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***ABSTRACT***

*The purpose of this research are: 1) to know job description of physical work environment and job satisfaction of lecturer of Faculty of Economics, State University of Jakarta, 2) to know the influence of work load to job satisfaction of lecturer of Faculty of Economics, State University of Jakarta; 3) to know the effect of physical work environment On job satisfaction of lecturer of Faculty of Economics, State University of Jakarta, 4) to know work load and physical work environment can predict increase of job satisfaction of lecturer of Faculty of Economics, State University of Jakarta. The research model used in this research is regression analysis. This research will be conducted on 67 lecturers of Faculty of Economics, State University of Jakarta. This research uses descriptive and explanatory analysis. Data collection techniques using SPSS statistical application program version 22.0 The results in this study are: 1) workload has a negative and significant impact on job satisfaction of FE UNJ lecturers. 2) the physical work environment has a positive and significant impact on the job satisfaction of FE UNJ lecturer. 3) the result of model feasibility test shows that work load and physical work environment can predict job satisfaction of FE UNJ lecturer.*
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**INTRODUCTION**

According to some experts job satisfaction is an important thing to be fulfilled by the company, because job satisfaction if fulfilled will affect the results of their work, further symptoms or behaviors that they show on their work is a picture of job satisfaction, job satisfaction needs Be considered in order to achieve the goals that have been made.

       Symptoms found in the behavior of lecturers is, lecturers who are late into the class or not in accordance with the lecture hours from the beginning has been determined, the next symptom is to complete the lecture faster than the time should be, the next symptom equalization of the final value of students in 1 class on the Achievement Index While (IPS). Some lecturers expressed this because of the workload they received and also the physical work environment they acquired. Here is the data load of teaching that can by lecturers FE UNJ:

**Table 1. The burden of teaching lecturers FE UNJ 104th semester**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Burden of teaching** | **Number of lecturers** | **Percentage** |
| > 12 sks | 49 | 57% |
| 9-12 sks | 31 | 36% |
| < 9 sks | 6 | 7% |
|
| Source: data processed by author, 2017  **Table 2. The burden of teaching lecturers FE UNJ 105th semester** | | | |
|  | **Burden of teaching** | **Number of lecturers** | **Percentage** |
| > 12 sks | 58 | 72,5% |
| 9-12 sks | 18 | 22,5% |
| < 9 sks | 4 | 5% |
|
| Sumber: data diolah oleh penulis, 2017 | | | |

From the data obtained above in 2 semesters of 104 and 105 is known there are more than 50% of lecturers who do not get the ideal teaching load set by the dikti that is as much as 9 -12 credits of teaching load. In addition, the lecturers also expressed dissatisfaction in terms of journal publication, in this case the final value of their performance derived from the study was only given an assessment of (0,5) for national journals and (0,6) for scopus journals or international journals.

       Whereas in the case of physical work environment, the lecturer explains dissatisfaction with the internet quality that is in the scope of the faculty of economics, the lecturer complains about the internet because it is needed to access the journal and run one of their workloads ie research, then on the projector wiring problem and also the screen Occasional problems such as disconnected and color on the screen can damage the eyes, as well as the lecture building, in the case of noise arising from outside the classroom, and the use of elevators that are often very crowded during class hours.

**Research indication**

Many factors that can affect job satisfaction include workload, physical work environment, non physical work environment, compensation and so on, but in this study will only discuss job satisfaction is only influenced by workload and physical work environment on the object of Faculty of Economics, State University of Jakarta.

**Research problem**

1. What is the description of workload, physical work environment and job satisfaction at lecturer of Faculty of Economics, State University of Jakarta?

2. Is there any influence of work load on job satisfaction of faculty of economics faculty of state university of jakarta?

3. Is there any influence of physical work environment on job satisfaction at lecturer of Faculty of Economics, State University of Jakarta?

4. Can workload and physical work environment predict increase of job satisfaction of lecturer of Faculty of Economics, State University of Jakarta?

