The Effect of Work Life Quality on Job Satisfaction Mediated by Performance in Employees of The Agricultural Service of Simalungun Regency

Yusniar Lubis & Fajar Rezeki Ananda Lubis

Agricultural science, Universitas Medan Area, Indonesia
Management science, Universitas Prima Indonesia Medan, Indonesia
yusniar@staff.uma.ac.id

Received date: March 7, 2025, Revision date: April 5, 2025, Accepted: May 28, 2025

ABSTRACT

Undoubtedly, a number of factors, including the norm of work-life balance, contribute to either gains or decreases in performance. Therefore, the goal of this study is to look at the relationship between employee performance at the Simalungun Regency Agriculture Service and job satisfaction and quality of work life. 63 employees make up the sample size for this quantitative descriptive study. The factors are measured using a Likert scale. The t-test and mediation test are used in multiple linear regression analysis to test hypotheses. The results of the study indicate that the quality of work life has a favorable and significant impact on the job satisfaction of Simalungun Regency Agriculture Service personnel. Work-life balance has a good and significant impact on staff performance at the Simalungun Regency Agriculture Service. Additionally, job satisfaction has a favorable and considerable impact on employee performance and is a mediating variable for Simalungun Regency Agriculture Service employees. Furthermore, performance is positively and significantly impacted by the quality of one's work life.

Keywords: Quality of Work Life, Job Satisfaction, Performance, Agricultural Service Employees

1. Introduction

The effective and efficient use of human resources is expected to improve the performance of every component of a government agency in order to achieve the national development goals. Performance is the result of someone finishing duties with knowledge, experience, sincerity, and patience (Bourne et al., 2005).

Ideas, innovation, creativity, inventions, and effective and efficient work procedures are some examples of how employees help get the job done. In the same way, the Simalungun Regency Agriculture Service is a government agency that instills enthusiasm and knowledge about effective agricultural techniques, provides guidance and supervision of food availability, and manages the potential of community agricultural resources. However, there are still several programs that have not been implemented properly, resulting in poor performance for employees and lower job satisfaction.

Job satisfaction is one important outcome of labor market activity, claim Raziq & Maulabakhsh (2015). Job satisfaction is one factor that keeps employees motivated to work longer hours. By recognizing that job happiness is a crucial factor, a company can boost roles and working conditions to promote and enhance employee work abilities (Siahaan et al., 2022; Purba et al., 2019). When employees are already loyal to the firm and understand the business goals it pursues, the company has a responsibility to maintain the quality of their work-life balance by making sure they are comfortable at work and while carrying out their responsibilities. In the end, this should make employees more inclined to stay. According to Nuning and Achmad (2021), quality of work life is the organization's highest performance in carrying out its duties and responsibilities, and both internal and external stakeholders can feel content with this maximum outcome.

The quality of their work life is one way that Department of Agriculture personnel are satisfied (Purba et al., 2018). This is an appreciation for their abilities and their commitment to improving their work results, which can make a significant contribution to the organization. However, observations show that some employees still feel comfortable working, there is progress in working conditions, and a more significant and important work life. Testing the Impact of Work Life Quality on Job Satisfaction and Its Effects on Employee Performance at the Department of Agriculture of Simalungun Regency is required in light of the aforementioned analysis.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Quality of Work Life

In an organization's management system, the quality of work-life paradigm describes how people naturally perform tasks connected to their jobs. Work is essentially the implementation of ideas regarding organizational management and the humane treatment of members of an organization. It is difficult for experts to conceptually define quality of work life because the notion is so wide.

The concept of quality of work life is related to the importance of human dignity in the workplace (Srivastava & Kanpur (2014). Changing the work environment is essential for businesses to both technically and morally give all of their employees a better and more profitable work life. According to Hackman and Oldham, a good work life consists of a comfortable environment, guarantees of health and safety, happiness, opportunities for professional development, and equitable compensation (Ahmad, 2013).

According to Bhende et al. (2020), improving the financial and non-financial aspects of work life is essential, especially for employees. Absenteeism, output, and productivity all suffer when work-life balance is compromised. Workers expect to be actively involved in the process of designing their work. The quality of work life can be defined as an organization's systematic efforts to provide its employees with the opportunity to learn about their operations and what they offer to the business in order to attain various goals and objectives (Narehan et al., 2014). Therefore, it can be said that the organization's methodical attempts to give its employees the chance to impact their work in order to increase the company's effectiveness.

2.2 Job Satisfaction

In essence, a person's behavior while employed by a company determines their level of job satisfaction. Numerous groups focus on job happiness, which makes it an intriguing topic for studies on employee loyalty and comfort in the workplace. When work outcomes meet or even beyond expectations, one is said to be satisfied with their job. Job satisfaction, according to Vrinda & Jacob (2015), is a person's attitude toward their employment. Their perception of their role is influenced by how well they mesh with the organization. However, Pushpakumari (2008) defines job satisfaction as an employee's evaluation of their role, taking into consideration factors including cooperation, compensation, working environment, and psychological and physical components.

