



## The influence of workload and compensation on employee satisfaction

\*Rizky Cahyadi, Rafly Adithio, Anton Budi Santoso

Universitas Widyatama, Indonesia

\*Corresponding Author e-mail: [riky.cahyadi@widyatama.ac.id](mailto:riky.cahyadi@widyatama.ac.id)

Received: December 2022; Revised: December 2022; Published: January 2023

### Abstract

It is known that many companies have succeeded in building their businesses; it's just that there is still a lack of company awareness in terms of employee welfare, especially in terms of employee job satisfaction. Employee job satisfaction can be felt from excessive workload or compensation that is not in accordance with the work they are experiencing. While employees sometimes need job satisfaction in carrying out their work in the company, this is necessary so that employees can be loyal and employees love their work more so that results can continue to be maximized, and this is a form of company achievement in treating its employees. Various aspects determine job satisfaction, both in terms of compensation and in terms of environment, workload, superiors, and colleagues. This study uses explanatory research methods where the number of respondents is 30 people, will be processed by focusing on testing the hypothesis of data analysis using statistical methods of validity testing and reliability testing using SPSS software. The following are the results of this study show that workload has an impact on job satisfaction, there is compensation for job satisfaction, and workload and compensation have a simultaneous effect on job satisfaction.

**Keywords:** *employees; workload; compensation; job satisfaction*

**How to Cite:** Cahyadi, R., Adithio, R., & Santoso, A. (2023). The influence of workload and compensation on employee satisfaction. *Prisma Sains : Jurnal Pengkajian Ilmu dan Pembelajaran Matematika dan IPA IKIP Mataram*, 11(1), 146-155. doi:<https://doi.org/10.33394/j-ps.v11i1.6618>



<https://doi.org/10.33394/j-ps.v11i1.6618>

Copyright© 2023, Cahyadi et al.

This is an open-access article under the [CC-BY](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/) License.



## INTRODUCTION

Companies in today's era compete with each other in showing the superiority of their own company but cannot be separated from human resources, as the role of employees is very important for the development or quality of a company itself. The company's goals will not be achieved or even hampered because the job satisfaction of its employees cannot be fulfilled optimally. Excessive workload can have a negative impact on employees, resulting in excessive workload (Rohman & Ichsan, 2021). It is only natural that compensation is a form of appreciation for the dedication and hard work of an employee, where this compensation can be a form of satisfaction at work. So that employees will continue to feel motivated with adequate compensation or even more, as said (Dewi & Harjoyo, 2019), the compensation that the company devotes to staff is both financial and non-financial. Compensation can have an indirect impact on staff careers.

The influence of workload can have a very pronounced effect, and sometimes an employee is given an excessive workload. Therefore, it is better for the company to provide motivation so that staff have good morale and are persistent when working. Staff who are satisfied with something obtained from the company perform better than expected and continue to strive for better performance. On the other hand, workers with low job satisfaction are more likely to perceive the job as boring, and the way they work is forced and sloppy. The obligation for the company to understand what aspects make staff satisfied at work Staff job satisfaction leads to increased productivity (Sujati, 2018).

In previous studies, the impact of compensation on job satisfaction at PT. Mandiri Sejahtera Fund showed that the appearance of perfect compensation led to perfect staff satisfaction (Ajimat, Aini, Budi, Ekonomi, & Pamulang, 2020). While the research conducted at PT. Panca Dewata indicates that the workload variable has a negative impact on job satisfaction at PT. PD, the greater the workload felt by the staff, the lower the job satisfaction felt by the staff (Mahendrawan, 2015). In the research mentioned by Jatimoyo & Wijaya (2019), compensation and workload have a significant direct effect on job satisfaction. The staff data based on position and the number of people at PT. Geo Tekno Globalindo, hereinafter referred to as PT. GTG, is recorded in Table 1. Staff data.

