www.bircu-journal.com/index.php/birci
Budapest International Research and Critics Institute-Journal (BIRCI-Journal)
Humanities and Social Sciences
ISSN 2615-3076 Online)
ISSN 2615-1715 (Print)
Budapest Institute

The Effect of Communication and Industrial Relations on Employee Job Satisfaction at PTPN VII Unit Tebenan

Dwi Ervina[1], Dina Mellita[2]
[1,2]*Faculty of Economics & Business, Universitas Bina Darma, Indonesia*
dwiervina210600@gmail.com, dinamellita@binadarma.ac.id

Abstract

The purpose of the research is to know the analysis of the impact of communication, as well as industrial relations on employee job satisfaction, and their effect on employee job satisfaction. The tentative assumption put forward is that communication has a significant effect on employee job satisfaction and there is a significant influence of industrial linkages on employee job satisfaction. It is evident from the research results that communication and industrial relations have a significant relationship with employee job satisfaction. In this research, it is proven that the most influential on employee job satisfaction is communication.

Keywords
communication; industrial relations; employee job satisfaction

I. Introduction

Job satisfaction is an employee's attitude towards work related to work situations, cooperation between employees, rewards received at work, and matters relating to physical and psychological factors (Sutrisno, 2019). Employee job satisfaction will appear if there is a good work environment. A good working environment is characterized by adequate lighting and emitted evenly and away from the noise that interferes with work concentration, good layout, and beautiful colors, as well as maintained cleanliness, really makes employees feel at home at work and have a good work spirit. In addition to the conditions of the work environment, several social work environments such as all conditions occur related to work relations, both relationships with superiors and relationships with coworkers, or relationships with subordinates.

PTPN VII Tebenan Unit is one of the state-owned companies that manage rubber commodities. The company is located on Jl. Raya Palembang-Sekayu Km. 75 Palembang. To achieve the company's vision, mission, and goals, the PTPN VII Tebenan Unit requires support from employees to support and for the progress of the company itself. The importance of this employee contribution is also supported by various parties. PTPN VII Tebenan Unit to increase employee job satisfaction must be able to pay attention to factors that affect employee job satisfaction, as is the case according to Rivai (2016), among others, financial compensation, leadership, education and training, participation, work environment, communication, and industrial relations.

However, there are still some employees who are dissatisfied with the industrial relations policies that have been carried out by PTPN VII Tebenan Unit, such as a discrepancy between employee expectations and the financial rewards received for their work performance, this causes personal problems for employees towards company management,

especially if it is associated with performance in resolving excessive workloads. According to Yani in Syardiansyah (2020) performance is a result of work achieved by a person in carrying out the tasks assigned to him based on skill, experience and sincerity as well as time. This means that in work contains elements of the standard that achievement must be met, so, for those who reach the standards set means good performance (Wahjudewanti, 2021). And also the lack of interaction between management and employees can be seen from the frequent sudden assignments for employees with heavy workloads without prior notification from management so that employees feel physically and mentally unprepared and often complain.

Based on this background, the researchers were interested in conducting research with the title: "The Effect of Communication and Industrial Relations on Employee Job Satisfaction at PTPN VII Tebenan Unit".

II. Research Method

The type of data in this study is quantitative data. Quantitative data is data in the form of numbers and can be calculated, such as the number of employees, scores or weights from questionnaires on communication effectiveness, industrial relations, and employee job satisfaction.

III. Results and Discussion

3.1 Characteristics of Respondents

a. Respondents by Gender

Description and gender of employees of PTPN VII Unit Tebenan, in full can be seen in table 1 below:

Table 1. Distribution of Respondent's Gender

	Gender	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Man	88	97.8	97.8	97.8
	Woman	2	2.2	2.2	100
	Total	90	100	100	

Data Source: Data processed, 2022

Based on the table above, it can be seen that from 90 respondents, namely employees of PTPN VII Tebenan Unit, 19 people aged 35-45 years, 69 people aged 46-55 years, and 2 people aged 56-60 years. The 46–55-year age category dominates because the productive age of employees is in this category.

