub>)**

		Performance (Y)	Competence (X <sub>1</sub> )	Innovation Literacy (X <sub>2</sub> )
N	Valid	160	160	160
	Missing	0	0	0
Mean		<b>4.4164</b>	<b>4.2320</b>	<b>4.2625</b>
Std. Error of Mean		<b>.03844</b>	<b>.03381</b>	<b>.03320</b>
Median		4.4375	4.2500	4.3750
Mode		5.00	4.25	4.50
Std. Deviation		.48619	.42773	.41992
Variance		.236	.183	.176
Range		2.00	1.88	2.00
Minimum		3.00	3.00	3.00
Maximum		5.00	4.88	5.00
Sum		706.63	677.13	682.00

The reference mean score to describe the variable data on employee performance (Y), competence (X<sub>1</sub>), and innovation literacy (X<sub>2</sub>), can be explained by reference scores: a) score 5.0 = very high; score 4.0 = high; score 3.0 = moderately high; score 2.0 = low; and a score of 1.0 = very low. Based on the descriptive analysis results presented in Table 4, it can be concluded that the average score (mean) of the money management department at Bank Indonesia's employee performance reached = 4.4164 with an error rate (std. error) of = 0.03844. This indicates that the performance of the money management department at Bank Indonesia's employees is 'high' and, therefore, must be maintained or increased to reach a score of 5.0. With an average competency score of 4.2320 and an error rate of 0.03381, the competency level of the money management department at Bank Indonesia's employees is deemed "high." In addition, the average innovation literacy score reached = 4.2625, with an error rate of = 0.03320; this indicates

that the innovation literacy ability of the money management department at Bank Indonesia's employees is "high"; the error rate of the mean score (std. error of the mean) for the three (three) research variables is very low.

### c. Test Requirements Analysis

Tests for normality, heteroscedasticity, autocorrelation, and multicollinearity were conducted before multiple regression analysis. The variables Y, X<sub>1</sub>, and X<sub>2</sub> possessed properly distributed data (Scatterplot: the data is seen to be spread around the diagonal line). This suggests that there is no heteroscedasticity, as the variance of the study data Y on X<sub>1</sub> and X<sub>2</sub> does not create a distinct pattern. The tolerance value of X<sub>1</sub> and X<sub>2</sub> is close to 1, or the Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) value is less than 10 (see Table 7), indicating that there is no autocorrelation; if the D-W value is between 2 and 4 (see Table 5), there is no multi-correlation. The four test conditions of the analysis were

satisfied. Hence the results of this study's regression analysis were usable.

#### d. Multiple Correlation and Regression Analysis

The multiple correlation analysis between employee performance (Y) and competence (X<sub>1</sub>) and innovation literacy (X<sub>2</sub>) yielded a correlation coefficient value of R = 0.726 (see Table 5), indicating that the relationship between competence (X<sub>1</sub>), innovation literacy (X<sub>2</sub>) and employee performance (Y) is "positive and robust." In addition, the value

of the coefficient of determination (R<sup>2</sup>) is 0.528, which is statistically significant because of sig F < 0.05 (0.00 < 0.05). This explains that the contribution of competence (X<sub>1</sub>) and innovation literacy (X<sub>2</sub>) of employees at Institution X to employee performance (Y) was 52.8%, with the remaining 47.2% attributable to other factors. The complete results of the examination of multiple correlation coefficients and coefficients of determination are shown in Table 5.

**Table 5. Model of Summary**

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std.-Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics				Sig. F Change	Durbin-Watson
					R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2		
1	.726 <sup>a</sup>	.528	.522	.33625	.528	87.707	2	157	.000	2.016

a. Predictors: (Constant), Competence, Innovation Literacy

b. Dependent Variable: Performance of Employees

The analysis of variance (ANOVA) results for the correlation between competence (X<sub>1</sub>), innovation literacy (X<sub>2</sub>),

and employee performance (Y) are shown in Tables 6 and 7 below.

