

***The Influence of Workload, Job Involvement, and Work Environment on Employee Job Satisfaction at the Department of Transportation, Binjai City***

**Pengaruh Beban Kerja, Keterlibatan Kerja dan Lingkungan Kerja terhadap Kepuasan Kerja Karyawan pada Dinas Perhubungan Kota Binjai**

**Johanes Aste Frans Karo Karo<sup>1</sup>, Muhammad Toyib Daulay<sup>2\*</sup>**

Universitas Pembangunan Panca Budi<sup>1,2</sup>

[aste.zammi@gmail.com<sup>1</sup>](mailto:aste.zammi@gmail.com)

[toyibdaulay@dosen.pancabudi.ac.id<sup>2</sup>](mailto:toyibdaulay@dosen.pancabudi.ac.id)

**Abstract**

*This research was conducted at the Department of Transportation of Binjai City with the aim of analyzing the partial and simultaneous effects of workload, work engagement, and work environment on employee job satisfaction. The population consisted of 128 permanent employees, and the sampling technique used was a census, resulting in a total sample of 128 respondents. The type of data used was primary data, with secondary data as supporting sources. Data collection techniques included literature review, surveys, and observation. The data analysis methods applied were multiple linear regression, classical assumption tests, and hypothesis testing. The findings reveal that workload, work engagement, and work environment significantly influence employee job satisfaction, both partially and simultaneously, at the Department of Transportation of Binjai City. There is a strong correlation between these variables and job satisfaction. Employee job satisfaction can be explained by workload, work engagement, and work environment by 51.9%, while the remaining 48.1% is influenced by other factors not examined in this study.*

**Keywords:** Workload, Work Engagement, Work Environment, Job Satisfaction

**Abstrak**

Penelitian ini dilakukan pada Dinas Perhubungan Kota Binjai dengan tujuan untuk menganalisis pengaruh beban kerja, keterlibatan kerja, dan lingkungan kerja terhadap kepuasan kerja karyawan baik secara parsial maupun simultan. Populasi dalam penelitian ini berjumlah 128 pegawai tetap, dengan teknik pengambilan sampel menggunakan metode sensus sehingga diperoleh jumlah sampel sebanyak 128 responden. Jenis data yang digunakan adalah data primer dengan data sekunder sebagai sumber pendukung. Teknik pengumpulan data meliputi studi pustaka, kuesioner, dan observasi. Metode analisis data yang digunakan adalah regresi linier berganda, uji asumsi klasik, dan uji hipotesis. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa beban kerja, keterlibatan kerja, dan lingkungan kerja berpengaruh signifikan terhadap kepuasan kerja karyawan baik secara parsial maupun simultan pada Dinas Perhubungan Kota Binjai. Terdapat hubungan yang kuat antara variabel tersebut dengan kepuasan kerja karyawan. Kepuasan kerja karyawan dapat dijelaskan oleh beban kerja, keterlibatan kerja, dan lingkungan kerja sebesar 51,9%, sedangkan sisanya sebesar 48,1% dipengaruhi oleh variabel lain yang tidak diteliti dalam penelitian ini.

**Kata Kunci:** Beban Kerja, Keterlibatan Kerja, Lingkungan Kerja, Kepuasan Kerja

**1. Introduction**

The phenomenon that occurs in organizations, both in government institutions and private companies, shows that operational success is largely determined by the role of employees in carrying out tasks according to the organizational structure. Each organization has different objectives, either profit-oriented or non-profit, but both require optimal employee performance (Widodo, 2019). Leaders expect employees to make maximum contributions to support organizational sustainability. However, in reality, employees often face obstacles

related to workload, work engagement, and work environment, which in turn affect their job satisfaction (Saputra, 2022; Jasmin et al., 2023).