3.2 Respondents Based on Last Education

To find out the level of education possessed by the respondents, namely the employees of PTPN VII Tebenan Unit in full, in can be seen in the following table:

Table 2. Distribution of Respondent's Last Education

	Education	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	junior high school	17	18.9	18.9	18.9
	high school	47	52.2	52.2	71.1
	Other	26	28.9	28.9	100
	Total	90	100	100	

Data Source: Data processed, 2022

Based on the table above, from 90 respondents, namely employees of PTPN VII Tebenan Unit. The average education level of employees of PTPN VII Unit Tebenan at the high school level was 47 respondents or 52%, the junior high school education level was 26 respondents or 28%, and other education levels were 17 respondents or 18%. High school education is the education that dominates the most because the average applicant to become an employee at that time most of the last education was high school.

c. Respondents Based on Length of Work

To find out the length of work of respondents, namely employees of PTPN VII Tebenan Unit in full, it can be seen in the following table:

Table 3. Distribution of Respondents Long Working

	Year	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	17 years	1	1.1	1.1	1.1
	18 years	1	1.1	1.1	2.2
	19 years old	1	1.1	1.1	3.3
	20 years	4	4.4	4.4	7.8
	21 years	19	21.1	21.1	28.9
	22 years	4	4.4	4.4	33.3
	23 years	4	4.4	4.4	37.8
	24 years old	18	20.0	20.0	57.8
	25 years	8	8.9	8.9	66.7
	26 years	4	4.4	4.4	71.1
	27 years	6	6.7	6.7	77.8
	28 years	4	4.4	4.4	82.2
	29 years	8	8.9	8.9	91.1
	30 years	6	6.7	6.7	97.8
	33 years old	2	2.2	2.2	100.0
	Total	90	100.0	100.0	

Data Source: Data processed, 2022

Based on the table above from 90 respondents, namely employees of PTPN VII Tebenan Unit, it can be concluded that as many as 7 respondents worked for 10-20 years, 81 respondents worked for 21-30 years, and 2 respondents worked for 31-35 years. Based on the explanation above, the most dominant length of work is in the age category of 21-30 years.

3.2 Research Instruments

a. Validity Test

To test the research instrument, the author uses an analysis with SPSS. For the level of validity of the significance test by comparing the value r^{hitung} with r^{table}. In this case the distribution of the $r^{table} the$ significance value of 5% obtained the result of 0.576, if r^{hitung} it is greater r^{table} than $r^{positif}$, then the question item is said to be valid. The results of validity testing can be seen in the following table.

b. Communication Variable Validity Test Results (X1)

Table 6. Communication Validity Test Results (X1)

	Correlations	X1	X2	X3	X4	X5	X6	X7	X8	X9	X10	TOTAL
X1	Pearson Correlation	1	.956**	.978**	.978**	.978**	.956**	.978**	.935**	.875**	.956**	.982**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		,000	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000
	N	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90
X2	Pearson Correlation	.956**	1	.978**	.933**	.933**	.955**	.933**	.889**	.915**	.911**	.963**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	<.001		,000	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000
	N	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90
X3	Pearson Correlation	.978**	.978**	1	.955**	.955**	.978**	.955**	.912**	.895**	.933**	.977**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	<.001	<.001		,000	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000
	N	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90
X4	Pearson Correlation	.978**	.933**	.955**	1	1,000**	.978**	1,000**	.956**	.895**	.978**	.991**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	<.001	,000	,000		,000	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000
	N	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90
X5	Pearson Correlation	.978**	.933**	.955**	1,000**	1	.978**	1,000**	.956**	.895**	.978**	.991**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	<.001	,000	,000			,000	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000
	N	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90
X6	Pearson Correlation	.956**	.955**	.978**	.978**	.978**	1	.978**	.933**	.915**	.955**	.986**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	<.001	,000	,000	,000	,000		,000	,000	,000	,000	,000
	N	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90
X7	Pearson Correlati	.978**	.933**	.955**	1,000**	1,000**	.978**	1	.956**	.895**	.978**	.991**

	on											
	Sig. (2-tailed)	<.001	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000		,000	,000	,000	,000
	N	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90
X8	Pearson Correlation	.935**	.889**	.912**	.956**	.956**	.933**	.956**	1	.935**	.978**	.968**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	<.001	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000		,000	,000	,000
	N	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90
X9	Pearson Correlation	.875**	.915**	.895**	.895**	.895**	.915**	.895**	.935**	1	.915**	.935**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	<.001	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000		,000	,000
	N	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90
X10	Pearson Correlation	.956**	.911**	.933**	.978**	.978**	.955**	.978**	.978**	.915**	1	.981**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	<.001	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000		,000
	N	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90
TOTAL	Pearson Correlation	.982**	.963**	.977**	.991**	.991**	.986**	.991**	.968**	.935**	.981**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	<.001	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000	
	N	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90
** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).						90	90	90	90	90	90	