**Research purpose**

1. To know and analyze the description of workload, physical work environment and job satisfaction at lecturer of Faculty of Economics, State University of Jakarta.

2. To determine the effect of workload on job satisfaction lecturers faculty economics of state universities jakarta

3. To know the effect of physical work environment on job satisfaction at lecturer of Faculty of Economics, State University of Jakarta.

4. To find out the work load and physical work environment can predict the increase of job satisfaction of lecturer of Faculty of Economics, State University of Jakarta

**LITERATURE REVIEW**

**Job Satisfaction**

Edy (2014: 74) proposes job satisfaction as a complex emotional reaction, an employee's attitude toward work-related work situations, employee cooperation, rewards received in work, and physical and psychological factors.

       Mila (2015: 229) states Job Satisfaction is the attitude or feelings of employees to the fun or unpleasant aspects of the work in accordance with the assessment of each worker.

       From some definitions it can be concluded that job satisfaction is the attitude or feeling of a worker likes or dislikes, likes or displeases both the work and the environment of his or her work, derived from the assessment of each worker.

**Workload**

According to the Minister of Manpower (2010: 16) understanding of workload is a set or number of activities that must be completed by an organizational unit or holder of office within a certain period.

       While Tarwaka (2015: 29) suggested workload is a number of activities that require mental processes or abilities to be completed within a certain time, both in physical and psychological.

       From some definitions it can be concluded that the workload is a set of task demands involving the time, effort, mental and labor of the workers to be done within a certain time period, in physical or psychic form.

**Physical Work Environment**

Sedarmayanti (2015: 1078) suggests that the physical work environment is all physical in nature and is located around the workplace that affects the way employees work both directly and indirectly.

       Sunyoto (2014: 2) states that the physical work environment is everything that exists around the workers and that can influence him in carrying out the tasks charged, such as hygiene, music, lighting.

       From some definitions can be concluded that the physical work environment is everything that is around the workers in the form of physical, either directly or indirectly affect the workers in carrying out the tasks charged and to achieve organizational goals.

**Research model**
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**Figure 1. Research model**

Source: Data processed by author, 2017

**Hypotesis**

Based on the study of the theories and frameworks above, then the translation of the hypothesis as follows:

Hypothesis 1 (H1):

Ho: Workload does not affect Job Satisfaction lecturer of Faculty of Economics, State University of Jakarta.

Ha: Workload has an effect on to Job Satisfaction of lecturer of Faculty of Economics, State University of Jakarta.

Hypothesis 2 (H2):

Ho: Physical Work Environment has no effect on Job Satisfaction of lecturer of Faculty of Economics, State University of Jakarta.

Ha: The Physical Work Environment affects the Job Satisfaction of the lecturer at the Faculty of Economics, State University of Jakarta.

Hypothesis 3 (H3):

Ho: Workload and Physical Work Environment Can not predict the increase of job satisfaction of lecturer of Faculty of Economics, State University of Jakarta.

Ha: Workload and Physical Work Environment can predict the increase of job satisfaction of lecturer of Faculty of Economics, State University of Jakarta.

**RESEARCH METHODS**

This research uses descriptive and explanatory method. The data used in this study comes from the primary data obtained through interviews and questionnaires, while secondary data obtained from the Faculty of Economics, State University of Jakarta, books, journals and thesis from previous research. Sampling method using saturated sampling technique or also called census. The number of samples used in this study is 67 lecturers with the criteria of permanent lecturers who get the teaching load each semester and not being served at the faculty and university level from the data obtained.

**RESULT AND DISCUSSION**

**Result of Test Instrument**

**Result of Validity Test**

Validity test is used to find out whether there is a statement in the questionnaire that should be removed or replaced because it is considered irrelevant. The number of respondents for the validity test is 20% of the population, so there were 17 respondents as the sample of validity test. Validity test in this research, using correlation product moment. Where if the value rhitung> rtabel then the instrument is valid and if rhitung <rtabel then the instrument is invalid. Rtabel in this study amounted to 0.482.

