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1. INTRODUCTION

Everyone wants their life's needs to be fulfilled in a moral and material form. To achieve this humanity must worship and work hard. By working hard, and accompanied by sincere and sincere intentions and honesty will get compensation. Receiving appropriate compensation from the above can improve employee or employee welfare. An organization or company in providing compensation to employees or employees based on the results of performance appraisals. A planned system is needed to get an appropriate performance evaluation so that the compensation given by the company to employees or employees is effective and efficient. If the compensation received matches the employee's performance or the employee will get satisfaction at work, because his performance is valued by the company. The company also receives great benefits, because satisfaction is important in increasing employee or employee productivity, so that company goals can be achieved. Based on the description above it can be assumed that performance evaluation is very important as a basis for compensation in order to increase employee productivity in a company, particularly the Teaching and Education Faculty of the Islamic University of North Sumatra. The purpose of this study was to determine the FKIP-UISU lecturer and staff assessment of performance appraisals, compensation provided, level of productivity. The results of the study using the formula of multiple correlation between variables x1 (performance appraisal) and x 2 (compensation) together with variable y (productivity of lecturers and staff) that is 0.826 which means it has a positive relationship because r count is greater than r table (0.826> 0.361 ). Based on the table, it is known that = 0.826 is at the coefficient interval 0.80 - 1.00, then the relationship of variable x1 (performance appraisal) with variable x2 (compensation) which is jointly correlated with variable y (lecturer and employee productivity) is included in the category very strong relationship. Based on the calculation of the value of Fcount = 28.890 this value is then consulted with Ftable with an error rate of 5% based on the numerator dk = k (2) and the denominator dk = n-k-1 (27), then Ftable = 3.35 is obtained. These results indicate that Fcount is greater than Ftable, 28.890> 3.35. Because the price of Fcount is far greater than the price of Fable, the proposed Zero Hypothesis (H0) is rejected and the Alternative Hypothesis (Ha) is accepted. According to the results of these calculations it can be concluded that the productivity of lecturers and staff at the Teaching and Education Faculty of the Islamic University of North Sumatra Medan is influenced by performance evaluation and compensation variables of 68.15%, while 31.85% is influenced by other variables.

ABSTRACT

Performance Appraisal is an effort to identify, measure (assess) and manage (management) to determine decisions about success or failure in carrying out work carried out by workers with work standards set by the company. Compensation for organizations / companies means rewards / rewards to workers who have contributed in realizing their goals, through activities called work. Total productivity is nothing but the ratio of what is produced (output) to all what is used (input) to obtain these results. FKIP-UISU Medan is part of one of the faculties at the Islamic University of North Sumatra Medan and its address at Jalan Puri Number 18 Simpang Jalan Alloy Tenaga Medan. The problem formulation is "How big is the effect of performance appraisal and compensation on the productivity of lecturers and staff at the Teaching and Education Faculty of the Islamic University of North Sumatra?" The purpose of this study was to determine the FKIP-UISU lecturer and staff assessment of performance appraisals, compensation provided, level of productivity. The results of the study using the formula of multiple correlation between variables x1 (performance appraisal) and x 2 (compensation) together with variable y (productivity of lecturers and staff) that is 0.826 which means it has a positive relationship because r count is greater than r table (0.826> 0.361 ). Based on the table, it is known that = 0.826 is at the coefficient interval 0.80 - 1.00, then the relationship of variable x1 (performance appraisal) with variable x2 (compensation) which is jointly correlated with variable y (lecturer and employee productivity) is included in the category very strong relationship. Based on the calculation of the value of Fcount = 28.890 this value is then consulted with Ftable with an error rate of 5% based on the numerator dk = k (2) and the denominator dk = n-k-1 (27), then Ftable = 3.35 is obtained. These results indicate that Fcount is greater than Ftable, 28.890> 3.35. Because the price of Fcount is far greater than the price of Fable, the proposed Zero Hypothesis (H0) is rejected and the Alternative Hypothesis (Ha) is accepted. According to the results of these calculations it can be concluded that the productivity of lecturers and staff at the Teaching and Education Faculty of the Islamic University of North Sumatra Medan is influenced by performance evaluation and compensation variables of 68.15%, while 31.85% is influenced by other variables.

