

The Influence of Supervision and Motivation on Job Satisfaction at PT. Wahana Semesta Linggau

Rusmila, Ronal Aprianto, Sutanto, Hardi Mulyono & Bagus Saputra
Faculty of Business and Business Economics, Management Study Program
Bina Insan University, Lubuk Linggau, Indonesia
Email: rusmila@mh.univbinainsan.ac.id

Abstract

This study focuses on the problem of the effect of supervision and motivation on job satisfaction at PT. Wahana Semesta Linggau with 38 people as the sample. While the questionnaire instrument from the respondents was taken directly. Then the data was analyzed quantitatively using SPSS 22 *tools* with simple linear regression analysis techniques and multiple linear regression. So it can be concluded that: (a) Partial supervision has an influence on job satisfaction (b) Motivation partially has an influence on job satisfaction. (c) The results of the study show that there is no significant effect simultaneously between supervision and motivation on job satisfaction at PT. Wahana Semesta Linggau.

Keywords: supervision, motivation, job satisfaction.

1. Introduction

One of the important roles of human resources in a company is creating an effective work system. Because human resources are closely related to organizational strategy. To create good human resources in a company, it is necessary to have a monitoring and motivation system that is designed effectively so that employees can do their jobs well. Basically, the company's expectations for its employees are not only competent and skilled, but also the most important thing is that these employees have a great ability to work and develop optimally. Based on observations made by researchers at PT. Wahana Universe Linggau, the supervision carried out by the leadership on their employees is still not effective because there are still employees who do not work on time. In addition, researchers also found the problem that employees' motivation is still low at work so that many problems arise in the company. So this research needs to be done in order to develop the knowledge of employees and leaders how important the role of supervision and motivation is on employee job satisfaction.

This research was conducted at PT. Wahana Semesta Linggau for with the intention the following objectives To determine the effect of supervision on employee job satisfaction at PT. Wahana Semesta Linggau, To determine the effect of motivation on employee job satisfaction at PT. Wahana Semesta Linggau and To determine the effect of supervision and motivation on employee job satisfaction at PT. Wahana Semesta Linggau.

2. Literature Review

Supervision is basically fully directed to avoid the possibility of misappropriation or deviation from the objectives to be achieved. Supervision is the process of monitoring, evaluating, and reporting plans for achieving the goals set for corrective action for further

improvement (Fahmi 2016). Supervision is a managerial activity, carried out with the intention that there are no irregularities in carrying out work. A deviation or error occurs or not during the execution of work depending on the ability and skill level of the employees. Supervision carried out by the leadership, especially in the form of built-in control, is a managerial activity carried out with the intention that there are no irregularities in carrying out work (Kadarisman 2015). Supervision (controlling) of human resources is an activity carried out to control the implementation of tasks or work carried out by someone, so that the work process is in accordance with the desired results (Kadarisman 2015).

Supervision is a process to ensure that organizational and management goals are achieved (Fahmi 2016). Supervision is the process of setting performance measures and taking actions that can support the achievement of the expected results in accordance with the performance of the employees who have been determined. Controlling is the process of measuring performance and taking action to ensure desired results. Supervision is also a process to ensure that all activities carried out are in accordance with what has been planned. The process of ensuring that actual activities conform to the planned activities (Subagyo 2017).

Motivation is one of the things that influence human behavior, motivation is also known as a driver, desire, support or needs that can make a person excited and motivated to reduce and fulfill their own impulses, so that they can act and act according to certain ways that will lead to the optimal. Motivation is an encouragement that grows from within a person both from within and outside of himself to do work with high enthusiasm and use all the abilities and skills he has to achieve satisfaction according to what is desired (Ansory and Indrasari 2018). Motivation is a driving force that can trigger a person's work passion so that they want to work together, work effectively and integrate with all efforts to achieve satisfaction (Novia R. Silaen 2021). Motivation is an encouragement from within a person that causes that person to carry out certain activities in order to achieve a goal (Ansory and Indrasari 2018).

Each individual has a different level of satisfaction according to the rating system that applies to him. The higher the assessment of the activities felt in accordance with individual wishes, the higher the satisfaction with these activities. By fulfilling all the needs or desires in employees, a feeling of satisfaction will be created, and employees with a high level of satisfaction will automatically experience an increase in performance. Job satisfaction itself is defined as a positive attitude which is based on the evaluation results of what is expected to be obtained through the efforts made in carrying out a job with the results or rewards it receives (Suparyadi, 2015).