**Tabel 3. The result of the validity test**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Variables** | **Item before being tested** | **Invalid item** | **Valid item** |
| Job Satisfaction | 12 | 0 | 12 |
| Workload | 7 | 0 | 7 |
| PhysicalWork Environment | 6 | 0 | 6 |

Source: Data processed by author, 2017

Based on Table 3 above note that all statement items of the three variables have been qualified rhitung> rtabel (0.482) then it can be said that the research item is valid.

**Result Reliability test**

Reliability test is used to determine the consistency of a research variable instrument if used more than once with the same respondent. This study uses Cronbach's Alpha test with criterion if Cronbach's Alpha value> 0.6 then reliable instrument and if Cronbach's Alpha value <0.6 then instrument is not reliable.

**Tabel 4. The result of the reliability test**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Uji Reliabilitas** | **Cronbach’s Alpha** | **Keterangan** |
| Job Satisfaction (Y) | 0,870 | Reliabel |
| Workload (X1) | 0,700 | Reliabel |
| Physical Work Environment (X2) | 0,760 | Reliabel |

Source: Data processed by author, 2017

Based on Table 4 above, it is known that the reliability test results for each variable with the value of Cronbach's Alpha> 0.6 then the three variables can be declared reliable.

**Descriptive Analysis**

Descriptive analysis is used to provide an overview of the distribution and distribution of research data through questionnaires distributed to 67 lecturers FE UNJ. Can be seen the results of descriptive analysis in the table below:

**Tabel 5. The result of the descriptive analysis**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Job Satisfaction** | **Workload** | **Physical Work Environment** |
| **Strongly Agree** | 10,8% | 25,6% | 13,9% |
| **Agree** | 27,8% | 39,0% | 26,9% |
| **Disagree** | 37,9% | 24,5% | 37,8% |
| **Strongly Disagree** | 23,5% | 10,9% | 21,4% |

Source: Data processed by author, 2017

Based on Table 5, it can be seen the results of descriptive analysis of each variable that is for job satisfaction variables respondents answered strongly agree and agree summed up 27.8% when compared with the criteria score (26% -50%) then the job satisfaction of lecturers FE UNJ quite low. This is due to the dissatisfaction with the payroll system that the clarity of the payroll system used by the faculty for the lecturers, as well as the problem of not knowing well their bosses in the faculty.

Then for the variable workload respondents answered strongly disagree and do not agree summed as much as 35.4% when compared with the criteria score (26% -50%) then the job stress of FE UNJ lecturer is high. This is due to the health conditions that affect the completion of tasks caused by the workload received, and then caused less satisfied with their task in this case is not the equitable burden of teaching perceived by the lecturer, then the equipment that has not been fully assist in Task completion.

       Physical work environment variables respondents answered strongly agree and agree summed as much as 40.8% when compared with the criteria score (26% -50%) then the physical work environment lecturer FE UNJ classified as less comfortable. This is due to the noise in which they work, the chairs are located on the workplace that is felt less comfortable, and work facilities that are not enough such as projector connecting cable, internet signal, wifi.

**Classical Asumption Test Result**

**Normality Test**

Normality test is used to determine whether the samples taken are normally distributed or not. The test was performed with one sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test and stated normally distributed if the value of significance> 0.05.

**Tabel 6. The result of the normality test**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test** | | | | |
|  | | Job Satisfaction | Workload | Physical work environment |
| N | | 67 | 67 | 67 |
| Normal Parametersa,b | Mean | 27,10 | 19,55 | 14,00 |
| Std. Deviation | 3,345 | 3,304 | 3,238 |
| Most Extreme Differences | Absolute | ,095 | ,072 | ,084 |
| Positive | ,095 | ,059 | ,077 |
| Negative | -,087 | -,072 | -,084 |
| Test Statistic | | ,095 | ,072 | ,084 |
| Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed) | | ,200c,d | ,200c,d | ,200c,d |
| a. Test distribution is Normal. | | | | |
| b. Calculated from data. | | | | |
| c. Lilliefors Significance Correction. | | | | |
| d. This is a lower bound of the true significance. | | | | |

Source: calculation SPSS 22, 2017

Based on Table 6 can be seen from the value of significance of each variable that is the work motivation variable of 0.200, job stress of 0.200, and career development of 0.200. The overall value of significance is greater than the significance level of 0.05. This shows that all variables are normally distributed and qualify multiple linear regression analysis methods.

