THE INFLUENCE OF JOB SATISFACTION, CAREER DEVELOPMENT, AND HUMAN RESOURCE TRAINING ON EMPLOYEE PERFORMANCE (CASE STUDY: CV. WARNA INDAH NUSANTARA)

Dyah Ayu Puri Palupi
Fakultas Ekonomi, Universitas Kristen Teknologi Solo, Indonesia
dyahayupuripalupi@gmail.com

Mardanung Patmo Cahjono
Fakultas Ekonomi, Universitas Kristen Teknologi Solo, Indonesia
mardanung@gmail.com

Elisabet Marin
Fakultas Ekonomi, Universitas Kristen Teknologi Solo, Indonesia
elismarin858@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

This research aims to analyze the influence of job satisfaction, career development, and human resource training on the performance of Warna Indah Nusantara employees. The hypotheses proposed in this research, namely H1: it is suspected that job satisfaction influences employee performance, H2: it is suspected that career development influences employee performance, H3: it is suspected that human resource training influences employee performance, and H4: it is suspected that job satisfaction, career development, and human resource training simultaneously influence employee performance. The research method used is quantitative research using surveys and interviews. Survey research is research that takes samples from a population and uses questionnaires as the main collection tool. Sampling uses a purposive sampling method where the sampling technique is carried out with certain considerations or criteria. The research involved 35 employees as respondents, the data was analyzed using a multiple linear regression model using the SPSS v25 application. The results of data analysis show that the T value of the Job Satisfaction variable is 1.703, the Career Development variable is 1.890 and Human Resources Training is 2.394. Meanwhile, the ttable value is 1.697. From the results of this research, it can be concluded that job satisfaction, career development, and human resource training partially and simultaneously influence the performance of Warna Indah Nusantara employees.

Keywords: Job Satisfaction, Career Development, Human resources training, employee performance.

INTRODUCTION

The ongoing developments in Indonesia are characterized by both physical and non-physical progress, particularly in enhancing the quality of human resources. In the context of contemporary global competition, the labor market necessitates individuals who possess foresight, intelligence, and innovation, alongside a capacity for high enthusiasm in addressing the evolving demands of the era. Additionally, the current landscape underscores the significant role of human resources within institutions, emphasizing the importance of mature managerial competencies in organizational management (Lucky Maskarto Nara Rosmadi, 2018).

Various scholars have proposed definitions of job satisfaction from differing perspectives, yet several yield interpretations that are closely aligned. It is posited that satisfaction arises from the comfort derived from positive interpersonal relationships within the organization, including amicable

interactions with colleagues, rapport with superiors, and effective communication among organizational members. Job satisfaction constitutes a personal experience for employees, influencing their perception of satisfaction or dissatisfaction in executing their duties. Employees are likely to demonstrate optimal performance when experiencing high job satisfaction, and conversely, low job satisfaction correlates with diminished performance. This indicates that employees who personally derive satisfaction from their work are more inclined to engage positively with their tasks, thereby impacting their overall performance. Consequently, job satisfaction is indicative of an employee's attitude towards their work, which ultimately influences their work outcomes (Meithiana, 2017:39). Based on the aforementioned definition, employee job satisfaction can be construed as a manifestation of emotional responses within the organization, reflected in their work behaviors. The positive or negative reactions exhibited by employees serve as concrete reflections of the satisfaction or dissatisfaction experienced in their workplace.

Discipline constitutes a significant aspect of organizational dynamics; however, career development also plays a crucial role in influencing employee performance. Implementing a career development program enhances employee performance in a structured manner, facilitating progression to higher career levels. According to Syahputra and Tanjung (2020), career development comprises a sequence of positions held by an individual throughout their tenure, facilitated by educational and training opportunities within the organizational context. As posited by Busro (2018), career development reflects the initiatives undertaken by both employees and organizations to foster motivation and enhance individual competencies in fulfilling the core responsibilities inherent in profit and non-profit sectors.