Job satisfaction is one of the most critical aspects influencing employee motivation, productivity, and loyalty. Each individual has a different background—such as age, education, work experience, and socioeconomic status—which shapes their perception of job satisfaction (Rizky, 2018). Several studies indicate that job satisfaction is dynamic and may change over time due to internal and external factors, including compensation, interpersonal communication, work environment, and organizational culture (Aisy et al., 2024; Sriani et al., 2022; Vanesa et al., 2019). Therefore, it is crucial for organizations, including government institutions, to understand the key factors that enhance employee job satisfaction.

One of the most widely studied factors is workload. High workloads tend to cause physical and mental fatigue, negatively affecting job satisfaction (Maimunah & Puspitarini, 2020; Dewi & Heryanda, 2022). Other studies show that workloads misaligned with employee capacity can reduce productivity (Fathomi, 2021; Firdaus & Anah, 2024; Trisnawati & Parwoto, 2020). However, some findings suggest that with proper workload management, employees may still achieve job satisfaction (Mariana et al., 2024; Munazilah & Iryanti, 2023). These inconsistent results make it necessary to re-examine the influence of workload, particularly in local government institutions such as the Department of Transportation of Binjai City.

In addition to workload, work engagement is another important factor that influences job satisfaction. Employees who feel engaged in strategic tasks often experience pride and greater satisfaction in their jobs (Mubarak, 2024; Prihastuty & Yutini, 2024). However, other research suggests that work engagement does not always directly lead to job satisfaction, as mediating variables such as organizational commitment or leadership style also play significant roles (Nurlaini & Almasdi, 2020; Hasibuan, 2019). This highlights a research gap regarding the extent to which work engagement influences job satisfaction, especially in the context of civil servants.

The third factor is the work environment, both physical and non-physical. A conducive work environment has been proven to increase employee comfort and satisfaction (Satriawati et al., 2023; Aisha & Juaeti, 2023). Several studies emphasize that a healthy, clean, and well-facilitated work environment drives productivity (Hamid, 2022; Irfan et al., 2022). However, other findings indicate that even if the work environment is adequate, employee satisfaction does not necessarily improve when compensation and other factors are lacking (Andriany, 2019; Lestari & Pangesti, 2022; Munica & Dwiarti, 2024). These differences underline the need to further investigate the role of the work environment in job satisfaction, particularly in the public sector.

Based on a preliminary survey at the Department of Transportation of Binjai City, it was found that most employees were dissatisfied with their jobs. This dissatisfaction stemmed from excessive workloads, lack of involvement in important decision-making, and less supportive work conditions. Questionnaire results indicated that the majority of respondents expressed negative responses regarding salary, allowances, coordination, and work environment, with dissatisfaction levels ranging from 53% to 60%. This phenomenon suggests that the job satisfaction level of employees at the Binjai City Department of Transportation is relatively low, making it an important case for further study.

The urgency of this research lies in the need to create a healthy, fair, and productive work environment within government institutions. Previous studies have largely focused on the private sector (Meilasari et al., 2020; Jasmin et al., 2023; Aisy et al., 2024), while research in the public sector remains relatively limited. Here lies the novelty of this study, namely examining the influence of workload, work engagement, and work environment simultaneously on employee job satisfaction within a local government institution. Thus, this study contributes empirically to strengthening the literature on human resource management in the public sector.

The objective of this research is to examine and analyze the effects of workload, work engagement, and work environment on employee job satisfaction at the Department of

Transportation of Binjai City, both partially and simultaneously. In addition, this research is expected to provide practical recommendations for institutional leaders to enhance employee satisfaction, which in turn will positively impact productivity and the achievement of organizational goals within local government institutions.

## **2. Literature Review**

### **Workload**

Workload refers to the amount of work assigned to employees within a certain period of time, which can be categorized into physical workload and mental workload (Maimunah & Puspitarini, 2020). A balanced workload that matches employee capacity can enhance performance, while excessive workload often leads to stress, fatigue, and decreased job satisfaction (Dewi & Heryanda, 2022; Firdaus & Anah, 2024). According to Fathomi (2021), misalignment between job demands and employee abilities reduces productivity and morale. However, Mariana et al. (2024) argue that appropriate workload management can mitigate negative effects and even support employee satisfaction. These findings demonstrate that the impact of workload on job satisfaction remains inconsistent, providing a basis for further investigation.