Furthermore, job satisfaction was defined by Khan et al. (2012) as loving one's work and having a positive emotional attitude. Work performance, discipline, placement, and morale all reflect this point of view. According to Ingtyas et al. (2021), Buntaran et al. (2019), and Amal et al. (2022), job satisfaction is an emotional state in which employees find common ground between their service limits and the amount of value of their service bias, both financially and non-financially.

According to Shaju & Subhashini (2017), job satisfaction is made up of several elements. Positive affective orientation toward work and the feelings and emotions that result from work experiences come after employee impressions of their employment. Job satisfaction is the extent to which workers or employees are happy with their work and all of its related aspects.

2.3 Performance

In order for a company to achieve its goals, objectives, and visions, performance is the achievement or result of those aims. The term "performance" or simply "performance" has become a common way to assess an employee's level of contribution to a company. This phrase can also be used to assess the level of development of an organization. Performance is the result that individuals or groups of individuals within an organization can achieve in accordance with their authority and duty to carry out organizational goals in a manner that is morally, legally, and ethically sound, according to Gerrish (2016).

Performance, according to Nash et al. (2015), is the amount and caliber of work that an employee completes after completing the tasks assigned to them. Performance is defined by Liu et al. (2012) as the results that employees achieve in relation to specific criteria that are pertinent to their positions. According to Anitha (2014), performance is determined by the interplay between aptitude, effort, and task perception. Reaching company objectives by performing well Consequently, efforts must be taken to improve this performance.

Ebrahim and Rangan (2014) define performance as the degree to which program activities or policies are carried out effectively in order to achieve the organization's vision, mission, goals, and objectives. Performance is taken into consideration in the organization's strategic planning. Several definitions state that performance is the result of the amount and quality of work that employees accomplish when they carry out their responsibilities with a sense of responsibility to the organization.

3. Research Methodology

This study was conducted in North Sumatra by the Department of Agriculture of the Simalungun Regency. Performance was the Z variable, job satisfaction was the Y variable, and work-life quality was the Y variable in this study. The study's sample consisted of sixty-three employees of the Department of Agriculture in Simalungun Regency. The two categories of data employed in the study are primary data sources, which have a direct connection to the research subjects, and secondary data sources, which have an indirect connection to the research subjects. Methods for collecting information using questionnaires, interviews, and documentation studies Sugiyono (2016) states that the Likert scale is used in research to measure the attitudes, beliefs, and perceptions of an individual or a group about social issues. Questionnaire items are weighted using this scale.

Quantitative analysis is one type of analysis that uses statistics and numerical data. For the SPSS for Windows vs. 20.00 application to facilitate analysis, data must be categorized using particular tables. The purpose of this study is to determine the impact of independent variables on dependent variables using multiple linear regression analysis. Check test quality data for validity and dependability.

3.1 Research Hypothesis

The following hypotheses are based on the conceptual framework of the research mentioned above :

1. A Quality of work life affects the job satisfaction of employees of the Simalungun Regency Agriculture Service.
2. Quality of work life affects the performance of employees of the Simalungun Regency Agriculture Service.
3. Job satisfaction affects the performance of employees of the Simalungun Regency Agriculture Service.
4. Quality of work life affects performance through job satisfaction as a mediating variable for employees of the Simalungun Regency Agriculture Service.

4. Results and Discussion

4.1 Respondents' Answers to Quality of Work Life (X)

Table 1 below displays the respondents' answers to the work-life quality indicators provided by the Simalungun Regency Agriculture Service. On average, 29.2% of respondents indicated they strongly agreed, 66.5% said they agreed, and 4.4% disagreed, based on their comments.

Table 1. Respondents' Answers on Quality of Work Life (X)

No	ANSWER											
	SS		S		KS		TS		STS		Amount	
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
1	16	25,4%	47	74,6%	0	0,0%	0	0,0%	0	0,0%	63	100,0%
2	14	22,2%	33	52,4%	16	25,4%	0	0,0%	0	0,0%	63	100,0%
3	29	46,0%	31	49,2%	3	4,8%	0	0,0%	0	0,0%	63	100,0%
4	13	20,6%	50	79,4%	0	0,0%	0	0,0%	0	0,0%	63	100,0%
5	13	20,6%	50	79,4%	0	0,0%	0	0,0%	0	0,0%	63	100,0%
6	36	57,1%	27	42,9%	0	0,0%	0	0,0%	0	0,0%	63	100,0%
7	13	20,6%	47	74,6%	3	4,8%	0	0,0%	0	0,0%	63	100,0%
8	13	20,6%	50	79,4%	0	0,0%	0	0,0%	0	0,0%	63	101,6%
Average	18	29,2%	42	66,5%	3	4,4%	0	0%	0	0%	63	100,2%

Source: Research Results 2024.

4.2 Respondents' Answers to Job Satisfaction (Y)

Table 2 below displays the respondents' answers to the work satisfaction metrics used by the Simalungun Regency Agriculture Service. The respondents' responses showed that, on average, 19.4% disagreed, 53.2% agreed, and 27.4% strongly agreed.

