

The Effect of Work Environment and Workload on Employee Job Satisfaction in the Production Division of UD. Setya Abadi D.M

Maulia Nira Safitri¹, Mei Retno Adiwati²

^{1,2} Management Study Program, Universitas Pembangunan Nasional Veteran Jawa Timur

Abstract

Between 2023 and 2025, the turnover rate among production-division employees at UD. Setya Abadi D.M Surabaya climbed from 9 percent to 16 percent alongside a shrinking workforce, a pattern that points to ward job satisfaction being shaped by both the surrounding work environment and the workload employees carry. This study set out to examine how far the work environment and workload influence the job satisfaction of production employees at UD. Setya Abadi D.M Surabaya. An associative quantitative design was adopted, with all 49 production employees included through total sampling. Data were gathered via a Likert-scale questionnaire and processed with Partial Least Square-Structural Equation Modeling (PLS-SEM) using SmartPLS 3.0, spanning outer-model assessment, inner-model assessment, and bootstrapped hypothesis testing. The findings confirm that the work environment exerts a positive and significant influence on job satisfaction, whereas workload exerts a negative and significant one. Together, the two variables account for 70.4 percent of the variation in employee job satisfaction. These results point to the need for the company to foster more conducive working conditions while distributing workload more proportionally so that employee job satisfaction can be sustained over time

Keywords: job satisfaction; PLS-SEM; work environment; workload

Copyright (c) 2026 **Maulia Nira Safitri¹**

✉ Corresponding author :

Email Address : meiadiwaty.mnj@upnjatim.ac.id

INTRODUCTION

As globalization accelerates alongside rapid technological change and fiercer business rivalry, organizations are pushed to manage their human resources with both effectiveness and efficiency so that they can withstand and adjust to a constantly shifting business landscape. Human resources function as a strategic asset precisely because employees do more than carry out assigned tasks they also help plan and steer organizational activities (Hasibuan, 2019), which places HR management at the center of organizational success, most notably in sustaining employee job satisfaction. In Indonesia, job dissatisfaction continues to be a tangible concern: a JobStreet and JobsDB survey covering 17,623 respondents in October 2021 revealed that roughly 73 percent of Indonesian employees felt dissatisfied with their jobs. Lower job satisfaction has repeatedly been linked to greater absenteeism and turnover (Robbins and Judge, 2022); Rahmawati and Nurwanti (2022) likewise found that diminished job satisfaction raises employees' likelihood of

quitting, a pattern corroborated by Elfenso and Andani (2022), who showed that stronger job satisfaction curbs employees' inclination to leave.

The present research centers on UD. Setya Abadi D.M (Kebab Mas Brow) in Surabaya, a food-trading enterprise operating since 2013 that turns out kebabs, maryam bread, and tortilla wraps by the thousands of packs each day. In principle, turnover should stay controlled and should not climb year after year if the production process is to run smoothly. What the pre-research data reveal, however, is a different story: turnover among the company's production employees climbed steadily 9 percent in 2023, 13 percent in 2024, and 16 percent by 2025 even as the workforce shrank from 57 to 49 people. This widening distance between what is expected and what actually occurs signals an underlying job satisfaction issue worth investigating further.

The work environment is one factor thought to be feeding into this situation. When the work environment falls short of being supportive, employees' comfort and perceptions can suffer, which in turn may erode job satisfaction (Vanessa and Nawawi, 2022). A pre-survey involving 20 production employees at UD. Setya Abadi D.M revealed that 70 percent felt the physical workspace its temperature, air circulation, and layout was not yet adequate for supporting daily production tasks; 80 percent had either experienced or witnessed a workplace accident tied to dirty, slippery floors; and 85 percent had felt tension or communication breakdowns with co-workers. These observations align with Puspitaningrum and Sudarsi (2024), who contend that a well-managed work environment boosts comfort and productivity by shaping employees' psychological state and morale, as well as with Wahyuni and Dewi (2024), who stress that healthy social relationships, workplace atmosphere, and supporting facilities all matter for job satisfaction.

