



Received: July 14, 2024

Revised: July 28, 2024

Accepted: July 29, 2024

*Corresponding author: Dwi Hartutik,
Department of Commercial Administration
Science, STIA Lancang Kuning Dumai,
Indonesia.

E-mail: dwiek26@gmail.com

DESCRIPTIVE OF QUANTITATIVE DATA | SUPPLEMENTARY

Job Satisfaction with The Performance of Employees of PT. Pos Indonesia (Persero) Dumai Branch

Dwi Hartutik^{1*}, Novelma Lastri², Suherman³, Andi Desy Musdiana⁴

^{1,2,3,4} Department of Commercial Administration Science, STIA Lancang Kuning Dumai, Indonesia. Email: dwiek26@gmail.com, novelmalastriz37@gmail.com, suherman.mkkp@gmail.com, andiidesymusdiana@gmail.com

Abstract: Employee satisfaction at work is certainly inseparable from the company's role in managing its employees. The satisfaction that arises will certainly have a positive impact on increasing work productivity. This research was conducted with the aim of determining the effect of job satisfaction on the performance of employees of PT. Pos Indonesia (Persero) Dumai Branch. The symptoms encountered such as the suboptimal availability of work support facilities, frequent employee turnover and the finding of several results of employee work assessments that declined became the starting point for this study. The location of the research is PT Pos Indonesia Dumai Branch. The study used a survey involving a sample of 35 people with a census sampling technique. The results of the study were obtained that there was an effect of job satisfaction on employee performance to increase the company's revenue results with details of job satisfaction results of 69.3% and employee performance of 73.8%. Further research in the future is very necessary for scientific development, especially in looking at the relationship between job satisfaction and employee performance.

Keywords: Job Satisfaction, Employee Performance

1. INTRODUCTION

In Indonesia, public organisations must provide excellent, effective public services while prioritizing transparency for the public. Optimal service quality is a key factor that determines public satisfaction. Every public organization tries to provide high-quality services to ensure public satisfaction (Hijeriah, Erlianti, Shaliza, & Afrizal, 2023). This surely encourages government service implementation units to continue to improve and innovate to provide great services to the community. The central and local governments have implemented quality services (Afrizal, Wallang, et al., 2023). Many local government agencies are currently actively developing service innovations that will maximize service delivery while also satisfying the community as service recipients (Hafrida et al., 2023; Afrizal, Saputra, et al., 2023). This also applies to local hospitals, which have to offer quality health services. A hospital is an organization that delivers and organizes health services for the community, backed up by medical personnel, supporting facilities, and medical equipment (Hijeriah, Erlianti, Shaliza, & Afrizal, 2023). Various service improvements are implemented to create superior health services. Various service improvements are implemented to offer high-quality healthcare services. Efforts to determine what must be mended, improved, or increased are critical. One of the efforts carried out in the process of providing quality services is to assess the public satisfaction index with the health services provided.

Community satisfaction is also known as patient satisfaction, which is the consequence of patient opinions and assessments of the quality of services offered by the hospital (Yuliana et al., 2024). Patient satisfaction shows the hospital's ability to provide excellent medical services (Susana et al., 2023). Patient satisfaction is a reaction that patients should experience when comparing the performance of healthcare services to their expectations (Hamida & Assiddiq, 2023). Measuring public satisfaction is intended to determine the level of public satisfaction with the services delivered



and to allow the public to rate the services they have received (Hamida & Assiddiq, 2023; Efendi et al., 2024). This is an action to improve service quality and speed efforts to meet performance targets for the state apparatus in the framework of public service organizations (Erlianti et al., 2021). The measurement of public satisfaction with services has, of course, been controlled in regulation of the minister of state apparatus empowerment and bureaucratic reform of the Republic of Indonesia Number 14 of 2017 concerning guidelines for compiling public satisfaction surveys of public service provider units. It includes detailed instructions for measuring the Community Satisfaction Index. Dumai city hospital is one of the regional government institutions that has given high-quality services. Currently, this hospital is known as Dr. Suhatman, MARS. Dumai city hospital, being a hospital with comprehensive facilities, particularly in servicing the population who require health services in Dumai City, may also accommodate patients from other districts. Dumai City Hospital is a Type B government hospital that offers medical services (Rosanti et al., 2022).