**Table 6. ANOVA**

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	19.834	2	9.917	87.707	.000 <sup>b</sup>
	Residual	17.752	157	.113		
	Total	37.585	159			

a. Dependent Variable: Performance of Employees

b. Predictors: (Constant), Competence (X<sub>1</sub>), Innovation Literacy (X<sub>2</sub>)

**Table 7. Coefficients**

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Collinearity Statistics	
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Tolerance	VIF
1	(Constant)	.499	.297		1.681	.095		
	Competence	.428	.081	.377	5.308	.000	.598	1.673
	Innovation Literacy	.494	.082	.427	6.014	.000	.598	1.673

Dependent Variable: Performance of Employees

Based on the results of the multiple regression coefficient analysis as shown in Table 7 above, it can be concluded that the multiple linear regression model of the relationship between competence ( $X_1$ ) and innovation literacy ( $X_2$ ), and employee performance ( $Y$ ) is as follows:

$$Y = 0.499 + 0.428 X_1 + 0.494 X_2$$

The significance test for the multiple regression model  $Y = 0.499 + 0.428 X_1 + 0.494 X_2$  indicates that the model is significant because the sig value is 0.000 0.05 and the computed F value is 87.707 (see Table 6). This indicates that the model  $Y = 0.499 + 0.428 X_1 + 0.494 X_2$  is highly significant and cannot be disregarded as a tool for predicting the upsides and downsides of employee performance in Institution X using competency data ( $X_1$ ) and innovation literacy ( $X_2$ ), provided that the data for the two independent variables are known. According to the multiple linear regression model  $Y = 0.499 + 0.428 X_1 + 0.494 X_2$ , if there is no element of competence ( $X_1 = 0$ ) and there is no element of innovation literacy ( $X_2 = 0$ ), then the magnitude of Institution X's employees' performance score is only = 0.499 (score below 1 = very low) on a scale of 1 to 5.

The results of the significance test on the regression constant (see Table 7), namely  $a = 0.499$ , the significance value = 0.095, shows 'not significant because the sig value  $> 0.05$  ( $0.095 > 0.05$ ), which means that the constant  $a = 0.499$  is not has a significant effect on the contribution of the performance of the money management department at Bank Indonesia's employees. The results of the significance test of the regression coefficient  $X_1$ , namely  $b = 0.428$  (see Table 7), shows 'significant' because the value of sig  $< 0.05$  ( $0.000 < 0.05$ ), which means that the variable competence

( $X_1$ ) has a significant effect on the size of the performance of employees of the money management department at Bank. Furthermore, the significance test of the regression coefficient  $X_2$ , namely  $c = 0.494$  (see Table 7) shows 'significant' because the value of sig  $< 0.05$  ( $0.000 < 0.05$ ); this means that the innovation literacy variable ( $X_2$ ) has a significant effect on the size of the employee performance ( $Y$ ) of the money management department at Bank Indonesia. The variable of innovation literacy ( $X_2$ ) has a 'higher' influence sensitivity on the achievement of the performance of the employees of the money management department at Bank Indonesia than the competence variable ( $X_1$ ), i.e.,  $0.494 > 0.428$ .

The results of the descriptive analysis in this study indicate that the average performance, competence, and innovation literacy score of employees is between 4.23 and 4.41 ( $> 4.0$ ). Descriptively, it can be concluded that the performance, competence, and innovation literacy of employees of the money management department at Bank Indonesia in the category are 'high,' indicating that employees are highly responsive to advances in science and technology and changes in the workplace. Respondents of this study were employees of the money management department at Bank Indonesia (Central Bank) in Jakarta, an entirely credible government institution. They are qualified, with the characteristics of employees who are strictly selected, so that the better the performance of the employees of an institution is demonstrated, the more certain it can be that they will contribute to the institution's development. According to Budiningsih and Soehari (2022g), the success of an institution in the era of global competition is determined by the rate at which the adapts to the industrial environment, which is evidenced by the

existence of a teaching organization that can anticipate changes and the diversity of employees' knowledge, skills, and abilities swiftly, to optimize the institution's performance. This is also pertinent to Muhammad's claim in Ismail (2013) that quality organizational learning (Lifelong learning) is regarded to be able to generate a workforce with better personal traits, such as innovative, productive, skilled, competitive, tough, and creative. This is because learning at Bank Indonesia is of sufficient quality, which has an impact on the upsurge of innovative behaviors from its employees; as the opinion of Fauziah et al. (2017) state that a quality learning organization in an institution is one of the most influential predictors of the level of innovative behavior.

