The Effect of Human Resource Quality and Work Environment on Job Satisfaction at the Bank Indonesia Representative Office in Pematang Siantar

Saut Aprino Tambunan, Darmilisani Rahayu, Sri

Abstract

This study examines the effect of human resource (HR) quality and work environment on the job satisfaction of employees at the Bank Indonesia Representative Office in Pematang Siantar. A quantitative approach with saturated sampling was applied to 38 employees; 37 complete questionnaires were analyzed using multiple linear regression in SPSS. The results show that HR quality has no significant effect on job satisfaction ($t = -0.329$; Sig. = 0.745), nor does the work environment ($t = 0.678$; Sig. = 0.502). Simultaneously, both variables have no significant effect ($F = 0.249$; Sig. = 0.781), with $R^2 = 0.014$. Employee job satisfaction is already very high (mean 4.59 out of 5), leaving too little variation to be explained by the independent variables.

Keywords: HR quality, work environment, job satisfaction, Bank Indonesia, multiple linear regression

Saut Aprino Tambunan
Department, Affiliation, Country
e-mail: aprinoaje@gmail.com

Darmilisani [2)] , Sri Rahayu[3)]
e-mail: darmilisani@dosen.pancabudi.ac.id ,srirahayu@dosen.pancabudi.ac.id.
3rd International Conference Epicentrum of Economic Global Framework (ICEEGLOF)
Theme: Cross-Sector and Cross-Disciplinary Strategies for Achieving the SDGS
https://proceeding.pancabudi.ac.id/index.php/ICEEGLOF

Introduction

Human resources are an organization's main asset, including public institutions such as Bank Indonesia, which is mandated to maintain the stability of the rupiah, the payment system, and the financial system. The Bank Indonesia Representative Office (KPw BI) in Pematang Siantar carries out these functions at the regional level, so its performance depends on employees who are competent and satisfied with their work.

Job satisfaction is a pleasant emotional attitude toward one's work (Hasibuan, 2017). Satisfied employees tend to be more loyal, more productive, and less often absent (Robbins & Judge, 2017). Two factors often associated with job satisfaction are human resource (HR) quality, namely employees' abilities, knowledge, and attitudes, and the work environment, namely the physical and non-physical conditions in which employees work (Sedarmayanti, 2017).

Based on this background, the research questions are:

1. Does HR quality affect job satisfaction at KPw BI Pematang Siantar?
2. Does the work environment affect job satisfaction at KPw BI Pematang Siantar?
3. Do HR quality and the work environment simultaneously affect job satisfaction at KPw BI Pematang Siantar?

This study aims to test and analyze the effect of HR quality and the work environment, both partially and simultaneously, on the job satisfaction of employees at KPw BI Pematang Siantar.

Literature Review

2.1 Human Resource Quality

HR quality is the level of employee ability, covering the knowledge, skills, and attitudes needed to perform the job (Sedarmayanti, 2017). In this study, HR quality is measured with four indicators (X1.1–X1.4) reflecting knowledge, skills, abilities, and work attitude.

2.2. Work Environment

The work environment is the totality of tools, materials, atmosphere, work methods, and work arrangements surrounding employees (Sedarmayanti, 2017). It consists of physical aspects (lighting, air circulation, cleanliness, equipment) and non-physical aspects (relationships with supervisors and co-workers). This variable is measured with four indicators (X2.1–X2.4).

2.3 Job Satisfaction

Job satisfaction is a pleasurable emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one's job or job experiences (Locke, 1976). According to Robbins and Judge (2017), job satisfaction is influenced by the work itself, pay, promotion, supervision, and co-workers. This variable is measured with four indicators (Y.1–Y.4).

Research Methodology

This study uses an associative quantitative approach. The population consists of all 38 employees of KPw BI Pematang Siantar, all of whom were taken as the sample (saturated sampling) because the population is smaller than 100 (Sugiyono, 2019). One respondent did not answer two job satisfaction items (Y.3 and Y.4), so the regression analysis uses 37 complete cases (*listwise* deletion, the SPSS default).

Data were collected using a 1–5 Likert-scale questionnaire (1 = strongly disagree, 5 = strongly agree). Each variable is measured with four statements, so the total score per variable ranges from 4 to 20.

The data were analyzed in IBM SPSS through the following stages:

1. Validity test (*Pearson product moment* correlation between each item and the total score; an item is valid if r count > r table of 0.320 at $n = 38$, $\alpha = 0.05$).
2. Reliability test (*Cronbach's Alpha*; reliable if $\alpha > 0.60$) (Ghozali, 2018).
3. Classical assumption tests: normality (*One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov*), multicollinearity (Tolerance > 0.10 and VIF < 10), and heteroscedasticity (Glejser test).
4. Multiple linear regression, t-test, F-test, and coefficient of determination (R^2).

