

ISSN: 0258-2724

DOI : 10.35741/issn.0258-2724.56.1.14

Research article

Social Sciences

**AN EMPIRICAL EFFECT OF WORKLOADS ON EMPLOYEE SATISFACTION: MEDIATING BY WORK ENVIRONMENT****工作负荷对员工满意度的实证影响：工作环境的中介**

Vivin Maharani Ekowati, Achmad Sani Supriyanto \*, Yuli Dwi Fatmawati, Zaim Mukaffi, Setiani  
Faculty of Economics, State Islamic University of Maulana Malik Ibrahim  
Malang, Indonesia, achmad\_sani72@yahoo.com

Received: November 16, 2020 ▪ Review: December 12, 2020 ▪ Accepted: January 10, 2021

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

**Abstract**

The purpose of this study is to analyze the influence of workload on job satisfaction, and the extent to which work environment mediates the impact of workload on job satisfaction. The research data was collected by a questionnaire through the survey method. The sample consists of 81 employees randomly selected. Data analysis uses Partial Least Square supported by descriptive statistics and correlation. The results show that workload has no direct effect on job satisfaction, while work environment mediates the effect of workload on job satisfaction. Managers who intend to enhance employee job satisfaction should focus on creating a conducive work environment in the Sugar Industry. The study is an important landmark in highlighting the relationship of workload to employee job satisfaction in the Malang sugar industry that is examined for the first time, after reviewing the literature. This model will facilitate leaders to make plans of action to design workloads to increase employee job satisfaction through a conducive work environment.

**Keywords:** Workload, Work Environment, Job Satisfaction, Sugar Industry, Partial Least Square

**摘要** 这项研究的目的是分析工作量对工作满意度的影响，以及工作环境在多大程度上介导工作量对工作满意度的影响。研究数据通过问卷调查法通过调查方法收集。该样本包括81名随机选择的员工。数据分析使用描述性统计和相关性支持的偏最小二乘。结果表明，工作量对工作满意度没有直接影响，而工作环境则在工作量对工作满意度的影响中起到中介作用。打算提高员工工作满意度的管理人员应专注于在制糖业中创造有利的工作环境。这项研究是在回顾文献后首次强调玛琅制糖业工作量与员工工作满意度之间关系的重要里程碑。该模型将有助于领导者制定行动计划以设计工作量，以通过一个有益的工作环境来提高员工的工作满意度。

**关键词:** 工作量，工作环境，工作满意度，制糖业，偏最小二乘

## **I. INTRODUCTION**

In recent years, the concept of job satisfaction has received increased attention from scholars and practitioners around the world, who have researched and conducted several social experiments in order to increase employee job satisfaction [1]. Employees are considered part of an organization's assets; therefore, they play a central role for the driving force and leading player of the organization [2]. Therefore, it is important that an organization provides a positive direction to achieve the corporate goals.

One of the many challenges for a business is to help its employees cope with an ever-changing and evolving work atmosphere while achieving success and remaining competitive [3], [4]. To increase efficiency, effectiveness, and productivity, the business must satisfy the needs of its employees by providing good working conditions [5], [6]. The company must be able to manage its employees properly in order to ensure they achieve job satisfaction.

One element that is essential to employee satisfaction is work environment. A good work environment can foster excellent employee performance, as expected by the company. On the other hand, an uncomfortable work environment can degrade their performance [7], [21]. [8] stated that a work environment is a place where all employees can carry out activities, and where the workplace can have a positive or negative impact on employees to achieve their stated goals. A conducive work environment will stimulate the work spirit of the employees and will improve satisfaction in any job.

Several past studies observing the impact of workload on job satisfaction were carried out by [9]. [10] showed a negative effect of workload on job satisfaction, while [11] explained that workload has a negative and insignificant effect on job satisfaction. Workload must be completed by an employee within a set timeframe in order employees can be responsible for their work. The impact of workload includes: work quality decrease, increase of customer complaints, decreased job satisfaction, and increased absenteeism [12].

Work environment can have a secondary effect on job satisfaction. The work environment is the situation around the workplace, such as physical and non-physical conditions when working [11]. [13] proved that work environment has a significant effect on job satisfaction. Similar research by [11], [15] showed that work environment, organizational culture have a positive and significant impact on job satisfaction. This suggests that when the work

environment is good, job satisfaction of employees will increase. [14] stated that workload has a positive and significant effect on work environment.

