



THE EFFECT OF WORK ENVIRONMENT AND WORKLOAD ON EMPLOYEE SATISFACTION

Mochammad Irfan, Mila Hariani

Universitas Mayjen Sungkono, Mojokerto

correspondence: milamasroni@gmail.com

Abstract

Efficient and effective utilization of human resources directs the organization to be ready to face competition in the industry with the hope of obtaining the best results, namely success. This was achieved with the support of human resources. Human resource issues are still a major concern for organizations to maintain survival. Workers must obtain satisfaction in work. There are two variables that are thought to have a role in shaping worker satisfaction, namely the work environment and workload. This study aims to determine the role of work environment and workload on worker satisfaction. Respondents in this study were 52 workers in a company and this used a census sampling technique. The data analysis tool used is SPSS version 26 using the regression analysis method regarding environmental and workload variables and worker satisfaction. Work environment is proven to have a role in shaping worker satisfaction and so does workload. Both are different in direction. The better the environment in the workplace causes greater worker satisfaction and the greater the workload received by workers, allowing a decrease in job satisfaction.

Keywords: work environment, workload, employee satisfaction.

Introduction

Human Resources play a very important role because a professional workforce determines the company's activities to the fullest. Regarding the importance of human resources, a company also needs a system that can support the company's performance. Achieving company goals requires good cooperation between every element involved. Companies must be able to create conditions that can encourage and enable them to develop and improve their capabilities optimally. One of the factors that companies can take to create these conditions is factors that can lead to job satisfaction for employees (Mardikaningsih & Sinambela, 2022). If employees at work do not feel comfortable, are not valued, cannot develop their potential, then automatically employees cannot work effectively and work performance will decrease so that company goals are not achieved.

Job satisfaction is an individual thing. Each individual has a different level of satisfaction according to the value system that applies to him (Andayani, 2011). The higher the assessment of activities that are felt according to individual wishes, the higher the satisfaction with these activities (Yee, 2018). Thus, job satisfaction is an evaluation that describes a person's feelings of pleasure or displeasure, satisfaction or dissatisfaction at work (Jiang et al., 2019). Employees must work more productively and professionally, driven by a sense of security and a good work environment (Mardikaningsih & Putra, 2021). The work environment is everything that is around the workers that can influence him in carrying out his duties (Novrianda et al., 2012). Poor working conditions have the potential to cause work disruption and threaten work productivity.

In achieving a comfortable workplace, this can be done, among other things, by maintaining physical infrastructure such as cleanliness that is always maintained, adequate lighting, air ventilation, sound music and a comfortable office layout. In addition to the physical work environment, the non-physical work environment also affects employee performance. If employees are unable to create a good work climate among other employees, it will interfere with employee performance (Putra, 2021). The work environment can create a binding working relationship between people in their environment (Putra & Mardikaningsih, 2021). In addition to the work environment, effective communication within the company is also needed to produce the desired performance by the company (Jahroni, 2022).

Workload shows the average activity of a job in a certain period of time (Darmawan & Putra, 2022). Workload can be seen from the physical and mental workload, if the workload borne by an employee is too heavy or the physical ability is weak it will certainly result in an obstacle in working so that the employee will feel sick because of a job (Anjanarko & Jahroni, 2022; Djaelani, 2022). A worker, of course, must be able to pay attention to his workload to get a harmony in work so that it will be in line with high productivity, apart from the additional burden that comes from the work environment and work capacity (Fatimah et al., 2018; Widiyana, 2021). Excessive workload will have an impact on worker performance and satisfaction (Darmawan et al., 2016; Danendra et al., 2019).

In the framework of today's openness and globalization, the mindset of managers or leaders should be more open and transparent, especially in looking at the position of human resources in the organization (Irfan, 2022). Today human resources are not only a means of achieving organizational targets and goals, but human resources are assets that must be maintained and developed (Freddy et al., 2015; Ishak et al., 2016). It needs to be understood that human resources in an institution or institution are very important for achieving goals, but have also become a determining factor for the success of the activities carried out. To strengthen excellence in human resources, companies must be able to increase employee job satisfaction influenced by many factors, including knowing the work environment and workload. This study intends to observe and know the role of work environment and workload on worker satisfaction.