Workload, too, is believed to shape how satisfied employees feel. Part of what drives job satisfaction lies in the nature of the work itself the demands the job places on employees and once workload keeps climbing without regard for what individuals can realistically handle, job satisfaction inevitably suffers (Afifaturchmah and Swasti, 2024). In UD. Setya Abadi D.M's production division, employees must remain standing throughout two lengthy shifts (07:00–17:00 and 17:00–04:00). The scale of this workload also shows up in the widening shortfall between production targets and actual output from 53,900 units in 2023 to 135,200 units in 2025 as the achievement rate slipped from 97 percent to 92 percent, even as the average workload per employee climbed from 29,966 to 32,016 units. Running a hybrid make-to-order and make-to-stock system at the same time has only intensified the workload without a matching expansion of the workforce. When job demands outpace what employees can manage, the resulting pressure erodes comfort (Rahayu et al., 2024), and conditions that exceed employees' capacity tend to produce fatigue and, eventually, dissatisfaction (Sulistiyowati et al., 2025).

Existing studies, however, do not agree on how the work environment and workload actually shape job satisfaction, leaving a gap this study seeks to address. Mangupei et al. (2026), for instance, found no significant effect of the work environment on job satisfaction, even as workload showed a positive and significant effect a result at odds with Rahayu et al. (2024), Sulistiyowati et al. (2025), Indriati et al. (2025), Yanuarti (2025), and Syarifah et al. (2025), all of whom consistently found a positive effect of the work environment, though the direction of workload's effect still varied sometimes negative, sometimes positive across these studies. This inconsistency, paired with what is actually happening at UD. Setya Abadi D.M rising turnover, a work environment that leaves much to be desired, and mounting workload makes a strong case for revisiting this relationship within a small-scale culinary enterprise using a PLS-SEM approach, which is where this study's novelty lies. Accordingly, this research sets out to examine how the work environment shapes the job satisfaction of employees at UD. Setya Abadi D.M Surabaya, and likewise how workload shapes that same outcome.

The work environment can be understood as everything surrounding workers as they carry out their jobs (Harjasa and Swasti, 2022) spanning the physical dimension (lighting, temperature, cleanliness, air circulation) as well as the non physical dimension (the quality of working relationships, communication, and fairness within the organization). This study measures the construct through four indicators: air circulation, cleanliness, workplace safety, and relationships among co-workers (Rahmawati et al., 2014, as cited in Rahayu et al., 2024).

Workload, meanwhile, reflects how workers perceive the tasks they must finish within a given period and the effort needed to navigate work-related difficulties, a perception that intensifies once job demands outstrip employees' capabilities (Alfian and Guswinta, 2023); this study captures workload through effective working hours, targets to be met, working conditions, and work standards (Budiasa, 2021). Job satisfaction, for its part, is a psychological condition reflecting whether employees feel pleasant or unpleasant about their work, measured here through the work itself, relationships with co-workers, and the overall working situation (Nabawi, 2019, as cited in Rahayu et al., 2024). Drawing on this theoretical foundation and the studies reviewed above, the conceptual framework positions the work environment (X1) and workload (X2) as exogenous variables shaping employee job satisfaction (Y), the endogenous variable, from which two hypotheses follow: H1, the work environment positively affects employee job satisfaction; and H2, workload negatively affects employee job satisfaction.

METHODOLOGY

This research adopted an associative quantitative design intended to uncover cause-and-effect relationships among variables (Sugiyono, 2019; Hardani, 2020), built around two independent variables work environment (X1) and workload (X2) and one dependent variable, job satisfaction (Y), captured through a five point Likert scale (Nurdin and Hartati, 2019). All 49 employees in the production division of UD. Setya Abadi D.M Surabaya made up the population and, given how small that population was, were all included as the sample via total sampling (Handayani, 2020; Arikunto, 2019). Primary data came from an online questionnaire distributed through Google Form, while secondary data were drawn from academic journals, reference texts, and internal company records. Before proceeding to the main analysis, the research instrument underwent testing for convergent validity (loading factor above 0.70 and AVE above 0.50), discriminant validity (through cross loading), and reliability (Cronbach's Alpha and Composite Reliability above 0.70). The data were then processed through component-based Structural Equation Modeling using a Partial Least Square (PLS-SEM) approach with SmartPLS 3.0, covering both outer-model and inner-model (R-Square) evaluation as well as hypothesis testing via bootstrapping, in which the resulting T-statistic was weighed against the 1.96 T-table threshold at a 0.05 significance level (Ghozali and Kusumadewi, 2023).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Research Object Profile and Respondent Characteristics