### **Work Engagement**

Work engagement is defined as a positive, fulfilling work-related state of mind characterized by vigor, dedication, and absorption (Schaufeli et al., 2002). Engaged employees are more likely to show enthusiasm, strong involvement, and resilience at work (Mubarok, 2024). Research has shown that higher levels of work engagement correlate with increased job satisfaction (Prihastuty & Yutini, 2024). However, Nurlaini & Almasdi (2020) emphasize that this relationship may be influenced by mediating variables such as leadership style and organizational commitment. Similarly, Hasibuan (2019) highlights that engagement does not guarantee satisfaction unless accompanied by supportive organizational policies. This indicates a research gap regarding the strength and consistency of the relationship between work engagement and job satisfaction in public organizations.

### **Work Environment**

The work environment encompasses physical conditions such as workspace layout, lighting, and facilities, as well as non-physical factors such as interpersonal relationships, leadership, and organizational culture (Hamid, 2022). A conducive work environment enhances employee comfort, motivation, and satisfaction (Satriawati et al., 2023; Aisha & Juaeti, 2023). Irfan et al. (2022) stress that a clean and supportive workplace encourages higher productivity. On the other hand, Andriany (2019) and Lestari & Pangesti (2022) found that even with a positive work environment, employees may remain dissatisfied if compensation, recognition, and career development opportunities are lacking. This suggests that the work environment may interact with other factors in shaping job satisfaction, requiring further empirical testing in government institutions.

### **Job Satisfaction**

Job satisfaction is a positive emotional state resulting from an individual's evaluation of their job experiences (Locke, 1976). It is influenced by factors such as compensation, workload, organizational culture, relationships with colleagues, and career opportunities (Vanessa et al., 2019; Sriani et al., 2022). Rizky (2018) explains that job satisfaction varies depending on personal characteristics, including age, education, and work experience. Previous studies have demonstrated that job satisfaction is strongly linked to employee motivation, performance, and organizational loyalty (Aisy et al., 2024; Jasmin et al., 2023). However, the determinants of satisfaction differ across organizational contexts, which highlights the importance of examining

it in the public sector, where structural and cultural dynamics often differ from private organizations.

## 2. Methodology

This research employs a quantitative associative approach to examine the influence of workload, work engagement, and work environment on job satisfaction among employees at the Department of Transportation in Binjai City. The study was conducted from September to December 2024, involving a population of 128 permanent employees, all of whom were selected as the sample using a census technique. The data used consisted of primary data (questionnaires) and secondary data (official institutional documents). The variables in this study include independent variables: workload (X1), work engagement (X2), and work environment (X3), as well as the dependent variable: job satisfaction (Y). Data collection techniques include literature review, surveys, and direct observation. The data analysis method was performed using SPSS, which involved validity and reliability tests, classical assumption tests (normality, multicollinearity, and heteroscedasticity), multiple linear regression analysis, and model testing (F-test, t-test, and coefficient of determination/R<sup>2</sup>) to assess both the simultaneous and partial effects of the independent variables on job satisfaction.