Table 2. Respondents' Answers Regarding Job Satisfaction (Y)

No	ANSWER											
	SS		S		KS		TS		STS		Amount	
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
1	16	25,4%	45	71,4%	2	3,2%	0	0,0%	0	0,0%	63	100,0%
2	6	9,5%	35	55,6%	22	34,9%	0	0,0%	0	0,0%	63	100,0%
3	13	20,6%	28	44,4%	22	34,9%	0	0,0%	0	0,0%	63	100,0%
4	30	47,6%	23	36,5%	10	15,9%	0	0,0%	0	0,0%	63	100,0%
5	18	28,6%	45	71,4%	0	0,0%	0	0,0%	0	0,0%	63	100,0%
6	13	20,6%	28	44,4%	22	34,9%	0	0,0%	0	0,0%	63	100,0%
7	6	9,5%	35	55,6%	22	34,9%	0	0,0%	0	0,0%	63	100,0%
8	6	9,5%	35	55,6%	22	34,9%	0	0,0%	0	0,0%	63	100,0%
9	18	28,6%	45	71,4%	0	0,0%	0	0,0%	0	0,0%	63	100,0%
10	47	74,6%	16	25,4%	0	0,0%	0	0,0%	0	0,0%	63	100,0%
Average	17	27,4%	34	53,2%	12	19,4%	0	0%	0	0%	63	100,0%

Source: Research Results 2024.

4.3 Respondents' Answers to Performance (Z)

Table 3 below displays the respondents' answers to the performance variable indicators of the Simalungun Regency Agriculture Service. On average, 20.9% of respondents indicated they strongly agreed, 64% indicated they agreed, and 15.1% disagreed, based on their comments.

Table 3. Respondents' Answers on Performance (Z)

No	ANSWER											
	SS		S		KS		TS		STS		Amount	
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
1	6	9,5%	36	57,1%	21	33,4%	0	0,0%	0	0,0%	63	100,0%
2	13	20,6%	28	44,4%	22	34,9%	0	0,0%	0	0,0%	63	100,0%
3	30	47,6%	23	36,5%	10	15,9%	0	0,0%	0	0,0%	63	100,0%
4	18	28,6%	45	71,4%	0	0,0%	0	0,0%	0	0,0%	63	100,0%
5	13	20,6%	29	46,0%	21	33,4%	0	0,0%	0	0,0%	63	100,0%
6	6	9,5%	36	57,1%	21	33,4%	0	0,0%	0	0,0%	63	100,0%
7	18	28,6%	45	71,4%	0	0,0%	0	0,0%	0	0,0%	63	100,0%
8	6	9,5%	57	90,5%	0	0,0%	0	0,0%	0	0,0%	63	100,0%
9	5	7,9%	58	92,1%	58	0,0%	0	0,0%	0	0,0%	63	100,0%
10	17	27,0%	46	73,0%	0	0,0%	0	0,0%	0	0,0%	63	100,0%
Average	13	20,9%	40	64%	10	15,1%	0	0%	0	0%	63	100,0%

Source: Research Results 2024

4.4 Descriptive Statistics

If the standard deviation number is greater than the mean value, the mean value is a poor representation of the entire set of data. However, if the standard deviation value is smaller than the mean value, the mean value can be used as a representation of the complete data set. Descriptive information for each of the performance, job satisfaction, and work-life quality factors is shown below.

1. Descriptive Statistics on Quality of Work Life (X)

Table 4. Results of Descriptive Statistical Tests on Quality of Work Life (X)

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Sum	Mean		Std. Deviation
	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Std. Error	Statistic
Quality of Work Life	63	4.00	5.00	268.00	4.2540	.05528	.43878
Quality of Work Life	63	3.00	5.00	250.00	3.9683	.08755	.69487
Quality of Work Life	63	3.00	5.00	278.00	4.4127	.07379	.58571
Quality of Work Life	63	4.00	5.00	265.00	4.2063	.05139	.40793
Quality of Work Life	63	4.00	5.00	265.00	4.2063	.05139	.40793
Quality of Work Life	63	4.00	5.00	288.00	4.5714	.06285	.49885
Quality of Work Life	63	3.00	5.00	262.00	4.1587	.06074	.48214
Quality of Work Life	63	4.00	5.00	265.00	4.2063	.05139	.40793
Total_X2	63	29.00	39.00	2141.00	33.9841	.27106	2.15146
Valid N (listwise)	63						

Source: SPSS Processing Results 2024

Since the standard deviation value in table 4 above is less than the mean (2.15 < 33.98), the mean value can be used as a representation of the entire data. Furthermore, the variable item of quality of work life has a mean value of 33.98, with the lowest value being 29 and the highest value being 39, based on the statistical data description from the 63 samples that were collected. The overall average of the quality of work life variables, which is (38.55 / 9) = 4.25, shows that the average indication of the quality of work life variable falls into the good/high group.