Moreover, the results of this study's multiple correlation analysis indicated a strong correlation between competence and innovation literacy along with employee performance is "positive and very strong" with a correlation coefficient of  $= 0.726$ , indicating that competence and innovation literacy together have a substantial impact on the performance level of the money management department at Bank Indonesia employees. The coefficient of determination ( $R^2$ ) of the relationship between competence and innovation literacy and employee performance at the money management department at Bank Indonesia is  $0.528$ , indicating that competence and innovation literacy together contributed  $52.8\%$  to the performance of the money management department at Bank Indonesia's employees, indicating that these two variables are dominant factors that can improve employee performance at the money management department at Bank Indonesia. This is reinforced by the findings of Rahmana et al. (2016), which indicate that activities within a work unit that incorporates innovation and

technology demonstrate strong development and performance. In an era of severe competition, sustainability refers to the capacity to maintain the optimal level of performance.

This study also identified important predictive models for obtaining optimal employee performance, namely:  $Y = 0.499 + 0.428 X_1 + 0.494 X_2$ , where  $X_1$  Means competence and  $X_2 =$  innovation literacy. This model demonstrates that competence and innovation literacy influence the achievement of the money management department at Bank Indonesia's employee performance (its contribution reaches  $52.8\%$ ), so the strengthening of competence and innovation literacy in an institution/organization/company must be accomplished through Lifelong learning and according to Sange in Prawiradilaga & Chaeruman, Lifelong learning is the only way to improve competence and innovation literacy (2018) 4 (four) pillars are required for the optimal implementation of a learning organization in an organization/ institution/ company: (a) personal mastery: the skills possessed by each employee must be clear and measurable; (b) mental model: pattern of thinking and understanding about something (always post-thinking); (c) building shared vision: creating future goals and evaluating together; and (d) team learning: ability sharing session, this will occur if: all members are willing to share their knowledge and experience; and critical thinking; innovation through concrete actions, and commitment to sharing session obligations.

According to Prawiradilaga and Chaeruman (2018), to grow a learning organization, the following are required: a) inviting and motivating employees to be involved in organizational problems; b) providing opportunities for every employee to participate in problem-solving; c)

encouraging employees to discover/innovate; and d) the presence of a leader who serves as a role model. Butler, cited in Ibrahim et al. (2017), highlights traditional measures of strengthening character to preserve the continuity of positive behavior, such as rewarding or praising employees for outstanding performance or competency attainment. Prior research from Merrill et al. (2002) supports the opinion of Prawiradilaga and Chaeruman that to transform a 'less' performing institution/ organization/ company into a high-performing one, the following dimensions must be strengthened: (a) learning culture; (b) agency connections with partners; (c) shared leadership; (d) common goals to keep learning; (e) user satisfaction; (f) effective learning organization. The results of research by Sapeta et al (2021) support the importance of continuous learning, namely that sustainable learning greatly influences personal development and professionalism which is the most important pillar in healthcare training for nurses.

The results of this study imply that continuous learning in an organization/ institution is necessary, in the era of advances in informatics technology as said by Budiningsih et al (2019d), namely that the era of advances in informatics technology has an impact on changes in culture/ human civilization which is very dynamic; characterized by, among others: a) the availability of information anywhere, anytime and by anyone; b) the implementation of the use of machines (computing) that can reach all routine work (automation) and can be done from anywhere and anywhere. Furthermore, Kurniawan et al (2022) explained that the rapid development of technology makes humans have to coexist with technology, and the rapid development of technology, makes the use of the mobile internet as one of the innovations in technological progress. The

next implication as stated by Prawiradilaga & Chaeruman (2018) is that in the era of scientific and technological progress as it is today, to develop organizations/institutions that are always learning (continuous learning) 'contemporary interventions' are needed can manage 'all employee potential', such as knowledge management, expertise, and skills to play a more role and always increase to maintain the existence of organizations /institutions in the era of Digital. One example of contemporary interventions that are widely developed in organizations/ institutions in Indonesia today is Corporate University which is expected to be able to manage knowledge for improving the performance of individuals (personal mastery) and organizations/institutions with the principle of human values. Another contemporary intervention according to Torres et al (2018) is the use of the TPACK (Technological Pedagogical Content Knowledge) learning model as a model for developing e-innovation in learning organizations that combines pedagogical, disciplinary, and technological dimensions in the integration of Information and Communication Technology (ICT) in pedagogic methodology.