Data Source: Data processed, 2022

Based on the results of the validity test above, the level of validity of the significance test by comparing the value r^{hitung} with r^{table}. In this case the distribution of the r^{table} the significance value of 5% obtained the result of 0.576, if r^{hitung} it is greater r^{table} than $r^{positif}$, then the question item is said to be valid. it can be concluded that all items in this research questionnaire are declared valid so that they can be used as research instruments.

c. Industrial Relations Variable Validity Test Results (X2)

Table 7. Industrial Relations Validity Test Results (X2)

Correlations												
		X1	X2	X3	X4	X5	X6	X7	X8	X9	X10	TOTAL
X1	Pearson Correl	1	.934**	.930**	.930**	.930**	.881**	.930**	.905**	.886**	.598**	.957**

	ation											
	Sig. (2-tailed)		0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
	N	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90
X2	Pearson Correlation	.934**	1	.954**	.867**	.954**	.941**	.907**	.842**	.828**	.615**	.949**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	<.001		0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
	N	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90
X3	Pearson Correlation	.930**	.954**	1	.909**	1,000**	.899**	.951**	.882**	.868**	.645**	.970**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	<.001	0.000		0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
	N	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90
X4	Pearson Correlation	.930**	.867**	.909**	1	.909**	.862**	.909**	.930**	.955**	.622**	.954**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	<.001	0.000	0.000		0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
	N	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90
X5	Pearson Correlation	.930**	.954**	1,000**	.909**	1	.899**	.951**	.882**	.868**	.645**	.970**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	<.001	0.000	0.000	0.000		0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
	N	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90
X6	Pearson Correlation	.881**	.941**	.899**	.862**	.899**	1	.856**	.839**	.826**	.580**	.922**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	<.001	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000		0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
	N	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90
X7	Pearson Correlation	.930**	.907**	.951**	.909**	.951**	.856**	1	.930**	.868**	.725**	.970**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	<.001	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000		0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
	N	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90

X8	Pearson Correlation	.905**	.842**	.882**	.930**	.882**	.839**	.930**	1	.933**	.716**	.952**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	<.001	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000		0.000	0.000	0.000
	N	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90
X9	Pearson Correlation	.886**	.828**	.868**	.955**	.868**	.826**	.868**	.933**	1	.594**	.925**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	<.001	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000		0.000	0.000
	N	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90
X10	Pearson Correlation	.598**	.615**	.645**	.622**	.645**	.580**	.725**	.716**	.594**	1	.733**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	<.001	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000		0.000
	N	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90
TOTAL	Pearson Correlation	.957**	.949**	.970**	.954**	.970**	.922**	.970**	.952**	.925**	.733**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	<.001	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	
	N	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Data Source: Data processed, 2022

Based on the results of the validity test above, the level of validity of the significance test by comparing the value r^{hitung} with r^{table}. In this case the distribution of the r^{table} the significance value of 5% obtained the result of 0.576, if r^{hitung} it is greater r^{table} than $r^{positif}$, then the question item is said to be valid. it can be concluded that all items in this research questionnaire are declared valid so that they can be used as research instruments.

d. Job Satisfaction Variable Validity Test Results (Y)

Table 8. Job Satisfaction Validity Test Results (Y)

		Y1	Y2	Y3	Y4	Y5	Y6	TOTAL
Y1	Pearson Correlation	1	.930**	.888**	.888**	.910**	.822**	.941**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		,000	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000
	N	90	90	90	90	90	90	90

Y2	Pearson Correlation	.930**	1	.909**	.909**	.931**	.883**	.963**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	<.001		,000	,000	,000	,000	,000
	N	90	90	90	90	90	90	90
Y3	Pearson Correlation	.888**	.909**	1	1,000**	.976**	.879**	.977**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	<.001	,000		,000	,000	,000	,000
	N	90	90	90	90	90	90	90
Y4	Pearson Correlation	.888**	.909**	1,000**	1	.976**	.879**	.977**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	<.001	,000	,000		,000	,000	,000
	N	90	90	90	90	90	90	90
Y5	Pearson Correlation	.910**	.931**	.976**	.976**	1	.900**	.985**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	<.001	,000	,000	,000		,000	,000
	N	90	90	90	90	90	90	90
Y6	Pearson Correlation	.822**	.883**	.879**	.879**	.900**	1	.931**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	<.001	,000	,000	,000	,000		,000
	N	90	90	90	90	90	90	90
TOTAL	Pearson Correlation	.941**	.963**	.977**	.977**	.985**	.931**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	<.001	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000	
	N	90	90	90	90	90	90	90