2. Descriptive Statistics on Job Satisfaction (Y)

Table 5. Results of Descriptive Statistical Tests on Job Satisfaction (Y)

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Sum	Mean		Std. Deviation
	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Std. Error	Statistic
Job satisfaction	63	3.00	5.00	266.00	4.2222	.06174	.49004
Job satisfaction	63	3.00	5.00	236.00	3.7460	.07828	.62135
Job satisfaction	63	3.00	5.00	243.00	3.8571	.09291	.73741
Job satisfaction	63	3.00	5.00	272.00	4.3175	.09282	.73672
Job satisfaction	63	4.00	5.00	270.00	4.2857	.05737	.45538
Job satisfaction	63	3.00	5.00	243.00	3.8571	.09291	.73741
Job satisfaction	63	3.00	5.00	236.00	3.7460	.07828	.62135
Job satisfaction	63	3.00	5.00	236.00	3.7460	.07828	.62135
Job satisfaction	63	4.00	5.00	270.00	4.2857	.05737	.45538
Job satisfaction	63	4.00	5.00	299.00	4.7460	.05528	.43878
Total_Y	63	34.00	48.00	2571.00	40.8095	.45078	3.57797
Valid N (listwise)	63						

Source: SPSS Processing Results 2024

Since the standard deviation number is less than the mean (3.58 < 40.81), the mean value in table 5 above

can be used as a representation of the entire data. The job satisfaction variable item also has a mean value of 40.81, with the lowest value being 34 and the highest value being 48, based on the statistical data description from the 63 samples that were collected. The average job happiness variable indicator is in the good/high category, with an overall average of (40.81 / 10) = 4.08 for all job satisfaction variable indicators.

3. Descriptive Statistics on Performance (Z)

Table 6. Results of Descriptive Statistics Test on Performance (Z)

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Sum	Mean		Std. Deviation
	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Std. Error	Statistic
Performance	63	3.00	5.00	237.00	3.7619	.07745	.61472
Performance	63	3.00	5.00	243.00	3.8571	.09291	.73741
Performance	63	3.00	5.00	272.00	4.3175	.09282	.73672
Performance	63	4.00	5.00	270.00	4.2857	.05737	.45538
Performance	63	3.00	5.00	244.00	3.8730	.09189	.72938
Performance	63	3.00	5.00	237.00	3.7619	.07745	.61472
Performance	63	4.00	5.00	270.00	4.2857	.05737	.45538
Performance	63	4.00	5.00	258.00	4.0952	.03728	.29590
Performance	63	4.00	5.00	257.00	4.0794	.03433	.27248
Performance	63	4.00	5.00	269.00	4.2698	.05637	.44744
Total_Z	63	35.00	50.00	2557.00	40.5873	.41517	3.29533
Valid N (listwise)	63						

Source: SPSS Processing Results 2024

Since the standard deviation value in table 6 above is smaller than the mean (3.29 < 40.59), the mean value can be used as a representation of the entire data. The performance variable item also has a mean value of 40.59, with the lowest value being 35 and the highest being 50, based on the statistical data description from the 63 samples that were collected. The overall average of all performance variable indicators, which is (40.59 / 10) = 4.06, indicates that the average performance variable indicator falls into the good/high category.

4.5 Validity and Reliability Testing

1. Validity Test

Table 7. Validity Test Results

Variable	No. Item	(n = 63, α = 5%) (r_{table})	*Corrected item-total correlation* (r_{count})	Conclusion
Quality of Work Life (X)	X 21	0,248	0,382	Valid
	X 22	0,248	0,636	Valid
	X 23	0,248	0,543	Valid
	X 24	0,248	0,573	Valid
	X 25	0,248	0,573	Valid
	X 26	0,248	0,429	Valid
	X 27	0,248	0,500	Valid
	X 28	0,248	0,573	Valid
Job satisfaction (Y)	Y 1	0,248	0,392	Valid
	Y 2	0,248	0,580	Valid
	Y 3	0,248	0,723	Valid

	Y 4	0,248	0,654	Valid
	Y 5	0,248	0,707	Valid
	Y 6	0,248	0,723	Valid
	Y 7	0,248	0,580	Valid
	Y 8	0,248	0,580	Valid
	Y 9	0,248	0,707	Valid
	Y 10	0,248	0,256	Valid
Performance (Z)	Z 1	0,248	0,532	Valid
	Z 2	0,248	0,772	Valid
	Z 3	0,248	0,679	Valid
	Z 4	0,248	0,639	Valid
	Z 5	0,248	0,770	Valid
	Z 6	0,248	0,500	Valid
	Z 7	0,248	0,639	Valid
	Z 8	0,248	0,504	Valid
	Z 9	0,248	0,594	Valid
	Z 10	0,248	0,306	Valid

Source: SPSS Processing Results Year 2024

To conduct a validity test, the correlation between the scores of each statement item and the total score is computed. With a computed r value > r table (0.248), it is clear from table 7 above that all of the components for performance (Z), job satisfaction (Y), and quality of work life (X) have a positive correlation. As a result, each statement item can be considered true.