Job satisfaction is a feeling that supports or does not support an employee's self related to his work or with his condition. Job satisfaction is basically something that is individual (Mangkunegara, 2011). Job satisfaction is a person's perspective, both positive and negative, about his work (Siagian, 2013). Job satisfaction is a pleasant or unpleasant emotional state for employees looking at their jobs (Edy Sutrisno, 2014).

3. Research Method

Simple Linear Regression Test: Testing the relationship with the independent and dependent variables (Sugiyono, 2018). Correlation Coefficient Test: To prove the prediction of the relationship of a variable in the population by looking at the related

sample variables and calculating the coefficients between the variables in the sample (Sugiyono, 2018). T test: To test the significance using the t test. $t_{\text{arithmetic}} > t_{\text{table}}$ at an error level of 5% or an error level of 1%, the t test or significance test is used to test the significance of the relationship (Sugiyono, 2018). Test Multiple Linear Regression: Test for the prediction of the dependent variable with the condition that there are at least 2 independent variables (Sugiyono, 2018). Determination Coefficient Test: To measure the influence of research variables simultaneously (Sugiyono, 2018). F test: To determine whether or not the independent variable influences the dependent variable simultaneously (Sugiyono, 2018).

4. Findings and Discussions

Simple Linear Regression Test

Supervision Variable (X1) on Job Satisfaction

Coefficients^a

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	std. Error	Betas		
1 (Constant)	11,740	5,242		2,239	.031
Supervision	,927	,117,798		7,956	,000

a. Dependent Variable: Job Satisfaction

The table above is processed by SPSS version 22 in this test which obtained a constant of 11.740 with $b = 0.927$. Thus, the following is the regression equation:

$$Y = a + b X_1$$

$$\text{Job Satisfaction} = 11.740 + 0.927 \text{ supervision.}$$

$a = 11.740$ means that mark the 11,740 is mark consistent variable satisfaction work .
 $bX = 0.927$. That is, value satisfaction Work increase 0.927 each 1% value addition variable supervision. So that second variable This Have tendency.

Motivation Variable (X2) on Job Satisfaction

Coefficients^a

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	std. Error	Betas		
1 (Constant)	23,676	6,724		3,521	,001
Motivation	,752	,170,593		4,418	,000

a. Dependent Variable: Job Satisfaction

The table above is processed by SPSS version 22 in this test which obtained a constant of 23.676 with $b = 0.752$. Thus, the following is the regression equation.

$$Y = a + bX_1$$

Job Satisfaction = 23.676 + 0.752 motivation.

a = 23.676 a means that mark the 23,676 is mark consistent variable satisfaction work .
bX = 23.676 . That is, value satisfaction Work increase 23,676 each 1% value addition
variable motivation. So that second variable This Have tendency.

Correlation Coefficient Test

Supervision Correlation Coefficient Test (X 1)

Summary models

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted RSquare	std. Error of the Estimate
1	,798 ^a	,637	,627	3,786

a. Predictors: (Constant), Monitoring

From this test, the coefficient value of supervision variable (X1) and job satisfaction (Y) is 0.798 at intervals of 0.000-1.000 and R Square is 0.637. This means that these two variables have a very strong influence because the correlation value is positive.

Motivation Correlation Coefficient Test (X 2)

Summary models

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted RSquare	std. Error of the Estimate
1	,593 ^a	,352	,334	5,063

a. Predictors: (Constant), Motivation

From this test, the coefficient values of motivation (X2) and job satisfaction (Y) were 0.593 at intervals of 0.000-1.000 and R Square 0.352. This means that these two variables have a very strong influence because the correlation value is positive.

T test

Supervision T Test (X 1)

Coefficients ^a

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients	Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	std. Error Betas		
1	(Constant)	11,740	5,242	2,239	.031
	Supervision	,927	,117	,798	,000

a. Dependent Variable: Job Satisfaction

From the table the obtained results t testing that variable supervision (X1) of satisfaction work (Y) with t count > t table (2.239 > 2.208), t significant level = 0.031 < (a) 0.05. So that in a manner Partial H_a accepted and H₀ is rejected. So variable X1 effect against Y.

Motivational T Test (X2)

Coefficients ^a

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	std. Error	Betas		
1 (Constant)	23,676	6,724		3,521	,001
Motivation	,752	,170	,593	4,418	,000

a. Dependent Variable: Job Satisfaction

From the table the obtained results t testing that variable motivation (X2) against satisfaction work (Y) with t count > t table (3.521 > 2.208), t significant level = 0.0 01 < 0.05. So that in a manner Partial H_a accepted and H₀ is rejected. So variable X2 has an effect against Y.