Data Source: Data processed, 2022

Based on the results of the validity test above, the level of validity of the significance test by comparing the value r^{hitung} with r^{table}. In this case the distribution of the r^{table} the significance value of 5% obtained the result of 0.576, if r^{hitung} it is greater r^{table} than $r^{positif}$, then the question item is said to be valid. it can be concluded that all items in this research questionnaire are declared valid so that they can be used as research instruments.

e. Reliability Test

A reliable instrument is an absolute requirement to get reliable research results. An instrument is said to be reliable or reliable if it has an alpha coefficient (α) greater than 0.60 (Sugiyono, 2017). In the reliability test in this study, the researcher used the SPSS 23 tool. The results of the reliability test can be seen in the following table:

Table 9. Instrument Reliability Test Results
Communication Variable (X1)

Reliability Statistics	
Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
0.995	10

Data Source: Data processed, 2022

Based on the information from the table above, it is known that each variable has a Cronbach Alpha > 0.60. Thus, it can be explained that 0.995 > 0.60. Therefore, it can be concluded that each variable can be said to be reliable.

f. Industrial Relations Variable (X2)

Table 10. Industrial Relations Variable (X2)

Reliability Statistics	
Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
0.981	10

Data Source: Data processed, 2022

Based on the information from the table above, it is known that each variable has a Cronbach Alpha > 0.60. Thus, it can be explained that 0.995 > 0.60. Therefore, it can be concluded that each variable can be said to be reliable.

g. Job Satisfaction (Y)

Table 11. Job Satisfaction (Y)

Reliability Statistics	
Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
0.995	10

Data Source: Data processed, 2022

Based on the information from the table above, it is known that each variable has a Cronbach Alpha > 0.60. Thus, it can be explained that 0.995 > 0.60. Therefore, it can be concluded that each variable can be said to be reliable.

h. Tabulation Results of Communication Variables, Industrial Relations, and Job Satisfaction

1. X1. Tabulation Results

Table 12. Communication Tabulation (X1)

No	Question Code	SS	S	N	TS	STS	Amount	Average	Note:
		5	4	3	2	1			
1	X1	49	41	0	0	0	409	4.54	Well
		54.4%	45.6%	0	0	0		100%	
2	X2	47	43	0	0	0	407	4.52	Well
		52.2%	47.8%	0	0	0		100%	
3	X3	48	42	0	0	0	408	4.53	Well
		53.3%	46.7%	0	0	0		100%	
4	X4	48	42	0	0	0	408	4.53	Well
		53.3%	46.7%	0	0	0		100%	
5	X5	48	42	0	0	0	408	4.53	Well
		53.3%	46.7%	0	0	0		100%	
6	X6	47	43	0	0	0	407	4.52	Well
		52.2%	47.8%	0	0	0		100%	
7	X7	48	42	0	0	0	408	4.53	Well
		53.3%	46.7%	0	0	0		100%	
8	X8	46	44	0	0	0	406	4.51	Well

		51.1%	48.9%	0	0	0		100%	
9	X9	43	47	0	0	0	403	4.48	Well
		47.8%	52.2%	0	0	0		100%	
10	X10	47	43	0	0	0	407	4.52	Well
		52.2%	47.8%	0	0	0		100%	

Data Source: Data processed, 2022

Based on the table above, it can be seen that all statements in the Communication variable questionnaire achieved a good average value and were included in the "GOOD" category. The highest score is seen from statement number 1, namely "I can understand the message and take action according to the content of the message communicated by the superior". This shows that the existing communication is well established.

While the smallest value number 8 is "Communication between superiors and other employees is well established" that is, with an average value of 4.51 this is due to some lack of communication between superiors and employees, but this is not a big problem because the average the value shown is still in the "GOOD" category.