2. Reliability Test

The majority of researchers use Crobach's Alpha to assess reliability. The alpha value of a reliable questionnaire usually falls between 0.60 and 0.80, which is enough for basic research.

Table 8. Results of X Y and Z Reliability Test

Variable	*Alpha Value*	Reliable/Unreliable	Conclusion
Quality of Work Life (X)	0,649	Reliable (Enough)	Used
Job Satisfaction (Y)	0,796	Reliable (Enough)	Used
Performance (Z)	0,789	Reliable (Enough)	Used

Source: SPSS Processing Results 2024

4.6 Classical Assumption Test

1. Data Normality Test

Finding out if the residuals of the regression model are regularly distributed is the goal of the normality test. The normality test method used in this study is the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test, which is performed using the Statistical Product and Service Solution (SPSS) for Windows software.

Table 9. Normality Test Results
One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test

		Unstandardized Residual
N		63
Normal Parameters[a,b]	Mean	0E-7
	Std. Deviation	.85758372
Most Extreme Differences	Absolute	.073
	Positive	.070
	Negative	-.073
Test Statistic		.073
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)		.200

Source: SPSS Processing Results 2024

As can be seen in Table 9 above, the Kolmogorov Smirnov test results in a significance value of 0.200 > 0.05 for the residual value in the Asymp.Sig. (2-tailed) row. By fulfilling the assumption of residual normality and proving that the data is normally distributed, these results show that the residual regression model is normally distributed.

2. Multicollinearity Test

Finding out if independent variables are connected to one another is the goal of multicollinearity testing. Multicollinearity testing is necessary because this investigation includes multiple independent variables. The procedure of figuring out if multicollinearity is present or not is explained by the Tolerance Value and Inflation Factor (VIF). Either the tolerance value limit is 0.10 or the VIF value is 10. If the VIF is less than 10 and the tolerance value is greater than 0.10, multicollinearity is not present, and vice versa. If the VIF is larger than 10 and the tolerance value is less than 0.10, multicollinearity is present. The results of the process are shown in Table 10 below :

Table 10. Multicollinearity Test Results
Coefficientsa

Model		Correlations			Collinearity Statistics	
		Zero-order	Partial	Part	Tolerance	VIF
1	(Constant)					
	Total_X1	.944	.921	.615	.616	1.623

Source: SPSS Processing Results 2024

Table 10 above makes it evident that there is no multicollinearity because each independent variable's tolerance value is greater than 0.10 and the VIF value is less than 10.

3. Heteroscedasticity Test

The heteroscedasticity test is used to determine whether or not the variance in the regression model is consistent across observations. "Heteroscedasticity" is the state in which the variances of the residuals vary from one observation to the next and remain constant. There is no heteroscedasticity in a good regression model. Table 11 shows that the researcher used the Statistical Product and Service Solution (SPSS) Program for Windows to evaluate the data in this conventional assumption test :

Table 11. Park Test Results

Coefficientsa

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
Total_X	.012	.118	.016	.103	.918
Total_Y	.016	.020	.119	.807	.423

Source: SPSS Processing Results 2024

The assumption of no heteroscedasticity has been satisfied since the Park test yields a significant result for each independent variable > 0.05, proving that the regression model is heteroscedastic (see table 11 above).

4. Autocorrelation Test

The autocorrelation test can be used to check for flaws in the conventional assumption of autocorrelation, which is the connection between residuals on one observation and additional data in a regression model. Autocorrelation is absent from an appropriate regression model. The Durbin-Watson test, also referred to as the DW test, is used to determine if autocorrelation is present or not. The regression model must have an intercept, or constant, and no extraneous variables among the independent variables. Only first-order autocorrelation, or first autocorrelation, is examined.

Table 12. Durbin-Watson Test Results (DW Test)

Model Summaryb

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Durbin-Watson
1	.966[a]	.932	.929	.87912	1.799

Source: SPSS Processing Results Year 2024

According to table 12 above, the Durbin-Watson value is 1.799. The table shows that the Durbin-Watson values for n = 63 respondents and K = 3 (in this example, the number of independent variables) are dl = 1.494 and du = 1.693. Therefore, it can be concluded that the regression model is suitable for usage because it lacks autocorrelation because the calculated DW value > du (1.799 > 1.693).

4.7 Multiple Linear Regression Hypothesis Testing I

The hypothesis is tested using the regression coefficient proof. It is used to evaluate the relationship between the independent variable, job satisfaction, and the dependent variable, quality of work life. This hypothesis test is tested independently using the t-test.