Drawing on the original model from [12], a revised model of work environment adds a mediating variable. This study fills in the gaps in [10], [12] research by exploring and identifying causal models within job satisfaction as a mediating variable. In this study, we introduce the role of employee workload and its relation to work environment in order to improve employee job satisfaction. To contribute more empirical results, this paper aims to propose a model of antecedents strengthening employee job satisfaction in the context of Indonesian organizations in order to help leaders design workloads and create work environments that motivate employees and increase job satisfaction. This study draws on research and studies from several countries in order to examine the direct effect of workload on employee job satisfaction and the role of work environment as a mediator on the effect of workload on job satisfaction.

## **II. LITERATURE REVIEW**

### **A. Workload and Job Satisfaction**

[16] defined workload as a number of activities that must be completed by an organizational unit or position holder systematically using job analysis techniques, workload analysis techniques, and other management techniques within a certain period of time to get information about work efficiency and effectiveness at an organizational unit. Workload refers to an employee's responsibility that must be completed within a specified time. An employee's job satisfaction can be affected by workload as felt by the employee [17].

[18] stated that job satisfaction was one's feeling toward one's work, produced by one's own business (internal) and supported by factors outside oneself (external), concerning work situation, work results, and work itself. [19] stated that job satisfaction was a positive feeling as the result of an evaluation with a good expected outcome. Job satisfaction is the result of employee perceptions of how well someone's job fulfills whatever is perceived as important through their work. Job satisfaction can be interpreted as a feeling of satisfaction or dissatisfaction with the job done [20].

[9], [10] stated that size or difficulty of workload has a shifting effect on job satisfaction. Therefore, a higher employee workload should decrease job satisfaction. [22] observed that

excessive workload could be a source of stress at work. Consequently, the following hypothesis was presumed:

*H1: Workload directly affects job satisfaction.*

### B. Workload, Work Environment, and Job Satisfaction

[23] showed that workload was the amount that must be borne by an office / organizational unit and the results of the volume times the norms. A work environment is a place where employees perform their activities, bringing positive and negative effects for the employees to achieve their results. A conducive work environment will have a good impact on the continuity of employment. In contrast, a less conducive work environment will negatively impact the continuity of its employment [15]. [11] also stated that the work environment was a condition around the workplace, both physically and non-physically, to give the impression of nice and appealing work. [24] stated the work environment includes working hours, work facilities, co-workers, and job stability.

Overall, job satisfaction of an individual is the amount of job satisfaction (every job aspects) multiplied by the importance level of the work. Satisfaction or dissatisfaction of an individual with his work is something personal that depends on how he perceives the compatibility or conflict between his desires with his outcome. It can be concluded that the sense of job satisfaction is the positive attitude of the workforce, which includes feelings and attitudes through the assessment of a job as a sense of respect in achieving one important value of the work [15].

[9] stated that workload was one element that must be considered for a workforce to get harmony and high work productivity in addition to elements of the work environment and work capacity. [14] stated that the workload has a positive and significant effect on the work environment. High workloads can increase the changes in the work environment. The work environment is a factor that affects how comfortable an employee feels in their work. Comfortable working conditions will affect an employee's satisfaction. [11], [13] proved that the work environment significantly affects the job satisfaction of an employee. [17] stated that there is a significant linear relationship between work relationships, workload, the work environment, and job satisfaction. Based on the arguments and studies above, the second hypothesis of this study is:

*H2: The work environment significantly mediates the impact of workload on job*

*satisfaction.*

### III. METHODOLOGY

The population consisted of all the full-time employees of the Administrative and Financial Sugar Industry Malang, totalling 102 respondents. A proportional random sampling technique using Slovin's formula is used. Furthermore, using a 5% confidence level, the total sample consisted of 81 employees, including supervisors.

$$n = \frac{N}{N(d)^2 + 1} \quad (1)$$

$$n = \frac{102}{102(0.05)^2 + 1} \quad (2)$$

$$n = 81 \quad (3)$$

where:

n: sample size

N: population size

d: precision

Workload variable indicators are measured based on the criteria of [16], namely: a) effective working hours, b) educational background, and c) job type. Job satisfaction is measured based on the criteria of [18], namely a) working in the right place, b) appropriate payment, c) organization and management, d) right supervision of the job, and e) right people at the job. The work environment indicator refers to criteria of [25], namely: a) lighting, b) air temperature, c) noise, d) colors used, e) space needed, f) work safety, and g) work relationships. The measure used to evaluate the variables was the Likert scale, weighed according to the items, with a range of 1 to 5 [26].