**Tabel 1.** PT.GTG Staff Data for 2022

No	Position	Lots of Staff
1	Director	1
2	Representative	1
3	Commercial Manager	1
4	Commercial	20
5	Technician Manager	1
6	Technician	28
7	Purchasing Manager	1
8	Purchasing staff	9
9	warehouse staff	6
10	Finance & accounting manager	1
11	Finance & Accounting Staff	13
12	Asmen of Finance	1
13	Asmen Accounting	1
13	HRD Manager	1
14	HR staff	10
15	Admin staff	5

Concerning the findings of the interviews, which were conducted as preliminary observations, the researchers discovered the following facts about the working conditions of the company's employees:

1. When an employee is late, no punishment is given in any form.
2. Leave is given to employees who are sick for at least 3 days; if more, a doctor's note is required, and it does not affect salary.
3. Companies often provide jobs with a high level of difficulty.
4. When employees work overtime, there is no compensation paid by the company.
5. There are no rewards or bonuses for productive staff.

Even though the work environment in the company is fairly fulfilling in terms of facilities and cleanliness, problems with job satisfaction are something that companies need to monitor for their employees. The initial conclusion can be drawn that the company does not provide sufficient compensation to its employees, which may reduce employee performance and satisfaction.

Based on the findings that the researchers made, there is a phenomenon of the impact of workload and compensation on employee job satisfaction. Researchers conducted further research at PT. Geo Tekno Globalindo with the aim of analyzing the Effect of Workload and Compensation on Employee Job Satisfaction at PT. Geo Tekno Globalindo. The research results are expected to be a form of reference to improve the policy system in place in companies that are still dissatisfied with the work of their employees. Because, even though the company provides a good and comfortable work environment, there are also employees who have a sense of ambition to fulfill their passion for a career at the company, further research on how compensation and workload can be a source of satisfaction at work for the staff is needed.

## METHOD

This research uses the explanatory research method, where the goal is to describe the causal relationship between research variables and carry out hypothesis testing (Sugiyono, 2018). The approach used in this research is the survey method. The research object is the HR staff working at PT. GTG.

This study's population consists of employees at PT. GTG, which may employ up to 100 people. The research sample was 30 people, obtained using the Roscoe formula with a standard error rate of 10%. data collection techniques by distributing questionnaires to staff who were used as research samples. There are 3 variables to be examined, namely (X1) as workload, (X2) as compensation, and (Y) as job satisfaction.

The types of data in this research are primary and secondary data. Primary data is defined as data obtained through the study of answers to questionnaires and observations. Secondary data is interpreted as data obtained indirectly through intermediary means, namely through the results of studies, books, articles, and various other reference materials regarding the object under study.

Data analysis uses statistical methods, for example, validity and reliability tests for questionnaires and multiple linear regression analysis with the F-test and t-test for proving the hypothesis and the coefficient of determination in order to be able to measure the regression model when explaining variations in variable Y. In this study, researchers were assisted by SPSS Software Version 26.

Table 2 shows the distribution of research indicators used in measuring each research variable, namely workload (X1), compensation (X2), and staff job satisfaction (Y).

**Tabel 2.** Research Indicators

Variabel	Dimension	Indicator
Workload (X1) (Somadayo, 2017)	1. Physical Burden 2. Load Time 3. Mental Burden	1. Level of effort 2. Time requirement 3. Time requirement performance 4. Achievement of targets from the company 5. Frustration level 6. Conditions in work
Kcompentation (X2) (Elmi, 2018)	1. Direct Compensation 2. Indirect Compensation	1. Bonuses 2. Insurance 3. Salary 4. Allowances 5. Intensive
job satisfaction (Y) (Putri & Hidayat, 2022)	1. The job 2. Rewards 3. Supervision 4. Promotional opportunities	1. Indirect job satisfaction 2. Creativity 3. Ability 4. Salary level 5. Leadership 6. Promotion or promotion system

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This research questionnaire has been tested for validity and reliability before being distributed to respondents. The results of the validity test show that all indicators for each variable are valid. While the reliability test shows that each variable has been reliably used as a research data collection tool, The results of the validity and reliability tests can be observed in the following table:

The Pearson correlation is used to measure validity in this research. In this research, researchers conducted a validity test using SPSS 26 software.