4.7.1 Multiple Linear Regression Analysis I

The degree to which work-life quality influences Simalungun Regency Agriculture Service employees' job satisfaction and performance can be ascertained using multiple linear regression analysis. The Statistical Product and Service Solution (SPSS) for Windows program was used to do this analysis, and the following are the findings :

Table 13. Multiple Linear Regression I
Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	1.212	6.492		.187	.853
	Total_X	.554	.200	.333		.007

Source: SPSS Processing Results 2024

The data processing displayed in table 13 output of the second column of section B (Unstandardized Coefficients) yields the multiple linear regression equation, specifically :

1. If the variable of work-life quality is ignored, the constant value of 1.212 shows that job satisfaction is 1.212.
2. The quality of work-life variable has a regression coefficient of 0.554, which indicates that job satisfaction will increase by 55.4% for every 1% increase in the component.

4.8 Multiple Linear Regression Analysis I

Multiple linear regression analysis is used by the Simalungun Regency Agriculture Service to evaluate how work-life balance and job satisfaction affect employee performance. The analysis, which was conducted using the Statistical Product and Service Solution (SPSS) for Windows software, produced the following findings :

Table 14. Multiple Linear Regression
Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	-4.074	2.000		-2.037	.046
	Total_X	.204	.065	.133	3.114	.003
	Total_Y	.722	.040	.784	18.157	.000

Source: SPSS Processing Results 2024

The data processing displayed in table 14 output of the second column of section B (Unstandardized Coefficients) is used to derive the multiple linear regression equation, namely :

1. If the variables of work-life quality and job satisfaction are ignored, the performance value is -4.074, which is the constant value.
2. The quality of work life variable has a regression coefficient of 0.204, which indicates that performance will increase by 20.4% for every 1% increase in the component.
3. The job satisfaction variable's regression coefficient is 0.722, which indicates that for every 1% increase in the quality of work-life component, performance will increase by 72.2%..

4.9 Multiple Linear Regression (Partial) t-Test II

The t-test is a test used to determine the partial influence of independent variables on dependent variables. The hypothesis in this study is:

H0: Work-life balance and job happiness as independent variables have a minor impact on performance as dependent factors.

H1: Work-life balance and job happiness are independent variables that partially affect performance, a dependent variable.
Each variable's t_{count} value is derived from table 15 below. Next, a 95% confidence level comparison between the t_{count} and t_{table} values is made or $\alpha = 0.05$. The t_{table} value at df 2:63 with $\alpha = 0.05$ from the t-distribution table is 1.998.

The partial effect of the work life quality variable, which obtained a t-value of 3.114, indicating that t-value> t-table (3.114> 1.998) and a significant value of 0.003 <0.05, indicates that the variable has a positive and significant impact on employee performance at the Simalungun Regency Agriculture Service, hence H0 is rejected and H1 is accepted. This suggests that if work-life balance improves, Simalungun Regency Agriculture Service performance will also improve. The partial effect of the job satisfaction variable, which obtained a t-value of 18.157, indicating that t-value> t-table (18.157> 1.998) and a significant value of 0.000 <0.05, indicates that the variable has a positive and significant impact on employee performance at the Simalungun Regency Agriculture Service, hence rejecting H0 and accepting H1. This suggests that if job satisfaction increases, Simalungun Regency Agriculture Service performance will also increase.

Table 15. Partial Test Results

Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	-4.074	2.000		-2.037	.046
	Total_X	.204	.065	.133	3.114	.003
	Total_Y	.722	.040	.784	18.157	.000

Source: SPSS Processing Results 2024

Table 15 above indicates that work satisfaction (Y) has the greatest regression coefficient value, at 0.784, or 78.4%. This indicates that at the Simalungun Regency Agriculture Service, job satisfaction (Y) has a greater impact on performance.

4.10 The Influence of Quality of Work Life on Performance Through Job Satisfaction

P1 is 0.133, P2 is 0.333, and P3 is 0.784, according to the statistics. The results of model 2's path analysis show that work-life quality affects performance directly and indirectly. For example, work-life quality may influence job satisfaction, which may act as an intervening factor, and then performance. The quantity of direct, indirect, and overall influence on performance is calculated using the formula below :

1. Direct influence $X \rightarrow Z = 0.133$ (p1)
2. Indirect influence $X2 \rightarrow Y \rightarrow Z = 0.261$ (p2 x p3)
3. Total influence $X \rightarrow Z = 0.394$ (p1 + (p2 x p3))

The results of the calculations above show that the direct influence value is 0.133 and the indirect influence value is 0.261. This suggests that the value of indirect influence is greater than the value of direct influence. These results show that job happiness has a major influence on employee performance at the Simalungun Agriculture Service, which in turn influences work-life balance.

5. Discussion

5.1 The Influence of Quality of Work Life on Job Satisfaction

The study's results (t_{count}> t_{table} (2.770> 1.998) and a significant value of 0.007 <0.05) indicate that the quality of work life has a positive and significant impact on employee job satisfaction at the Simalungun Regency Agriculture Service. The regression equation, $Y = 1.212 + 0.626X1 + 0.554X2 + \varepsilon$, predicts that job satisfaction will improve by 55.4% for every 1% increase in the quality of work life factor and drop by

55.4% for every 1% decline in the quality of work life factor. The results of this study support those of previous studies by BU et al. (2019) and Zittaian Amelia et al. (2023), which discovered that the quality of work life has an impact on job satisfaction.