2. X2 Tabulation Results

Table 13. Industrial Relations Tabulation (X2)

No	Question Code	SS	S	RR	TS	STS	Amount	Average	Note:
		5	4	3	2	1			
1	X1	34	56	0	0	0	394	4.38	Well
		37.8%	62.2%	0	0	0	100%		
2	X2	32	57	1	0	0	391	4.34	Well
		35.6%	63.3%	0	0	0	100%		
3	X3	31	59	0	0	0	391	4.34	Well
		34.4%	65.6%	0	0	0	100%		
4	X4	35	55	0	0	0	395	4.39	Well
		38.9%	61.1%	0	0	0	100%		
5	X5	31	59	0	0	0	391	4.34	Well
		34.4%	65.6%	0	0	0	100%		
6	X6	32	57	1	0	0	391	4.34	Well
		35.6%	63.3%	0	0	0	100%		
7	X7	31	59	0	0	0	391	4.34	Well
		34.4%	65.6%	0	0	0	100%		
8	X8	34	56	0	0	0	394	4.38	Well
		37.8%	62.2%	0	0	0	100%		
9	X9	37	53	0	0	0	397	4.41	Well
		41.1%	58.9%	0	0	0	100%		
10	X10	30	58	2	0	0	388	4.31	Well
		33.3%	64.4%	0	0	0	100%		

Data Source: Data processed, 2022

Based on the table above, it can be seen that all statements in the Industrial Relations variable questionnaire achieved a good average value. The highest value is seen from statement number 9, namely. "Employees have the right to protection for their work". This

shows that the existing Industrial Relations at PTPN VII Tebenan Unit are following the SOP applied both in terms of facilities and the relationship between employees and the company. The prevailing Industrial Relations is proven by the average answer of 4.41 all respondents fill in to agree.

While the smallest value number 10 is "Strikes are the personal rights of employees". That is with an average value of 4.31 but this is not a big problem because the average value shown is still in the "good" category.

3. Y . Tabulation Results

Table 14. Job Satisfaction Tabulation (Y)

No	Question Code	SS	S	RR	TS	STS	Amount	Average	Note:
		5	4	3	2	1			
1	Y1	36	54	0	0	0	396	4.40	Well
		40.0%	60.0%	0	0	0	100%		
2	Y2	35	55	1	0	0	398	4.42	Well
		38.9%	61.1%	0	0	0	100%		
3	Y3	32	58	0	0	0	392	4.35	Well
		34.40 %	65.60 %	0	0	0	100%		
4	Y4	31	59	0	0	0	391	4.34	Well
		34.4%	65.6%	0	0	0	100%		
5	Y5	32	58	0	0	0	392	4.36	Well
		35.6%	64.4%	0	0	0	100%		
6	Y6	33	56	1	0	0	392	4.36	Well
		36.7%	62.2%	0	0	0	100%		

Data Source: Data processed, 2022

Based on the table above, it can be seen that all statements in the Employee Job Satisfaction variable questionnaire achieved a good average value. The highest value is seen in statement number 2, namely "The currently available work facilities are sufficient to support work activities". This shows that the existing employee job satisfaction is good because the company has fulfilled what the employees are entitled to.

While the smallest value number 4 is "My high-risk work is not met with adequate direct compensation". That is with an average value of 4.34 but this is not a big problem because the average value shown is still in the "good" category.

i. Classic Assumption Test

a) Normality test

Table 15. Normality Test Results

One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test		
		Unstandardized Residual
N		12
Normal Parameters, b	mean	0
	Std. Deviation	1.07657888
Most Extreme Differences	Absolute	0.096

	Positive	0.096
	negative	-0.068
Test Statistics		0.096
asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.170c,d	
a. Test distribution is Normal.		
b. Calculated from data.		
c. Lilliefors Significance Correction.		
d. This is a lower bound of the true significance.		

Data Source: Data processed, 2022

Based on the results of the normality test using the Kolmogorov Smirnov method, the significant result of the normality test was 0.170. Where the results are stated to be greater than the 0.05 significance level, so it can be concluded that the normality test in this study was normally distributed.

j. Data Analysis Technique

a) Multiple Linear Regression Analysis

Table 16. Multiple Linear Regression Analysis Results

Coefficients

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients				Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	0.045	3.008		0.015	0.988
	X1	0.293	0.173	0.366	1,698	0.124
	X2	0.457	0.161	0.611	2,833	0.02

a. Dependent Variable: Y

Data Source: Data processed, 2022

The regression equation above shows the relationship between the independent variable and the dependent variable partially, based on this equation it can be concluded.

