

THE EFFECT OF SUITABILITY BETWEEN PERSONALITY TYPES AND WORK ENVIRONMENT MODELS ON JOB SATISFACTION

Alpha Ariani¹, Faridah Karyati²

¹Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Achmad Yani University, Banjarmasin;

²Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Achmad Yani University, Banjarmasin

Correspondence: [1alpharin2012@gmail.com](mailto:alpharin2012@gmail.com)

ABSTRACT

Job satisfaction is essential in improving employee performance and productivity so that the institution can realize its goals. One factor that influences job satisfaction is employees' personality characteristics. This study aims to determine the effect of suitability between personality types and work environment on job satisfaction. The research was conducted at the Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, XYZ University, with a sample of 24 lecturers. Data was collected through the questionnaires and analyzed with simple linear regression analysis. The results showed no significant effect of the suitability between personality type and work environment on job satisfaction; the contribution is only 5.3%.

Keywords:

Personality type; job environment model; job satisfaction

INTRODUCTION

Human resources are significant for an institution, both for-profit and non-profit, product producers and service producers such as institutions in education. No matter how perfect the financial and technological resources are, it is difficult for the institution to achieve its goals without human resources that are suitable and qualified for the job or organization. Qualified human resources who can work effectively-efficiently will be able to increase the productivity and performance of the employees themselves and the institution. Hassan (in Pitasari and Perdhana, 2018) argues that employee satisfaction is essential to productivity and performance.

The employees' positive attitudes towards their work, willingness to work harder, and more productive due to a high level of job satisfaction tend to make them more committed, contribute, and have high dedicated to the institutions where they work. Otherwise, employees with low job satisfaction tend to show a negative attitude toward their work and will turnover, as well as decreased discipline and work productivity (Robbins, 2012; Wiliandari, 2015). Thus job satisfaction is an essential element that any institution or business venture cannot ignore. However, in reality, job satisfaction often receives less attention.

An initial survey was conducted at a university in South Kalimantan, including informal interviews with several lecturers. It turned out that not all lecturers were satisfied with their jobs, especially in terms of salary, feeling quite depressed because they had to teach subjects that were not to their educational background, tasks that did not match their expertise, gaps in lecturers' perceptions with other lecturers about something causes discomfort so that it can reduce satisfaction at work. In addition, there is a decline in discipline, such as it is easy not to attend meeting invitations, not implementing agreements that have been mutually agreed upon, and a lack of enthusiasm in helping campus or faculty activities. This fact shows the possibility of dissatisfaction felt by lecturers.

Lecturers are professional educators who work in particular higher education units, which are in charge and responsible for educating the nation's children through teaching and publishing the results of their thoughts. As employees in a higher education institution, Lecturers have an essential position and, like the spearhead for the institution's glory, students and lecturers themselves. Therefore, it is necessary to have satisfaction with their work.

Many factors affect employee job satisfaction. According to Pitasari and Perdhana (2018), the factors that affect employee job satisfaction conditions are (1) job content, including work autonomy and role clarity; (2) management, including job evaluation and management support; (3) work environment, including the physical environment, superior-subordinate relations, relations among coworkers; (4) compensation, including salary and rewards; (5) job promotion, including promotion system, promotion opportunity; (6) job training, including training routine, training effectiveness. Job satisfaction is an individual thing. People will feel satisfied or dissatisfied depending on whether they feel justice or not for a situation and feel happy or unhappy because of various things in the organization/institution (As'ad, 2003; Timothy, 2016).

Robbins (2001), based on Herzberg's two-factor theory, states that job satisfaction is more often related to achievement, recognition, job characteristics, responsibility, and advancement. Based on that, external factors generally affect job satisfaction. Can internal factors also affect the level of job satisfaction of an employee? The research results by Rondo et al. (2018) show that personality and work environment significantly affect employee performance. Individual characteristics are one of the factors that influence job satisfaction, in addition to situational variables and the characteristics of the job itself (Windiana et al., 2020; Wiliandari, 2015). Individual characteristics include individual needs, values, and personality traits.