Operating under the Kebab Mas Brow brand since 2013, UD. Setya Abadi D.M Surabaya is a frozen-food trading enterprise that manufactures kebabs, maryam bread, tortilla wraps, churros, and peanut cookies, holding both a BPOM license and MUI halal certification. Of the 49 production employees sampled, 20 were men (41%) and 29 were women (59%). Employees aged 31–35 made up the largest age bracket at 18 respondents (37%), followed by those aged 25–30 with 10 respondents (20%) a distribution suggesting that the workforce leans toward employees in their productive years who bring a fair degree of maturity and experience to the job (Angela and Rojuaniah, 2022). Most respondents (41%)

had worked at the company for under two years, a figure that lines up with the elevated turnover observed throughout the study period.

Outer Model Testing Results

Every indicator across the three variables produced loading factor values above 0.50 alongside t-statistics above 1.96, satisfying the convergent validity criteria with strong overall validity, as Table 1 illustrates

Table 1. Outer Loading and Average Variance Extracted (AVE)

Variable	Indicator	Outer Loading	AVE
Work Environment (X1)	X1.1 Air Circulation	0.881	0.725
	X1.2 Cleanliness	0.821	
	X1.3 Work Safety	0.822	
	X1.4 Relationship Among Co-Workers	0.879	
Workload (X2)	X2.1 Effecting Working Hours	0.865	0.770
	X2.2 Target to Be Achieved	0.855	
	X2.3 Working Conditions	0.879	
	X2.4 Work Standards	0.909	
Job Satisfaction (Y)	Y1.1 The Work Itself	0.889	0.718
	Y1.2 Co-Workers	0.805	
	Y1.3 Working Situation	0.846	

Source: Researcher's processed data (2026)

Cross-loading results further confirm that every indicator loads most strongly on its intended construct rather than on any other, holding true across the work environment, workload, and job satisfaction alike, which satisfies the discriminant validity requirement. All three AVE values likewise clear the 0.50 threshold 0.725 for the work environment, 0.770 for workload, and 0.718 for job satisfaction indicating that each construct accounts for a substantial share of the variance among its indicators. Table 2 reports the accompanying reliability results.

Table 2. Cronbach's Alpha and Composite Reliability

Variable	Cronbach's Alpha	Composite Reliability
Work Enviroment (X1)	0.873	0.913
Workload (X2)	0.901	0.930
Job Satisfaction (Y)	0.804	0.884

Source: Researcher's processed data (2026)

With every variable clearing the 0.70 mark on both Cronbach's Alpha and Composite Reliability, the instrument can be regarded as reliable and internally consistent.

Inner Model Testing and Hypothesis Testing Results

Assessing the structural model hinges on the R-Square value, which captures how well the model accounts for the relationships among its variables specifically, how much of the variation in the endogenous variable the exogenous variables can explain. Here, the R-Square for Job Satisfaction (Y) reached 0.704, meaning the Work Environment (X1) and Workload (X2) jointly account for 70.4 percent of the variation in Job Satisfaction, leaving the remaining 29.6 percent to factors outside the model. Under the criteria set out by Ghazali and Kusumadewi (2023), this places the model in the moderate category. The Adjusted R-Square, at 0.691 (69.1%), offers a more conservative reading once the number of predictors is taken into account.

Hypothesis testing, meanwhile, gauges whether the relationships among variables are statistically meaningful by examining the path coefficient together with the t-statistic and p-value; a hypothesis holds up when the t-statistic tops 1.96 and the p-value falls under 0.05. Table 3 presents what the bootstrapping procedure yielded.