#### **4. Conclusion**

Conclusions from this study include: (a) competence and innovation literacy together affect the level of achievement of employee performance in Institution X; (b) the relationship between competence and innovation literacy on the performance of money management department at Bank Indonesia employees is 'positive' and strong with a correlation coefficient of  $R=0.726$ ; (c) a mathematical model can be used to predict the achievement of employee performance at money management department at Bank Indonesia:  $Y = 0.499 + 0.428 X_1 + 0.49$  (d)



the results of this study indicate the need to strengthen competence and technological literacy, as these two variables are pretty influential in determining the achievement of optimal employee performance through continuous learning by habituation/ cultivation of learning within the organization, and the creation of a sustainable learning organization; (e) the concept of lifelong learning will undoubtedly continue to be an important component of continuous learning. Developing organizations/ institutions are always learning (continuous learning) and require 'contemporary interventions' that can manage 'all employee potential', such as the development of a Corporate University that is expected to manage knowledge for improving individual performance (personal mastery) and organizations/institutions with human value principles' and the TPACK learning model (Technological Pedagogical Content Knowledge) as a model for the development of e-innovation can be applied in various organizations/institutions. One of the limitations of this study is that the research respondents are limited to employees of the money management department (Bank Indonesia) at the Central level; therefore, additional research is required on employees of Bank Indonesia from various other regions/regions of Indonesia or other country using the same questionnaire.

## 5. References

- Abidin, Y., Mulyati, T., Yunansah, H. (2017). *Pembelajaran Literasi*. Jakarta: Bumi Aksara.
- Afandi, M., Wahyuningsih, S., & Mayasari, LK. (2021). Does Elementary School Teacher Performance Matter? *Cakrawala Pendidikan*, 40(1), 242-252. DOI:10.21831/ cp.v40i1.35284.
- Barrand J., Sanseau P.-Y., Ferrante G., 2012, The Leader-Member Relationship at the Core of Innovation Development: "Member Perceptions, Positions and Expectations", [In:] D.G. Assimakopoulos, E.G. Carayannis, R. Dossani, (Eds.) *Knowledge Perspectives of New Product Development: A Comparative Approach*, New York: Springer.
- Budiningsih, I., Soehari, T.D., & Ashari Z. (2017a). Improvement of Employees' Performance through Training Intervention in Digital Era. *European Research Studies Journal (ERSJ)*, XX(4B), 637-654. Retrieved from <https://ersj.eu/dmdocuments/2017-xx-4-b-48.pdf>.
- Budiningsih, I., Soehari, T. D., & Ahmad, M. (2017b). Increased Competency Through Training Interventions. *International Journal Applied Business and Economic Research (IJABER)*, 15(6), 249-266. Retrieved from [http://serialsjournals.com/index.php?route=product/product/volumearticle&issue\\_id=115product\\_id=343](http://serialsjournals.com/index.php?route=product/product/volumearticle&issue_id=115product_id=343).
- Budiningsih I, Soehari TD, Leonard J. (2018c). Dominant Factors Influence the Behavior to Produce Innovative Products. David Publishing. *China-USA Business Review*, 17(9), 453-461. DOI:10.17265/1537-1514/2018.09.002.
- Budiningsih, I; Soehari, T.D.& Irwansyah (2019d) Dominant Factor for Improving Information Security Awareness. *Cakrawala Pendidikan*, 38 (3): 490-498. <https://doi.org/doi:10.21831/cp.v38i2.25626>.
- Budiningsih, I., Sukanto H., & Mujiani S. (2021e). Dominant Determinant Characteristics of Innovative Behavior of New Entrepreneur Candidates. *Management Science Letters*, 11, 1-7. DOI: 10.5267/j.msl.2021.1.022.
- Budiningsih, I., Soehari T.D., & Alfulailah, F. (2021f). The Strengthening Innovation and Information Technology Capabilities in Vocational School as an HRD Enter Point to Improve the Performance of SMEs. *Jurnal Pendidikan Teknologi dan Kejuruan*