The regression model used is:

$Y = a + b_1X_1 + b_2X_2 + e$

Y is job satisfaction, X1 is HR quality, X2 is the work environment, a is the constant, b1 and b2 are the regression coefficients, and e is the error term. The t table value is 2.032 (df = 34) and the F table value is 3.276 (df1 = 2, df2 = 34) at $\alpha = 0.05$.

Results

4.1 Validity Test

Eleven of the twelve items are valid (r count > 0.320). Item X1.2 is not valid (r = 0.170; Sig. = 0.308).

Table 2. Validity Test Results

Item	r count	r table	Sig.	Remarks
X1.1	0.777	0.320	0.000	Valid
X1.2	0.170	0.320	0.308	Not valid
X1.3	0.702	0.320	0.000	Valid
X1.4	0.736	0.320	0.000	Valid
X2.1	0.717	0.320	0.000	Valid
X2.2	0.634	0.320	0.000	Valid
X2.3	0.432	0.320	0.007	Valid
X2.4	0.692	0.320	0.000	Valid
Y.1	0.777	0.325	0.000	Valid
Y.2	0.826	0.325	0.000	Valid
Y.3	0.643	0.325	0.000	Valid
Y.4	0.676	0.325	0.000	Valid

Sumber : Output SPSS

4.2 Reliability Test

Only the job satisfaction variable is reliable. HR quality and the work environment have *Cronbach's Alpha* values below 0.60.

Table 3. Reliability Test Results

Variable	Cronbach's Alpha	Threshold	Remarks
HR Quality (X1)	0.391	0.60	Not reliable
Work Environment (X2)	0.459	0.60	Not reliable
Job Satisfaction (Y)	0.711	0.60	Reliable

Sumber : Output SPSS

If item X1.2 is deleted, the alpha of X1 rises to 0.737 (reliable); if X2.3 is deleted, the alpha of X2 becomes 0.601. The low alpha values are caused by the narrow range of answers (only 4 and 5), which weakens the inter-item correlations.

4.3 Classical Assumption Tests

The regression model meets all three classical assumptions.

Table 4. Classical Assumption Test Results

Test	Statistic	Criterion	Remarks
Normality (Kolmogorov-Smirnov, residuals)	KS = 0.134; Sig. = 0.089	Sig. > 0.05	Normal
Multicollinearity X1	Tolerance = 0.958; VIF = 1.044	VIF < 10	Not present
Multicollinearity X2	Tolerance = 0.958; VIF = 1.044	VIF < 10	Not present
Heteroscedasticity (Glejser) X1	Sig. = 0.325	Sig. > 0.05	Not present
Heteroscedasticity (Glejser) X2	Sig. = 0.757	Sig. > 0.05	Not present

Sumber : Output SPSS

4.4 Multiple Linear Regression and t-Test

Table 5. Regression Coefficients

Model	B	Std. Error	Beta	t count	Sig.
(Constant)	17.030	5.017	–	3.394	0.002
HR Quality (X1)	-0.074	0.226	-0.057	-0.329	0.745

Model	B	Std. Error	Beta	t count	Sig.
Work Environment (X2)	0.149	0.219	0.118	0.678	0.502

Sumber : Output SPSS

The resulting regression equation is:

$$Y = 17.030 - 0.074X_1 + 0.149X_2 + e$$

The constant of 17.030 means that job satisfaction is already high without accounting for the two independent variables. The coefficient of X1 is slightly negative and that of X2 slightly positive, but neither is significant.

H1 rejected: t count X1 = -0.329 < t table 2.032 and Sig. 0.745 > 0.05.

H2 rejected: t count X2 = 0.678 < t table 2.032 and Sig. 0.502 > 0.05.

4.5 F-Test and Coefficient of Determination

Table 6. ANOVA and Model Summary

Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Regression	1.276	2	0.638	0.249	0.781
Residual	87.156	34	2.563		
Total	88.432	36			

Sumber : Output SPSS

H3 rejected: F count 0.249 < F table 3.276 and Sig. 0.781 > 0.05. R = 0.120, R^2 = 0.014, and Adjusted R^2 = -0.044. This means HR quality and the work environment explain only 1.4% of the variation in job satisfaction; the remaining 98.6% is explained by other factors outside the model.

Conclusion

1. HR quality has no significant effect on the job satisfaction of employees at KPw BI Pematang Siantar (Sig. 0.745).
2. The work environment has a positive but non-significant effect on job satisfaction (Sig. 0.502).
3. Simultaneously, the two variables have no significant effect (Sig. 0.781) and explain only 1.4% of the variation in job satisfaction.

References

[1] Arikunto, S. (2018). *Prosedur penelitian: Suatu pendekatan praktik* (Edisi revisi). Jakarta: Rineka Cipta.

[2] Armstrong, M. (2020). *Armstrong's handbook of human resource management practice* (15th ed.). London: Kogan Page.