Interests, perspectives, and abilities are part of the personality. Interests and abilities make people tend to think, perceive things, and behave in a certain way (Holland, 1985). According to Holland (1985), personality will direct a person to choose a particular job so that there is a match between personality and work. Individuals with personality types that are congruent with their jobs, there should be right suitability of interests, talents and abilities to meet the demands of the job so that they are more likely to succeed in the job. This creates a greater probability of achieving high job satisfaction.

METHOD

The approach used in this research is a quantitative approach using a survey method. The survey method is quantitative research used to obtain data about variable relationships and to test several hypotheses about sociological and psychological variables (Sugiyono, 2014).

The research was conducted at the Faculty of Teacher Training and Education at one of the higher education institutions in South Kalimantan Province, XYZ University. The subjects of this research were permanent Foundation lecturers and civil servant lecturers. The population was 30 people and as a sample of 24 people were taken based on random sampling techniques.

Data collection techniques through questionnaires, namely:

- 1) Vocational Preference Inventory (VPI) of John Holland. This questionnaire is used to determine a person's personality type through a list of interests in occupations. The questionnaire consists of three groups of statements, namely statements regarding

preferred activities, statements regarding activities that can be done well (ability), and statements about the jobs they are interested in. The six personality types proposed by Holland are Realistic (R), Investigative (I), Artistic (A), Social (S), Enterprising (E), and Conventional (C). The more similar a person with a certain type, the more likely it is to show that personality traits and behaviors related to that type.

2) Questionnaire about job satisfaction. This questionnaire is a Likert scale consisting of 64 questions. The questionnaire was based on the two-factor theory of Frederick Herzberg. The questionnaire is built based on indicators: (a) achievement, which is the likelihood of the employee achieving work performance; (b) recognition, which is the amount of recognition given to employees for their work performance; (c) the job itself, which is the amount of challenge employees feel from their work; (d) responsibility, which is the amount of responsibility given to employees; e) advancement, which is how much the employee can advance in their job; and (f) development of individual potential, which is the likelihood of developing in their job.

The data analysis used in this research is frequency distribution and simple linear regression analysis. The frequency distribution is used to find out how many lecturers have a match between personality types and their work. a lecturer would be suitable for individuals with the social personality type. This is because of the specific nature and experience of social people who prefer activities that require manipulation of others to provide information, training, development, maintenance, or illumination (Holland, 1985). These behavioral tendencies will lead to proficiency in the ability to relate to others such as interpersonal and educational skills. The work environment can also be grouped into six models, Realistic, Investigative, Artistic, Social, Enterprising, and Conventional.

A person's relationship with their environment can be determined according to the degree of suitability using the following hexagonal model:



Figure 1. Hexagonal model of interaction between personality type and Holland's environment model

The greatest degree occurs if a personality is in a suitable environment, for example a Social type in a Social environment. The next degree of suitability occurs if a personality type is in an environment next to it, for example a Social type in an Enterprising or Artistic environment. A Social personality in a Conventional or Investigative environment is the third degree of suitability. Finally, the highest degree of unsuitability occurs when a personality is in the opposite environment, such as

Social in a Realistic environment. Using the hexagonal model four levels of suitability can occur for each type: suitable, slightly suitable, less suitable, not suitable.

In addition, the frequency distribution is also used to determine how many lecturers have high, medium, and low job satisfaction. Meanwhile, simple linear regression analysis was used to determine how the effect of the match between personality type and work environment on job satisfaction. The simple regression formula is : $Y = a + bX$ (Winarsunu, 2006)

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

a. The suitability between personality types and work environment models

Type that is suitable to be a lecturer is Social personality. If it is associated with the work environment model from Holland, the lecturer's work environment can be grouped into a Social work environment.

TABLE I. The suitability between personality types and work environment models

Criteria	F	%	Category
Suitable	12	50	Quite a lot
Slightly suitable	3	12.5	Very little
Less suitable	8	33.3	Little
Unsuitable	1	4.2	Very little
Total	24	100	-

As many as 50% (quite a lot) of lecturers in this higher education institution have a Social personality type, so they have a match between their personality type and their work environment or demands. This personality type ranks first. The second place is lecturers with Conventional and Investigative personality types as much as 33.3%. This personality type is classified as less suitable to be in the Social work environment model. The third and fourth places are enterprising, artistic, and realistic personality types.