**Linearity Test**

Linearity test is done by finding the equation of regression line of work stress variable and career development toward work motivation. This test uses test for linearity with a significance level of 0.05. The criterion is that two variables are said to have a linear relationship if the significance <0.05.

**Tabel 7. The result of the linearity test between workload with job satisfaction**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **ANOVA Table** | | | | | | | |
|  | | | Sum of Squares | Df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
| Job satisfaction \* workload | Between Groups | (Combined) | 331,640 | 14 | 23,689 | 3,029 | ,002 |
| Linearity | 213,108 | 1 | 213,108 | 27,252 | ,000 |
| Deviation from Linearity | 118,532 | 13 | 9,118 | 1,166 | ,330 |
| Within Groups | | 406,629 | 52 | 7,820 |  |  |
| Total | | 738,269 | 66 |  |  |  |

Source: calculation SPSS 22, 2017

Based on the results of linearity test above between work load variable with job satisfaction variable, it is known to have a linearity significance value of 0.000. That is, the significance value is less than 0.05 so it can be concluded that between the two variables there is a linear relationship.

**Tabel 8. The result of the linearity test between physical work environment with job satisfaction**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **ANOVA Table** | | | | | | | |
|  | | | Sum of Squares | Df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
| Job satisfaction \* physical work environment | Between Groups | (Combined) | 338,570 | 13 | 26,044 | 3,453 | ,001 |
| Linearity | 259,792 | 1 | 259,792 | 34,448 | ,000 |
| Deviation from Linearity | 78,778 | 12 | 6,565 | ,870 | ,581 |
| Within Groups | | 399,699 | 53 | 7,541 |  |  |
| Total | | 738,269 | 66 |  |  |  |

Source: calculation SPSS 22, 2017

Based on the results of linearity test between physical work environment variables with job satisfaction variables in the table above, it is known that the value of linearity significance of 0.000. That is, the significance value is less than 0.05 so it can be concluded that between the two variables there is a linear relationship.

**Multicollinearity Test**

Multicollinearity test is used to determine whether the regression model found strong correlation between independent variables (independent). Measuring multicolinearity by calculating VIF (variance inflation factor) and correlation coefficient between independent variables. The criterion is that if the VIF value <10 or close, then there is no multicollinearity.

**Tabel 9. The result of the multicllonearity test**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Coefficientsa** | | | |
| Model | | Collinearity Statistics | |
| Tolerance | VIF |
| 1 | Workload | ,941 | 1,062 |
| Physical work environment | ,941 | 1,062 |
| a. Dependent Variable: job sarisfaction | | | |

Source: calculation SPSS 22, 2017

Based on Table 9 above multicollinearity test results, it is known that VIF value for work load is 1.062 and physical work environment is 1.062. Therefore, the independent variable does not occur multicollinearity because the VIF value of all independent variables is <10.

**Heteroscedasticity Test**

Heteroskedasticity test aims to find out whether in a regression model there is a variant inequality of the residual of an observation to another observation. In this study using Spearman's Rho test method, which is to correlate residual value (unstandardized residual) with each independent variable. The criterion, if the significance <0.05 then the problem of heteroscedasticity.