[3] Colquitt, J. A., LePine, J. A., & Wesson, M. J. (2019). *Organizational behavior: Improving performance and commitment in the workplace* (6th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill Education.

[4] Damanik, A., Rahayu, S., & Ferine, K. F. (2025). *The influence of competence and work environment to improve the performance of ASN employees by work motivation as an intervening variable at the Regional Secretariat Kota Tebing Tinggi*. Jurnal Multidisiplin Indonesia, 4(12). https://doi.org/10.58344/jmi.v4i12.2566

[5] Darmilisani, D., Istiqamah, N. K., & Hasibuan, R. F. (2024). *Analisis disiplin kerja, aksesibilitas dan produktivitas terhadap kinerja guru di SMAN 4 Medan*. Jurnal Bina Bangsa Ekonomika, 17(1), 585–598. https://doi.org/10.46306/jbbe.v17i1.529

[6] Dessler, G. (2019). *Human resource management* (16th ed.). New York: Pearson.

[7] Ghozali, I. (2018). *Aplikasi analisis multivariate dengan program IBM SPSS* (Edisi 9). Semarang: Badan Penerbit Universitas Diponegoro.

[8] Ghozali, I., & Latan, H. (2018). *Partial least squares: Konsep, teknik, dan aplikasi menggunakan program SmartPLS 3.0* (Edisi 2). Semarang: Badan Penerbit Universitas Diponegoro.
[9] Hair, J. F., Hult, G. T. M., Ringle, C. M., & Sarstedt, M. (2020). *A primer on partial least squares structural equation modeling (PLS-SEM)* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
[10] Kreitner, R., & Kinicki, A. (2018). *Organizational behavior* (11th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill Education.
[11] Luthans, F. (2019). *Organizational behavior: An evidence-based approach* (13th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.
[12] Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. (2018). *Commitment in the workplace: Theory, research, and application*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
[13] Milkovich, G. T., Newman, J. M., & Gerhart, B. (2019). *Compensation* (13th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill Education.
[14] Musyarofah, S., et al. (2021). Pengaruh reward terhadap kepuasan kerja karyawan. *Jurnal Manajemen dan Bisnis*, 5(2), 123–130.
[15] Nashrudin Setiawan, Akhmad Taufik, Emi Wakhyuni, Abdi Setiawan, Surya Asih, Sri Rahayu, Yossie Rossanty, MDTP Nasution (2018), *The effect of organizational commitment, work climate and career development toward employee's work morale at universitas pembangunan panca budi*, Jurnal human resources
[16] Newstrom, J. W. (2018). *Organizational behavior: Human behavior at work* (14th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill Education.
[17] Nitisemito, A. S. (2017). *Manajemen personalia*. Jakarta: Ghalia Indonesia.
[18] Noe, R. A., Hollenbeck, J. R., Gerhart, B., & Wright, P. M. (2017). *Human resource management: Gaining a competitive advantage* (10th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill Education.
[19] Qhalis, A. N., & Rahayu, S. (2024). *Analisis motivasi, kepuasan kerja dan komitmen terhadap kinerja karyawan pada PT Gergas Utama Medan*. Jurnal Ekonomi Bisnis dan Manajemen, 2(4). https://doi.org/10.59024/jise.v2i4.950
[20] RA Darmilisani (2025), *Building A Superior Team Through Human Resource Development For PT Pertamina Employees In North Sumatra Region*, International Journal of Management, Economic and Accounting 2 (3), 48-55, 2025
[21] Robbins, S. P., & Coulter, M. (2017). *Management* (13th ed.). New York: Pearson Education.
[22] Robbins, S. P., & Judge, T. A. (2018). *Organizational behavior* (17th ed.). New York: Pearson.
[23] SAMS Mifta Sudrajad, Darmilisani(2025), *Pengaruh Gaya Kepemimpinan Situasional, Disiplin Kerja Dan Pengalaman Kerja Terhadap Prestasi Kerja Karyawan Hotel Fourpoints By Sheraton Medan,* JOURNAL OF COMMUNITY RESEARCH AND SERVICE 9 (1), 2549-1849, 2025
[24] Sedarmayanti. (2018). *Manajemen sumber daya manusia: Reformasi birokrasi dan manajemen pegawai negeri sipil*. Bandung: Refika Aditama.
[25] Sedarmayanti. (2018). *Tata kerja dan produktivitas kerja: Suatu tinjauan dari aspek ergonomi atau kaitan antara manusia dengan lingkungan kerjanya* (Edisi revisi). Bandung: Mandar Maju.
[26] Sekaran, U., & Bougie, R. (2018). *Research methods for business: A skill-building approach* (7th ed.). Chichester: Wiley.
[27] Sugiyono. (2019). *Metode penelitian kuantitatif, kualitatif, dan R&D*. Bandung: Alfabeta.