

Employee Performance Based on Job Satisfaction and Work Environment

Anis Anshari Mas'ud¹, Wahyu Maulid Adha²

^{1,2}Management, Economics, University of West Sulawesi, Majene, West Sulawesi, Indonesia

*e-mail correspondence: anisanshari177@gmail.com, wahyuadha@unsulbar.ac.id

(Received: on 12 May 2023; Reviewed: on 30 May 2023; Accepted on 07 July 2023)

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to determine the effect of job satisfaction and work environment on employee performance. The data analysis method used is descriptive analysis and multiple linear regression analysis using the SPSS version 25 application. The data collection techniques in this study were interviews, questionnaires and observations. The population in this study amounted to 32 employees at the Parepare City Youth and Sports Department of Tourism. The sampling technique in this study was Saturated sampling. The sample in this study were 28 permanent employees and 4 non-permanent employees) at the Youth and Sports Department of Tourism of Parepare City. The results showed that Job Satisfaction has a positive and insignificant effect on performance with a regression coefficient value of 0.340 and a probability value of $0.037 > 0.005$. Partially job satisfaction also affects performance in terms of the t value of $2.189 > t$ table 2.045. The work environment has a positive and significant effect on performance with a regression coefficient value of 0.554 and a probability value of $0.003 < 0.005$. Partially, the work environment also affects performance in terms of the t value of $3.226 > t$ table 2.045. Job Satisfaction and Work Environment simultaneously affect performance seen from the F value of $10.797 > F$ table 3.32.

Keywords: Employee Performance, Job Satisfaction, Work Environment

ABSTRAK

Tujuan penelitian ini untuk mengetahui pengaruh kepuasan kerja dan lingkungan kerja terhadap kinerja Pegawai. Metode analisis data yang digunakan adalah analisis deskriptif dan analisis regresi linear berganda dengan menggunakan aplikasi SPSS versi 25. Teknik pengumpulan data dalam penelitian ini adalah wawancara, kuesioner dan observasi. Populasi dalam penelitian ini berjumlah 32 orang Pegawai Pada Kantor Dinas Kepemudaan, Olahraga dan Pariwisata Kota Parepare. Teknik pengambilan sampel dalam penelitian ini adalah sampling Jenuh. Sampel dalam penelitian ini merupakan pegawai tetap 28 orang dan 4 orang pegawai tidak tetap) Pada Kantor Dinas Kepemudaan, Olahraga dan Pariwisata Kota Parepare. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa Kepuasan Kerja memiliki pengaruh positif dan tidak signifikan terhadap kinerja dengan nilai koefisien regresi sebesar 0,340 dan nilai probabilitas sebesar $0,037 > 0,005$. Secara parsial kepuasan kerja juga berpengaruh terhadap kinerja ditinjau dari nilai t hitung sebesar $2,189 > t$ tabel 2,045. Lingkungan Kerja memiliki pengaruh positif dan signifikan terhadap kinerja dengan nilai koefisien regresi sebesar 0,554 dan nilai probabilitas sebesar $0,003 < 0,005$. Secara parsial lingkungan kerja juga berpengaruh terhadap kinerja ditinjau dari nilai t hitung sebesar $3,226 > t$ tabel 2,045. Kepuasan Kerja dan Lingkungan Kerja secara simultan berpengaruh terhadap kinerja dilihat dari nilai F hitung sebesar $10,797 > F$ tabel 3,32.