Y= The dependent variable whose value will be predicted by the independent variable. In this study, the dependent variable is employee job satisfaction whose value is predicted by variables (X1) and (X2).

a = -0.045 is a constant value, which is an estimate of job satisfaction of employees of PTPN VII Tebenan Unit, the results show that the variables (X1) and (X2) are equal to zero. These results can prove that employee job satisfaction is not influenced by other variables that are not included in the study because the value is -0.045.

b1 = 0.293 is the slope or direction coefficient of the self-actualization variable (X1) that affects employee job satisfaction (Y). With a significant value of 0.124 less than 0.05

b2 = 0.457 is the slope tau coefficient by the variable (X2) that affects job satisfaction (Y) employees have a value equal to zero, with a significant 0.20 less than 0.05

e = is the residual value or the possible error of the regression equation model, which can affect the employee job satisfaction variable but is not included in the equation model.

k. Determination Analysis

Table 17. Coefficient of Determination Results

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. The error in the Estimate
1	.964a	0.93	0.928	0.76241

a Predictors: (Constant), Industrial Relations, Communication

Data Source: Data processed, 2022

According to Sugiyono (2017), the coefficient of determination in a study is used to measure how much a model can run the dependent variables. The value of a coefficient of determination is 0 (zero) to 1 (one), and if the value of the coefficient of determination is close to 0, it can be concluded that a model in explaining the dependent variable is weak.

Based on the table above, it is known that the value of the coefficient of determination is in the adjusted R Square value of 0.930. This means that the ability of the independent variable to explain the dependent variable is 86.6%, and the remaining 13.4% is explained by other variables not discussed in this study. This shows that the contribution of the independent variable is getting stronger on that variable.

l. Regression Hypothesis Testing

a) Simultaneous Regression Coefficient Test (F-test)

Table 18. Simultaneous Test Results (F-test)

ANOV Aa

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	672,585	2	336,293	578,551	<.001b
	Residual	50.57	87	0.581		
	Total	723,156	89			

a Dependent Variable: Job Satisfaction

b Predictors: (Constant), Industrial Relations, Communication

Data Source: Data processed, 2022

Based on the test results in the table above, it can be seen that the calculated value is 36.679 with a value of 0.2084, so that f count > f table or > 0.2084, and a significance level of 0.001 < 0.05 then HO is rejected and Ha is accepted, it can be concluded that variables X1 and X2 in the equation have a significant effect on employee job satisfaction (Y).

b) Partial Regression Coefficient Test (t-test)

Table 19. Partial Test Results (t-test)

Coefficients

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	0.148	0.811		0.183	0855
	Communication	0.055	0.024	0.095	2.263	0.026
	Industrial relations	0.547	0.026	0.893	21,361	<.001

a Dependent Variable: Job Satisfaction

Data Source: Data processed, 2022

Based on the table above by observing the row, column t, and sig, the data can be explained as follows:

1) The Effect of Communication Variables on Employee Job Satisfaction (H1)

Based on the results of calculations using the SPSS 23 program as shown in the table above, the communication variable (X1) has a t count of 2.263 with a big value. 0.026. The decision-making provisions for the hypothesis are accepted or rejected, based on the value of t count > t table, -t count < -t table, or if the significance is < 0.05, it can be concluded that the hypothesis is accepted. The results of the research in this study obtained a value of t arithmetic > t table (2.263> 0.2084) and a significance value of 0.026 <0.05, it can be concluded that communication (X1) has a positive effect on employee job satisfaction (Y).

2) The Effect of Industrial Relations on Employee Job Satisfaction (H2)

Based on the results of calculations using the SPSS 23 program as shown in the table above, the Industrial Relations variable (X2) has a t count of 21,361 with a value of sig. 0.001. The decision-making provisions for the hypothesis are accepted or rejected, based on the value of t count > t table, -t count < -t table, or if the significance is < 0.05, it can be concluded that the hypothesis is accepted. The results of the research in this study obtained a t value > t table (21.361 > 0.2084) and a significance value of 0.001 < 0.05, it can be concluded that Industrial Relations (X2) has a positive and significant effect on employee job satisfaction (Y).