The management of the Dumai City Hospital which can fulfill the wishes of the community as its patients is certainly an essential thing (Kurniawan et al., 2022). Especially while inspecting and assessing the services of a hospital owned by the Dumai City government. Dumai City Hospital's primary criteria for providing quality services is compliance with acknowledged health service standards. Dumai City Hospital is a category B hospital that currently serves as a referral center for various other hospitals. Aside from having excellent facilities and infrastructure, this hospital provides one of the most comprehensive medical services in Dumai City. Dumai City Hospital provides polyclinic services in obstetrics and gynecology, children, internal medicine, heart, general surgery, nerves, neurosurgery, eyes, skin and genitals, teeth, pediatric dental care, oral surgery, and various other services. According to data from the Ministry of Health's official website, Dumai Regional Hospital provides 61 services (https://sirs.kemkes.go.id/fo/home/profile_rs/1473013).

Several investigations on Dumai City Hospital indicated that the healthcare delivery mechanism was still not optimum (Hildawati et al., 2022). The necessity for innovation about patient waiting times, which affects public satisfaction with the services offered (Hijeriah, Erlianti, Shaliza, Sofyan, et al., 2023). The aspect of facilities and infrastructure is also a point that must be improved to support hospital operations (Odelia, 2018). The process of monitoring and reporting damage, as well as technical limits associated with facilities and infrastructure, must be enhanced to improve patient service quality (Fauzi et al., 2023). In addition, the most recent study from Dumai City Hospital included many BPJS Health patients (Mutu et al., 2022). Meanwhile, the quality of outpatient or polyclinic services for BPJS customers at the Public Hospital is rated as excellent but has not yet achieved a good level (Khaz et al., 2024). Obstacles to providing these services must also be considered, such as medical personnel training, finance, and facility and infrastructure improvements (Nisa & Tua, 2023). Meanwhile, for the most recent research, the measurement of the public satisfaction index specifically for BPJS Health card holders about the services of Dumai City Hospital received an IKM value of 74.73. Based on the public satisfaction index value, the Dumai City Hospital service performance is classified as Good, with a Service Quality of "B" (Hildawati et al., 2022). According to the conclusions of analysts, no one is now focusing on the total Public Satisfaction Index of Dumai City Hospital's services. What is commonly observed is for specific service categories and groups of patients. This study is intended to fill this gap. It is hoped that it will contribute to policymakers' efforts to improve services at Dumai City Hospital.

Table 1. Respondent Characteristics

Age (Years)			
1	20 – 30	15	42,85 %
2	31 – 40	10	28,57 %
3	41 – 50	6	17,14 %
4	51 – 60	4	11,43 %
Gender			
1	Man	20	57,14 %

2	Women	15	42,86 %
Education Level			
1	Senior High School	23	65,71%
2	Diploma-3	7	20 %
3	Bachelor	5	14,29 %
Work Length Period (Years)			
1	< 4	16	45,72 %
2	5 - 13	11	31,43 %
3	14 - 20	5	14,28 %
4	21 - 27	2	5,71 %
5	28 - 34	1	2,86 %

Table 2. Validity Test of Job Satisfaction Variable

No	Assessment Item	Corrected Item Total Correlation	Sig. 1-tailed	Info
1	Psychological Factors	0.690	0.001	Valid
2	Social Factors	0.720	0.000	Valid
3	Physical Factors	0.710	0.008	Valid
4	Financial Factors	0.660	0.011	Valid

Table 3. Employee Performance Variable Validity Test

No	Assessment Item	Corrected Item Total Correlation	Sig. 1-tailed	Info
1	Quality	0.670	0.003	Valid
2	Quantity	0.560	0.006	Valid
3	Time	0.620	0.001	Valid
4	Cost Emphasis	0.680	0.002	Valid
5	Surveillance	0.710	0.008	Valid
6	Employee Relations	0,760	0.009	Valid

Table 4. Reliability Test Results of Research Variables

Variable	Cronbach Alpha	N of Item	Info
Job Satisfaction Variable	0.695	4	Reliable
Employee Performance Variable	0.648	6	Reliable