Kata Kunci: Kinerja pegawai, Kepuasan kerja, Lingkungan kerja,

INTRODUCTION

Human resources now play an increasingly large role in the success of an organization or government agency. Humans are potential and strategic resources in life (Zuhaeda, 2019). The potentials that humans have can be seen when they carry out their roles in organizations. Employees are the most important part of the agency, because they have a big role in determining the success of achieving organizational goals. The function and role of employees are needed to maximize the performance, productivity, and effectiveness of the organization through efficient work methods so as to produce added value for the organization (Amellya et al., 2022). Even within the scope of government agencies, employees have an important role in the bureaucracy as the main executor of government tasks. Employees are one of the important organs for the sustainability of a country because of their function as servants of the state and servants of society (Anshari et al., 2022). To develop an organization to be more

advanced, the organization must focus on Human Resources (HR) in this case, namely employees, where employee performance needs to be improved. Good employee performance will also affect the performance of the organization so that it will have a positive impact because it can increase public and government confidence in the organization concerned (Roberts & David, 2020). Job satisfaction is a pleasant or unpleasant emotional state in which employees view their work. Job satisfaction appears in employee attitudes, positive attitudes when satisfied or negative attitudes when dissatisfied (Loan, 2020). Job satisfaction will be related to employee attachment to the organization (Biswas-Diener et al., 2013). Employee dissatisfaction can be shown in various ways, for example, employees complain, disobey, or avoid some of their work responsibilities. The work environment is something that is closely related to the employee where he works. The work environment and employees cannot be separated from the organizational elements that influence each other on employee performance. A conducive work environment will make employees feel at home and work safely and comfortably so that employees can work optimally (Sofyan, 2013). The work environment includes working relationships formed between fellow employees and working relationships between subordinates and superiors and the physical environment in which employees work (Tenriyola & Anshari, 2023). In an effort to create employee performance at the Office of Youth, Sports and Tourism, it seems that there are still several obstacles faced so that it is difficult to achieve organizational goals. These obstacles include: In carrying out their duties, employees sometimes receive more than one job, where the work being done has not been completed plus there is another job that has just been given. So that employees sometimes complain about their work. In addition, the work environment is also an obstacle. The work environment in the Office of the Youth, Sports and Tourism Office, the atmosphere of the office environment is not conducive, such as sufficient space but the arrangement of the work desk is not neat with document files so that it makes it look less neat, even though neatness is one of the factors that trigger enthusiasm to work harder so that it will affect performance. Thus, the existence of job satisfaction and work environment will greatly affect the high and low performance of employees.

RESEARCH METHODS

This study describes the effect of job satisfaction and work environment on employee performance at the Parepare City Youth, Sports and Tourism Office. In this study, 32 employees were taken as research samples. Characteristics of respondents, namely describing the description of the identity of respondents according to the predetermined research sample. One of the objectives with the description of the characteristics of the respondents is to provide an overview of the sample in this study. In this study, the sample characteristics of respondents were grouped according to gender, age, education and tenure.

Table 1. RESPONDENTS BY GENDER

Gender	Total	Percentage (%)
Male	19	59%
Female	13	41%
Total	32	100%

Source: Primary Data (Questionnaire), processed 2023

Table 2. RESPONDENTS BY AGE

Age	Total	Percentage (%)
20 - 30 Years	3	9%

31 - 40 Years	13	41%
41 - 50 Years	9	28%
> 50 Years	7	22%
Total	32	100%

Source: Primary Data (Questionnaire), processed 2023

Table 3. RESPONDENTS BY LAST EDUCATION

Education	Total	Percentage (%)
High school or equivalent	4	12,5%
Diploma III (D3)	1	3%
Strata I (S1)	23	72%
Strata II (S2)	4	12,5%
Total	32	100%

Source: Primary Data (Questionnaire), processed 2023

Table 4. RESPONDENTS BY PERIOD OF SERVICE

Period of Service	Total	Percentage (%)
1-10	10	31%
11-20	14	44%
21-30	8	25%
Total	32	100%

Source: Primary Data (Questionnaire), processed 2023

Data Analysis

The validity test decision making in this study is based on the correlation value, namely the moment product correlation test or better known as the pearson correlation (r count) with the help of the SPSS version 25 application. If decision making is based on the correlation value, the r table value must first be found. Determining the r table with the number of respondents (n), namely 32 respondents, a significance level of 5% with a 2-way test, and a degree of freedom, namely the formula $df = n - 2$, $32 - 2 = 30$.