5.2 The Influence of Quality of Work Life on Performance

The results of the study show that the quality of work life has a favorable and substantial impact on employee performance at the Simalungun Regency Agriculture Service (t_{count}> t_{table} (3.114> 1.998) and a significant value of 0.003 <0.05). The following findings were obtained from the regression equation: Y = -4.074 + 0.249X1 + 0.204X2 + 0.722X3 + ε. This means that for every 1% improvement in the quality of work-life factor, performance will increase by 20.4%, and for every 1% drop in the quality of work-life factor, performance will decline by 20.4%. The results of the study support those of other studies by Sipayung (2023), Fathiyah et al. (2017), and Nst (2019) that indicated work-life balance affects performance.

5.3 The Influence of Job Satisfaction on Performance

The test results also show a significant value of 0.000 <0.05 and t_{count}> t_{table} (18.157> 1.998), indicating that job satisfaction has a positive and significant impact on the performance of the Simalungun Regency Agriculture Service's employees. The following findings are obtained from the regression equation: Y = -4.074 + 0.249X1 + 0.204X2 + 0.722X3 + ε. This means that for every 1% increase in job satisfaction, performance will increase by 72.2%, and for every 1% decrease in job satisfaction, performance will decrease by 72.2%. The results of this study support earlier studies that demonstrate a connection between performance and job satisfaction (Ardiansyah, 2016; Zulham, 2023; Adiwinata et al., 2019).

5.4 The Influence of Quality of Work Life on Performance Through Job Satisfaction as a Mediating Variable

The direct impact of work-life quality on performance was determined to be 0.133 based on the mediation test results. In the meantime, work satisfaction had an indirect influence of 0.333 × 0.784 = 0.261. The findings of the computation demonstrated that the indirect influence of job satisfaction was more significant than the direct influence of work-life quality on performance. Based on these findings, it can be said that the job satisfaction variable has the capacity to mediate the relationship between performance and work-life quality. The findings of this study corroborate those of earlier research by Noviana & Rijanti (2014) and Sipayung (2023), which found that job satisfaction mediates the relationship between employee performance and work-life quality.

6. Conclusion

According to the results of the tests and analysis that have been discussed on the Influence of Quality of Work Life on Job Satisfaction and its Implications on Employee Performance, job satisfaction at the Simalungun Regency Agriculture Service is positively and significantly impacted by quality of work life. Furthermore, work-life balance has a good and significant impact on Simalungun Regency Agriculture Service performance. By acting as a mediating variable, job satisfaction also has a positive and significant impact on performance for Simalungun Regency Agriculture Service employees, and quality of work life also has a favorable and significant impact on performance.

Acknowledgements

The research was supported by Universitas Islam Sumatera Utara, for which the authors are grateful. The researchers would also like to thank the support from other authors in data collection.

References

Ahmad, S. (2013). Paradigms of quality of work life. *Journal of Human Values*, *19*(1), 73-82.

Adiwinata, D., Irawan, I., Adha, S., & Kusuma, H. W. (2022). The influence of organizational culture and work environment toward lecturer performance with instrinsic motivation as intervening variables. *International Journal of Business, Economics and Management*, *5*(4), 287-296.

Amelia, Z., Natsir, U. D., Dipoatmodjo, T. S., Kurniawan, A. W., & Ruma, Z. (2023). The Influence of Quality of Work Life on Employee Job Satisfaction at PT. Pelindo IV (Persero) Makassar Container Terminal Branch. *Jurnal Ilmu Manajemen, Bisnis dan Ekonomi (JIMBE)*, *1*(2), 67-72.

Amal, B. K., Pasaribu, F., & Purba, A. S. (2022). The Analysis Of The Benefits Of Expo Bank Sumatera Utara To Reduce Poverty. *Webology*, *19*(1), 6900-6920.

Anitha, J. (2014). Determinants of employee engagement and their impact on employee performance. *International journal of productivity and performance management*, *63*(3), 308-323.

Ardiansyah, D. O. (2016). The Influence of Communication on Employee Performance Mediated by Job Satisfaction (Study on the Production Division of PT. Setia Kawan Makmur Sejahtera Tulungagung Paper Factory). *Jurnal Bisnis dan Manajemen*, *3*(1).

BU, R. R., Sadriatwati, S. E., & Barokah, S. N. (2019). Influence of Quality of Work Life on Job Satisfaction among Educational Personnel in Semarang State Polytechnic. *Admisi dan Bisnis*, *20*(3), 203-212.

Bourne, M., Kennerley, M., & Franco-Santos, M. (2005). Managing through measures: a study of impact on performance. *Journal of manufacturing technology management*, *16*(4), 373-395.

Buntaran, F. A. A., Andika, D., & Alfiyana, V. Y. (2019). Impact of job satisfaction on job performance. *Review of Behavioral Aspect in Organizations and Society*, *1*(2).