**Table 3.** Validity Test Results

Statement items	rcount	rtable	interpretation
X.1.1	0,741	0,205	Valid
X.1.2	0,741	0,205	Valid
X.1.3	0,616	0,205	Valid
X.1.4	0,962	0,205	Valid
X.1.5	0,741	0,205	Valid
X.1.6	0,962	0,205	Valid
X.1.7	0,962	0,205	Valid
X.1.8	0,962	0,205	Valid
X.2.1	0,972	0,205	Valid
X.2.2	0,972	0,205	Valid
X.2.3	0,698	0,205	Valid
X.2.4	0,972	0,205	Valid
X.2.5	0,972	0,205	Valid
X.2.6	0,769	0,205	Valid
X.2.7	0,972	0,205	Valid
Y.1	0,728	0,205	Valid
Y.2	0,940	0,205	Valid
Y.3	0,649	0,205	Valid
Y.4	0,940	0,205	Valid
Y.5	0,728	0,205	Valid
Y.6	0,940	0,205	Valid
Y.7	0,592	0,205	Valid

As can be seen from Table 1, the results of the validity test for all the workload variable statement options (X1), which include the 8 questionnaire statement options, can be declared valid because  $r_{count} > r_{table}$ . Thus, the workload table questionnaire statement (X1) can be used as a measuring medium for the variables studied.

The table above shows that compensation (X2), which includes 7 items of questionnaire statements, can be said to be valid because  $r_{count} > r_{table}$ . Thus, the statement of the compensation table questionnaire can be used as a measuring medium for the variables studied.

It can be seen from the table above that job satisfaction (Y), which includes 7 items of questionnaire statements, can be said to be valid because  $r_{count} > r_{table}$ . So, the job satisfaction table questionnaire statement can be used as a measuring medium for the variables studied.

The researcher tested the questionnaire in order to understand whether it was consistent or not. In order to understand whether it is consistent or not, this questionnaire is tested repeatedly. So a reliability test was carried out to measure reliability in this research using Cronbach's alpha. If the Cronbach Alpha is greater than 0.60, the questionnaire is considered reliable.

**Table 4.** Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
,910	8

The results of the reliability test for the workload variable (X1) if the 8 options in the questionnaire statements show a Cronbach Alpha value with a lot of 0.910, as shown in the table above. which means the Cronbach Alpha value has a lot of  $0.910 > 0.60$ , that is, if the statement options in the workload variable (X1) can be said to be reliable as a research measuring media instrument.

**Table 5. Reliability Statistics**

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
,941	7

According to the table above, the compensation (X2) of the questionnaire's 7 statement items has a Cronbach's alpha of 0.941. which means the Cronbach alpha value is  $0.941 > 0.60$ , that is, if the statement items in Compensation (X2) can be declared reliable as a research measuring tool.

**Table 6. Reliability Statistics**

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
,848	7

Job satisfaction (Y) of the 7 questionnaire statement items shows a Cronbach Alpha of 0.848. which means the Cronbach alpha value is  $0.848 > 0.60$ , that is, if the statement options in Job Satisfaction (Y) can be declared reliable as a research measuring medium.

Multiple linear regression is an analytical tool that can collect or predict the value of the impact of two independent or independent variables on the dependent or dependent variable in order to prove whether or not these two variables have an effect. The aim is to predict or forecast the value of X or Y and to understand the magnitude of the impact of workload (X1) and compensation (X2) on job satisfaction (Y). The regression equation model in this study is:

$$Y = a + b_1X_1 + b_2X_2$$

Information:

Y = Job Satisfaction (Y)

a = constant number

b1 = regression coefficient of Workload (X1)

b2 = regression coefficient of Compensation (X2)