Multiple Linear Regression Test

Coefficients ^a

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	std. Error	Betas		
1 (Constant)	11.173	5,618		1,989	.055
Supervision	,890	, 169	,766	5,270	,000
Motivation	,057	,185	,045	,309	,759

a. Dependent Variable: Job Satisfaction

From the processed SPSS version 22 in the test above, the following regression equation is obtained:

$$Y = \alpha + b_1 X_1 + b_2 X_2$$

$$Y = 11.173 + 0.890 X_1 + 0.057 X_2$$

a = 11.173 a means that mark the 11.173 is mark constanta that shows mark variable satisfaction work 13.352 if second variables (X1 and X2) exist change .

bX₁ = 23.676 , bX₂ = 0.057 . That is, value satisfaction Work increase each 1% value addition variable supervision And or motivation. So that second variable This Have tendency.

Correlation Coefficient Test

Summary models

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	std. Error of the Estimate
1	,799a	,638	,618	3,834

a. Predictors: (Constant), Motivation, Monitoring

In this test it was found that there is a large influence between the 2 variables with the proven

value of $R = 0.799$ with a coefficient of $R^2 = 0.638$. So that these two variables contribute to Y.

F test

ANOVA ^a

	Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	908,502	2	454,251	30,898	,000 ^b
	Residual	514,551	35	14,701		
	Total	1423,053	37			

a. Dependent Variable: Job Satisfaction

b. Predictors: (Constant), Motivation, Monitoring

Calculated F value $30.898 > F_{table 3, 26}$, significance level $0.000 < F_{table}(\alpha) 0.05$, $f = (k, nk) = 2-38 = 3.26$. This is what makes H_0 is rejected and H_a is accepted. Kindly simultaneous second variable this influence significant for variable dependent, so the hypothesis is accepted.

The following are the results of the research that has been conducted regarding the influence of supervision and motivation on job satisfaction at PT. Linggau Semesta Linggau rides:

The correlation coefficient in the study on supervisory variables (X1) to satisfaction (Y) has a significant relationship to job satisfaction (Y) with $t_{count} > t_{table}$ ($2.203 > 2.208$), significance = $0.031 < 0.05$, simple linear regression results are obtained $b = 0.927$, $a = 11.740$. Thus the monitoring variable has a significant effect on job satisfaction at PT. Wahana Semsta Linggau. These results are consistent with research (Fitrianingrum, 2015) regarding the effect of supervision with work discipline at the Samarinda Ulu District Office, Samarinda City. Obtained r_{xy} count $> r_{xy}$ table ($0.775 > 0.381$), $N = 27$, and a constant of 5% with a simple regression test obtained $Y' = 6.48 + 1.15X$.

The results of the study show that the correlation coefficient between motivational variables (X2) and satisfaction (Y) has a significant relationship to job satisfaction (Y) with significance = $0.001 < 0.05$, $t_{count} > t_{table}$ ie $2.521 > 2.208$ with regression results simple linear obtained $b = 0.752$, $a = 23.676$. Thus the motivation variable has a significant effect on job satisfaction at PT. Wahana Semesta Linggau. These results are in accordance with research (Rizal Radiman, 2019) regarding the influence of work discipline motivational variables at the Public Works and Public Housing Office of Aceh Tamiang Regency. The difference, in previous research is not significant. From the partial test, it was found that $t_{count} > t_{table}$ ($1.254 > 1.668$) r_{xy} count $> r_{xy}$ table ($0.775 > 0.381$), a significance of $0.214 > 0.05$.

The results showed that the resulting significance value was $0.055 > 0.05$, $t_{count} > t_{table}$ ($1.989 > 2.208$), with linear regression results obtained $b_{X1} = 0.890$ $b_{X2} = 0.057$ and $a = 11.173$. From the value of $R = 0.799$ it is evident that the two variables X_1 and X_2 have a strong influence. Supported by the results of the coefficient of determination = 0.638 , which means that these two variables also contribute to each other. As well as obtaining $F_{count} > F_{table}$ ($30.898 > 3.26$), the simultaneous significance is $0.000 < (\alpha) = 0.05$, $F(k, nk) = F(2-38) = 3.26$. This shows that H_a is accepted and H_0 is rejected. So that the

influence of the two variables is significant on job satisfaction.