Bhende, P., Mekoth, N., Ingalhalli, V., & Reddy, Y. V. (2020). Quality of work life and work–life balance. *Journal of Human Values*, *26*(3), 256-265.

Ebrahim, A., & Rangan, V. K. (2014). What impact? A framework for measuring the scale and scope of social performance. *California management review*, *56*(3).

Fathiyah, F., Firdaus, A., & Putra, A. K. (2017). The Influence of Work Commitment and Quality of Work Life (QWL) on Job Satisfaction and Its Impact on Employee Performance at PT. Indofood Cbp Sukses Makmur, Jambi Branch. *J-MAS (Jurnal Manajemen Dan Sains)*, *2*(1), 105-120.

Gerrish, E. (2016). The impact of performance management on performance in public organizations: A meta-analysis. *Public administration review*, *76*(1), 48-66.

Ingtyas, F. T., Ampera, D., Wahidah, S., Purba, A. S., & Amal, B. K. (2021). Development of" Product Design" Learning Based On Kkni through Creative Industry Students. *Review Of International Geographical Education*, *11*(3).

Khan, A. H., Nawaz, M. M., Aleem, M., & Hamed, W. (2012). Impact of job satisfaction on employee performance: An empirical study of autonomous Medical Institutions of Pakistan. *African journal of business management*, *6*(7), 2697.

Liu, F., Chen, G., Li, L., & Guo, Y. (2012). Study of impact performance of rubber reinforced concrete. *Construction and building materials*, *36*, 604-616.

NST, A. A. (2019). Pengaruh Quality Of Work Life Dan Komunikasi Terhadap Kinerja Karyawan Pt. Sinar Mas Perkebunan Libo Ksndis (Doctoral dissertation, Universitas Islam Negeri Sultan Syarif Kasim Riau).

Nash, N. H., Young, T. M., McGrail, P. T., & Stanley, W. F. (2015). Inclusion of a thermoplastic phase to improve impact and post-impact performances of carbon fibre reinforced thermosetting composites—A review. *Materials & Design*, *85*, 582-597.

Narehan, H., Hairunnisa, M., Norfadzillah, R. A., & Freziamella, L. (2014). The effect of quality of work life (QWL) programs on quality of life (QOL) among employees at multinational companies in Malaysia. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *112*, 24-34.

Noviana, U., & Rijanti, T. (2014). The Influence of Quality of Work Life and Communication on Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment as Intervening Variables on Employee Performance (Study at Lpmp Central Java Province). *Jurnal Ilmiah Telaah Manajemen*, *11*(2).

Nuning, Achmad. 2021. Organizational Behavior. Surabaya: Scopindo Media Utama.

Purba, A. S., Hufad, A., Negara, C. P., Nasrawati, N., & Ramdani, A. M. (2018, November). The implication of Baduy Dalam tribe's closure on Indonesia's rank in the World Economic Forum. In *Annual Civic Education Conference (ACEC 2018)* (pp. 426-428). Atlantis Press.

Pushpakumari, M. D. (2008, January). The impact of job satisfaction on job performance: An empirical analysis. In *City Forum* (Vol. 9, No. 1, pp. 89-105).

Purba, A. S., Hufad, A., & Sutarni, N. (2019). Women's entrepreneurial literacy and their business competitiveness. In *Research for Social Justice* (pp. 163-168). Routledge.

Raziq, A., & Maulabakhsh, R. (2015). Impact of working environment on job satisfaction. *Procedia economics and finance*, *23*, 717-725.

Srivastava, S., & Kanpur, R. (2014). A study on quality of work life: key elements & It's Implications. *IOSR journal of business and management*, *16*(3), 54-59.

Sipayung, B. (2023). The Influence of Financial Management, Risk Management, Corporate Governance, on Company Value at PT. XYZ. *Sanskara Akuntansi Dan Keuangan*, *1*(03), 153-162.

Srivastava, S., & Kanpur, R. (2014). A study on quality of work life: key elements & It's Implications. *IOSR journal of business and management*, *16*(3), 54-59.

Sugiyono. (2016). Quantitative, Qualitative and R&D Research Methods. Bandung: PT Alfabet.

Shaju, M., & Subhashini, D. (2017). A study on the impact of job satisfaction on job performance of employees working in automobile industry. *Journal of management research*, *17*(2), 74-83.

Siahaan, M., Anantadjaya, S. P., Kurniawan, I. M. G. A., & Purba, A. S. (2022). Syariah Technology Financial Potential to Reach Non-bank Financing. *Webology*, *19*(1), 77-91.

Vrinda, N. N., & Jacob, N. A. (2015). The impact of job satisfaction on job performance. *International Journal in Commerce, IT & Social Sciences*, *2*(2), 27-37.

Zulham, Z. (2023). A Critical Review Of Indonesian Online Consumer Protection Online Shopping, False Advertising, And Legal Protection For Indonesian E-Commerce Customers. *Journal of Law and Sustainable Development*, *11*(5), 1-15.