- (*JPTK*), 27(2), 126-137. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.21831/jptk.v27i2.42212>.
- Budiningsih, I., Soehari T.D. (2022g). *Strengthening Innovative Leadership in the Turbulent Environment*. In Mario Franco (Ed.). *Leadership - New Insights* (pp 139-176). London: IntechOpen. DOI: 10.5772/intechopen.95224.
- Cendon, E. (2018). Lifelong Learning at Universities: Future Perspectives for Teaching and Learning. *Journal New Approaches in Educational Research*, 7(2), 81–87. DOI: 10.7821/naer.2018.7.32.
- Fauzia S., Budiningsih I., Djaelani A., & Ahmad M. (2017). Dominant Factors Affecting the Behavior of Innovator Employees. *Polish Journal of Management Studies (PJMS)*, 16(1), 32-40. DOI: 10.17512/pjms.2017.16.1.03.
- Hersey, P., Kenneth H., B. and Dewey E., J. (1996). *Management Of Organizational Behavior*, 7th Edition. New Jersey: Prentice Hall, Inc.
- Hidayat, N., Wulandari, F. (2020). The Impact of Leadership behavior on school Performance. *Cakrawala Pendidikan*, 39(3), 493 – 506. DOI:10.21831/cp.v39i3.3100.
- Ibrahim, M., Baharun,H., Haru, H., Othman, M. (2017). Antecedents Of Intrinsic Motivation, Metacognition and Their Effects on Students' Academic Performance in Fundamental Knowledge for Matriculation Courses. *Malaysian Journal of Learning and Instruction (MJLI)*, 14(2), 211-246. Retrieved from <https://e-journal.uum.edu.my/index.php/mjli/article/view/mjli2017.14.2.8>.
- Ireland R.D., Hoskisson R.E., Hitt M. A. (2011). *The Management of Strategy: Concept and Cases*. United State: South-Western Cengage Learning.
- Ismail, S. N. (2014). Total Quality Management (TQM) Practices and School Climate Amongst High, Average, and Low-Performance Secondary Schools. *Malaysian Journal of Learning and Instruction (MJLI)*, 11, 41-58. Retrieved from <https://e-journal.uum.edu.my/index.php/mjli/article/view/7664>.
- Johannessen J.A., Skaalsvik H. (2014). Innovative Leadership in Organizations: The Road to Innovation Performance. *Problems And Perspectives in Management*, 12(2), 139-152. Retrieved from <https://www.businessperspectives.org/index.php/journals/problems-and-perspectives-in-management/issue-2-cont/innovative-leadership-in-organizations-the-road-to-innovation-performance>.
- Jason A. C.; Lepine, J.A., & Wesson. M.J. (2011). *Organizational Behavior*, 2nd edition. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Khan, W.A., Hasan, R.A., Wafa, S.A., & Arshad, M. Z. (2020). “Does Innovation Affect the Firm Performance in Developing Countries? A Conceptual Framework”, *Jurnal Pengurusan*, 59, 1-13. Retrieved from <http://ejournal.ukm.my/pengurusan/article/view/34675>.
- Kleysen, R. F., & Street, C. T. 2001. Toward A Multi-Dimensional Measure of Individual Innovative Behaviour. *Journal of Intellectual Capital*, 2 (3), 284-296.
- Loaiza-Aguirre, M.I., Andrade-Abarca, P.S., & Salazar-Romer, A.C. (2017). Determination of the Innovative Capacity of Ecuadorian Universities. *Journal of New Approaches in Educational Research*, 6(1), 57–63. DOI: 10.7821/naer.2016.8.174.
- Kurniawan, D.A., Astalini, Darmaji, Tanti & Maryani, S. (2022). Innovative Learning: Gender Perception of e-Module Linear Equations in Mathematics and Physics. *Indonesian Journal on Learning and Advanced Education (IJOLAE)*, 4 (2): 92-106. DOI: 10.23917/ijolae.v4i2.16610.
- Merrill, L.M., et al. (2002). Development and Testing of an Instrument Measuring a School Faculty's Commitment to Continuous Learning and Improvement.