Method

This research was conducted at one of the companies in Driyorejo District, Gresik Regency. The time for conducting the research was carried out in March 2022. The sampling technique was carried out by census. There are 52 workers in the company. The data used in this study are primary data obtained from the results of questionnaires and direct interviews with workers. The questionnaire is prepared based on variable indicators. Work Environment (X.1) is a condition in the workplace with indicators covering the working atmosphere; relationships with colleagues and superiors; and availability of work facilities. Workload (X.2) is the obligation of workers to complete tasks with indicators including targets to be achieved, working

conditions, use of time at work, and work standards. Worker satisfaction (Y) is a worker's assessment and feelings of conditions at work with indicators that include satisfaction with the work itself; satisfaction with the compensation system; satisfaction with the attitude of colleagues; and satisfaction with superiors. The data analysis tool used is SPSS version 26 using the regression analysis method regarding environmental variables and workload and worker satisfaction.

Result and Discussion

The description of the respondent is used to explain the identity of the respondent. The identity of the respondents in this research questionnaire includes gender, age, last education, and years of service.

There are 29 male workers and 23 female workers. There are three workers under the age of 21. There are 35 workers aged between 21-30 years, and those aged 31-40 years are 18 people. The rest are over 40 years old. This shows that the composition of the workforce is more ideal age as workers. Employees are dominated by high school education level of 42 people; six people with undergraduate level education and only four D1-D3 level education. Companies do not seem to need a lot of workers with a high level of education. Most of the workers had a working period of 1-5 years, namely 32 people, then followed by a working period of < 1 year, namely 10 people, and a working period of 6-10 years with 10 people (12.7%). This company requires relatively young employees so that rejuvenation is possible.

The results of the validity test by observing the value of the corrected item total correlation must be above 0.3. All statement items fulfill this according to the SPSS output. While the reliability test obtained a score on the work environment variable of 0.792; workload of 0.805; and job satisfaction of 0.833. This means that the Cronbach's Alpha for each variable is > 0.70 , meaning that the work environment variable (X.1), workload variable (X.2), and job satisfaction variable (Y) are declared reliable and worthy of further analysis.

The normality test in this study uses the One Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov method with an Exact P Value to determine whether a data is normally distributed. If the p value is > 0.05 , the data is said to be normally distributed. The results of the normality test obtained a p value of $0.698 >$

0.05 so that it can be said that the data in this study were normally distributed. The following can be seen in table 1 which describes the multiple linear regression coefficients of each independent variable.

Table 1. Coefficients^a

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	39.265	4.832		8.127	.000
	X.1	5.957	.884	.663	6.741	.000
	X.2	-2.546	1.012	-.247	-2.515	.015

Source: SPSS Output Results

The SPSS output is translated into a multiple linear regression model as follows: $Y = 39.265 + 5.957 X.1 - 2.546 X.2$. From the regression model it can be stated that the multiple linear regression coefficients have an effect of each independent variable on job satisfaction of 39.265 indicating that if the independent variables (environment and workload) are constant or equal to zero, then job satisfaction is at 39.265 units.

The regression coefficient (b1) of the work environment variable (X.1) is 5.957. This means that if there is a change in the value of the work environment by one unit, it will cause a change in the direction of increasing job satisfaction. The above phenomenon applies if it is assumed that the workload variable is considered fixed. The regression coefficient (b2) of the workload variable (X.2) is 2.546. This means that if there is a change in the workload value of one unit, it will cause a change in the opposite way to an increase in job satisfaction, which means a decrease. This phenomenon applies if it is assumed that the work environment variable is considered fixed.

Based on the multiple linear regression model, it can also be argued that there are results from testing the effect of the independent variables partially on the dependent variable. To prove the significance of each independent variable partially, the t test was used, through SPSS a significant value was obtained for each independent variable, namely 0.000 for the work environment variable and 0.015 for the workload variable. This means $\text{sig} < \alpha = 0.05\%$ and it is partially proven that the two independent variables have a significant effect on job satisfaction.