X1 = Workload

X2 = Compensation

The results of the multiple linear regression test in this study, by processing data using SPSS 26 software can be observed from the table:

**Table 7. Regression test**

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
1 (Constant)	-2,468	2,780		-,888	,383
Beban Kerja	,828	,059	,937	14,096	,000
Kompensasi	,145	,067	,143	2,156	,040

According to the table above, the results of the multiple linear regression test can be understood by the value:

$$a = -2,468$$

$$b_1 = 0,828$$

$$b_2 = 0,145$$

obtained multiple linear regression equation:

$$Y = a + b_1X_1 + b_2X_2$$

$$\text{Job satisfaction} = -2,468 + 0,828X_1 + 0,145X_2$$

Test the hypothesis with partial / t test. The purpose of doing this test is to understand the impact of the individual in each independent variable on the dependent variable, as follows:

**Table 8. Partial t-test**

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
1 (Constant)	-2,468	2,780		-,888	,383
Beban Kerja	,828	,059	,937	14,096	,000
Kompensasi	,145	,067	,143	2,156	,040

In the table above it can be understood the results of testing each variable, namely Workload (X1) and Compensation (X2) on Job Satisfaction (Y):

1. Workload t test (X1) to Job Satisfaction (Y)

Partial statistical tests can be understood using the following steps:

a. Doing the formulation of hypotheses

- 1) Workload (X1) has no positive impact on job satisfaction (Y)
- 2) Workload (X1) has a positive impact on job satisfaction (Y)

b. Set a significant level

The significant level is  $\alpha = 0.05 / 5\%$

- 1) If the significant value is  $> 0.05$ , workload (X1) is not significant for job satisfaction (Y)
- 2) If the significant value is  $< 0.05$ , workload (X1) is significant for job satisfaction (Y)

The significant level of workload (X1) is  $0.000 < 0.05$ , workload (X1) is significant for job satisfaction (Y).

c. Tracing t-count values

From table 8. It can be understood that the t-count is 14.096

d. Finding t-table values

To understand it use the formula:

$$a = 0.05 ; df = n - k - 1$$

Where n is the amount of data and k is the number of independent variables.

So that  $df = 30 - 2 - 1 = 27$  it can be understood that the t-table value observed from one perception is 2.05

e. Comparing the t-count value with the t-table terms:

- 1)  $Tcount \leq ttable$ ,  $H_0$  is accepted and  $H_a$  is rejected
- 2)  $Tcount \geq ttable$ ,  $H_0$  is rejected and  $H_a$  is accepted

It can be understood  $tcount 14.096 > ttable 2.05$ ,  $H_0$  is rejected and  $H_a$  is accepted, meaning that workload (X1) has an impact on job satisfaction (Y).

f. Creating conclusions

From the results of the comparison between the value of tcount and ttable, it can be concluded that if  $tcount > ttable$ , namely  $14.096 > 2.05$ ,  $H_0$  is rejected and  $H_a$  is accepted. With a positive coefficient  $\beta_1 = 0.828$ . This means that workload (X1) partially has a good impact on job satisfaction (Y). It is observed that the significance value of workload (X1) is  $0.000 < 0.05$ , namely workload (X1) is significant for job satisfaction (Y). In conclusion, workload (X1) has a significant positive impact on job satisfaction (Y).

2. Compensation t test (X2) to Job Satisfaction (Y)

Partial statistical tests can be understood using the steps:

a. Doing the formulation of hypotheses

- 1)  $H_0 =$  Compensation (X2) has no positive impact on job satisfaction (Y)

- 2)  $H_a$  = Compensation (X2) has a positive impact on job satisfaction (Y)
- b. Set a significant level  
The significant level is  $\alpha = 0.05 / 5\%$

1) If the significant value is  $> 0.05$ , compensation (X2) is not significant for job satisfaction (Y)

2) If the significant value is  $< 0.05$ , compensation (X2) is significant for job satisfaction (Y)

The significant level of compensation (X2) is  $0.04 < 0.05$ , compensation (X2) is significant for job satisfaction (Y).