Job selection and adjustment is a picture of a person's personality. The development of personality types is the result of interaction between innate factors and the environment (Amalianita & Putri, 2019). According to Holland's (1985) theory, there are six personality types and work environment models, namely Realistic, Investigative, Artistic, Social, Enterprising, and Conventional. Holland asserts that there is a connection between personality traits, environment, and work that allows individuals to hone their skills and abilities, express the attitudes and values they believe in, and work with individuals of the same personality so as to create a suitable environment and appreciate their type (Rahmi, 2017; Sheu, et al., 2010). The relationship between personality types and environment will match, so that it can develop itself in a certain work environment. Ultimately, satisfaction, stability and work results depend on the suitability between the individual's personality type and the individual's work environment (Amalianita & Putri, 2019).

The work environment of lecturers is included in the Social environment model. Therefore, lecturers with Social personality type fall into the category of there is a match between personality type and work environment. The results of this research support Holland's theory that quite a lot (50%) of lecturers have a Social personality

type. Social types have an interest in activities such as teaching, training and informing, helping, treating, healing and serving, greeting, caring about their own welfare and the welfare of others. Working as a lecturer is one of the suitable jobs for individuals with the Social personality type.

33.3% of lecturers have Investigative and Conventional personality types. This is the second most after the Social type, although according to Holland if individuals with Investigative and Conventional personality types work in a Social work environment model it is less suitable. The Investigative types have interests in discovering and researching ideas, observing, investigating and experimenting, asking questions, and solving problems. Whereas, conventional personality types are interested in working indoors and on tasks that involve organizing and accuracy, following procedures, working with data or numbers, and planning work

The job of a lecturer requires the ability and skills to think analytically and logically, communicate by writing and speaking, experiment, investigate, record and keep records, and pay attention to detail. These skills are part of some of the key skills of investigative and conventional type individuals (Wille & De Fruyt in Amalianita & Princess, 2019). Thus, it is possible that the Investigative or Conventional personality type ranks second most after the Social personality type of individuals who work as lecturers.

b. Job satisfaction

Physical and psychological work environment conditions are perceived differently by each lecturer. The results of these perceptions will affect how their job satisfaction is. Based on the questionnaire results, lecturers who have high, moderate, or low job satisfaction are relatively equal in number.

TABLE 2. Job Satisfaction

Job satisfaction level	F	%	Category
High	9	37.5	Little
Moderate	9	37.5	Little
Low	6	25	Little
Total	24	100	-

Job satisfaction is basically an individual thing, and each individual has a different level of job satisfaction according to their desires and value system. This job satisfaction is the result of employees' perceptions of how well their jobs provide things that are considered important to them (Luthans, 2006). This is in line with the opinion of Davis and Newstrom (1994) that job satisfaction is a set of employee feelings about whether their job is pleasant or not. According to Hasibuan (in Muayyad and Gawi, 2016) job satisfaction is an emotional attitude that is pleasant and loves work. An employee's satisfaction with their work is reflected through a sense of love and enjoyment of their work.

The results of research by Nurrohmat and Lestari (2021), having a feeling of satisfaction with work makes employee performance increase and be productive. Damayanti et al (2018) also concluded that job satisfaction has a strong and significant effect on employee performance. The results of research by Muayyad and Gawi

(2016) also show the same thing even though the magnitude of the effect of job satisfaction on productivity is only 7.5%, the rest is influenced by other factors. Thus, satisfaction with work is one of the factors that employees need to have and needs the attention of the management of the organization or institution.

In this study, lecturers who had high job satisfaction were 37.5%. Similarly, there are many lecturers who feel moderate job satisfaction. Lecturers who have low job satisfaction are 25%. If confirmed into the percentage criteria, the number of lecturers who have high, moderate, and low job satisfaction is in the same range (relatively the same). The existence of lecturers who have low job satisfaction should be a concern for the institution. Institutions or organizations that are able to create job satisfaction for their employees are good institutions (Dwiyanti and Bagia, 2020).