In conjunction with work discipline and career development, human resource training emerges as a vital component in bolstering employee performance. Handoko (2014), as cited in Bahri et al. (2022), emphasizes that training fundamentally constitutes a learning process. Consequently, effective employee training necessitates an understanding of learning methodologies. Furthermore, Mathis and Jackson (2010) contend, as quoted in Nurul (2018), that training serves as a mechanism through which employees acquire and refine the skills essential for their roles. Given the rapid advancements in various fields, training is increasingly imperative, as prior formal education alone may insufficiently address the evolving demands of job positions within organizations.

However, empirical evidence suggests that job training may not exert a significant impact on employee performance, as indicated by Fitria et al. (2020) in their study conducted at PT. Aksata Satya Pratama Jakarta. Moreover, Palutturi et al. (2020) demonstrate that work discipline does not significantly affect employee performance at the Tanimbar Islands Health Office.

In light of the aforementioned issues, the researcher aims to conduct a study titled "The Effect of Job Satisfaction, Career Development, and Human Resource Training on Employee Performance: A Case Study of CV. Warna Indah Nusantara.".

RESEARCH METHOD

This study investigates the effects of job satisfaction, career development, and human resource training on employee performance at CV. Warna Indah Nusantara Surakarta. The population comprises all employees of the organization, while the sample consists of a subset of this population (Algifari, 2018). Thus, the population in this research includes all 42 employees of CV. Warna Indah Nusantara Surakarta, with a sample size of 35 individuals. The sampling method employed is purposive sampling, which involves selecting respondents based on specific criteria (Jaya, 2020). The independent variables in this study are job satisfaction, career development, and human resource training, while the dependent variable is employee performance.

The data sources utilized in this study comprise primary data, which is obtained directly from respondents through their responses to a questionnaire administered by the researcher. The analysis methods employed in this study include validity tests, reliability assessments, classical assumption tests, multiple linear regression analysis, as well as F and t tests, and coefficient of determination tests. Validity tests are conducted to ascertain the extent to which a measuring instrument accurately measures the intended construct. Reliability serves as an index indicating the degree to which a measuring instrument can be deemed trustworthy or dependable. Classical assumption tests are implemented to examine the relationship or proximity between the independent variable (X) and the dependent variable

(Y). An effective regression model is expected to satisfy several classical assumption tests, including the Normality Test, which evaluates whether the residuals exhibit a normal distribution within the regression model (Imam, 2016). Additionally, the Multicollinearity Test assesses whether correlations exist among independent variables; a sound regression model should demonstrate a lack of correlation among these variables (Widodo, 2017). The Heteroscedasticity Test aims to identify the presence of deviation in variance. Lastly, the analysis of data in this study employs multiple linear regression analysis:

$$Y = \beta 1X1 + \beta 2X2 + \beta 3X3 + e$$

The F-test and t-test serve distinct purposes within statistical analysis. The F-test is employed to assess whether the independent variable exerts a simultaneous effect on the dependent variable (Sugiyono, 2015). Conversely, the t-test provides a provisional analysis regarding the relationship between two or more variables (Sugiyono, 2015). The determination coefficient test (R^2) functions as an indicator of the congruence or accuracy between the estimated value or regression line and the sample data (Sugiyono, 2017).

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Description of Respondents

The study included a total of 35 respondents. A detailed overview of the respondents is presented in Table 1.

Table 1. Respondent Background

No	Item	Keterangan	Jumlah	Persen (%)
1	Gender	Male	22	62.9
		Female	13	37.1
2	Age	18-30 years old	10	28.6
		31-40 years old	16	45.7
		41-50 years old	9	25.7
3	Education	Senior High School	3	8.6
		D3	25	71.4
		Bachelor	7	20.0
4	Working Time	1-5 years	13	37.1
		5-10 years	3	8.6
		>10 years	19	54.3

Source: Data Processing Results (2024)

According to Table 1, it is indicated that the predominant demographic among the respondents is male, comprising 22 individuals or 62.9% of the total sample. Additionally, the age group of 31-40 years encompasses 16 respondents, representing 45.7% of the total. The education level categorized as D3 is represented by 25 respondents, amounting to 71.4% of the total, while individuals with work experience exceeding 10 years constitute 19 respondents or 54.3%.