3.3 Discussion

a. The Effect of Communication (X1) on Employee Job Satisfaction (Y) At PTPN VII Tebenan Unit

The Effect of Communication on Employee Job Satisfaction From the statistical test results that communication (X1) on employee job satisfaction (Y) has an effect. it can be seen that all statements in the Communication variable questionnaire achieve a good average value. The highest score is seen from statement number 1, namely "I can understand the message and take action according to the content of the message communicated by the superior". This shows that the existing communication is well established.

Based on the results of calculations using the SPSS 23 program as shown in the table above, the communication variable (X1) has a t count of 2.263 with a big value. 0.026. Provisions for decision-making hypotheses are accepted or rejected, based on the value of t count > t table, -t count < -t table, or if the significance is < 0.05, it can be concluded that the hypothesis is accepted. The results of this study obtained a value of t arithmetic > t table (2.263> 0.2084) and a significance value of 0.026 <0.05, it can be concluded that (X1) has a positive effect on employee job satisfaction (Y). This is also confirmed by the findings of previous research, namely by This is supported by previous research entitled "The Effect of

Communication and Industrial Relations on Employee Job Satisfaction at the Fave Petitenget Hotel, Bandung Regency Bali" by I Ketut Merta (2019).

b. The Effect of Industrial Relations (X2) on Employee Job Satisfaction (Y) At PTPN VII Tebenan Unit

The Effect of Industrial Relations on Employee Job Satisfaction from the statistical test results that Industrial Relations (X2) on Employee Job Satisfaction (Y) has an effect. it can be seen that all statements in the Industrial Relations variable questionnaire achieve a good average value. The highest value is seen from statement number 9, namely. "Employees have the right to protection for their work". This shows that the existing Industrial Relations at PTPN VII Tebenan Unit are following the SOP applied both in terms of facilities and the relationship between employees and the company. The prevailing Industrial Relations is proven by the average answer of 4.41 all respondents fill in to agree.

Based on the results of the research in this study, with the value of t count > t table, -t count < -t table, or if the significance is < 0.05, it can be concluded that the hypothesis is accepted. The results of the study in this study obtained a t value > t table (21.361 > 0.2084) and a significance value of 0.001 < 0.05, it can be concluded that Industrial Relations (X2) have a positive and significant effect on Employee Job Satisfaction (Y). This is supported by a previous study entitled "The Influence of Communication and Industrial Relations on Employee Job Satisfaction at the Fave Petitenget Hotel, Bandung Regency Bali" by I Ketut Merta (2019) which obtained the results of the industrial relations variable (X2) partially significant resulting in a t-count of 5.349 and a significance of 0.000. t count 5.349 > t table whose value is 1.663 with a significance level of 0.173 > 0.05, it can be seen that the hypothesis that industrial relations have a significant positive effect on employee job satisfaction, proves that industrial relations run harmoniously.

c. The Effect of Communication (X1) and Industrial Relations (X2) on Employee Job Satisfaction (Y) At PTPN VII Tebenan Unit

Based on the statistical test, namely the F test, the Effect of Communication (X1) and Industrial Relations (X2) have a simultaneous effect on Employee Job Satisfaction (Y) at PTPN VII Tebenan Unit. This finding can be strengthened by the results of the questionnaire tabulation of the highest average value of the Communication variable (X1) on Job Satisfaction (Y) has an effect. it can be seen that all statements in the Communication variable questionnaire achieve a good average value. The highest score is seen from statement number 1, namely "I can understand the message and take action according to the content of the message communicated by the superior". This shows that the existing communication is well established.

The results of the questionnaire tabulation of industrial relations (X2) also support the highest score seen from statement number 9, namely. "Employees have the right to protection for their work". This shows that the existing Industrial Relations at PTPN VII Tebenan Unit are following the SOP applied both in terms of facilities and the relationship between employees and the company. The prevailing Industrial Relations is proven by the average answer of 4.41 all respondents fill in to agree. This has shown a good relationship between the two variables so that employee job satisfaction can run well so that employees feel comfortable working at PTPN VII Tebenan Unit.

This is supported by a previous study entitled "The Effect of Communication and Industrial Relations on Employee Job Satisfaction at the Fave Petitenget Hotel, Bandung Regency, Bali" by I Ketut Merta (2019).