This is an open access article under the CC-BY-SA license.
Faculty of the North Sumatra Islamic University (FKIP-UISU) Medan, so the authors are interested in conducting further research by choosing the title: “The Effect of Performance Appraisal and Compensation on the Productivity of Lecturers and Staff at the Teaching and Education Faculty of the Islamic University of North Sumatra.”

2. METHODS

2.1 Research Location, Research Object, and Research Time

2.1.1 Research Location
The location of the study was conducted at the Teaching and Education Faculty of the Islamic University of North Sumatra, Medan, which is located at Campus I of UISU, Jalan SM Raja Teladan, Medan.

2.1.2 Research Objects
The object of research is the performance appraisal variable and compensation as well as its effect on productivity.

2.1.3 Research Time
This research is planned by the author starting from April to July 2019.

2.2 Population and Sample

2.2.1 Population
According to Sugiyono (2005:72) the population is a generalization area consisting of: objects / subjects that have certain quantias and characteristics determined by researchers to be studied and then conclusions drawn. As for the population in this study were all Employees (Lecturers and Staff) in the Teaching and Education Faculty of the Islamic University of North Sumatra, Medan, amounting to 60 people.

2.2.2 Samples
Sugiyono (2005: 73) states the sample is part of the number of characteristics possessed by the population. If the population is large, and researchers may not study everything in the population, for example due to limited funds, manpower and time, then researchers can use samples taken from that population. Istijanto (2005: 119) states that the number of samples drawn from the population often confuses researchers, because there are no standard guidelines that can be applied to all research situations. However, what needs to be considered is the level of population homogeneity. The more homogeneous the population, the number of samples used can be reduced, whereas for populations that are increasingly heterogeneous, the number of samples needed is increasingly large, so that differences or variations that can be covered entirely.

2.3 Data Collection Techniques
To obtain the data and information needed, the following data collection techniques are used:

1. Interview
Namely communicating directly (face to face) to the parties involved in this research.

2. Questionnaire
That is compiling a list of questions that are shown to respondents.

3. Document Study
Namely data obtained from company archives relating to the research title.

2.4 Data Analysis Techniques

2.4.1 Descriptive Analysis Method
That is an analysis process that begins by collecting data and then compiling by reporting it, analyzing and interpreting it so that a clear picture of the facts under study is obtained.

2.4.2 Quantitative Analysis Method
Namely testing and analyzing data by calculating the numbers and then drawing conclusions from the test, with the following formula:

a. Product Moment Correlation Test (Partial Test) to find the relationship between performance appraisal (x1) to productivity (y), then the product moment formula from Karl Pearson (1857-1936) is quoted from Sugiyono (2005: 182)

b. Hypothesis test partially or t test

c. Double Correlation (Simultaneous Test) Multiple correlation is used to find the simultaneous relationship between performance appraisal and compensation for productivity in the Teaching and Education Faculty of the Sumatara Islamic University, Medan by using the multiple correlation formula

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Here are the data from the field observations:

a. Data on the results of a questionnaire trial of 30 respondents consisting of employees and lecturers

b. Data on result of 3 aspects from 30 respondents
Table 1. F test Table Questionnaire Calculation of 30 Respondents:

| No. | Res. | x₁  | x₂  | y   | x₁² | x₂² | y²  | x₁y | x₂y | x₁x₂ |
|-----|------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|------|
| 1   | 43   | 42  | 40  | 1849| 1764| 1600| 1720| 1680| 1806|
| 2   | 42   | 40  | 40  | 1764| 1600| 1600| 1680| 1680| 1680|
| 3   | 46   | 50  | 50  | 2116| 2500| 2500| 2300| 2500| 2300|
| 4   | 40   | 45  | 42  | 1600| 2025| 1764| 1680| 1890| 1800|
| 5   | 41   | 40  | 40  | 1681| 1600| 1600| 1640| 1600| 1640|
| 6   | 39   | 46  | 42  | 1521| 2116| 1764| 1638| 1932| 1794|
| 7   | 43   | 43  | 41  | 1849| 1849| 1681| 1763| 1763| 1849|
| 8   | 45   | 33  | 45  | 2025| 1089| 2025| 2025| 1485| 1485|
| 9   | 42   | 42  | 43  | 1764| 1764| 1849| 1806| 1806| 1764|
| 10  | 43   | 42  | 38  | 1849| 1764| 1444| 1634| 1596| 1806|
| 11  | 43   | 46  | 48  | 1849| 2116| 2304| 2064| 2208| 1978|
| 12  | 44   | 47  | 43  | 1936| 2209| 1849| 1892| 2021| 2068|
| 13  | 41   | 44  | 40  | 1681| 1936| 1600| 1640| 1760| 1804|
| 14  | 39   | 41  | 40  | 1521| 1681| 1600| 1560| 1640| 1599|
| 15  | 44   | 40  | 39  | 1936| 1600| 1521| 1716| 1560| 1760|
| 16  | 41   | 40  | 38  | 1681| 1600| 1444| 1558| 1520| 1640|
| 17  | 49   | 46  | 46  | 2401| 2116| 2116| 2254| 2116| 2254|
| 18  | 41   | 41  | 45  | 1681| 1681| 2025| 1845| 1845| 1681|
| 19  | 42   | 43  | 41  | 1764| 1849| 1681| 1722| 1763| 1806|
| 20  | 44   | 45  | 41  | 1936| 2025| 1681| 1804| 1845| 1980|
| 21  | 41   | 43  | 48  | 1681| 1849| 2304| 1968| 2064| 1763|
| 22  | 46   | 47  | 45  | 2116| 2209| 2025| 2070| 2115| 2162|
| 23  | 38   | 40  | 42  | 1444| 1600| 1764| 1596| 1680| 1520|
| 24  | 42   | 42  | 43  | 1764| 1764| 1849| 1806| 1806| 1764|
| 25  | 41   | 44  | 45  | 1681| 1936| 2025| 1845| 1980| 1804|
| 26  | 41   | 44  | 45  | 1681| 1936| 2025| 1845| 1980| 1804|
| 27  | 43   | 39  | 39  | 1849| 1521| 1521| 1677| 1521| 1677|
| 28  | 42   | 44  | 41  | 1764| 1936| 1681| 1722| 1804| 1848|
| 29  | 35   | 43  | 42  | 1225| 1849| 1764| 1470| 1806| 1505|
| 30  | 31   | 44  | 41  | 961 | 1936| 1681| 1271| 1804| 1364|
| ∑   | 1252 | 1286| 1273| 52570| 55420| 54287| 53211| 54690| 53705 |
### Table 2. Point calculation table Performance Evaluation Aspects of 30 respondents

| No. Responden | Performance Evaluation |
|---------------|------------------------|
|               | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
| 1             | SS | SS | SS | S | S | S | STS | S | TS | KS |
| 2             | SS | SS | S | S | S | KS | STS | SS | KS | S |
| 3             | SS | SS | SS | SS | SS | SS | STS | SS | SS | SS |
| 4             | SS | S | S | S | S | S | TS | S | TS | KS |
| 5             | S | SS | S | S | S | S | KS | S | STS | S |
| 6             | SS | SS | S | S | SS | S | KS | S | TS | S |
| 7             | SS | SS | S | SS | S | S | STS | S | KS | KS |
| 8             | SS | SS | SS | SS | SS | SS | STS | S | KS | TS |
| 9             | SS | SS | S | S | SS | S | KS | S | TS | S |
| 10            | SS | SS | SS | SS | S | S | STS | S | KS | KS |
| 11            | SS | SS | SS | SS | SS | SS | TS | S | KS | TS |
| 12            | SS | SS | S | SS | S | SS | TS | S | TS | S |
| 13            | SS | SS | S | SS | SS | KS | KS | SS | KS | S |
| 14            | SS | SS | S | S | S | S | KS | KS | S | KS |
| 15            | S | SS | SS | SS | SS | S | TS | S | TS | S |
| 16            | SS | SS | S | S | S | S | TS | S | KS | S |
| 17            | SS | SS | SS | SS | SS | SS | STS | S | STS | SS |
| 18            | SS | SS | SS | SS | SS | S | S | KS | S | S | S |
| 19            | S | SS | S | SS | SS | S | TS | S | KS | S |
| 20            | SS | SS | SS | SS | SS | SS | TS | SS | KS | TS |
| 21            | SS | SS | S | S | SS | SS | KS | SS | S | KS |
| 22            | SS | SS | S | S | SS | SS | STS | S | TS | SS |
| 23            | SS | S | S | S | S | KS | TS | S | TS | TS |
| 24            | SS | SS | S | SS | SS | S | KS | S | TS | KS |
| 25            | S | S | S | S | SS | S | TS | S | TS | S |
| 26            | S | S | S | S | SS | S | TS | S | TS | S |
| 27            | S | S | S | SS | SS | S | STS | S | TS | S |
| 28            | S | SS | S | SS | SS | SS | KS | S | STS | TS |
| 29            | STS | SS | SS | S | SS | S | SS | S | SS | SS |
| 30            | STS | SS | S | SS | S | TS | KS | TS | SS | S |