**Tabel 10. The result of the heteroscedasticity test**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Correlations** | | | | | |
|  | | | Unstandardized Residual | Workload | Physical work environment |
| Spearman's rho | Unstandardized Residual | Correlation Coefficient | 1,000 | ,017 | -,065 |
| Sig. (2-tailed) | . | ,890 | ,602 |
| N | 67 | 67 | 67 |
| Beban Kerja | Correlation Coefficient | ,017 | 1,000 | -,316\*\* |
| Sig. (2-tailed) | ,890 | . | ,009 |
| N | 67 | 67 | 67 |
| Lingkungan Kerja fisik | Correlation Coefficient | -,065 | -,316\*\* | 1,000 |
| Sig. (2-tailed) | ,602 | ,009 | . |
| N | 67 | 67 | 67 |
| \*\*. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed). | | | | | |

Source: calculation SPSS 22, 2017

Based on Table 10, it can be seen that the correlation between work stress with unstandardized residual yielded a significance value of 0.890 and the correlation between career development with unstandardized residual yielded a significance value of 0.602. This shows that in this regression model there is no problem of heteroscedasticity, because the value of correlation significance> 0.05.

**Multiple Regression Linear Result**

**Result T Test**

**Tabel 11. The result of the t test**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Coefficientsa** | | | | | | |
| Model | | Unstandardized Coefficients | | Standardized Coefficients | t | Sig. |
| B | Std. Error | Beta |
| 1 | (Constant) | 28,266 | 2,453 |  | 11,523 | ,000 |
| Workload | -,423 | ,091 | -,418 | -4,667 | ,000 |
| Physical work environment | ,508 | ,093 | ,492 | 5,491 | ,000 |
| a. Dependent Variable: job satisfaction | | | | | | |

Source: calculation SPSS 22, 2017

**Hypothesis 1**

Ho: The work load has no effect on job satisfaction.

Ha: Work load has an effect on job satisfaction.

       Based on Table 11, the workload variable has a t-count of -4.667. Then the value of tcount is compared with ttable value. Therefore, -thount <-ttable (-4,667 <-1,997) with a significance value of 0.000 <0.05. This shows that hypothesis 1 Ho is rejected and Ha accepted. This means that the workload variable has a negative and significant effect on job satisfaction. The results of this study support the research that has been done previously by Putu Melati Purbaningrat Yo and Ida Bagus Ketut Surya (2015) and research conducted by I Gede Mahendrawan and Ayu Desi Indrawati (2015) in which both studies stated that the workload has a negative effect and Significant to job satisfaction. And this study also denied the results of research conducted by Yahdi Anhar, Wiji Utami, Markus Apriono (2014) where from their research found that the workload has a positive effect. These results also at once prove the theory of Tarwaka (2016) which suggests there are two factors that affect the workload of internal factors and external factors.

**Hypothesis 2**

Ho: The physical work environment has no effect on job satisfaction.

Ha: The physical work environment has no effect on job satisfaction.

       Based on Table 11, career development variables have a t count of 5.491. Then the value of tcount is compared with ttable value. Therefore, thitung> ttable (5,491> 1,997) with a significance value of 0.00 <0.05. This shows that hypothesis 2 Ho is rejected and Ha accepted. This means that the physical work environment variables have a positive and significant influence on job satisfaction. This research supports previous research which has been done by Gurawan Dayona and Ridha Agus (2016) and research conducted by QuineritaStevani Aruan and Mahendra Fakhri (2015) where from the research result it is found that the environment of physical keraj have positive and significant effect to job satisfaction beside The results of this study are also supported by other researchers namely Kadek Sujana, AA Sagung Kartika Dewi (2015) and research conducted by Sandi J, Djumadi, Anwar Alaydrus (2016) where the results of research conducted by them also found That the physical work environment has a positive and significant effect on job satisfaction. This also proves the Sedarmayanti (2014) theory of physical work environment that can influence the facilities, cleanliness and seats

**Result F test (feasiblity model)**

The f test (Model feasibility test) according to Ken Black is used to test the overall model in which the independent variables contribute significantly in predicting the dependent variable.

**Hypothesis 3 (H3):**

Ho: Workload and Environment Physical Work Can not predict the increase of job satisfaction of lecturer of Faculty of Economics, State University of Jakarta.

Ha: Workload and Environment Physical Work can predict the increase of job satisfaction of lecturer of Faculty of Economics, State University of Jakarta.