c. Find the t-count value

From table 7. It can be understood that the t-count is 2.156

d. Finding t-table values

To understand it using the formula:

$$a = 0.05 ; df = n - k - 1$$

Where n is the amount of data and k is the number of independent variables. So that  $df = 30 - 2 - 1 = 27$  it can be understood that the t-table value observed from one perception is 2.05

e. Comparing t-count values with t-table conditions:

1)  $Tcount \leq ttable$ ,  $H_0$  is accepted and  $H_a$  is rejected

2)  $Tcount \geq ttable$ ,  $H_0$  is rejected and  $H_a$  is accepted

It can be understood  $tcount 2.156 > ttable 2.05$ ,  $H_0$  is rejected and  $H_a$  is accepted, meaning that compensation (X2) has an impact on job satisfaction (Y).

f. Creating conclusions

From the results of the comparison between the value of tcount and ttable, it can be concluded that if  $tcount > ttable$ , namely  $2.156 > 2.05$  so that  $H_0$  is rejected and  $H_a$  is accepted. With a positive coefficient  $\beta_1 = 0.145$ . This means that compensation (X2) partially has a good impact on job satisfaction (Y). It is observed that the significance value of compensation (X2) is  $0.04 < 0.05$ , namely compensation (X2) is significant for job satisfaction (Y). In conclusion, compensation (X2) has a good and significant impact on job satisfaction (Y).

Test the hypothesis with simultaneous (simultaneous) \ test f. The aim is to understand the simultaneous (simultaneous) impact of all independent variables on the dependent variable. Following are the results of the F test:

**Table 9. ANOVA test**

Model	Sum Squares	of df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1 Regression	43,618	2	21,809	100,100	,000 <sup>b</sup>
Residual	5,882	27	,218		
Total	49,500	29			

Partial statistical tests can be understood in the following steps:

a. Doing the formulation of hypotheses

1)  $H_0$  = workload (X1) and compensation (X2) have no positive impact on job satisfaction (Y)

2)  $H_a$  = workload (X1) and compensation (X2) have a positive impact on job satisfaction (Y)

b. Set a significant level

Significance level of  $\alpha = 0.05 / 5\%$

1) If the significant value is  $> 0.05$ , workload (X1) and compensation (X2) are not significant for job satisfaction (Y)

2) If the significant value is  $< 0.05$ , workload (X1) and compensation (X2) are significant to job satisfaction (Y)

The significant level of workload (X1) and compensation is  $0.000 < 0.05$ , workload (X1) and compensation (X2) are significant for job satisfaction (Y).

c. Finding the F-count value

From table 7. It can be understood that the t-count is 100,100

d. Find the F-table values

With the determination of degrees of freedom /  $df1 = d - k = 3 - 1 = 2$  so that  $df1 = 2$  and  $df2 = n - k = 30 - 3 = 27$ , the Ftable value is 3.35. The results can be observed through the distribution table F table.

e. Comparing the F-count values with the F-table with the following criteria:

1)  $F_{count} \leq F_{table}$ ,  $H_0$  is accepted and  $H_a$  is rejected

2)  $F_{count} \geq F_{table}$ ,  $H_0$  is rejected and  $H_a$  is accepted

It can be understood that  $F_{count} 100.100 > F_{table} 3.35$ ,  $H_0$  is rejected and  $H_a$  is accepted, meaning that workload (X1) and compensation (X2) simultaneously have an impact on job satisfaction (Y).

f. Creating conclusions

From the results of the comparison between the values of  $F_{count}$  and  $F_{table}$ , it can be concluded that if  $F_{count} > F_{table}$ , namely  $100.100 > 3.35$ ,  $H_0$  is rejected and  $H_a$  is accepted. The meaning of workload (X1) and compensation (X2) simultaneously have an impact on job satisfaction (Y). Observed from the significant value of workload (X1) and compensation (X2) is  $0.000 < 0.05$  meaning workload (X1) and compensation (X2) are significant to job satisfaction (Y). In conclusion, workload (X1) and compensation (X2) simultaneously have a significant impact on job satisfaction (Y).