## 3. Results and Discussion

**Table 1. Validity and Reliability Test Results**

Variable	Item	Corrected Item–Total Correlation	Conclusion	Cronbach's Alpha	Reliability Conclusion
<b>Workload (X1)</b>	Workload_1	0.816	Valid	<b>0.821</b>	Reliable
	Workload_2	0.635	Valid		
	Workload_3	0.591	Valid		
<b>Work Engagement (X2)</b>	Work_Engagement_1	0.632	Valid	<b>0.783</b>	Reliable
	Work_Engagement_2	0.558	Valid		
	Work_Engagement_3	0.557	Valid		
	Work_Engagement_4	0.611	Valid		
<b>Work Environment (X3)</b>	Work_Environment_1	0.460	Valid	<b>0.733</b>	Reliable
	Work_Environment_2	0.486	Valid		
	Work_Environment_3	0.479	Valid		
	Work_Environment_4	0.320	Valid		
	Work_Environment_5	0.594	Valid		
	Work_Environment_6	0.479	Valid		
<b>Job Satisfaction (Y)</b>	Job_Satisfaction_1	0.253	Valid	<b>0.690</b>	Reliable
	Job_Satisfaction_2	0.359	Valid		
	Job_Satisfaction_3	0.328	Valid		
	Job_Satisfaction_4	0.459	Valid		
	Job_Satisfaction_5	0.456	Valid		
	Job_Satisfaction_6	0.365	Valid		
	Job_Satisfaction_7	0.534	Valid		
	Job_Satisfaction_8	0.299	Valid		

The results of the validity tests indicate that all questionnaire items for the four research variables—workload, work engagement, work environment, and job satisfaction—have corrected item–total correlation values greater than the r-table value (0.172). This confirms that

every item used in the instrument is valid and capable of accurately measuring the intended construct. Meanwhile, the reliability tests show that all variables have Cronbach's Alpha values above the standard threshold of 0.6 (ranging from 0.690 to 0.821). This demonstrates that the instruments are reliable, meaning the responses from participants are consistent and stable across different items measuring the same construct. Thus, the measurement instruments used in this study are both valid and reliable, providing strong support for subsequent data analysis.

### Classical Assumption Test Results

The results of the classical assumption tests demonstrate that the regression model in this study meets the required statistical assumptions. The normality test, conducted using the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test, yielded a significance value of 0.584, which is greater than 0.05, indicating that the residuals are normally distributed. This finding is further supported by the P-Plot graph, where the data points lie close to the diagonal line, and the histogram method, which shows a bell-shaped distribution, both confirming the normality assumption. The multicollinearity test results reveal that all independent variables—workload, work engagement, and work environment—have tolerance values above 0.1 and VIF values below 10, signifying the absence of multicollinearity. Furthermore, the heteroscedasticity test using both the Glejser method and scatterplot graph indicates that all variables have significance values greater than 0.05 and that the scatterplot does not display any clear pattern, thus confirming that the regression model is free from heteroscedasticity. Overall, these results confirm that the regression model fulfills the classical assumptions, making it suitable for further analysis.

### Multiple Linear Regression Test Results

The following presents the multiple linear regression test results between the independent variables (workload, work engagement, and work environment) and the dependent variable (job satisfaction), based on the tabulated responses of the respondents:

**Table 2. Multiple Linear Regression Results**

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients	Std. Error	Standardized Coefficients
	B		Beta
1 (Constant)	11.883	2.122	–
Workload_X1	0.918	0.112	0.541
Work Engagement_X2	0.131	0.102	0.089
Work Environment_X3	0.320	0.075	0.294

Table 2 above shows the results of the multiple linear regression test, with the following equation:

$$Y = 11.883 + 0.918X_1 + 0.131X_2 + 0.320X_3.$$

The explanation is as follows:

1. The constant value (a) is 11.883 and is positive, which means that employee job satisfaction will increase by 11.883 assuming the variables of workload, work engagement, and work environment are held constant (at zero).
2. Workload ( $X_1$ ) has a coefficient value of 0.918 and is positive, meaning that for every one-unit increase in workload, job satisfaction decreases by 0.918 (91.8%).
3. Work engagement ( $X_2$ ) has a coefficient value of 0.131 and is positive, meaning that for every one-unit increase, job satisfaction increases by 0.131 (13.10%).
4. Work environment ( $X_3$ ) has a coefficient value of 0.320 and is positive, meaning that for every one-unit increase, job satisfaction increases by 0.320 (32%).