The data analysis method was conducted by using descriptive statistics and Structural Equation Modeling–Partial Least Squares (SEM-PLS) with IBM Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (IBM SPSS) Statistics 22.0 software and smart PLS 3 program. These tools have were selected because they work efficiently even with only small sample sizes and complex models. These tools are also able to work under the assumption that the data distribution is not normal, and test the formative and reflective measurement models without causing any identification problems [15]. According to [27], [28], there are five stages in using the SEM-PLS model, namely: 1) conceptualizing the model; 2) determining the method of algorithm analysis; 3) determining the resampling methods; 4) drawing a path diagram, and 5) evaluating the model in terms of measurement model or outer model, and

structural model or inner model.

## IV. DATA ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

### A. Descriptive Analysis

Analysis in relation to the characteristics of the information was conducted, with 75% of the respondents being male and 25% female. In accordance with the unit, 100% are employed by the Administrative and Financial Sugar Industry Malang. Regarding experience, 20% have less than 5 years of experience, 44% percent have 5-10 years, and 36% more than 10 years. The characteristics of the respondent analysis is shown in Table 1.

Table 1.  
The respondents' characteristics

Demographic variable	N	Percentage
<b>Gender</b>		
Male	61	75.0
Female	20	25.0
<b>Unit</b>		
Administration and Finance Division	81	100.0
<b>Experience (in years)</b>		
< 05	16	20.0
05 < 10	36	44.0
10 and above	29	36.0

Table 2.  
Root values of average variance extracted (AVE)

Research variables	AVE	$\sqrt{AVE}$
Workload	0.578	0.760
Job Satisfaction	0.569	0.754
Work Environment	0.529	0.727

Table 3.  
Composite reliability test results

Description	Composite reliability	Results
Workload	0.872	Reliable
Job Satisfaction	0.901	Reliable
Work Environment	0.899	Reliable

### B. Testing the Structural Equation of the PLS Approach

Discriminant validity uses the square root of the average extracted ( $\sqrt{AVE}$ ). If the  $\sqrt{AVE}$  value of each latent variable is greater than the correlation with other variables, then the instrument has good discriminant validity [29]. The recommended measurement value must be

Table 5.  
The direct effects of research variables

Relationship	Path coefficients	t-value	p-value	Decision
Workload Job satisfaction	0.280	1,464	0.144	Insignificant
Workload Work environment	0.623	4,978	0,000	Significant
Work Job satisfaction	0.510	2,988	0.003	Significant

greater than 0.5. The results of calculating the  $\sqrt{AVE}$  value, as shown in Table 2, demonstrate that all variables have good reliability values because the AVE value is greater than 0.5.

Table 3 shows that the reliability examination and composite reliability coefficient are obtained for Workload, Job Satisfaction, and Work Environment variables above 0.6. This value shows that the research instrument is reliable.

Table 4.  
R-square values

R-square	Variable
0.518	Job Satisfaction
0.388	Work Environment

Table 4 shows that the R-squared value for the job satisfaction variable is 0.518 and that the work environment is 0.388. The goodness of fit model is measured by the Q-squared value ( $Q^2$ ). A  $Q^2$  value  $> 0$  indicates the model has predictive relevance. The value of  $Q^2$  has a vulnerable value of  $0 < Q^2 < 1$  [28].

The respective  $R^2$  values are below.

$$Q^2 = 1 - (1 - R_1^2)(1 - R_2^2) \quad (4)$$

$$Q^2 = 1 - (1 - 0.518)(1 - 0.388) \quad (5)$$

$$Q^2 = 0.705 \quad (6)$$

$Q^2$  is 0.705 or 70.5%, and the data contribution to explain the model is 70.5%. The remaining 29.5% is explained by other variables outside the research model.

The analysis showed that the  $Q^2$  was 0.705 or 70.5 percent, which showed that the model was able to explain 70.5 percent of the data, while the remaining 29.5 percent was explained by other variables (outside the model) and error. In conclusion, based on the analysis, the PLS model was good due to its ability to explain 70.5 percent of the overall information.