Table 5. JOB SATISFACTION VARIABLE VALIDITY TEST

		Correlations						
		X1.1	X1.2	X1.3	X1.4	X1.5	X1.6	TOTAL
X1.1	Pearson Correlation	1	.525**	.359*	.388*	.526**	.177	.755**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.002	.043	.028	.002	.332	.000
	N	32	32	32	32	32	32	32
X1.2	Pearson Correlation	.525**	1	.194	.501**	.480**	.311	.773**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.002		.289	.003	.005	.083	.000
	N	32	32	32	32	32	32	32
X1.3	Pearson Correlation	.359*	.194	1	.194	.382*	.217	.623**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.043	.289		.288	.031	.234	.000
	N	32	32	32	32	32	32	32
X1.4	Pearson Correlation	.388*	.501**	.194	1	.128	-.063	.546**



	Sig. (2-tailed)	.028	.003	.288		.485	.732	.001
	N	32	32	32	32	32	32	32
X1.5	Pearson Correlation	.526**	.480**	.382*	.128	1	.235	.695**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.002	.005	.031	.485		.195	.000
	N	32	32	32	32	32	32	32
X1.6	Pearson Correlation	.177	.311	.217	-.063	.235	1	.492**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.332	.083	.234	.732	.195	32	.004
	N	32	32	32	32	32	.492**	32

Source: Primary Data by SPSS V.25, processed 2023

Based on table 5 above, it shows that all total pearson correlation (r count) of each statement in the job satisfaction variable (X₁) is valid. It can be seen that the r value of each statement item is greater than the r table value of 0.349.

Table 6. VALIDITY TEST OF WORK ENVIRONMENT VARIABLE

		Correlations						
		X2.1	X2.2	X2.3	X2.4	X2.5	X2.6	TOTAL
X2.1	Pearson Correlation	1	.228	.258	.119	.129	-.102	.459**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.210	.154	.517	.481	.577	.008
	N	32	32	32	32	32	32	32
X2.2	Pearson Correlation	.228	1	.378*	.423*	.189	-.193	.572**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.210		.033	.016	.300	.290	.001
	N	32	32	32	32	32	32	32
X2.3	Pearson Correlation	.258	.378*	1	.197	.250	.170	.653**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.154	.033		.279	.168	.352	.000
	N	32	32	32	32	32	32	32
X2.4	Pearson Correlation	.119	.423*	.197	1	.428*	.302	.709**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.517	.016	.279		.015	.093	.000
	N	32	32	32	32	32	32	32
X2.5	Pearson Correlation	.129	.189	.250	.428*	1	.198	.635**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.481	.300	.168	.015		.276	.000
	N	32	32	32	32	32	32	32
X2.6	Pearson Correlation	-.102	-.193	.170	.302	.198	1	.426*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.577	.290	.352	.093	.276		.015
	N	32	32	32	32	32	32	32

Source: Primary Data by SPSS V.25, processed 2023

Based on table 6 above, it shows that all total pearson correlation (r count) of each statement in the work environment variable (X₂) is valid. It can be seen that the r value of each statement item is greater than the r table value of 0.349.