### Hypothesis Test Results

#### a. Partial Test Results (t-test)

The following presents the partial test results between the independent variables (workload, work engagement, and work environment) and the dependent variable (employee job satisfaction), based on the tabulated responses of the respondents:

**Table 3. Partial Test Results (t-Test)**

Model	t	Sig.
Workload_X1	8.214	0.000
Work Engagement_X2	1.967	0.001
Work Environment_X3	4.237	0.000

In this study, the sample size is  $n = 128$ , resulting in a t-table value of 1.657 at a 0.05 significance level. Based on Table 4.14, the results of the partial test can be explained as follows:

1. Workload has a positive and significant partial effect on job satisfaction at the Department of Transportation of Binjai (t-count > t-table,  $8.214 > 1.657$  at sig.  $0.000 < 0.05$ ), thus research hypothesis H1 is accepted.
2. Work engagement has a positive and significant partial effect on job satisfaction at the Department of Transportation of Binjai (t-count > t-table,  $1.967 > 1.657$  at sig.  $0.001 < 0.05$ ), thus research hypothesis H2 is accepted.
3. Work environment has a positive and significant partial effect on job satisfaction at the Department of Transportation of Binjai (t-count > t-table,  $4.237 > 1.657$  at sig.  $0.000 < 0.05$ ), thus research hypothesis H3 is accepted.

#### b. Simultaneous Test Results (F-Test)

The following presents the results of the simultaneous test between the independent variables (workload, work engagement, and work environment) and the dependent variable (job satisfaction), based on the tabulated responses of the respondents:

**Table 4. Simultaneous Test Results (ANOVA)**

Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1 Regression	563.946	3	187.982	44.631	0.000
Residual	522.273	124	4.212	–	–
Total	1086.219	127	–	–	–

In this study, the sample size is  $n = 128$ , where  $df(1) = k - 1 = 4 - 1 = 3$  and  $df(2) = n - k = 128 - 4 = 124$ , resulting in an F-table value of 2.68 at a 0.05 significance level. Meanwhile, the calculated F-value (F-count) is 44.631 at a significance level of 0.000. Based on the table above, it can be concluded that workload, work engagement, and work environment jointly have a significant effect on employee job satisfaction at the Department of Transportation of Binjai City (F-count > F-table,  $44.631 > 2.68$  at sig.  $0.000 < 0.05$ ), thus research hypothesis H4 is accepted.

#### c. Coefficient of Determination Test Results ( $R^2$ )

The following presents the coefficient of determination test results based on the tabulated responses of the respondents:

**Table 5. Coefficient of Determination ( $R^2$ ) Results**

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square
1	0.721	0.519	0.508

Table 5 shows that the coefficient of determination is  $R = 0.721$ , indicating a strong correlation between workload, work engagement, and work environment with employee job satisfaction. The  $R^2$  value is 0.519, meaning that 51.9% of the variance in employee job satisfaction at the Department of Transportation of Binjai City can be explained by workload,

work engagement, and work environment. The remaining 48.1% is explained by other variables not examined in this study.

## **Discussion**

The findings of this study confirm that workload has an influence on employee job satisfaction. When employees are given tasks that exceed their capabilities, they may experience pressure and stress that reduce satisfaction levels. However, when workloads are assigned proportionally to skills and capacity, employees tend to perceive them as a challenge that can enhance motivation and responsibility. This aligns with Dewi and Heryanda (2022) who found that excessive workload leads to decreased satisfaction, as well as with Firdaus and Anah (2024) who emphasized that workload management plays a crucial role in maintaining employee well-being. Similarly, Mariana et al. (2024) highlighted that a balanced workload encourages productivity and strengthens satisfaction, while Maimunah and Puspitarisni (2020) noted that disproportionate workloads can trigger fatigue and reduce job contentment.