Table 2. ANOVA^a

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	6112.246	2	3056.123	56.392	.000 ^b
	Residual	2655.523	49	54.194		
	Total	8767.769	51			

Source: SPSS Output Results

In the F test there are criteria so that the model is feasible for further analysis, namely if the significance value is <0.05. Table 2 shows a significance value of 0.000 <0.05, so it can be concluded that the research model is declared fit for further analysis and there is a simultaneous role of the two independent variables on job satisfaction.

Table 3. Model Summary^b

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Durbin-Watson
1	.835 ^a	.697	.685	7.362	1.369

Source: SPSS Output Results

Based on table 3, it can be seen in the R Square column with a value of 0.697 or 69.7%. This means that the environment and workload contribute at a percentage level of 69.7% to the formation of job satisfaction. While the remaining 30.3% is influenced by other factors outside the model examined in this study.

Thus, this study found two main things, namely the work environment has a role in shaping job satisfaction. This is in accordance with previous studies (Bakotic & Babic, 2013; Sinambela, 2014; Lestari et al., 2020; Arifin & Mardikaningsih, 2022; Radjawane & Darmawan, 2022). Second, workload has a negative role on job satisfaction. This means that excessive workload will cause a decrease in job satisfaction. These results agree with the study by Guarnaccia et al. (2018).

Conclusion

The work environment is proven to have a role in shaping worker satisfaction and so does workload. Both are in different directions. The better the environment at work causes greater worker satisfaction and the greater the workload received by workers; it allows for a decrease in job satisfaction.

Conditions in the company demand high adaptability to ongoing environmental changes. With the existence of various challenges, companies need to place human resources as the main paradigm in the framework of developing companies that are ready to compete. Based on observations, the work environment and workload must really receive special attention because if these two things cannot function properly in the company, then the increase in employee satisfaction will not be maximized, because excessive workload causes disruption to workers.

Workload that is in accordance with work standards and capabilities will have the potential to increase employee satisfaction. They must have good knowledge and skills so that employee empowerment efforts can run properly. To encourage and arouse morale and the potential that exists within employees, it is necessary to strive for good knowledge and skills so that employees carry out their activities.

References

- Andayani, D. & D. Darmawan. 2011. Determinan Variabel Kepuasan Kerja, Komitmen Organisasi, Kinerja Karyawan Sebagai Kontributor Perilaku dan Kinerja Organisasi Berbasis Keunggulan Bersaing, *Jurnal Ekonomi dan Bisnis*, 1(2), 35-54.
- Anjanarko, T.S. & J. Jahroni. 2022. The Effect of Workload and Compensation on Employee Productivity, *International Journal of Service Science, Management, Engineering, and Technology*, 1(2), 51 - 55.
- Arifin, S. & R. Mardikaningsih. 2022. Pencapaian Kepuasan Kerja bagi Karyawan melalui Kondusivitas Lingkungan Kerja dan Motivasi Kerja. *Jurnal Ilmiah Satyagraha*, 5 (2), 98-106.
- Bakotic, D. & T. Babic. 2013. Relationship between Working Conditions and Job Satisfaction: The case of Croatian shipbuilding company, *International Journal Business Social Sciences*, 4(2), 206-213.
- Danendra, A.N.B., & A.G. Rahyuda. 2019. The effect of workloads on employee performance with job satisfaction as a mediation variable. *Economic Research*, 3(8), 40-49.
- Darmawan, D., E. A. Sinambela & Nur Ika Mauliyah. 2016. The Effect of Competence, Independence and Workload on Audit Quality, *JARES*, 1(2), 47 - 57.
- Darmawan, D. & A. R. Putra. 2022. Pencapaian Efektivitas Kerja Melalui Optimalisasi Kecerdasan Emosional Dan Pemberian Beban Kerja Secara Tepat Kepada Karyawan. *Jurnal Baruna Horizon*, 5(1), 8-16.
- Djaelani, M. & D. Darmawan. 2022. Pengaruh Keselamatan dan Kesehatan Kerja serta Beban Kerja terhadap Kinerja Pekerja Proyek Konstruksi, *Jurnal Penelitian Rumpun Ilmu Teknik*, 1 (4), 15-27.
- Fatihah, S., A.K. Wahyudi, E. Retnowati, D. Darmawan, R. Mardikaningsih & M. Kemarauwana. 2018. The Importance of Scale in Attention Organizations to Issues, *Academy of Management Review*, 43(2), 217-241.