### Table 3. Point calculation table Compensation Aspects of 30 respondents

| No. Responden | Compensation |
|---------------|--------------|
|               | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
| 1             | S | S | S | S | S | S | SS | SS | S | S |
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Table 4. Point calculation table Productivity Aspects of 30 respondent

| No. Responden | Productivity |
|---------------|--------------|
| 1             | S            |
| 2             | SS           |
| 3             | SS           |
| 4             | S            |
| 5             | S            |
| 6             | SS           |
| 7             | S            |
| 8             | S            |
| 9             | S            |
| 10            | S            |
| 11            | S            |
| 12            | SS           |
| 13            | SS           |
| 14            | S            |
| 15            | S            |
| 16            | S            |
| 17            | SS           |
| 18            | S            |
| 19            | SS           |
| 20            | SS           |
| 21            | KS           |
| 22            | SS           |
| 23            | S            |
| 24            | S            |
| 25            | S            |
| 26            | S            |
| 27            | S            |
| 28            | KS           |
| 29            | S            |
| 30            | S            |

| No. Responden | Productivity |
|---------------|--------------|
| 1             | S            |
| 2             | TS           |
| 3             | SS           |
| 4             | SS           |
| 5             | SS           |

Table 4. Point calculation table Productivity Aspects of 30 respondent
RESPONDENTS AMOUNT ANALYSIS

In the following bar chart graph can be seen the total accumulated amount of measurement measurements for each point in each aspect in total. on the bar graph the symbols "SS" (really like), "S" (like), "KS" (less like), "TS" (don't like), "STS" (very dislike).

a. Product Moment Correlation Test (Partial Test)

To calculate whether the relationship between variable x1 (Performance Appraisal) and variable y (Productivity of Lecturers and Staff) is significant or not, it can be known through calculation and the results of the above calculation = 0.807. The calculation result above = 0.807 is the result of the correlation between the variable x1 (performance appraisal) and the variable y (lecturer and staff productivity) is positive, because the r count is greater than the table (0.807 > 0.361). The calculation result above = 0.725 is the result of the correlation between the variable x1 (performance evaluation) and the variable x2 (compensation) is positive, because the r count is greater than the r table (0.725 > 0.361)

b. Hypothesis of Partially Test or t-Test

To find out the value of this coefficient is significant or can not be calculated and the results of the above calculation = 7.227, with an error level of 5% and dk = 28 obtained price table = 2.048, then the correlation coefficient is significant, because t count is greater than the table (7.227 > 2.048).