Table 2. Validity and Reliability Test

Variabel	Indikator	Kor.(r) R	Kor.(r) Sig.	Status	Koef. Alfa Cornbach	Status
Job Satisfaction (X1)	X1.1	0,573	0,000	Valid	0,707	Reliable
	X1.2	0,532	0,001	Valid		
	X1.3	0,698	0,000	Valid		
	X1.4	0,625	0,000	Valid		
	X1.5	0,521	0,001	Valid		
	X1.6	0,573	0,000	Valid		
	X1.7	0,473	0,004	Valid		
	X1.8	0,693	0,000	Valid		
Career Development (X2)	X2.1	0,651	0,000	Valid	0,755	
	X2.2	0,715	0,000	Valid		
	X2.3	0,668	0,000	Valid		
	X2.4	0,718	0,000	Valid		
	X2.5	0,796	0,000	Valid		
Human Resource Traning (X3)	X3.1	0,546	0,001	Valid	0,715	Reliable
	X3.2	0,716	0,000	Valid		
	X3.3	0,772	0,000	Valid		
	X3.4	0,716	0,000	Valid		
	X3.5	0,719	0,000	Valid		
Employee Performance (Y)	Y1	0,641	0,000	Valid	0,67	Reliable
	Y2	0,618	0,000	Valid		
	Y3	0,479	0,004	Valid		
	Y4	0,424	0,011	Valid		
	Y5	0,487	0,003	Valid		
	Y6	0,643	0,000	Valid		
	Y7	0,587	0,000	Valid		
	Y8	0,628	0,000	Valid		

Source: Data Processing Results. (2024)

Based on Table 2, it is evident that all questions pertaining to the training method variable possess a valid status, as the rcount (Corrected Item-Total Correlation) value exceeds the rtable value of 0.3246. In relation to the reliability assessment, a variable is considered reliable if the responses to the questions consistently yield the same results. The reliability coefficients for the respective instruments are as follows: job satisfaction instrument (rll = 0.707), career development instrument (rll = 0.755), human resource training instrument (rll = 0.715), and employee performance instrument (rll = 0.670). Notably, these coefficients surpass the "AlphaCronbach" threshold of 0.60, thereby indicating that the three instruments are deemed reliable and satisfactorily meet the established criteria.

Table 3. Normality Test

One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test

		Standardized Predicted Value
N		35
Normal Parameters[a,b]	Mean	,0000000
	Std. Deviation	1,0000000
Most Extreme Differences	Absolute	,166
	Positive	,166
	Negative	
Test Statistic		-,112
Asymp.Sig (2-tailed)		,166
a. Test distribution is Normal.		,200[c]
b. Calculated from data.		
c. Lilliefors Significance Correction.		

Source: Data Processing Results. (2024)

Based on the table above, it shows that the data is normally distributed. This can be seen from the significance value of 0.200 > 0.05. It was proven that the data had a normal distribution of 35 data.

Table 4. Multicollinearity Test

Variabel	Collinearity Statistics	
	Tolerance	VIF
X1	0,795	1,258
X2	0,543	1,84
X3	0,557	1,794

Source: Data Processing Results. (2024)

Based on the multicollinearity test between the variables job satisfaction (X1), career development (X2), and HR training (X3), there is no multicollinearity, in other words, there is no correlation. This can be seen from the VIF < 10.00 and tolerance value > 0.10, namely: the value of the work satisfaction variable (X1) shows a VIF result of 1.258 < 10.00 and a tolerance value of 0.795 > 0.10. The career development value (X2) shows a VIF result of 1.840 < 10.00 and a tolerance value of 0.543 > 0.10. The HR training variable value (X3) shows a VIF result of 1.794 < 10.00 and a tolerance value of 0.557 > 0.10.