V. Conclusion

Communication on Employee Job Satisfaction from the statistical test results that Communication on Job Satisfaction has an effect. It can be seen that all statements in the Communication variable questionnaire achieved an average value of «GOOD».

Industrial Relations on Employee Job Satisfaction from the statistical test results that Industrial Relations on Employee Job Satisfaction have an effect. It can be seen that all statements in the Industrial Relations variable questionnaire achieved an average value of «GOOD».

Statistical test, namely the F test, the influence of communication and industrial relations have a simultaneous effect on employee job satisfaction at PTPN VII Tebenan Unit.

References

Bangun. (2012). Human Resource Management. Jakarta: Erlangga.

Hadiyasa, ID (2015). The Influence of Leadership, Communication and Industrial Relations on Employee Morale at Villa Semana Ubud, Gianyar. Thesis.

Hamali. (2016). Understanding of Human Resources. Yogyakarta: CAPS.

Imam, G. (2018). Application of Multivariate Analysis with IBM SPSS 25 Program 9th edition. Semarang; Diponegoro University.

Judge, R. d. (2015). Organizational Behavior: Organizational Behavior 16th Edition. Yogyakarta.

Mandagie, USA (2016). Effect of Work Environment, Communication and Work Stress on Employee Performance at Manado Health Polytechnic. Vol.4 No.1, 344-354. Accessed November 15, 2021, From https://ejournal.unsrat.ac.id/index.php/emba/article/download/11602/11198

Mangkunegara. (2017). Company Human Resources Management. PT. Earth Literacy, Jakarta.

Marwansyah. (2016). Human Resource Management. Bandung: Alphabeta.

Merta, IK (2019). The Effect of Communication and Industrial Relations on Employee Job Satisfaction at the Fave Petitenget Hotel, Bandung Regency, Bali. Volume 4, No. 1, June 2019, 12-33.

Noviani, DA (2016). Effect of Industrial Relations and Compensation on Employee Job Satisfaction at Hotel Natura in Ubud, Gianyar. Thesis.

Poniasih, NL (2015). The Influence of Work Motivation, Communication and Job Stress on Employee Job Satisfaction. Vol.4, No. 6, 1560-1573. Accessed November 10, 2021, From https://repositori.unud.ac.id/protected/storage/upload/repositori/a773869a7e54314ddce8a60184fc1425.pdf.

Rivai. (2016). Human Resource Management for Companies from Theory to Practice. Raja Grafindo Persada, Jakarta.

Sariyathi, LM (2017). The Influence of Motivation, Communication and Work Discipline on Employee Performance at Warung Mina Peguyangan in Denpasar. Vol. 6, No. 7, 3540-3569, 3540-3569. Accessed December 5, 2021, From https://ojs.unud.ac.id/index.php/Management/article/view/30157

Siagian. (2016). Human Resource Management. Earth Literacy, Jakarta.

Sugiyono. (2017). Quantitative, Qualitative, and R&D Research Methods. Bandung: Alphabeta.

Sunarta. (2019). The Importance of Job Satisfaction. Efficiency - Study of Administrative Sciences. 16(2), 63 - 75. https://doi/10.21831/efficiency.v16i2.27421.

Suparno. (2015). Human Resource Development Management. Yogyakarta: STUDENT LIBRARY.
Suranto. (2010). Socio-Cultural Communication. Yogyakarta: Graha Ilmu.
Sutrisno, E. (2019). Human Resource Management. Kencana, Jakarta.
Syardiansah, et al. (2020). The Effect of Job Satisfaction and Organizational Culture on Employee Performance of the Royal Hotel in East Aceh District. Budapest International Research and Critics Institute-Journal (BIRCI-Journal). P. 849-857.
Trisnayanti, K. (2015). The Effect of Industrial Relations and Physical Work Environment on Employee Job Satisfaction at PT. Narayana Bali in Denpasar. Thesis.
Wahjudewanti, A.S., Tjakraatmaja, J.H., and Anggoro, Y. (2021). Knowledge Management Strategies to Improve Learning and Growth in Creative Industries: A Framework Model. Budapest International Research and Critics Institute-Journal (BIRCI-Journal) Vol 4 (2): 1903-1915.
Wibowo. (2016). Performance Management, Fifth Edition. PT. Rajagrafindo Persada Jakarta.
Winardi. (2016). Motivation and Motivating in Management. Jakarta. Mighty Grafindo King.