5. Conclusion

Following are the conclusions from this study: (1) The results of the analysis carried out were obtained that hypothesis First (H1) on variable supervision (X1) exists influence significant to satisfaction work at PT. Wahana Semesta Linggau. Obtained t count > t table ($2.203 > 2.208$) and significance $0.031 < 0.05$. This become because H_0 was rejected and H_a accepted. It means, Correct exists if variable the influence significant to satisfaction work. (2) The results of the analysis carried out were obtained that hypothesis Both (H2) exist influence significant variable motivation (X2) to satisfaction work at PT. Wahana Semesta Linggau. Obtained t count > t table ($2.521 > 2.208$) and significance $0.001 < 0.05$. This becomes cause H_0 is rejected and H_a accepted. It means, Correct exists if variable the influence significant to satisfaction work. (3) The results of the analysis carried out were obtained that hypothesis Third (H1) on variable supervision motivation (X1) and motivation (X2) exists influence significant to satisfaction work at PT. Wahana Semesta Linggau. Obtained t count > t table ($1.989 > 2.208$) and significance $0.055 < 0.05$ with the results of linear regression obtained $bX_1 = 0.890$ $bX_2 = 0.057$ and $a = 11.173$. As wellas obtaining F count > F table ($30.898 > 3.26$), the simluran significance is $0.000 < (a) = 0.05$, $F(k, nk) = F(2-38) = 3.26$. This shows that H_a is accepted and H_0 is rejected. It means, Correct exists if second variable the influence significant to satisfaction work.

References

- Busro. (2018). HR Management Theories. In *Human Resource Management Theories*.
- Eva Dila Fitrianingrum1. (2015). The Effect of Supervision on Employee Work Discipline at the Samarinda Ulu District Office, Samarinda City. *EJournal of State Administration*, 1644 – 1655.
- Fahmi. (2014). *case management theory and solutions*.
- Fahmi. (2016). Human Resource Management (Theory and Practice). In *Human Resource Management (Theory and Practice)*.
- Hasibuan (2020), *Human Resource Management*, Bumi Aksara, Jakarta
- Indra Syahputra Marpaung, S.Sos, MSJL (2018). *The Effect of Supervision on Employee Motivation (Case Study of the DPRD Secretariat of South Tapanuli Regency)*. 8.
- M. Ansory, H. A. F., & Indrasari, *Revised Edition of Human Resource Management*. Sidoarjo.: Indomedia Pustaka, 2018.
- Mangkunegara, Anwar Prabu. (2005) *HR Performance Evaluation*. Bandung Mangkunegara, Anwar Prabu (2017) *Human Resource Management*, Alfabeta, Bandung.
- Martoyo. (2015). *Human Resources management (Kelime)*.
- Ni Kadek Eni I Gede Riana2 Made Subuni3. (2015). The Effect of Motivation on Job Satisfaction and Performance of Civil Servants (PNS) at the Nusa Dua Bali Tourism School. *E-Journal of Economics and Business*, Adayana University, 2337 – 3067.
- Novia Ruth Silaen et al (2021), *Employee Performance*, Widina Bhakti Persada, Bandung
- P. Hutabarat. (2020). *The effect of supervision, career development, and promotion on employee performance at pt. Saka is the true partner of the field*. 2 (3).

- Priance. (2016). *HR planning and development*.
- Risa Kartika Lubis. (2020). Analysis of Work Motivation and Job Satisfaction Performance Against Serdang Agricultural Extension Bedaga. *Journal of Management Science (JMAS)*, 3.
- Said Muhammad Rizal1), R. (2019). The Influence of Motivation, Supervision, and Leadership on Employee Work Discipline. *Journal of Scientific Master of Management*, 2.
- Saydam, Gouzali (2015) *Human Resource Management: An Approach Micro*, Djbaran, Jakarta
- Siagian, Sondang. (2013). *Human Resource Management*. Jakarta: PT. EarthScript
- Sinambela. (2016). *human resource management to build a solid work team to improve performance*.
- Sudarmanto (2018) *HR Performance and Competency Development*, Student Libraries, Yogyakarta
- Sugiyono. (2017). *Quantitative Research Methods, Qualitative and R&D*. ALPHABET.
- Sugiyono. (2018). *Management Research Methods*. Alphabet.
- Sugiyono, *Statistics for Research*. 2019
- Sujarweni. (2015). *Research Methodology - Business and Economics* (1st ed). NEW PRESS LIBRARY.
- Sutrisno. (2016). *human resource management*
- Sutrisno, Edy. (2011) *Human Resource Management*. Dawn Interpretama Independent: Jakarta.
- Syofian, S. (2017). *Quantitative Research Methods equipped with Manual Calculations and SPSS*. golden.
- Widodo. (2015). *human resource development management*.

Copyrights

Copyright for this article is retained by the author(s), with first publication rights granted to the journal.

This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>)