Analysis of the coefficient of determination can be used to find out how much the independent variable (X) has an impact on the dependent variable (Y) expressed as a percentage. The value of the coefficient of determination is between 0 and 1.

**Table 10.** Coefficient of determination

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted Square	RStd. Error of the Estimate
1	,939 <sup>a</sup>	,881	,872	,467

a. Predictors: (Constant), Kompensasi, Beban Kerja

Source: Hasil Pengolahan Data SPSS Versi 26, 2022

$$Kd = R^2 \times 100\%$$

Information:

Kd = coefficient of determination

R<sup>2</sup> = square of the double coefficient

$$Kd = 0,881 \times 100\%$$

$$= 88,1\%$$

Based on the table above, it shows that the value of R square is 0.881 / 88.1%. That means that job satisfaction (Y) of 88.1% can be described by the independent variables, namely workload (X1) and compensation (X2). Meanwhile, 11.9% can be explained by other variables not examined in this research.

**Tabel 11.** Instructions for interpretation of the coefficient of determination

Coefficient intervals	Influence level
0% - 19%	Very weak
20% - 39,9%	Weak

40% - 59,9%	Currently
60% - 79,9%	Strong
80% - 100%	Very strong

*Source: Sugiyono (2012)*

From table 11 above the coefficient of determination obtained is 88.1%, including a very strong classification. So the conclusion is that the correlation between the variables in this research has a very strong correlation.

## Discussion

From table above, it is obtained if the equation of the multiple regression values is:  $Y = - 2,468 + 828X_1 + 145X_2$ . The first hypothesis put forward in this study is that there is a significant positive effect between workload and job satisfaction. This hypothesis is supported if the significant value indicates a value of 0.05. Based on Table 5, the workload variable has a t-count of 14.096 (0.000 0.05). The results show a significance level of 0.05, and the regression model can be used to predict the dependent variable (Y), or in other words if the workload variable has an influence on job satisfaction variables. From the analysis that has been done, it can be concluded that hypothesis 1 in this study is accepted. This is in line with the research of Melati and Bagus (2015), namely workload has an effect on job satisfaction. From the results of the statistical tests described above, it shows that if H1 is accepted, it means that there is a positive influence between workload and job satisfaction.

The second hypothesis put forward in this study is that there is a positive effect of compensation on job satisfaction. This hypothesis is supported if the significant value indicates a value of 0.05. Based on Table 5, the compensation variable has a t-count of 2.156 (0.04 0.05). The results showed a significance level of 0.05, and the regression model can be used to predict the dependent variable (Y), or in other words if the compensation variable has an influence on job satisfaction variables. From the analysis that has been done, it can be concluded that hypothesis 2 in this study is accepted. These results are in line with the research of Jufrizen, J. (2017) which states that there is a positive and significant effect between compensation variables on employee job satisfaction.

The third hypothesis proposed in this study is that there is a simultaneous effect of workload and compensation on job satisfaction. The results of statistical calculations show that the value of  $F_{count} = 100.100 > 3.35$  with a significance of 0.000 0.05. This means that H0 is rejected and H is accepted; this shows that there is a simultaneous influence between workload, compensation, and job satisfaction, so that hypothesis 3 in this study is accepted.

## CONCLUSION

Workload has a positive impact on job satisfaction. The research results show that there is a positive impact between workload and job satisfaction. From the results of the regression test carried out, it shows that the results of the calculation of tcount 14.096 are greater than ttable 2.05 with a significant level of t of 0.000 0.05. because of the alpha value's significance value. This shows that workload has an impact on job satisfaction. With the emergence of the initial hypothesis, which explains if there is an effect of workload on job satisfaction.