Work engagement also emerges as an important factor influencing job satisfaction. Employees who are actively engaged in their tasks tend to show greater enthusiasm, dedication, and emotional attachment to their work, which in turn improves satisfaction. Engagement not only contributes to task completion but also strengthens organizational commitment. This is consistent with Hasibuan (2019) who emphasized that job satisfaction dominates in moderating employee engagement, and Mubarak (2024) who demonstrated that engagement positively correlates with satisfaction and performance. Similarly, Prihastuty and Yutini (2024) found that engagement directly enhances both satisfaction and work outcomes, while Sriani et al. (2022) highlighted the role of interpersonal communication and engagement in fostering job satisfaction within organizations.

The work environment is another essential determinant of satisfaction. A safe, comfortable, and harmonious environment allows employees to perform their duties with focus and dedication, reducing stress and encouraging collaboration. According to Aisha and Juaeti (2023), as well as Aisy et al. (2024), the work environment significantly contributes to employee satisfaction by providing conditions that support productivity and well-being. Similarly, Andriany (2019) and Jasmin et al. (2023) concluded that supportive environments directly foster satisfaction, while Irfan et al. (2022) emphasized that motivation and productivity are strongly influenced by conducive workplace conditions. In addition, Vanesa et al. (2019) and Hamid (2022) also affirmed that a positive work environment improves discipline, collaboration, and employee satisfaction.

When viewed simultaneously, workload, work engagement, and work environment collectively strengthen employee job satisfaction. This indicates that satisfaction is not shaped by a single factor, but rather by the balance between the demands of work, the involvement of employees, and the organizational atmosphere. Saputra (2022) showed that workload, compensation, and environment jointly affect satisfaction, while Meilasari et al. (2020) highlighted the role of workload alongside compensation and discipline in enhancing job satisfaction. Furthermore, Munica and Dwiarti (2024) as well as Satriawati et al. (2023) emphasized that employee satisfaction can be optimized when fair compensation, engaging tasks, and a conducive environment are provided simultaneously. These findings also align with Widodo (2019), who stressed that effective human resource development requires balancing workloads, ensuring employee involvement, and fostering a supportive work climate.

Overall, this study reinforces the idea that workload, work engagement, and work environment are interrelated dimensions that significantly influence employee job satisfaction. Organizations that can manage workloads proportionally, foster employee engagement, and create a supportive work environment are more likely to achieve long-term employee satisfaction and sustain organizational performance.

#### 4. Conclusion

This study concludes that workload, work engagement, and work environment play a crucial role in shaping employee job satisfaction at the Department of Transportation of Binjai City. The findings demonstrate that workload has a significant effect on satisfaction, where excessive or disproportionate responsibilities may lead to stress and dissatisfaction, while a balanced workload can foster positive outcomes. Similarly, work engagement contributes meaningfully to job satisfaction, as employees who are involved and committed to their tasks tend to feel more fulfilled and aligned with the organization's vision and mission. Furthermore, the work environment is found to be an essential determinant of satisfaction, with a supportive, safe, and harmonious workplace enhancing employees' willingness to perform effectively. Taken together, the simultaneous influence of workload, work engagement, and work environment highlights the importance of integrated human resource strategies to ensure employees remain satisfied and motivated in fulfilling their responsibilities.

Although this study provides valuable insights, it has limitations that open opportunities for future research. First, the study focuses solely on employees at the Department of Transportation of Binjai City, limiting the generalizability of findings to other government or private institutions. Future studies could extend the scope to different sectors or regions to provide a broader understanding of job satisfaction determinants. Second, the study emphasizes only three variables—workload, work engagement, and work environment—while other important factors such as compensation, leadership style, career development, and organizational culture may also influence satisfaction. Incorporating these variables would enrich the analysis. Additionally, future research could employ a longitudinal design to capture changes in employee satisfaction over time, particularly in response to organizational reforms or policy adjustments. Finally, qualitative approaches such as in-depth interviews or focus group discussions could complement quantitative findings, offering deeper insights into employees' perceptions and lived experiences.