In this research, the heteroscedasticity test uses the Glejser test. If the result is more than 0.05, then heteroscedasticity does not occur.

Table 5. Heteroscedasticity Test

Variable	Sig	Information
X1	0.616	Heteroscedasticity Free
X2	0.543	Heteroscedasticity Free
X3	0.557	Heteroscedasticity Free

Source: Data Processing Results. (2024)

From the results of the table above, it can be seen that the significance value (Sig) of each variable is > 0.05, which means that heteroscedasticity does not occur for each variable (job satisfaction, career

development, and HR training).

Table 6. Multiple Linear Regression Analysis Test Coefficients[a]

Model 1	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
Constant	10.585	2.956		3.580	,001
Total_X1	0.085	0.121	0.104	1.703	,003
Total_X2	0.347	0.175	0.346	1.890	,007
Total_X3	0.512	0.210	0.421	2.394	,041

a.Dependent Variable: Total_Y

Source: Data Processing Results. (2024)

Based on the table above, a linear regression equation is formed as follows:

$$Y = 0.104X1 + 0.346X2 + 0.421X3 + e.$$

Table 7. Test Coefficients[a] T test and F test

Anovaa

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	51.814	3	17.271	9.758	.000[b]
	Residual	54.871	31	1.770		
	Total	106.686	34			

a. Dependent Variable: Total_Y

b. Predictors: (Constant), Total_X3, Total_X1, Total_X2

Source: Data Processing Results. (2024)

Based on this output, it can be seen that the Fcount value is 9.758 with a significance level of 0.000. This result means the significance value is less than 0.05 (<0.05 or 5%). Based on the simultaneous test decision making method in regression analysis, it can be concluded that the quality of job satisfaction (X1), career development (X2), and human resource training (X3) together have a significant effect on employee performance (Y).

Table 8. Simultaneous Hypothesis Testing

Anova[a]

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	51.814	3	17.271	9.758	.000[b]
	Residual	54.871	31	1.770		
	Total	106.686	34			

a. Dependent Variable: Total_Y

b. Predictors: (Constant), Total_X3, Total_X1, Total_X2

Source: Data Processing Results. (2024)

Based on the output table above, it can be seen that the Fcount value is 9.758. This value will be compared with the Ftable value. Df1 = k-1 = 3 and Df2 = n-k = 31, it is known that the Ftable value is 2.911. From the values above, it is known that the Fcount value is 9.758 > Ftable 2.911 so that H1 is accepted, meaning that there is a significant simultaneous influence of job satisfaction (X1), career development (X2) and HR training (X3) on Employee Performance (Y).

Table 9. Determination Coefficient Test

Model Summary[b]

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.697[a]	.486	.436	1.330

a. Predictors: (Constant), Total_X3, Total_X1, Total_X2

b. Dependent Variable: Total_Y

Source: Data Processing Results. (2024)

Based on the results of the coefficient of determination test in the table above, it can be seen that the value of the coefficient of determination or Adjusted R Square is 0.436 or 43.6%. This value shows that job satisfaction (X1), career development (X2), and HR training (X3) have a significant effect of 43.6% on employee performance. Meanwhile, 56.4% was influenced by other factors not examined in this study.

CONCLUSION, LIMITATION, SUGGESTION

Conclusion

Based on the multiple linear test, the results obtained are Y = 0.104X1 + 0.346X2 + 0.421X3, which means that variable tcount 1.703 > ttable 1.697 with a significance value of 0.003, then it is decided that H1 is accepted. Partial career development has a significant effect on employee performance because the t value is 1.890 > t ANOVAa Model Sum of Squares df Mean Square F Sig. 1 Regression 51.814 3 17.271 9.758 .000b Residual 54.871 31 1.770 Total 106.686 34 a. Dependent Variable: Total_Y b. Predictors: (Constant), Total_X3, Total_X1, Total_X2table 1.697 with a significance value of 0.007, so it can be decided that H2 is accepted. HR training partially has a significant effect on employee performance because the tcount value is 2.394 > ttable 1.697 with a significance value of 0.041, so it can be decided that H3 is accepted.