- Freddy, H. I., R. Mardikaningsih, D. Darmawan & E. Supriyadi. 2015. Pengembangan Karir dan Pelatihan Kerja: Studi untuk Mengembangkan Kualitas Kerja Karyawan. *Jurnal Ekonomi, Bisnis dan Manajemen*, 5(1), 35-48.
- Guarnaccia, C., F. Scrima & A. Civilleri. 2018. The role of occupational self-efficacy in mediating the effect of job insecurity on work engagement, satisfaction and general health. *Current Psychology*, 37(3), 488-497.
- Irfan, M. 2022. Measurement of Mental Workload and Fatigue of Production Operator of PT. MTK, *International Journal of Service Science, Management, Engineering, and Technology*, 1(3), 11-13.
- Ishak, M., I. Zaidi, D. Darmawan & Z. Yang. 2016. Conceptualizing Cultural Organization Studies, *Management Review*, 9(2), 146-158.
- Jahroni, J. & D. Darmawan. 2022. Pengaruh Motivasi, Disiplin, dan Lingkungan Kerja terhadap Kinerja Karyawan, *Jurnal Terapan Ilmu Manajemen dan Bisnis*, 5(2), 95-106.
- Jiang, Y., P. Li & J. Wang. 2019. Relationships between kindergarten teachers' empowerment, job satisfaction, and organizational climate: a Chinese model. *Journal of Research in Childhood Education*, 33(2), 257-270.
- Lestari, U. P., E. A. Sinambela, R. Mardikaningsih, & D. Darmawan. 2020. Pengaruh Efikasi Diri dan Lingkungan Kerja terhadap Kepuasan Kerja Karyawan. *Jurnal Ekonomi dan Ekonomi Syariah (JESYA)*, 3(2), 529-536.
- Mardikaningsih, R. & A. R. Putra. 2021. Efforts to Increase Employee Work Productivity through Job Satisfaction and Job Training, *Studi Ilmu Sosial Indonesia*, 1(1), 51-64.
- Mardikaningsih, R. & E. A. Sinambela. 2022. Impact of Burnout and Stress on Employee Satisfaction in Work, *International Journal of Service Science, Management, Engineering, and Technology*, 2(1), 21-25.
- Novrianda, D., T. Agustin & D. Darmawan. 2012. Kontribusi Norma Subjektif dan Lingkungan Kerja untuk Mengembangkan Profesionalisme. *Jurnal Ekonomi, Bisnis dan Manajemen*, 2(1), 47-58.
- Putra, A. R. 2021. Wages and Work Environment as Factors for Workers' Motivation, *Studi Ilmu Sosial Indonesia*, 1(2), 43-52.
- Putra, A. R., & R. Mardikaningsih. 2021. Kompensasi dan Lingkungan Kerja serta Pengaruhnya terhadap Komitmen Organisasi. *Jurnal Ilmiah Edunomika*, 6(1), 44-53.
- Radjawane, L.E. & D. Darmawan. 2022. Construction Project Worker Satisfaction Reviewing from the Role of the Work Environment and Leadership, *International Journal of Service Science, Management, Engineering, and Technology*, 1(3), 36-40.
- Sinambela, E. A. 2014. Pengaruh Motivasi, Disiplin dan Lingkungan Kerja terhadap Kepuasan dan Loyalitas Kerja, *Jurnal Ilmu Sosial*, 7(3), 123-136.
- Widiyana, E.O & D. Darmawan. 2021. Pengaruh Stres Kerja, Beban Kerja, Konflik Kerja dan Kompensasi Terhadap Komitmen Kerja Karyawan PT Intidragon Suryatama Mojokerto, *Jurnal Ilmu Manajemen*, 1(1), 33-42.
- Yee, L.C. 2018. An Analysis on the Relationship between Job Satisfaction and Work Performance among Academic Staff in Malaysian Private Universities. *Journal of Arts & Social Sciences*, 1(2), 64-73.