#### References

- Aisha, R. K., & Juaeti. (2023). Pengaruh kompensasi dan lingkungan kerja terhadap kepuasan kerja karyawan bagian kitchen PT. Sumber Rasa Jaya di Jakarta. *JIMEN: Jurnal Inovatif Mahasiswa Manajemen*, 3(2), 102–114.
- Aisy, R., Sutikno, B., & Oktafiah, Y. (2024). Pengaruh kompensasi dan lingkungan kerja terhadap kepuasan kerja karyawan pada CV. Karya Geni, Mayangan, Kota Pasuruan. *BISEI: Jurnal Bisnis dan Ekonomi Islam*, 9(1), 22–29.
- Andriany, D. (2019). Pengaruh kompensasi dan lingkungan kerja terhadap kepuasan kerja karyawan pada PT. Repex Perdana Internasional (Licensee of Federal Express) Medan. *Prosiding Seminar Nasional Kewirausahaan*, 1(1), 392–398. ISSN 2714-8785.
- Dewi, N. N. C., & Heryanda, K. K. (2022). Pengaruh kompensasi dan beban kerja terhadap kepuasan kerja pada buruh tani di Desa Unggahan Kecamatan Seririt. *Bisma: Jurnal Manajemen*, 8(3), 1–10.
- Fathomi, M. I. (2021). Pengaruh beban kerja terhadap produktivitas kerja karyawan tenaga non kesehatan di Unit Pelaksana Teknis Rumah Sakit Pratama Kota Yogyakarta tahun 2020. *Jurnal OPTIMAL*, 18(1), 74–100.
- Firdaus, M. F., & Anah, L. (2024). Pengaruh beban kerja dan kompensasi terhadap kepuasan kerja karyawan di Rumah Sakit Nahdlatul Ulama Jombang. *BIMA: Journal of Business and Innovation Management*, 6(3), 347–357.
- Hamid, S. (2022). Pengaruh motivasi dan lingkungan kerja terhadap produktivitas karyawan. *Economic and Digital Business Review*, 3(2), 247–262.