The employee job satisfaction factor is very important for the institution because with employee satisfaction, it is expected that it will further improve performance and have an impact on increasing the overall productivity of the institution. In service management, the term "happy employee, happy customer" is known, meaning that before satisfying customers, employee satisfaction must be created first, so that employees are happy and sincere in providing optimal service for their customers; in this case, students. Students who feel satisfied will be a means of positive promotion for an educational institution.

c. The effect of suitability between personality types and work environment on job satisfaction

In this research, simple linear regression analysis was used to prove the extent of the influence of the suitability between personality type and work environment model on job satisfaction. Based on statistical calculations, the regression equation is obtained:

$$Y = 275,871 - 0,242X$$

From this equation, it can be predicted that if there is no suitability between personality type and work environment model, the value of lecturer job satisfaction is 275.871. However, if the match between personality type and work environment model increases once, then the average job satisfaction will decrease by 0.242. This shows a negative correlation. Based on the results of the statistical calculation of SPSS 23, the value of R Square = 0.053, meaning that the contribution of the suitability between the personality types and the work environment model to lecturer job satisfaction is 5.3%. Meanwhile, 94.7% were influenced by other factors beyond the variables that studied.

The t-test analysis was carried out to determine the effect of the suitability between personality type and work environment models on lecturers job satisfaction.

TABLE 3. Coefficient of determination results (R²)

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics				
					R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change
1	,230 ^a	,053	,010	18,08037	,053	1,224	1	22	,281

a. Predictors: (Constant), Kecocokan antara tipe kepribadian dan lingkungan kerja

Source: SPSS 23 Statistical Output (2022)

Table 4. Simple linear regression test

Coefficients^a

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	275,871	35,738		7,719	,000
	Kecocokan antara tipe kepribadian dan lingkungan kerja	-,242	,219	-,230	-1,106	,281

a. Dependent Variable: Kepuasan kerja

Source: SPSS 23 Statistical Output (2022)

Based on the results of data processing, the tcount value = -1.1, while the ttable value with a significance level of 5% is 2.064. It can be seen that the value of tcount < ttable = -1.1 < 2.064, so it means that there is no effect of suitability between personality types on job satisfaction of lecturers at XYZ University.

The determinants of job satisfaction are achievement, recognition from superiors, job characteristics, responsibility for work, and the possibility of advancement and development (Herzberg in Robbin, 2001). If these factors are felt by employees, it will foster a sense of satisfaction with work. The results of research by Rondo, et.al (2018), Windiana, et.al (2020), Wiliandari (2015) showed that individual characteristics (individual needs, values adopted, and personality traits), situational variables (comparison to existing situations, influence of reference groups, and influence of previous work experience), and job characteristics (compensation or salary, supervision provided by superiors, their own work, relationships between colleagues, work environment, infrastructure, and opportunities for promotion) being a factor that affects job satisfaction. There is a significant relationship between job satisfaction and attendance (Utami, et al., 2021). A sense of satisfaction with work will also foster organizational commitment (Dwiyanti and Bagia, 2020).

Personality traits, in this case are a person's interests, skills and abilities in carrying out teaching activities, communicating orally and in writing, analytical-logical thinking, and making observations and research only have an effect of 5.3% on job satisfaction. It turns out that although there is suitability between personality types and job, it does not have much effect on job satisfaction. Satisfaction with work is influenced by other factors, which may come from outside the individual. Based on the regression equation, it was also found that if there is a match between the personality types and the work environment, there is a tendency to be dissatisfied with the work. There are other factors that more strongly influence the growth of job satisfaction than personality factors; specifically, the suitability between personality types and work environment. This needs further investigation.

This research has limitations where it only conducted at one higher education institution, which of course has different characteristics from other institutions. This causes the results of this study cannot be generalized to other higher education institutions.

CONCLUSION

Individuals will find and develop jobs that suit their personality type. Working as a lecturer is dominantly done by individuals with the Social, Investigative, and Conventional personality types. The more suitable a person's personality type is with their job does not guarantee that their job satisfaction will increase. Job satisfaction is much influenced by other factors that exist within the individual and outside itself, such as the conditions of the institution where their work, the outside situation of the institution where their work, and so on. It is recommended to develop research on other internal and external factors in order to become input for the purpose of developing an institution.