Table 7. EMPLOYEE PERFORMANCE VARIABLE VALIDITY TEST

		Correlations						
		Y1	Y2	Y3	Y4	Y5	Y6	TOTAL
Y1	Pearson Correlation	1	.156	.373*	.356*	.392*	.366*	.640**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.395	.036	.046	.027	.039	.000
	N	32	32	32	32	32	32	32
Y2	Pearson Correlation	.156	1	.394*	.367*	.132	.415*	.620**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.395		.026	.039	.470	.018	.000
	N	32	32	32	32	32	32	32
Y3	Pearson Correlation	.373*	.394*	1	.756**	.404*	.246	.764**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.036	.026		.000	.022	.174	.000
	N	32	32	32	32	32	32	32
Y4	Pearson Correlation	.356*	.367*	.756**	1	.441*	.341	.778**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.046	.039	.000		.011	.056	.000
	N	32	32	32	32	32	32	32
Y5	Pearson Correlation	.392*	.132	.404*	.441*	1	.447*	.658**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.027	.470	.022	.011		.010	.000
	N	32	32	32	32	32	32	32
Y6	Pearson Correlation	.366*	.415*	.246	.341	.447*	1	.681**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.039	.018	.174	.056	.010		.000
	N	32	32	32	32	32	32	32

Source: Primary Data by SPSS V.25, processed 2023

Based on table 7 above, it shows that all total pearson correlation (r count) of each statement in the performance variable (Y) is valid. It can be seen that the r value of each statement item is greater than the r table value of 0.349.

The reliability test used in this study is using the Cronbach alpha method. Decision making for the reliability test uses the Cronbach alpha reliability level (Bass et al., 2001) as follows:

- - 0.20 = Less Reliable
- >0.20 - 0.40 = Somewhat Reliable
- >0.40 - 0.60 = Moderately Reliable
- >0.60 - 0.80 = Reliable
- >0.80 - 1.00 = Very Reliable

Table 8. RESEARCH VARIABLE RELIABILITY TEST

Variable	Cronbach Alpha	Ket.
Job Satisfaction	0,719	Reliable
Work Environment	0,589	Moderately Reliable
Employee Performance	0,775	Reliable

Source: Processed Primary Data, 2023

Table 9. MULTIPLE LINEAR REGRESSION ANALYSIS



Coefficients^a

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
	(Constant)	2.602	5.015		
1 Job Satisfaction	.340	.155	.323	2.189	.037
Work Environment	.554	.172	.477	3.226	.003

a. Dependent Variable: Employee Performance

Source: Primary Data (Questionnaire), processed 2023

From the results of the multiple linear regression analysis above, it can be seen that the multiple linear regression equation regarding the effect of job satisfaction (X_1) and work environment (X_2) on performance (Y), can be written in the following equation:

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

$$Y = 2,602 + 0,340 X_1 + 0,554 X_2$$

Table 10. PARTIAL TEST RESULTS (t-test)

Coefficients^a

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
	(Constant)	2.602	5.015		
1 Job Satisfaction	.340	.155	.323	2.189	.037
Work Environment	.554	.172	.477	3.226	.003

a. Dependent Variable: Employee Performance

Source: Primary Data (Questionnaire), processed 2023

Based on the table above, it can be seen that the t count for variable X_1 (job satisfaction) of 2.189 > t table 2.045 shows that H_0 is rejected, which means that job satisfaction has a partial effect on performance. Meanwhile, the t count for variable X_2 (work environment) of 3.226 > t table 2.045 shows that H_0 is rejected, which means that the work environment has a partial effect on performance.

Table 10. SIMULTANEOUS TEST RESULTS (F TEST)

ANOVA^a

Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1 Regression	54.724	2	27.362	10.797	.000 ^b
Residual	73.495	29	2.534		
Total	128.219	31			

a. Dependent Variable: Employee Performance



b. Predictors: (Constant), Job Satisfaction, Work Environment

Source: Primary Data (Questionnaire), processed 2023

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

This study aims to examine the effect of Job Satisfaction and Work Environment on Employee Performance at the Youth and Sports Department of Tourism of Parepare City. Based on the results of the analysis, the discussion of the research results is as follows.

1. The Effect of Job Satisfaction on Performance

The results showed that job satisfaction partially affected the performance of employees at the Youth and Sports Department of Tourism of Parepare City, where the results obtained by job satisfaction had a t value of $2.189 > t$ table 2.045 . Indicates H_0 is rejected and H_a is accepted. Based on the results of multiple linear regression analysis, the regression coefficient value is 0.340 . The positive coefficient value indicates that job satisfaction on performance has a positive effect. This illustrates that the value of employee performance will increase from Job Satisfaction. In addition, the probability value of Job Satisfaction is $0.037 < 0.005$, which means that the job satisfaction variable does not have a significant effect on employee performance.