- Hasibuan, H. A. (2019). Dominasi kepuasan kerja dalam memoderasi pengaruh kepemimpinan transformasional terhadap employee engagement pegawai ASN di Medan. *Jurnal Kajian Ekonomi dan Kebijakan Publik*, 4(2), 1–15.
- Irfan, Kirana, K. C., & Septyarini, E. (2022). Pengaruh disiplin, lingkungan kerja dan motivasi kerja terhadap produktivitas kerja karyawan di PT. Rifan Financindo Berjangka Yogyakarta. *INOVATOR: Jurnal Manajemen*, 11(3), 372–383.
- Jasmin, M., Ridwan, & Asbara, N. W. (2023). Pengaruh beban kerja dan lingkungan kerja terhadap kepuasan kerja karyawan pada PT. Malatunrung Rezkindo. *Malama: Jurnal Manajemen dan Akuntansi*, 1(3), 338–348.
- Lestari, S., & Pangesti, A. S. (2022). Pengaruh kompensasi dan lingkungan kerja terhadap kepuasan kerja karyawan (Studi kasus pada CV. Aneka Jaya). *Jurnal ECONOMIA*, 1(2), 1–10.
- Maimunah, S., & Puspitarisni, R. (2020). Pengaruh beban kerja terhadap tingkat kelelahan pegawai tidak tetap (PTT), Kantor Kecamatan Kademangan Kota Probolinggo. *Jurnal Ilmiah Politik, Kebijakan & Sosial (Publicio)*, 2(1), 1–7.
- Mariana, T., Pranitasari, D., Prastuti, D., Hermastuti, P., & Saodah, N. S. (2024). Pengaruh beban kerja, pengembangan karir serta pelatihan kerja terhadap kepuasan kerja karyawan pada PT. Bank Mandiri (Persero) Tbk. *Media Manajemen Jasa*, 12(1), 17–30.
- Meilasari, L. L., Parashakti, R. D., Justian, & Wahyuni, E. (2020). Pengaruh kompensasi, beban kerja dan disiplin kerja terhadap kepuasan kerja karyawan. *JIMT: Jurnal Ilmu Manajemen Terapan*, 1(6), 1–12.
- Mubarok, F. (2024). Pengaruh keterlibatan kerja, motivasi kerja, budaya organisasi dan disiplin kerja terhadap kepuasan kerja. *Jurnal RIMBA: Riset Ilmu Manajemen Bisnis dan Akuntansi*, 2(1), 306–320.
- Munazilah, S. N., & Iryanti, E. (2023). Pengaruh beban kerja dan disiplin kerja terhadap kepuasan kerja karyawan Kantor Pos Cabang Utama Surabaya 6000. *Journal of Management and Business (JOMB)*, 5(2), 1841–1849.
- Munica, P. T., & Dwiarti, R. (2024). Pengaruh promosi jabatan, kompensasi dan lingkungan kerja terhadap kepuasan kerja karyawan pada Badan Pengelola Keuangan dan Aset Daerah (BPKAD) Kabupaten Sintang. *Jurnal Akuntansi, Manajemen, dan Perencanaan Kebijakan*, 1(3), 1–16.
- Nurlaini, & Almasdi. (2020). Pengaruh budaya organisasi dan keterlibatan kerja terhadap kinerja karyawan dengan komitmen organisasi sebagai variabel intervening pada PT. XYZ. *Jurnal Profita: Akuntansi dan Bisnis*, 1(2), 101–119.
- Prihastuty, D. R., & Yutini, R. S. (2024). Pengaruh stres kerja, keterlibatan kerja, kepuasan kerja terhadap kinerja karyawan pada PT. Corona Dwi Daya Balikpapan. *PPIMAN: Pusat Publikasi Ilmu Manajemen*, 2(1), 211–230.
- Rizky, M. C. (2018). Pengaruh faktor-faktor motivasi kerja terhadap kepuasan kerja karyawan pada PT. Mitra Jasa Power Medan. *Jurnal Manajemen*, 1(2), 1–12.
- Saputra, A. A. (2022). Pengaruh kompensasi, lingkungan kerja dan beban kerja terhadap kepuasan kerja karyawan. *Technomedia Journal (TMJ)*, 7(1), 68–77.
- Satriawati, N. K. S., Rismawan, P. A. E., & Andika, A. W. (2023). Pengaruh kompensasi, lingkungan kerja, dan promosi jabatan terhadap kepuasan kerja karyawan pada LPD Desa Adat Kesiman Denpasar. *Jurnal EMAS*, 4(5), 1258–1271.
- Sriani, N. K., Abiyoga, N. L. A., & Premayani, N. W. W. (2022). Pengaruh komunikasi interpersonal, budaya organisasi dan keterlibatan kerja terhadap kepuasan kerja karyawan. *Jurnal Widya Amrita: Jurnal Manajemen, Kewirausahaan dan Pariwisata*, 2(1), 139–150.
- Trisnawati, M., & Parwoto. (2020). Pengaruh lingkungan kerja dan beban kerja terhadap produktivitas kerja karyawan (Studi kasus pada bagian produksi I PT. JS Jakarta). *DAYA SAING: Jurnal Ekonomi Manajemen Sumber Daya*, 22(2), 84–92.

- Vanesa, Y. Y., Matondang, R., Sadalia, I., & Daulay, M. T. (2019). The influence of organizational culture, work environment and work motivation on employee discipline in PT. Jasa Marga (Persero) Tbk, Medan Branch, North Sumatra, Indonesia. *American International Journal of Business Management (AIJBM)*, 2(5), 37–45.
- Widodo, S. E. (2019). *Manajemen pengembangan sumber daya manusia*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.