Suggestion

This research is also not free from limitations, limitations in this research include: This research is only limited to 3 independent variables, namely job satisfaction, career development, and HR training, as well as employee performance as the dependent variable, so this research only knows and focuses on variables the. To optimize this research, there must be further research regarding other variables that can improve employee performance such as compensation, work appraisal, and work motivation as well as other factors that can contribute to improving employee performance which are not used in this research. Apart from that, there are limitations. In this research, the questionnaire method was used, that is, sometimes the answers given by respondents did not show the actual situation and could not guide the questionnaire takers one by one in filling out the questionnaire.

REFERENCES

Algifari. (2018). Statistika deskriptif plus untuk ekonomi dan bisnis (2nd ed.).

Bahri, M. S., Irawan, B., & Nuri, Z. (2022). Pengaruh pengembangan karir dan kompensasi terhadap kinerja pegawai satuan polisi pamong praja kota probolinggo. PUBLIK: Jurnal Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia, Administrasi Dan Pelayanan Publik Universitas Bina Taruna Gorontalo, IX, 794–803.

Busro, D. M. (2018). Teori-teori manajemen sumber daya manusia (1st ed.). Jakarta: Prenadamedia Group.

Fitria, J., Mulyapradana, A., Hakim, M., & Huda, S. T. (2020). The Impression of Job Training and Work Motivation Effect at PT. Aksata Satya Pratama Jakarta. International Journal Of Science, Technology & Management. November. https://doi.org/10.46729/ijstm.v1i4.62

Imam, G. (2016). Aplikasi analisis multivariate dengan program IBM SPSS 23 (Cet. VIII). Semarang:

Badan Penerbit Universitas Diponegoro.
Jaya, I. M. L. M. (2020). Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif dan Kualitatif. Quadrant.
Lucky Maskarto, N., Rosmadi, Z. T. (2018). Pengaruh Pelatihan, Disiplin, dan Pengembangan Karir Terhadap Kinerja Karyawan.
Meithiana Indrasari. (2017). Kepuasan Kerja dan Kinerja Karyawan, Tinjauan dari Dimensi Iklim Organisasi, Kreativitas dan Karakteristik Pekerjaan. Indomedia Pustaka.
Nurul, K. (2018). Analisis Pelatihan dan Pengembangan Sumber Daya Manusia di PT. Beon Intermedia Cabang Malang.
Palutturi, S., Hasanuddin, U., Thamrin, Y., Hasanuddin, U., & Rahmadani, S. (2020). The Effect of Work Discipline on Employee Performance (The Health Office Case Study of Tanimbar Island). August.
Sri Wijayanti, Zandra Dwanita Widodo, K. D. (2021). Pengelolaan Sumber Daya Manusia Pada Industri Kreatif Sablon (Zee Screenprinting) Karanganyar di Masa Pandemi COVID-19. PUBLIK: Jurnal Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia, Administrasi Dan Pelayanan Publik Universitas Bina Taruna Gorontalo, VIII, 58–66.
Sugiyono. (2015). Statistik Non Parametris. Alfabeta.
Sugiyono. (2017). Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif, Kualitatif, dan R&D. Alfabeta, CV.
Suryantiko, D., Lumintang, G., Manajemen, J., Sam, U., & Manado, R. (2018). Pengaruh Pelatihan Kerja dan Pengembangan Karir Terhadap Kinerja Karyawan (Studi Pada PT. Air Manado). Jurnal Emba, Vol.2. 6(1), 351–360.
Syahputra, M. D., & Tanjung, H. (2020). Pengaruh Kompetensi, Pelatihan dan Pengembangan Karir Terhadap Kinerja Karyawan. Maneggio: Jurnal Ilmiah Magister Manajemen, 3 (September), 283–295.
Widodo. (2017). Metodologi Penelitian Populer dan Praktis. Jakarta: PT. Raja Grafindo Persada.