2. The Effect of Work Environment on Performance

The results showed that the work environment partially influenced the performance of employees at the Youth and Sports Department of Tourism of Parepare City, where the results obtained by the work environment had a t value of $3.226 > t$ table 2.045 . indicates that H_0 is rejected and H_a is accepted. Based on the results of multiple linear regression analysis, the regression coefficient value is 0.554 . The positive coefficient value indicates that the work environment on performance has a positive effect. This illustrates that the value of employee performance will increase from the work environment. In addition, the probability value of the work environment is $0.003 < 0.005$, which means that the work environment variable has a significant effect on employee performance.

3. The Effect of Job Satisfaction and Work Environment on Performance

The results showed that job satisfaction and work environment simultaneously affect the performance of employees at the Youth and Sports Department of Tourism of Parepare City, where the results obtained from the calculated F value of $10.797 > F$ table 3.32 indicate that H_0 is rejected or H_a is accepted.

CONCLUSION

Based on the results of the analysis discussed in the previous chapter, it can be concluded that the effect of the Work Environment on employee performance has an effect but not significant on employee performance variables not significant to the Employee performance variable. The results showed that the effect of Job Satisfaction on employee performance was influential but not significant. The results of The results showed that the effect of job satisfaction on employee performance positive and significant effect. The results showed that there was a positive and significant influence between Work Environment variables, Job satisfaction and workload on employee performance at the Youth and Sports Department of Tourism of Parepare City.

References

- Amellya, A., Fitriasuri, F., & Elpanso, E. (2022). Pengaruh Kompetensi dan Motivasi terhadap Kinerja Pegawai pada Badan Pengelola Keuangan dan Aset Daerah Kabupaten Banyuasin. *Mbia*, *21*(1), 98–110. <https://doi.org/10.33557/mbia.v21i1.1667>
- Anshari, A., Tenriyola, A. P., & Asike, A. (2022). Peranan Kompetensi Karyawan SDM

- Terhadap Peningkatan Kinerja. *Amsir Management Journal*, 3(1), 42–48.
<https://doi.org/10.56341/amj.v3i1.115>
- Bass, D. A., Hickok, D., Quig, D., & Urek, K. (2001). Trace element analysis in hair: Factors determining accuracy, precision, and reliability. *Alternative Medicine Review*, 6(5), 472–481.
- Biswas-Diener, R. M., Buss, D. M., Cacioppo, J. T., Compton, R. J., Diener, C., Diener, E., Diener, M. L., McGavran, M. B. D., Eid, M., Emmons, R. A., & Al, E. (2013). *The science of subjective well-being*.
- Loan, L. T. M. (2020). The influence of organizational commitment on employees' job performance: The mediating role of job satisfaction. *Management Science Letters*, 10(14), 3307–3312. <https://doi.org/10.5267/j.msl.2020.6.007>
- Roberts, J. A., & David, M. E. (2020). Boss phubbing, trust, job satisfaction and employee performance. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 155(November), 109702. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2019.109702>
- Sofyan, D. K. (2013). Pengaruh Lingkungan Kerja Terhadap Kinerja Kerja Pegawai BAPPEDA. *Malikussaleh Industrial Engineering*, 2(1), 18–23.
- Tenriyola, A. P., & Anshari, A. (2023). *MANARANG : Jurnal Manajemen dan Bisnis Pengaruh Kompetensi dan Lingkungan Kerja Terhadap Kinerja Pegawai di Badan Kesbangpol Kabupaten Pangkep*. 04(1), 2–4.
- Zuhaeda. (2019). Resources and Communication Optimalization. *Journal Of Educational Administration And Review*, 3(1), 1–9.