### C. Hypothesis Testing Results (Inner Model)

Hypotheses testing and path coefficients show the direct effects of workload on job satisfaction. The t value of statistics is shown in Table 5. The workload has no significant effect on job satisfaction with a path coefficient of 0.280 and a t count value of  $1.464 < 1.96$ . The study results do not support H1.

Table 6.  
Test results for indirect effects

Variables	Original sample	Sample mean	Standard deviation	t-statistic	p-value
Workload-Work environment-Job Satisfaction	0.317	0.285	0.112	2.822	0.004

Table 5 shows the effect of the workload variable on job satisfaction producing a path coefficient of 0.280 with a positive direction. A positive path coefficient means that workload has a direct relationship to job satisfaction. The results obtained by t-value of  $1.464 < 1.96$  with a p-value of  $0.144 > 0.05$ . The workload is directly unable to increase job satisfaction. This study results consistent with [11] that workload does not significantly affect job satisfaction. It is inconsistent with [9] that workload has a negative and significant effect on job satisfaction for employees.

The insignificant effect of workload on job satisfaction is explained by [30] that job satisfaction is affected by external factors in the form of tasks, work organization, and work environment. The two internal factors are somatic (sex, age, health condition) and psychological factors (motivation, trust).

Table 6 proved that workload has an indirect effect on job satisfaction. The coefficient result of workload on job satisfaction is 0.317. The results of t-statistic value were  $2.888 > 1.96$  with a p-value of  $0.004 < 0.005$ . Then the workload indirectly can increase employee job satisfaction. The study results support H2.

These findings are consistent with [10] that workload has an indirect effect on job satisfaction. [31] stated that workload has a significant indirect effect on job satisfaction through work climate. The factors affecting workloads are time pressure, work schedule or working hours, role conflict, noise, room temperature, repetitive action, and responsibility [32]. The impact of the workload itself, according to [12], was a decrease in work quality, job satisfaction, customer complaints, and increased absenteeism.

The Sugar Industry Malang employees stated that the workloads are boredom, a pile of work that must be completed within a certain period. The employees also feel the effect of workloads, such as getting complaints from customers related to delays in funding claims due to incomplete administration. Other factors cause the work environment so that workload can indirectly affect job satisfaction. Employees feel

a conducive work environment, adequate and supportive infrastructure, and good work organization. This can affect employees' physical and mental conditions where employees will feel comfortable with the company's treatment. Conducive work atmosphere can be achieved if there is a good working relationship between co-workers and superiors. So this condition is an important factor in creating a conducive working atmosphere.

This study found that the work environment becomes a mediation variable. This condition supports the research of [33], that the work environment mediates the relationship between training effectiveness and performance. The field findings combine the results of [14], that workload has a positive and significant effect on work environment. The results are consistent with [15], that work environment has a positive and significant effect on job satisfaction. Work environment provides security and allows employees to work optimally, and it can influence the emotions of the employee. If the employee enjoys their working environment, they will enjoy their time in the workplace to do such activities, they will use their working time effectively and optimally. Likewise, their work performance will also be high. Besides the employees' physical environment, the work environment also includes the working relationship between fellow employees and between subordinates and superiors.

Many factors can affect job satisfaction, namely: (1) psychological factors such as interest, peace of mind at work, attitudes, talents, and skills, (2) social factors such as interactions among employees and interactions with superiors, (3) physical factors such as type of work, scheduling rest time, equipment, health conditions, room condition, temperature, and lighting, (4) financial factors such as the payment structure and salary, social security, various benefits, promotions, and so on [19].

## V. CONCLUSION

Workload cannot directly affect the employee job satisfaction. There are many factors that affect job satisfaction, namely: psychological



factors (interests, talents and skills), social factors (interactions with superiors and fellow employees), physical factors (work type, working time, environment), and financial factors (salary system, benefits, promotions).

The work environment mediates the effect of workload on employee job satisfaction. A comfortable work environment can cause employees to be satisfied with their work. Conversely, an uncomfortable work environment and workload can decrease the job satisfaction of employees. Sugar Industry Malang must improve their work environment in order for it to be conducive and enhance job satisfaction. This can be realized by upgrading the supervisory aspects of the environment, making the employees feel better supported. Creating this atmosphere around the employees will increase employee satisfaction in terms of supervision of work.