Compensation has a positive impact on job satisfaction. The research results show that there is a positive impact between workload and job satisfaction. According to the results of the regression test, the calculation results of tcount 2.156 are greater than ttable 2.05 with a significant level of t of 0.04 0.05. because of the alpha value's significance value This shows that there is compensation for job satisfaction. With the emergence of the second hypothesis, which explains if there is an effect of compensation on job satisfaction.

Workload and compensation have a simultaneous effect on job satisfaction. This is in line with the value on the F test results.

This research is expected to be able to contribute to companies paying more attention to the influence of workload on the compensation given to employees, especially PY.GTG. Where a company gives an excessive workload to employees, sometimes the employee always expects indirect compensation; it's just that usually they don't dare to disclose it. With compensation, staff will feel satisfied while working and will be more loyal and love their work at the company.

This research is still very limited, because it is only done to test the effect of workload and compensation on job satisfaction. Therefore, researchers suggest to develop further research by adding other variables that affect job satisfaction. This is because there are many other variables that can optimize job satisfaction variables.

## REFERENCES

- Ajimat, Aini, N., Budi, S., Ekonomi, F., & Pamulang, U. (2020). Pengaruh kompensasi dan beban kerja terhadap kepuasan kerja karyawan pada PT Dana Mandiri Sejahtera Cabang Sepatan. *Jurnal Disrupsi Bisnis*, 3(3), 1–10.
- Elmi, Farida. 2018. *Telisik Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia: Edisi 1*. Mitra Wacana Media. Jakarta.
- Dewi, D. P., & Harjoyo. (2019). *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia*. In *Unpam Press*.
- Jatimoyo, D., & Wijaya, M. A. D. I. (2019). *Pengaruh Kompensasi Dan Beban Kerja Terhadap Kepuasan Kerja Dengan Stres Kerja Sebagai Variabel Mediasi Pada Karyawan Dinas Kependudukan Dan Pencatatan Sipil Kabupaten Blitar*. 1–18.
- Jufrizen, J. (2017). Efek mediasi kepuasan kerja pada pengaruh kompensasi terhadap kinerja karyawan. *Jurnal Ilmiah Manajemen Dan Bisnis*, 17(1).
- Mahendrawan, G. (2015). Pengaruh Beban Kerja dan Kompensasi terhadap Kepuasan Kerja. *E-Jurnal Manajemen Unud*, 4(11), 3936–3961.
- Putri, R., & Hidayat, R. (2022). Model Pengukuran Kepuasan Kerja Karyawan Dengan Kompensasi Dan Motivasi. *EKOMBIS REVIEW: Jurnal Ilmiah Ekonomi Dan Bisnis*, 10(1), 305–315. <https://doi.org/10.37676/ekombis.v10i1.1776>
- Rohman, M. A., & Ichsan, R. M. (2021). Pengaruh Beban Kerja Dan Stres Kerja Terhadap Kinerja Karyawan Pt Honda Daya Anugrah Mandiri Cabang Sukabumi Malik. *Jurnal Mahasiswa Manajemen, Volume 2 No.1 (April 2021) E-ISSN 2798-1851 PENGARUH*, 2(1), 1–22. Retrieved from <https://journal.stiepasim.ac.id/index.php/JMM/article/view/130/116>
- Somadayo, H. (2017). *Hubungan Antara Beban Kerja Perawat Dengan Pelaksanaan Komunikasi Terapeutik Di Bangsal Penyakit Dalam Dan Bedah RSUD Dr. Tjitrowardojo Purworejo*.
- Sugiyono, 2018. *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif*. Bandung: Alfabeta
- Sujati, Y. G. G. (2018). Kepuasan Kerja : Arti Penting, Faktor-Faktor Yang Mempengaruhi dan Implikasinya Bagi Organisasi. *Jurnal Pendidikan Ekonomi*, 1–60.
- Yo, P., Melati, P., & Surya, I. B. K. (2015). *Pengaruh beban kerja terhadap kepuasan kerja dengan stres kerja sebagai variabel mediasi* (Doctoral dissertation, Udayana University).