The calculation results above = 5.268, with an error level of...
5% and \( d_k = 28 \) obtained the value of \( t_{table} = 2.048 \), then the correlation coefficient is significant, because \( t_{count} \) is greater than \( t_{table} \) (5.268 > 2.048). The calculation results above = 5.578, with an error level of 5% and \( d_k = 28 \) obtained the value of \( t_{table} = 2.048 \), then the correlation coefficient is significant, because \( t_{count} \) is greater than the table (5.578 > 2.048).

c. Double Correlation (Simultaneous Test)

Then to find out the correlation between variables \( x_1 \) (Performance Assessment) and \( x_2 \) (Compensation) on the Productivity of Lecturers and Staff (y) in FKIP-UISU, whether significant or not, can be calculated using multiple correlation analysis the following results are obtained. The results of these calculations are the values obtained from the calculation of the correlation between the variables \( x_1 \) (performance appraisal) and \( x_2 \) (compensation) together with the variable y (lecturer and employee productivity) which is 0.826 which means it has a positive relationship because the \( r \) count is greater than the \( r_{table} \) (0.826 > 0.361). Based on the table, it is known that = 0.826 is at the coefficient interval 0.80 - 1.00, then the relationship of variable \( x_1 \) (performance appraisal) with variable \( x_2 \) (compensation) which is jointly correlated with variable y (lecturer and employee productivity) is included in the category very strong relationship.

d. Simultaneous hypothesis test or F-test

To see whether the coefficient can be generalized, the significance must be tested through calculations and the value of \( F_{calculate} = 28.890 \) this value is then consulted with \( F_{table} \) with a 5% error level based on the numerator \( d_k = k \) (2) and \( d_k \) the denominator = \( n-k-1 \) (27), then obtained \( F_{table} = 3.35 \). These results indicate that \( F_{count} \) is greater than \( F_{table} \), 28.890 > 3.35. Because the price of \( F_{count} \) is far greater than the price of Fable, the proposed Zero Hypothesis (H0) is rejected and the Alternative Hypothesis (Ha) is accepted.

e. Determinant Test (D)

Furthermore, to see which variable is the most influential between performance appraisal and compensation for the productivity of lecturers and staff at the Teaching and Education Faculty of the Islamic University of North Sumatra, Medan, a determinant test (D) was conducted with the following results:

\[
\begin{align*}
D &= x \times 100
d &= (0.826) \times 100
D &= 0.6815 \times 100
D &= 68.15%
\end{align*}
\]

From the results of these calculations it can be concluded that the productivity of lecturers and staff at the Teaching and Education Faculty of the Islamic University of North Sumatra, Medan is influenced by variables outside the contribution of this study such as leadership, communication, and Occupational Safety and Health (K3).

4. CONCLUSION

Based on the results of the descriptions above, the following conclusions can be drawn:

1. Performance Appraisal is an effort to identify, measure (assess) and manage (management) to determine decisions about success or failure in carrying out work carried out by workers with work standards set by the company.

2. Compensation for the organization/company means appreciation/reward to workers who have contributed in realizing their goals, through activities called work.

3. Total productivity is nothing but the ratio of what is produced (output) to all what is used (input) to obtain these results.

4. In accordance with the analysis and evaluation obtained, that the performance appraisal has a significant influence or role on the productivity of lecturers and staff at the Teaching and Education Faculty of the North Sumatra Islamic University in Medan which can be seen from the calculated value of \( r_{table} \) (0.807 > 0.361). Where the effect is positive. Then compensation has a significant role or influence on the productivity of lecturers and staff at the Teaching and Education Faculty of the Islamic University of North Sumatra, Medan, which can be seen from the size of the \( r_{table} \) (0.706 > 0.361). and has a positive influence. Whereas performance appraisal has influence or a significant role in compensation in the Teaching and Education Faculty of the Islamic University of North Sumatra, Medan, which can be seen from the size of the \( r_{table} \) (0.725 > 0.361).

5. Based on the calculation of the value of \( F_{count} = 28.890 \) this value is then consulted with \( F_{table} \) with a 5% error level based on the numerator \( d_k = k \) (2) and the denominator \( d_k = n-k-1 \) (27), then \( F_{table} = 3.35 \) is obtained. These results indicate that \( F_{count} \) is greater than \( F_{table} \), 28.890 > 3.35. Because the price of \( F_{count} \) is far greater than the price of Fable, the proposed Zero Hypothesis (H0) is rejected and the Alternative Hypothesis (Ha) is accepted.

6. According to the results of these calculations it can be concluded that the productivity of lecturers and staff at the Teaching and Education Faculty of the Islamic University of North Sumatra, Medan is influenced by the performance evaluation and compensation variables of 68.15%, while 31.85% is influenced by other variables.
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