The study investigated the determinants of employee job satisfaction. It employed the hierarchical component model to examine workloads, work environment and job satisfaction among employees working in the sugar industry in Malang. The findings offer practical implications for organizational leaders to enhance job satisfaction by creating a conducive work environment. The study makes a significant theoretical contribution to the existing knowledge on job satisfaction. The study has some limitations as well as related suggestions for further research. As data was collected through the survey method, it is possible that popular method variance artificially amplified the observed affiliations. Therefore, future studies should conduct measures of the independent and dependent variables from the distinctive sources to control popular method bias.

## REFERENCES

- [1] MOON, M.J. (2000) Organizational Commitment Revisited in New Public Management: Motivation, Organizational Culture, Sector, and Managerial Level. *Public Performance & Management Review*, 24 (2), pp. 177-194.
- [2] SANI, A. and EKOWATI, V.M. (2019) Spirituality at work and organizational commitment as moderating variables in relationship between Islamic spirituality and OCB IP and influence toward employee performance. *Journal of Islamic Marketing*, 11 (6), pp. 1777-1799.
- [3] MUN, C., YING, C., LEW, S., WEI, T., and NING, T. (2017) *The Relationship between Work Environment and Job Satisfaction in Hotel Industry*. Bachelor research project, University Tunku Abdur Rahman.
- [4] YILDIRIM, B., GULMEZ, M., and YILDIRIM, F. (2016) The relationship between the five-factor personality traits of workers and their job satisfaction: a study on five star hotels in Alanya. *Procedia Economics and Finance*, 39, pp. 284-291.
- [5] BEXHETI, L. and BEXHETI, A. (2016) The impact of Herzberg's two-factor theory and efficiency at work. *European Journal of Multidisciplinary Studies*, 1 (2), pp. 378-385.
- [6] RAZIQ, A. and MAULABAKHSH, R. (2015) Impact of working environment and job satisfaction. *Procedia Economics and Finance*, 23, pp. 717-725.
- [7] PUTRI, E.M., EKOWATI, V.M, SUPRIYANTO, A.S., and MUKKAFI, Z. (2019) The Effect of Work Environment on Employee Performance through Work Discipline. *International Journal of Research – Granthaalayah*, 7 (4), pp. 132-140.
- [8] SUPRIYANTO, A.S., EKOWATI, V.M., and VIRONIKA, H. (2020) Linking work environment to employee performance: the mediating role of work discipline. *BISMA (Bisnis dan Manajemen)*, 13 (1), pp. 14-25.
- [9] MAHENDRAWAN, I.G. and INDRAWATI, A.D. (2015) Pengaruh Beban Kerja Dan Kompensasi Terhadap Kepuasan Kerja Pt. Panca Dewata Denpasar. *E-Jurnal Manajemen*, 4 (11), pp. 3936-3961.
- [10] YO, P.M.P. and SURYA, I.B.K. (2015) Pengaruh Beban Kerja Terhadap Kepuasan Kerja Dengan Stres Kerja Sebagai Variabel Mediasi. *E-Jurnal Manajemen*, 4 (5), pp. 1149-1165.
- [11] IROTH, A., LENGKONG, V.P.K., and DOTULONG, L.O.H. (2015) Pengaruh Kompensasi, Lingkungan Kerja Fisik Dan Beban Kerja Terhadap Kepuasan Kerja Pada Beberapa Karyawan Restoran Di Manado. *Jurnal EMBA: Jurnal Riset Ekonomi, Manajemen, Bisnis dan Akuntansi*, 6 (4), pp. 2098-2107.
- [12] IRAWATI, R. and CAROLLINA, D.A. (2017) Analisis Pengaruh Beban Kerja Terhadap Kinerja Karyawan Operator Pada Pt Giken Precision Indonesia. *Inovbiz: Jurnal*

*Inovasi dan Bisnis*, 5 (1), pp. 51-58.

[13] NUGRAHA, M.B.I. and SURYA, I.B.K. (2016) Pengaruh Kompensasi, Lingkungan Kerja Dan Promosi Jabatan Terhadap Kepuasan Kerja. *E-Jurnal Manajemen*, 5 (1), pp. 59-87.