REFERENCES

- Amalianita, B., Putri, Y.E. (2019). Perspektif Holland Theory Serta Aplikasinya Dalam Bimbingan dan Konseling. *Jurnal Riset Tindakan Indonesia*, Vol. 4, No. 2.
- As'ad, M. (2003). *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia*. Jakarta: Bumi Aksara.
- Damayanti, R., Hanafi, A., & Cahyadi, A. (2018). Pengaruh Kepuasan Kerja Terhadap Kinerja Karyawan (Studi Kasus Karyawan Non Medis RS Islam Siti Khadijah Palembang). *Jurnal Ilmiah Manajemen Bisnis Dan Terapan*, Tahun XV No 2, Oktober.
- Davis, K.J.W dan Newstrom. (1994). *Perilaku Dalam Organisasi*. Jakarta: Penerbit Erlangga.
- Dwiyanti, I.A.K.A., dan Bagia, I.W. (2020). Peningkatan Kepuasan Kerja Karyawan Melalui Komitmen Organisasi. *Prospek: Jurnal Manajemen dan Bisnis*, Vol. 2 No. 2, Bulan Desember.
- Holland, John, L. (1985). *Making Vocational Choice: A theory of vocational personalities and work environment*. Second Edition. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc. Englewood Cliffs.
- Luthans, Fred. (2006). *Perilaku Organisasi* edisi 10, Yogyakarta: Andi.
- Muayyad, DM., dan Gawi, AIO. (2016). Pengaruh Kepuasan Kerja Terhadap Produktivitas Kerja Pegawai Bank Syariah X Kantor Wilayah II. *Jurnal Manajemen dan Pemasaran Jasa*, Vol. 9, No. 1.
- Nurrohmat, A., dan Lestari, R. (2021). Pengaruh Kepuasan Kerja terhadap Kinerja Karyawan. *Journal Riset Akuntansi*, Vol. 1, No. 2, Desember.
- Pitasari, N.A.U dan Perdhana, M.S. 2018. Kepuasan Kerja Karyawan: Studi Literatur. *Diponegoro Journal Of Management*. Vol. 7. Nomor 4, Hal 1-11. <http://ejournal-S1.undip.ac.id/index.php/management>
- Rahmi, A. (2017). *Konseling Karir Model Career Development Resource Centre (Cdrc) Di Perguruan Tinggi Untuk Persiapan Tenaga Kerja Menyongsong Masyarakat Ekonomi Asean (Mea)*. Proceeding IAIN Batusangkar, 1(1), Hal 34-45.
- Robbins, S. (2012). *Perilaku Organisasi, Konsep Kontroversi dan Aplikasi*. Jakarta: PT. Indeks Kelompok Gramedia.

- Robbins, S. (2001). *Perilaku Organisasi*. Jakarta: IndeksTim Indeks.
- Rondo, DWR., Koleangan, RAM., Tawas, H. (2018). Pengaruh Kepribadian, Lingkungan Kerja Dan Penempatan Kerja Terhadap Kinerja Karyawan (Pada PT. BPR Prisma Dana Manado). *Jurnal EMBA*, Vol.6 No.4 September 2018, Hal. 2848 – 2857.
- Sheu, H.-B., Lent, R. W., Brown, S. D., Miller, M. J., Hennessy, K. D., & Duffy, R. D. (2010). Testing the choice model of social cognitive career theory across Holland themes: A meta-analytic path analysis. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 76(2), 252-264.
- Sugiyono. (2014). *Metode Penelitian Manajemen*. Bandung: Alfabeta.
- Timotius, Duha. (2016). *Perilaku Organisasi*. Yogyakarta: Budi Utama.
- Utami, P.P., Widiatna, A.D., Herlyna, Ariani, A., Karyati, F., Nurvrita, A.S. (2021). Does civil servant teachers' job satisfaction influence their absenteeism?. *International Journal of Evaluation and Research in Education (IJERE)*, Vol. 10, No. 3, September.
- Wiliandari, Y. (2015). Kepuasan Kerja Karyawan. Society, *Jurnal Jurusan Pendidikan IPS Ekonomi*, Edisi XIV, Oktober.
- Winarsunu, Tulus. (2006). *Statistik Dalam Penelitian Psikologi Dan Pendidikan*. Malang: UMM.
- Windiana, L., Tain, A., Baroh, I. (2020). Kepuasan Kerja Karyawan di Unit Usaha Milik Kampus. *Agriecobis (Journal of Agricultural Socioeconomics and Business)* Vol. 3, No. 2, October 2020, pp. 87-92.