Table 3. Hypothesis Testing Results (Path Coefficient)

Relationship Between Variables	Original Sample	T-Statistic	P-Values	Description
Work Environment → Job Satisfaction	0.491	5.834	0.000	Significant, positive
Workload → Job Satisfaction	-0.493	6.131	0.000	Significant, negative

Source: Researcher's processe data (2026)

Reading across Table 3, both hypotheses hold up. Hypothesis 1 (H1) that the Work Environment (X1) positively affects the job satisfaction of employees at UD. Setya Abadi D.M Surabaya is supported and statistically significant, carrying a path coefficient of 0.491, a T-Statistic of 5.834, and a P-Value of 0.000; since the T Statistic clears 1.96 and the P-Value sits below 0.05, the Work Environment (X1) is confirmed to exert a positive, significant pull on Job Satisfaction (Y) put simply, a more conducive work environment translates into greater job satisfaction. Hypothesis 2 (H2) that Workload (X2) negatively affects job satisfaction at the same company is equally supported, with a path coefficient of -0.493, a T Statistic of 6.131, and a P-Value of 0.000; again the T-Statistic exceeds 1.96 and the P-Value falls under 0.05, confirming that Workload (X2) drags Job Satisfaction (Y) downward the heavier the workload employees carry, the less satisfied they become.

The Effect of Work Environment on Job Satisfaction

The data confirm a positive and significant relationship between the work environment and the job satisfaction of UD. Setya Abadi D.M Surabaya's employees: as the work environment becomes more conducive, job satisfaction rises in tandem. This tracks closely with the pre-survey findings, which flagged ongoing concerns around room temperature, air circulation, layout, and cleanliness within the production area. Among the indicators, air circulation was the indicator with the strongest effect on job satisfaction

unsurprising given that hot, stuffy conditions are made worse by the production floor sitting right next to high-temperature cooking equipment running throughout the shift, placing considerable physical strain on employees. This effect is amplified by the fact that the workforce skews toward the 31–35 age bracket, employees who bring greater work-experience maturity and, correspondingly, higher expectations for the quality of their surroundings meaning that any shortfall in workplace comfort tends to hit their job satisfaction harder, a pattern consistent with Angela and Rojuaniah (2022), who identify age as a key demographic factor shaping job satisfaction. This finding also fits within Herzberg's Two-Factor Theory, which treats working conditions as a hygiene factor, and echoes the work of Syarifah et al. (2025) and Rahayu et al. (2024), both of which found a positive effect of the work environment on job satisfaction. For UD. Setya Abadi D.M specifically, upgrading air circulation, regulating temperature, and better organizing and maintaining the production area stand out as priorities for building a safer, more comfortable, and more conducive workplace steps that would help employees perform at their best and, in turn, lift performance and productivity (Indriati et al., 2025).

The Effect of Workload on Job Satisfaction

Workload, by contrast, had a negative and significant effect on job satisfaction at UD. Setya Abadi D.M Surabaya: the heavier the load employees carry, the less satisfied they report being. This lines up with the company's own production data, which show output falling short of target for three consecutive years a shortfall rooted in a shrinking workforce driven by high turnover that was never offset by adjusting production targets, leaving each remaining employee to shoulder a heavier load. Among workload's indicators, work standards exerts the strongest pull; here, “work standards” does not point to any departure from company SOPs but rather to a mismatch between the output employees are expected to deliver and the workforce actually available to deliver it, since staff must simultaneously fulfill make-to-order production for daily orders and keep make-to-stock production running within the very same working hours, all while the workforce keeps shrinking without any offsetting increase in headcount. This finding is consistent with Indriati et al. (2025) and Sulistiyowati et al. (2025), both of which found workload to negatively and significantly affect job satisfaction. Within UD. Setya Abadi D.M, failing to bring job demands in line with what employees can realistically manage breeds pressure and dissatisfaction, which eventually chips away at motivation, productivity, and loyalty to the company (Swedana, 2023).

CONCLUSION

The evidence gathered here shows that a safe, supportive, and comfortable work environment lifts the job satisfaction of employees at UD. Setya Abadi D.M Surabaya, with air circulation standing out as its strongest driver meaning that improvements targeted at air circulation in particular would translate directly into higher job satisfaction. Workload works in the opposite direction, eroding job satisfaction, with work standards as its most influential component, underscoring how a mismatch between job demands and employee capacity can visibly undermine how satisfied employees feel. Together, these two variables account for 70.4 percent of the variation in employee job satisfaction. The company would do well to upgrade ventilation in the production area through exhaust fans, improved window openings, or a reworked floor layout and to revisit its production standards and targets so they better reflect what the workforce can realistically deliver, whether by separating by-order and by-stock production schedules or bringing in additional staff for particular shifts. Future researchers might consider incorporating compensation and shift-work as additional variables, given that UD. Setya Abadi D.M's employees already work beyond standard hours under a two-long-shift system without this being recognized as overtime or matched with

proportional compensation; extending the research to other companies or industries with larger samples, and exploring qualitative or mixed method designs, would also help broaden what these findings can tell us.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors extend their thanks to the management and staff of UD. Setya Abadi D.M Surabaya for granting permission and taking part in the research questionnaire, and to the Management Study Program, Faculty of Economics and Business, Universitas Pembangunan Nasional “Veteran” Jawa Timur, for its support throughout this research