[14] RAZA, S., HUSSAIN, M.S., AZEEM, M., ANSARI, N.U.A., and AZIZ, K. (2017) Workload, Work Stress, Role Conflict, and Workplace Deviant Behavior in Banks: an Empirical Analysis. *European Online Journal of Natural and Social Sciences*, 4 (4), pp. 701-707.

[15] SUHARNO, P., SARJANA, P.K., and GUNAWAN, R. (2017) The effect of work environment, leadership style, and organizational culture towards job satisfaction and its implication towards. *International Journal of Law and Management*, 59 (6), pp. 1337-1358.

[16] ELLYZAR, N., YUNUS, M., and AMRI. (2017) Pengaruh Mutasi Kerja, Beban Kerja, Konflik Interpersonal terhadap Stress Kerja Serta Dampaknya Pada Kinerja Pegawai BPKP Perwakilan Provinsi Aceh. *Jurnal Magister Manajemen. Fakultas Ekonomi dan Bisnis Unsyiah*, 1 (1), pp. 35-45.

[17] ANASI, S. (2020) Perceived influence of work relationship, work load and physical work environment on job satisfaction of librarians in South-West, Nigeria. *Global Knowledge, Memory and Communication*, 69 (6/7), pp. 377-398.

[18] RIVAI, V. and SAGALA, E.J. (2011) *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia Untuk Perusahaan dari Teori ke Praktik*. Jakarta: Rajawali Press.

[19] BUSRO, M. (2018) *Teori-teori Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia*. Jakarta: Prenada Media Group.

[20] SUPRIYANTO, A.S., EKOWATI, V.M., IDRIS, I., SUSMININGSIH, and ISWANTO, B. (2020) Leadership Styles as a Predictor of the Voluntary Work Behaviors of Bank Employees. *International Journal of Economics and Management*, 14 (1), pp. 1-11.

[21] KHALIL, N., KAMARUZZAMAN, S.N., BOHARI, A.A.M., HUSIN, H.N., and OTHMAN, I. (2020) Individual Priority Weights of Indoor Environmental

Performance to Sanction a Safe and Healthy Work Environment. *Journal of Southwest Jiaotong University*, 55 (3). Available from <http://jsju.org/index.php/journal/article/view/606>.

[22] LO, K. and LAMM, F. (2005) Occupational stress in the hospitality industry – an employment relations perspective. *New Zealand Journal of Employment Relations*, 3 (1), pp. 23-48.

[23] THE MINISTER OF HOME AFFAIRS (2008) *Tentang Pedoman Analisis Beban Kerja di Lingkungan Departemen Dalam Negeri dan Pemerintahan Daerah*. [Online] Available from: <https://drive.riau.go.id/index.php/s/C3eXB0trQfOBGfI#pdfviewer> [Accessed 17/12/20].

[24] AMRAN, W.F., GAZALI, H., and HASHIM, S. (2019) Influence of Working Environment, Workload and Job Autonomy Towards Job Stress: A Case of Casual Dining Restaurant Employees in Klang Valley, Malaysia. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 9 (5), pp. 744-755.

[25] SEDARMAYANTI. (2009) *Tata Kerja dan Produktivitas Kerja*. Bandung: CV Mandar Maju.

[26] SEKARAN, U. (2003) *Research Methods for Business: A Skill-Building Approach*. New York: John Wiley and Sons.

[27] GHOZALI, I. and LATAN, H. (2014) *Partial Least Squares Konsep, Metode dan Aplikasi*. Semarang: Badan Penerbit Universitas Diponegoro.

[28] SUPRIYANTO, A.S. and MAHARANI, V. (2019) *Riset Manajemen SDM*. Malang: PT Citra Intans Selaras.

[29] SOLIMUN and FERNANDES, A.A.R. (2017) Investigation of instrument validity: Investigate the consistency between criterion and unidimensional in instrument validity (case study in management research). *International Journal of Law and Management*, 59 (6), pp. 1203-1210.

[30] TJIABRATA, F.R., BUMANAUW, B., and DOTULOG, L. (2017) Pengaruh Beban Kerja dan Lingkungan Kerja terhadap Kinerja Karyawan PT. Sabar Ganda Manado. *Jurnal EMBA: Jurnal Riset Ekonomi, Manajemen, Bisnis dan Akuntansi*, 5 (2), pp. 1570-1580.