Table 5. Results of t-test Coefficients^a

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	7,413	,690		10,741	,000
	Job Satisfaction	,043	,143	,044	,302	,764

a. Dependent Variable: Job Satisfaction

Table 6. R² Test Results Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	,044 ^a	,002	-,019	1,380

a. Predictors: (Constant), Job Satisfaction

Table 7. Respondents' Responses on Psychological Factors

No	Assessment Item	Rating Category					Total	Weight
		Not Satisfied	Less Satisfied	Quite Satisfied	Satisfied	Very Satisfied		
1.	Peace of Mind	-	-	25 71,4%	10 28,6%	-	35	115
2.	Attitude Toward Work	-	-	20 57,1%	15 42,9%	-	35	120

No	Assessment Item	Rating Category					Total	Weight
		Not Satisfied	Less Satisfied	Quite Satisfied	Satisfied	Very Satisfied		
3	Work Feeling	-	-	15 42,8%	20 57,2%	-	35	125
Total		-	-	60	45	-	105	360
Mean		-	-	20	15	-	35	120
Percentage		-	-	57,1%	42,9%	-	100 %	68,5%

Table 8. Respondents' Responses on Social Factors

No	Assessment Item	Rating Category					Total	Weight
		Not Satisfied	Less Satisfied	Quite Satisfied	Satisfied	Very Satisfied		
1.	Interaction between Employees	-	-	20 57,1 %	15 42,9 %	-	35	120
2.	Interaction with superiors	-	-	15 42,9 %	20 57,1 %	-	35	125
3.	Interaction with the Environment	-	-	16 45,7 %	19 54,3 %	-	35	124
Total		-	-	51	54	-	105	369
Mean		-	-	17	18	-	35	123
Percentage		-	-	48,5%	51,5 %	-	100 %	70,2%

Table 9. Respondents' Responses Regarding Physical Factor Indicators

No	Assessment Item	Rating Category					Total	Weight
		Not Satisfied	Less Satisfied	Quite Satisfied	Satisfied	Very Satisfied		
1.	Facilities and Infrastructure	-	-	20 57,1%	15 42,9%	-	35	120
2.	Type of Work	-	-	15 42,8%	20 57,2%	-	35	125
3	Work Hours	-	-	16 45,7%	19 54,3%	-	35	124
Total		-	-	51	54	-	105	369
Mean		-	-	17	18	-	35	123
Percentage		-	-	48,5%	51,5 %	-	100 %	70,2%

Table 10. Respondents' Responses on Financial Factors

No	Assessment Item	Rating Category					Total	Weight
		Not Satisfied	Less Satisfied	Quite Satisfied	Satisfied	Very Satisfied		
1.	Bonus	-	-	25 71,4%	10 28,6 %	-	35	115
2.	Promotion	-	-	20 57,2%	15 42,8%	-	35	120
3	Job Security	-	-	15 36 %	20 64 %	-	35	125
Total		-	-	60	45	-	105	360
Mean		-	-	20	15	-	35	120
Percentage		-	-	57,2%	42,8%	-	100 %	68,5%

Table 11. Respondents' Responses on Quality Indicators

No	Assessment Item	Rating Category					Total	Weight
		Not Satisfied	Less Satisfied	Quite Satisfied	Satisfied	Very Satisfied		
1.	Responsiveness	-	-	10 28,5 %	25 71,5 %	-	35	130
2.	Circumstances	-	-	10 28,5 %	25 71,5 %	-	35	130
3	Tangible	-	-	10 28,5 %	25 71,5 %	-	35	130
Total		-	-	30	75	-	105	390
Mean		-	-	10	25	-	35	130
Percentage		-	-	28,5 %	71,5 %	-	100 %	74,2%

Table 12. Respondents' Responses Regarding Quantitative Indicators

No	Assessment Item	Rating Category					Total	Weight
		Not Satisfied	Less Satisfied	Quite Satisfied	Satisfied	Very Satisfied		
1.	Revenue generation	-	-	12 34,2 %	23 65,8 %	-	35	128
2.	Unit result	-	-	12 34,2 %	23 65,8 %	-	35	128
3	Activities completed	-	-	12 34,2 %	23 65,8 %	-	35	128
Total		-	-	36	69	-	105	384
Mean		-	-	12	23	-	35	128
Percentage		-	-	34,2 %	65,8 %	-	100 %	73,1%