References:

- Afifaturachmah, L., & Swasti, I. K. (2024). Pengaruh beban kerja dan work-life balance terhadap turnover intention pada karyawan PT Kediri Intermedia Pers. *Journal of Management: Small and Medium Enterprises (SMEs)*, 17(3). <https://doi.org/10.35508/jom.v17i3.17473>
- Alfian, A., & Guswinta, R. (2023). Pengaruh kompensasi dan beban kerja terhadap kinerja pegawai pada Puskesmas Lubuk Tarok. *Jurnal Economina*, 2(2), 653–665. <https://doi.org/10.55681/economina.v2i2.349>
- Angela, J., & Rojuaniah. (2022). The model of supervisor support, work-life balance, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment on IT employee performance moderated by demographic factors. *Jurnal Manajemen Indonesia*, 22(3), 314–332. <https://doi.org/10.25124/jmi.v22i3.3840>
- Arikunto, S. (2019). *Prosedur penelitian: Suatu pendekatan praktik (Edisi revisi)*. Rineka Cipta.
- Budiasa, I. (2021). *Beban kerja dan kinerja sumber daya manusia*. CV Pena Persada.
- Elfenso, R., & Andani, K. W. (2022). Pengaruh job stress dan job satisfaction pada turnover intention karyawan perbankan. *Jurnal Manajerial dan Kewirausahaan*, 4(2). <https://journal.untar.ac.id/index.php/JMDK/article/view/18252>
- Ghozali, I., & Kusumadewi, K. A. (2023). *Partial least square (PLS): Konsep, teknik dan aplikasi menggunakan program SmartPLS 4.0 (1st ed.)*. Penerbit Yoga Pratama.
- Handayani, T. (2020). *Metodologi penelitian sosial*. Penerbit Andi.
- Hardani. (2020). *Metode penelitian kualitatif dan kuantitatif*. Pustaka Ilmu.
- Harjasa, F. Z. P., & Swasti, I. K. (2022). Pengaruh beban kerja dan lingkungan kerja terhadap kinerja karyawan PT. Petrojaya Boral Plasterboard Gresik. *Jurnal Ilmu Manajemen dan Bisnis*, 13(2), 109–114. <https://doi.org/10.17509/jimb.v13i2.48297>
- Hasibuan, M. S. P. (2019). *Manajemen sumber daya manusia (Edisi revisi)*. PT Bumi Aksara
- Herzberg, F., Mausner, B., & Snyderman, B. B. (1959). *The motivation to work (2nd ed.)*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Indriati, I. H., Pramono, J., & Sari, D. P. (2025). Pengaruh beban kerja, kompensasi, dan lingkungan kerja terhadap kepuasan kerja karyawan bagian produksi PT Abi Elang Indo Sleman. *Forum Ekonomi*, 27(1), 487–492. <https://ejournals2.unmul.ac.id/index.php/FORUM EKONOMI/article/view/3535>
- Mangupei, R., Nelwan, O. S., & Lumantow, R. Y. (2026). Pengaruh lingkungan kerja, beban kerja dan kebahagiaan terhadap kepuasan kerja karyawan dengan gaya kepemimpinan sebagai variabel moderasi pada bagian produksi PT. Royal Coconut Kawangkoan.