[31] GOH, Z.W., ILIES, R., and WILSON, K.S. (2015) Supportive Supervisors Improve Employees' Daily Lives: The Role Supervisors Play in the Impact of Daily Workload on Life Satisfaction via Work-Family Conflict. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 89, pp. 65-73.

[32] CANDRA, R. and ADRIANSYAH, D. (2017) Pengaruh Beban Kerja dan Stres Kerja terhadap Kinerja Karyawan pada PT Mega Auto Central Finance Cabang di Langsa. *Jurnal Manajemen dan Keuangan*, 6 (1), pp. 670-678.

[33] CARLISLE, J., BHANUGOPAN, R., and D'NETTO, B. (2019) Enhancing Task Performance through Effective Training: The Mediating Role of Work Environment and Moderating Effect of Non-Mandatory Training. *Journal of Business Research*, 104, pp. 340-349.

## 参考文献:

[1] MOON, M.J. (2000) 重新审视了新公共管理中的组织承诺：动机，组织文化，部门和管理水平。公共绩效与管理评论，24 (2)，第 177-194 页。

[2] A. SANI 和 V.M. EKOWATI. (2019) 工作中的精神和组织承诺是伊斯兰精神与华侨银行知识产权之间关系的调节变量以及对员工绩效的影响。伊斯兰营销杂志，11 (6)，第 1777-1799 页。

[3] MUN, C., YING, C., LEW, S., W EI, T., 和 NING, T. (2017) 酒店行业工作环境与工作满意度之间的关系。东库·阿卜杜勒·拉赫曼大学的学士研究项目。

[4] B. YILDIRIM, M. GULMEZ, 和 F. YILDIRIM (2016) 工人的五因素人格特征与工作满意度之间的关系：对阿拉尼亚五星级酒店的调查。经济与金融，39，第 284-291 页。

[5] BEXHETI, L. 和 BEXHETI, A. (2016) 赫兹伯格的两因素理论和工作效率的影响。欧洲多学科研究杂志，1 (2)，第 378-385 页。

[6] RAZIQ, A. 和

MAULABAKHSH, R. (2015) 工作环境和满意度的影响。经济与金融，23，第 717-725 页。

[7] PUTRI, E.M., EKOWATI, V.M, SU PRIYANTO, A.S., 和 MUKKAFI, Z. (2019) 通过工作纪律，工作环境对员工绩效的影响。国际研究杂志-图书馆，7 (4)，第 132-140 页。

[8] A.S. SUPRIYANTO, V.M. EKOWATI, 和 H. VIRONIKA (2020) 将工作环境与员工绩效联系起来：工作纪律的中介作用。BIS MA (业务与管理)，13 (1)，第 14-25 页。

[9] 马亨德拉万 (I.G.) 和 INDRAWATI, A.D. (2015) 工作量和薪酬对 Pt 工作满意度的影响。潘卡·杜瓦塔登巴萨。电子期刊杂志，4 (11)，第 3936-3961 页。

[10] YO, 下午还有 SURYA, I.B.K. (2015) 以工作压力为中介变量的工作量对工作满意度的影响。电子期刊杂志，4 (5)，第 1149-1165 页。

[11] A. IROTH, V.P.K. LENGKONG, 和 L.O.H. DOTULONG. (2015) 薪酬，体力劳动环境和工作量对万鸦老部分餐厅员工工作满意度的影响。期刊工商管理硕士：期刊杂志经济研究，管理，商业与会计，6 (4)，第 2098-2107 页。

[12] R. IRAWATI 和 D.A. CAROLLINA. (2017) 工作量对员工绩效的影响分析运营商在铂技研精密印尼。Inovbiz：日报，5 (1)，第 51-58 页。

[13] NUGRAHA, M.B.I. 还有 SURYA, I.B. K. (2016) 薪酬，工作环境和晋升对工作满意度的影响。电子期刊杂志，5 (1)，第 59-87 页。

[14] RAZA, S., HUSSAIN, M.S., AZEE M, M., ANSARI, N.U.A., 和 AZIZ, K. (2017) 银行的工作量，工作压力，角色冲突和工作场所偏差行为：一项实证分析。欧洲自然与社会科学在线杂志，4 (4)，第 701-707 页。