Table13. Respondents' Responses About Time

No	Assessment Item	Rating Category					Total	Weight
		Not Satisfied	Less Satisfied	Quite Satisfied	Satisfied	Very Satisfied		
1.	Accuracy	-	-	12 34,2 %	23 65,8 %	-	35	128
2.	Speed	-	-	12 34,2 %	23 65,8 %	-	35	128
3	Compatibility	-	-	12 34,2 %	23 65,8 %	-	35	128
Total		-	-	36	69	-	105	384
Mean		-	-	12	23	-	35	128
Percentage		-	-	34,2 %	65,8 %	-	100 %	73,1%

Table 14. Respondents' Responses Regarding Cost Emphasis Indicators

No	Assessment Item	Rating Category					Total	Weight
		Not Satisfied	Less Satisfied	Quite Satisfied	Satisfied	Very Satisfied		
1.	Promotion	-	-	6 17,1%	29 82,9%	-	35	134
2.	Reward	-	-	6 17,1%	116 82,9%	-	35	134
3	Spending	-	-	6 17,1%	116 82,9%	-	35	134
Total		-	-	18	87	-	105	402
Mean		-	-	6	29	-	35	134
Percentage		-	-	17,1%	82,9%	-	100 %	76,5%

Table 15. Respondents' Responses (Supervision) The Effect of Job Satisfaction on Employee Performance

No	Assessment Item	Rating Category					Total	Weight
		Not Satisfied	Less Satisfied	Quite Satisfied	Satisfied	Very Satisfied		
1.	Direct	-	-	20 57,1%	15 42,9%	-	35	120
2.	In Direct	-	-	20 57,1%	15 42,9%	-	35	120
3	Others	-	-	20 57,1%	15 42,9%	-	35	120
Total		-	-	60	45	-	105	360
Mean		-	-	20	15	-	35	120
Percentage		-	-	57,1%	42,9%	-	100 %	68,5%

Table 16. Respondents' Responses (Relationships Between Employees) The Effect of Job Satisfaction on Employee Performance

No	Assessment Item	Rating Category					Total	Weight
		Not Satisfied	Less Satisfied	Quite Satisfied	Satisfied	Very Satisfied		
1.	Ability	-	-	20 57,1%	15 42,9%	-	35	120
2.	Cooperation	-	-	20 57,1%	15 42,9%	-	35	120
3	Group	-	-	20 57,1%	15 42,9%	-	35	120
Total		-	-	60	45	-	105	360
Mean		-	-	20	15	-	35	120
Percentage		-	-	57,1%	42,9%	-	100 %	68,5%

Table 17. Recapitulation of the Effect of Job Satisfaction on Employee Performance

No	Variables	Indicators	Response					Total	Weight	Result	Info
			NS	LS	QS	S	VS				
1	Job Satisfaction	Psychological Factors	-	-	20	15	-	105	120	360	Satisfied
		Factors Social	-	-	17	18	-	105	123	369	Satisfied
		Factors Physical	-	-	17	18	-	105	123	369	Satisfied
		Financial Factors	-	-	20	15	-	105	120	360	Satisfied
Total			-	-	74	66	-	420	486	1458	Satisfied

Table 18. Recapitulation of the Effect of Job Satisfaction on Employee Performance

No	Variables	Indicators	Response					Total	Weight	Result	Info
			NS	LS	QS	S	VS				
1	Employee Performance	Quality	-	-	10	25	-	105	130	390	Satisfied
		Quantity	-	-	12	23	-	105	128	384	Satisfied
		Time	-	-	12	23	-	105	128	384	Satisfied
		Cost Emphasis	-	-	6	29	-	105	134	402	Satisfied
		Surveillance	-	-	20	15	-	105	120	360	Satisfied
		Relationship between employees	-	-	20	15		105	120	360	Satisfied
Total			-	-	80	130		630	760	2280	Satisfied