- Jurnal EMBA, 14(1), 184-195.
<https://ejournal.unsrat.ac.id/v3/index.php/emba/article/view/66115>
- 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.
<https://doi.org/10.31539/jomb.v5i2.6589>
- Nurdin, I., & Hartati, S. (2019). Metodologi penelitian sosial Media Sahabat Cendekia.
- Puspitaningrum, Y., & Sudarsi, S. (2024). Pengaruh pelatihan kerja, lingkungan kerja dan stres kerja terhadap produktivitas kerja karyawan: Studi kasus pada CV Airin Graha Persada. *Management Studies and Entrepreneurship Journal (MSEJ)*, 5(1), 3221-3230.
<https://doi.org/10.37385/msej.v5i2.4384>
- Rahayu, N. M. F., Darmita, M. Y., & Oktaviani, L. (2024). Pengaruh work life balance, beban kerja, dan lingkungan kerja terhadap kepuasan kerja karyawan (Studi pada PT. Ciomas Adisatwa di Kabupaten Badung). *Journal Research of Management (JARMA)*, 6(1), 89-99. <https://doi.org/10.51713/jarma.2024.6128>
- Rahmawati, A., & Adiwati, M. R. (2021). Pengaruh mutasi kerja dan lingkungan kerja terhadap kepuasan kerja karyawan BPJS Ketenagakerjaan Karimunjawa Surabaya. *Jurnal Dinamika Ekonomi & Bisnis*, 18(2), 131-142.
<https://doi.org/10.34001/jdeb.v18i2.2396>
- Rahmawati, L., & Nurwanti. (2022). Pengaruh komitmen organisasi, stres kerja, dan kepuasan kerja terhadap turnover intention. *E-Jurnal Manajemen Trisakti School of Management*, 2(2), 147-156.
<https://jurnaltsm.id/index.php/EJMTSM/article/view/1417>
- Robbins, S. P., & Judge, T. A. (2022). *Organizational behavior* (19th ed.). Pearson.
- Sugiyono. (2019). *Metode penelitian kuantitatif, kualitatif, dan R&D*. Alfabeta.
- Sulistiyowati, L., Suroso, S., & Anggela, F. P. (2025). Pengaruh lingkungan kerja dan beban kerja terhadap kepuasan kerja karyawan. *Journal of Business and Economics Research (JBE)*, 6(2), 468-474. <https://doi.org/10.47065/jbe.v6i2.7271>
- Swedana, I. N. (2023). The role of workload and work motivation in influencing performance through job satisfaction. *Jurnal Manajemen dan Bisnis Indonesia*, 10(2), 112-124.
<https://jurnal.stiepar.ac.id/index.php/jmbi>
- Syarifah, M. Z. T., Andriani, D., & Firdaus, V. (2025). Pengaruh kompensasi, lingkungan kerja fisik dan beban kerja terhadap kepuasan kerja karyawan CV. Alfana Jaya. Permana: *Jurnal Perpajakan, Manajemen, dan Akuntansi*, 17(3), 2437-2453.
<https://permana.upstegal.ac.id/index.php/permana/article/view/1329>
- Vanchapo, A. (2020). *Beban kerja dan stres kerja*. Qiara Media.
- Vanessa, V., & Nawawi, M. T. (2022). Pengaruh lingkungan kerja, stres kerja, dan motivasi terhadap kepuasan kerja karyawan. *Jurnal Manajerial dan Kewirausahaan*, 4(2), 402-409.
<https://doi.org/10.24912/jmk.v4i2.18257>
- Wahyuni, N. K. S., & Dewi, I. G. A. M. (2024). Pengaruh lingkungan kerja terhadap kepuasan kerja dengan motivasi kerja sebagai variabel mediasi. *E-Jurnal Manajemen*, 13(2), 337-356. <https://ojs.unud.ac.id/index.php/Manajemen/article/view/104156>
- Wibowo, C. A. (2021). Pengaruh pelatihan kerja, lingkungan kerja dan kompensasi terhadap kepuasan kerja karyawan di Roy Sentoso Collection Yogyakarta. *Jurnal Bisnis dan Manajemen*, 17(July), 1-23.

- Yanuarti, A. W. (2025). Pengaruh lingkungan kerja dan beban kerja terhadap kepuasan kerja karyawan di PT. Europack. *Musytari: Jurnal Manajemen, Akuntansi, dan Ekonomi*, 24(2), 71–80. <https://cibangsa.com/index.php/musytari/article/view/6266>
- Yazid, M. N., & Husniati, R. (2023). Pengaruh work life balance, kompensasi dan lingkungan kerja terhadap kepuasan kerja karyawan PT. XYZ. *Jurnal Ilmiah Metansi*, 6(2)