- [15] SUHARNO, P., SARJANA, P.K., 和 GUNAWAN, R. (2017) 工作环境, 领导风格和组织文化对工作满意度及其影响的影响。国际法律与管理杂志, 59 (6), 第 1337-1358 页。
- [16] N. ELLYZAR, M. YUNUS, 和 AMRI. (2017) 工作变异, 工作量, 冲突的影响人际关系压力应力该工作及其对亚齐省BPKP代表绩效的影响。司法大法官马纳吉门 (贾纳纳尔·魔导师)。Unsyiah经济与商业学院, 1 (1), 第 35-45 页。
- [17] ANASI, S. (2020) 在尼日利亚西南地区, 工作关系, 工作量和体力劳动环境对图书馆员工作满意度的影响。全球知识, 记忆和沟通, 69 (6/7), 第 377-398 页。
- [18] RIVAI, V. 和 SAGALA, E.J. (2011) 从理论到实践的公司人力资源管理。雅加达: 拉贾瓦利出版社。
- [19] BUSRO, M. (2018) 人力资源管理理论。雅加达: 普雷纳达媒体集团。
- [20] SUPRIYANTO, A.S., EKOWATI, V.M., IDRIS, I., SUSMININGSIH, 和 ISWANTO, B. (2020) 领导风格作为银行员工自愿工作行为的预测指标。国际经济与管理杂志, 14 (1), 第 1-11 页。
- [21] KHALIL, N., KAMARUZZAMAN, S.N., BOHARI, A.A.M., HUSIN, H.N., 和 OTHMAN, I. (2020) 为保护安全健康的工作环境而对室内环境绩效的优先权重。西南交通大学学报, 55 (3)。可从<http://jsju.org/index.php/journal/article/view/606>获得。
- [22] LO, K. 和 LAMM, F. (2005) 酒店业的职业压力-雇佣关系的观点。新西兰就业关系杂志, 3 (1), 第 23-48 页。
- [23] 民政事务部长 (2008) 关于内政部和地方政府内部工作量分析的准则。[在线] 可从以下网站获得: <https://drive.riau.go.id/index.php/s/C3eXB0trQfOBGfI#pdfviewer> [访问日期20/12/17]。
- [24] AMRAN, W.F., GAZALI, H., 和 HASHIM, S. (2019) 工作环境, 工作量和自主权对工作压力的影响: 马来西亚巴生谷休闲餐厅员工的案例。国际商业和社会科学学术研究杂志, 9 (5), 第 744-755 页。
- [25] SEDARMAYANTI. (2009) 工作程序和工作效率。万隆: 简历曼达·马朱。
- [26] SEKARAN, U. (2003) 商业研究方法: 一种技能培养方法。纽约: 约翰·威利父子。
- [27] GHOZALI, I. 和 LATAN, H. (2014) 部分最小二乘概念, 方法与应用。三宝垄: 巴丹佩内比特大学迪波尼哥罗。
- [28] SUPRIYANTO, A.S. 和 MAHARANI, V. (2019) 人力资源管理研究。玛琅: PT即时图像对齐。
- [29] SOLIMUN 和 FERNANDES, A.A.R. (2017) 仪器有效性调查: 研究仪器有效性中准则与一维之间的一致性 (管理研究中的案例研究)。国际法律与管理杂志, 59 (6), 第 1203-1210 页。
- [30] TJIABRATA, F.R., BUMANAUW, B., 和 DOTULOG, L. (2017) 工作量和工作环境对PT萨巴尔·甘达员工绩效的影响万鸦老。期刊工商管理硕士: 期刊杂志经济研究, 管理, 商业与会计, 5 (2), 第 1570-1580 页。
- [31] GOH, Z.W., ILIES, R. 和 WILSON, K.S. (2015) 支持性主管改善员工的日常生活: 主管在通过工作家庭冲突对日常工作量对生活满意度的影响中扮演的角色。职业行为杂志, 89, 第 65-73 页。
- [32] CANDRA, R. 和 ADRIANSYAH, D. (2017) 工作量和工作压力对朗萨PT超级汽车中央金融分公司员工绩效的影响。管理与金融杂志, 6 (1), 第 670-678 页。
- [33] CARLISLE, J., BHANUGOPAN, R., 和

D'NETTO, B. (2019) 通过有效的培训提高任务绩效：工作环境的中介作用和非强

制性培训的调节作用。商业研究杂志，104，第 340-349 页。