- Paper presented at the 11th Annual CREATE National Evaluation Institute Boise, Idaho. AEL, Inc., Charleston, WV; Educational Research and Improvement (ED), Washington, DC.*
- Michael, A., Taylor, S. (2014). *Armstrong's Handbook of Human Resource Management Practice* 13th edition. London: Kogan Page Limited.
- Noe, Hollenbeck, Gerhart, Wright. (2015). *Human Resource Management*, 9<sup>th</sup> Edition. UK: McGraw-Hill.
- Palan. (2007). *Competency Management: Teknik Mengimplementasikan Manajemen SDM Berbasis Kompetensi Untuk Peningkatan Daya Saing Organisasi*. Edisi bahasa Indonesia. Jakarta: PPM.
- Prawiradilaga, D. S. and Chaeruman, U. A. (2018). *Modul Hypercontent: Teknologi Kinerja*. Jakarta: Kencana.
- Rahmana, N. A., Zulnaldi Yaacobb, Z. and Radzic, R.M. 2016. An Overview of Technological Innovation on SME Survival: A Conceptual Paper. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences* 224, 508 – 515. DOI: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2016.05.427. Retrieved from <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>.
- Robbins, Stephen P., and Mary Coulter. (2012) *Management*, New Jersey: Pearson Education Inc.
- Sapeta, P., Centeno, C., Alazne Belar, A. & Arantzamendi, M. (2021). Adaptation and Continuous Learning: Integrative Review of Coping Strategies of Palliative Care Professionals. *Palliative Medicine*, 36 (1): 15-29. DOI: 10.1177/02692163211047149.
- Soehari, T. D., Budiningsih, I., Aima, A., & Assauri, H. (2017a). Strategic Factors of Human Capital for Employees Performance Improvement. *International Journal of Economic Research (IJER)*, 14(12), 55-73. Retrieved from [http://serialsjournals.com/abstract/49654\\_5.pdf](http://serialsjournals.com/abstract/49654_5.pdf).
- Soehari T.D., Budiningsih, I., and Bakdi, B. (2017b). Performance Improvement through Human Capital Strategic for Civil Servant. *International Journal of Applied Business and Economic Research, (IJABER)*, 15(24), 1-18. Retrieved from [http://serialsjournals.com/abstract/57747\\_40.pdf](http://serialsjournals.com/abstract/57747_40.pdf).
- Susetyo, B., Soetantyo, S. P., Sayuti, M. & Nur, D. (2022). The Innovation and the Transformation of Indonesian Schools Accreditation Management System. *Indonesian Journal on Learning and Advanced Education (IJOLAE)*, 4 (2): 128-139. DOI: 10.23917/ijolae.v4i2.17113
- Taneo, S.Y.M., Setiyati, E.A., & Stephanus, D. (2013). "Innovation and Economic Behavior of Chinese Ethnic Entrepreneurs in Improving Competitiveness of Small and Medium Scale Food Industry" in. *Proceedings of 2013 ICOI, The International Conference on Organizational Innovation* July 2 – 4, Taiwan.
- Taşçı, G. and Titrek, O. (2020). Evaluation of Lifelong Learning Centers in Higher Education: A Sustainable Leadership Perspective. *Sustainability*, 12(22): 1 – 19. DOI:10.3390/su12010022.
- Tidd, J. and Bessant J. (2009). *Managing Innovation, Integrating Technological, Market and Organizational Change*, Fourth Ed. England: John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.
- Torres; R. M.; Santa; A.; Lorenzo, C. (2018) Resignification of educational e-innovation to enhance opportunities for graduate employability in the context of new university degrees. *Journal of New Approaches in Educational Research*, 7 (1): 70-78. DOI: 10.7821/naer.2018.1.263.
- Uno, H. B., Budiningsih, I. & Panjaitan, K. (2012). *Model Pembelajaran*. Gorontalo, Indonesia: BMT Nurul Jannah.
- Sparks, B. and Vann, V. (2018). A Study of Emotional Intelligence and Self-

Leadership. *SAM Advanced Management Journal*, 82(3), 18-28.  
Retrieved from  
[https://www.researchgate.net/publication/343921136\\_A\\_Study\\_of\\_Emotional\\_Intelligence\\_and\\_Self-Leadership](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/343921136_A_Study_of_Emotional_Intelligence_and_Self-Leadership).