REFERENCES

- Afrizal, D. (2018). Analisis Kinerja Birokrasi Publik pada Dinas Sosial Kota Dumai. *SOROT*, 13(1), 53–63. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.31258/sorot.13.1.5655>
- Cooper, D. R. (1998). *Metode Penelitian Bisnis* (Jilid 2). Erlangga.
- Daryanto, F., FoEh, J. E. H. J., & Simon Sia Niha. (2023). Pengaruh Motivasi, Budaya Organisasi, dan Lingkungan Kerja terhadap Kinerja Karyawan Melalui Kepuasan Kerja sebagai Variabel Mediasi (Kajian Studi Literatur Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia). *Jurnal Ilmu Multidisplin*, 2(2), 217--225. <https://greenpub.org/JIM/article/view/348>
- Erlianti, D., Khaz, F., Wibowo, A., Tinggi, S., Lancang, I. A., Dumai, K., & Artikel, I. (2023). Kepuasan Pelanggan Pada PT FIF Group Cabang Dumai. *Jurnal Ilmiah Ekonomi Dan Pajak (EJAK)*, 3(1), 30–34. <https://ojs-cjak.id/index.php/Ejak>
- Fenny, F., & Setyawan, A. (2024). Peran Kepuasan Kerja Dalam Pengaruh Gaya Kepemimpinan Dan Motivasi Kerja Terhadap Kinerja Karyawan Umkm Batam. *Jurnal Ilmiah Manajemen, Ekonomi, & Akuntansi (MEA)*, 8(1), 372–388. <https://doi.org/10.31955/mea.v8i1.3688>
- Muharromah, I., Yusuf, Y., & Utami, P. (2024). Inovasi Pelayanan Melalui Aplikasi Pos Aja Sebagai Upaya Menjaga Daya Saing Jasa Pengiriman Barang di PT. Pos Indonesia. *Jurnal Ilmiah Wahana Pendidikan*, 10(2), 467–476.
- Sartika, G., Iryadana, M. R., Seta, A. B., & Mulyani, S. (2024). Pengaruh Motivasi Dan Lingkungan Kerja Terhadap Kepuasan Kerja Yang Berdampak Pada Kinerja Karyawan Pada Pt Daya Santosa Di Bandung. *Jurnal Ilmiah M-Progress*, 14(2), 333–346.
- Setiani, Y., & Febrian, W. D. (2023). Pengaruh Pelatihan Kerja, Lingkungan Kerja Dan Kepuasan Kerja Terhadap Kinerja Karyawan Pt Indomarco Prismatama Jakarta. *Ekonomi, Manajemen Dan Akuntansi*, 1(1), 279–292. <https://doi.org/10.51544/jmm.v7i1.2529>
- Setiawan, Z., Hildawati, H., Sanulita, H., Afrizal, D., Ibrahim, S. M., Susanto, A., Indahyani, T., Adiwijaya, S., Laka, L., Ansor, M., Andari, S., Putra, M. F. M., Martawijaya, A. P., & Judijanto, L. (2024). *Methodologi Dan Teknik Penulisan Ilmiah*. PT. Sonpedia Publishing Indonesia.
- Shaliza, F., & Yanti, D. R. (2022). Faktor Penentu Kepuasan Pelanggan Grapari Telkomsel Dumai. *Jurnal Ilmiah Ekonomi Dan Pajak (EJAK)*, 2(2), 30–35.
- Siska Khairunnisa. (2024). Pengaruh Kepuasan Kerja Terhadap Kinerja Karyawan PT Soho Global Health. *BUDGETING: Journal of Business, Management and Accounting*, 5(2), 1517–1526. <https://doi.org/10.53625/juremi.v2i1.2691>
- Sugiyono. (2018). *Metode penelitian kuantitatif* (Cet. 1). Alfabeta.
- Wisamsur, C. A., Trang, I., & Ogi, I. (2024). Pengaruh Kondisi Kerja Dan Perubahan Organisasi Terhadap Perilaku Kerja Di PT. POS Indonesia KCU Manado. *Jurnal EMBA*, 12(1), 1096–1105.
- Yani, N. N., & Andani, K. W. (2024). Pengaruh Motivasi, Disiplin Dan Kepuasan Kerja Terhadap Kinerja Karyawan. *Jurnal Manajerial Dan Kewirausahaan* Vol., 06(01), 154–160.
- Yuhardi, Y., Sari, T. V., & Afrizal, D. (2022). Dimensi Kualitas Pelayanan Terhadap Kepuasan Konsumen Pada Mayang Suri Hotel. *Ekonomika*, 6(1), 123–130. <https://doi.org/10.32503/jmk.v5i2.1003>