**Tabel 12. The result of the f test**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **ANOVAa** | | | | | | |
| Model | | Sum of Squares | Df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
| 1 | Regression | 381,301 | 2 | 190,651 | 34,181 | ,000b |
| Residual | 356,967 | 64 | 5,578 |  |  |
| Total | 738,269 | 66 |  |  |  |
| a. Dependent Variable: job satisfaction | | | | | | |
| b. Predictors: (Constant), physical work environment, workload | | | | | | |

Source: calculation SPSS 22, 2017

In table 12. F arithmetic obtained for 34.181. The value of F arithmetic is then compared with the value of F table sought with a 95% confidence level, α = 5% with df 1 (number of variables-1) or 3-1 = 2, and df 2 (nk-1) or 67-2- 1 = 64. Based on these calculations, obtained F table of 3.14 thus F arithmetic> F table. Significance on the F test of 0.000; Thus less than 0.05. The conclusion obtained is the research model of work load and physical work environment can predict the increase of the dependent variable of job satisfaction. These results support the research of Yahdi Anhar Markhus, Wiji Utami, Markus Apriono (2014) found that workload and physical work environment simultaneously affect job satisfaction.

**Determination Coefficient Analysis Result**

**Tabel 13. The result of determination coefficient**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Model Summaryb** | | | | |
| Model | R | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate |
| 1 | ,719a | ,516 | ,501 | 2,362 |
| a. Predictors: (Constant), physical work environment, workload | | | | |
| b. Dependent Variable: job satisfaction | | | | |

Source: calculation SPSS 22, 2017

From Table 13, the value of Adjusted R2 is 0.516 or (51.6%). This shows that 51.6% job satisfaction is influenced by workload factor and physical work environment. While the rest of 48.4% is explained by other variables outside this study.

**CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMENDATIONS**

**Conclusion**

Based on the results of research on "Influence Workload and Physical Work Environment Against Job Satisfaction lecturer Faculty of Economics, State University of Jakarta", it can be concluded as follows:

1. Description of workload, physical work environment and job satisfaction of lecturer of Faculty of Economics, State University of Jakarta are:

A. Workload on FE-UNJ lecturers is high.

B. Physical Working Environment of FE-UNJ lecturer is not comfortable.

C. Job Satisfaction with FE-UNJ lecturers is low.

2. Workload has a negative and significant impact on job satisfaction of FE-UNJ lecturers. If the workload is low then job satisfaction increases, otherwise if the workload is high then job satisfaction decreases.

3. Physical Work Environment has a positive and significant influence on job satisfaction of FE-UNJ lecturers. If the lecturer gets a decent physical work environment, it will make their job satisfaction increase. Conversely, if the lecturer get the physical work environment is not feasible, it will make their job satisfaction decreased.

4. The feasibility of the research model as a whole shows that workload and physical work environment can predict job satisfaction of FE UNJ lecturer.

**Suggestion**

Suggestions addressed to state university of jakarta:

1 FE UNJ, need to improve the physical work environment. Firstly, it is necessary to improve the condition of the room from problems arising from outside noise in which they operate. Second, FE UNJ should improve or renew the chair because some lecturers feel uncomfortable with it. Third, FEUNJ must repair or renew existing facilities such as complained by lecturers such as renewing cable connecting laptop with projector screen and also in some places difficult to get internet signal either from wifi or from their mobile so that needed additional wifi in some place. It is possible to increase job satisfaction in the physical work environment of the lecturers.

2 FE UNJ, it is better to reduce the level of workload with; First, add new lecturers. Then for the problem of work tools provided the faculty should be able to replace or renew the equipment they already have. It may improve job satisfaction at the workload of lecturers.

3 In an effort to create job satisfaction of lecturers, the faculty of economics State University of Jakarta need to improve the condition of the payroll system, the clarity of the payroll system and also know the boss well, mungking faculty can make a special event that was attended only by the lecturers FE UNJ, with the theme of the third The problem above so that the problem of direct job satisfaction can be solved with the implementation of the event and hear from both parties both the leadership and the lecturers on the matter.
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