

The effect of working conditions and coworking on employee job satisfaction

Farida Nurvitasari

Faculty of Economics and Business, University of Airlangga, Surabaya

Email: farida.nurvitasari-2017@feb.unair.ac.id

Abstract

This research aimed to examine the effect of working conditions and coworking on employee job satisfaction. This research belonged to quantitative research. The analysis technique used was multiple linear regression analysis. The data collection technique was done by distributing the questionnaires to 90 respondents, then it was processed by using SPSS. The results showed that working conditions and coworking had a significant effect on employee job satisfaction.

Keywords: Working condition; coworking; employee job satisfaction

INTRODUCTION

Human resources are an important aspect as they have high-influence for the companies in dealing with the rapidly developing global business environment. In the competitive world of business, the organization needs human resources possessing high skills, motivation, initiative, skills, and responsibility for working. In addition, human resources also required the right strategy and organizational structure to achieve organizational goals, Baker (2011). The organizational structure was a facility in coordinating and controlling behavior by directing individuals to obtain organizational goals, Costa et al., (2013). An effective organizational structure is able to help an organization achieving its goals and reduce individual differences or variations within an organization. The organizational structure is well designed according to organizational strategy and working environment (external and internal). Organizational achievement is associated with coordinating individuals within the organization.

Human resources determine how the company runs its activities properly in which the working conditions and coworking influence the employees to be more eager in working, employees are expected to be able to solve work challenges well, and there is a marked increase in their working results. Special attention was needed to achieve the success of an organization, employees needed to get a balanced reward after they doing the best contribution to the company, Akgün & Keskin (2014).

According to Rockström et al., (2009), the importance for companies in paying special attention to employee job satisfaction was expected to foster employee commitment to the organization which would affect productivity, quality, and work services. There is a theory of two satisfying factors covering hygiene and motivating factors. The hygiene factor (good climate) describes an organizational environment that prevents the emergence of dissatisfaction in the work called maintenance, due to several factors such as company administration policies, relationships between individuals, and working conditions that sometimes cannot be fulfilled and must, therefore, be maintained. While the motivator factor where there is a tendency of recognition, appreciation, and responsibility to achieve satisfaction. Employees who have gained satisfaction at the working place were able to motivate themselves to achieve achievements and provide the best contribution to the company. This condition made employees feel more comfortable in the organization because there was a feeling of satisfaction with the organization that had given awards to the contributions they made so that it improved employee performance that had an impact on achieving organizational goals, Eldor (2016). This condition will be inversely reversed for employees who have little or no attention at all on the organization, the employee will try to withdraw from the organization.

Not all employees in working place are money-oriented to get job satisfaction. There are some people who are willing to accept a small amount of money to work in the desired location or in jobs that are lacking, even not challenging, it could also be because they choose it for reasons of greater freedom in their work they do during working hours. For some people, job satisfaction is not an absolute amount that must be paid by the company, but they are more concerned with a sense of justice obtained from the company environment.

Tight competition in the business world makes PT. Enggang Karunia Abadi continues to strive to improve the quality of services produced by the company. Therefore, it is highly needed employees who are willing to give the best contribution and devote their potential to get the best results for the company. The best contribution made by employees for the benefit of the organization is inseparable from the level of job satisfaction. Job satisfaction is influenced by two types of work aspects which include working conditions and coworking.

Employee job satisfaction as the dependent variable according to Hasibuan Malayu, (2008) is an emotional attitude that is fun and loves the job. Reflected by working morale, discipline, and employee work performance, there is three job satisfaction that can be enjoyed referring to job satisfaction at work, outside of work and combination of inside and outside work. Job satisfaction at work refers to job satisfaction that can be enjoyed at work by obtaining goals for working results, placement, treatment, and a good working environment (intrinsic factor). An employee who likes to enjoy job satisfaction in this job will prioritize his work rather than rewards even though remuneration is also very important. Job satisfaction outside of work where employee job satisfaction is enjoyed outside of

work with remuneration to be received from work in order to meet physiological needs (extrinsic factor). Employees who prefer job satisfaction outside of work will prioritize remuneration rather than their duties. Job satisfaction inside and outside of work is job satisfaction which is reflected in a balanced emotional attitude between remuneration and work. An employee who often enjoys job satisfaction with a combination of inside and outside work will feel satisfied if the results of his work and remuneration are fair and appropriate.

According to Robbins & Judge (2008), there were four factors that affected job satisfaction. First, mentally challenging jobs where employees tended to prefer jobs that gave them the opportunity to use their skills and abilities by offering a variety of tasks, freedom, and feedback on the results. These characteristics made work mentally challenging. The less challenging jobs created frustration and failure for some employees. Many workers felt satisfied at the condition of moderate level of challenges. Second, appropriate rewards for employees where workers wanted a wage system and promotion policies that were fair and in accordance with what they expected. Wages produced satisfaction when they were based on job demands, individual skill levels, and general wage standards. Workers strove for fair promotion policies and practices, providing opportunities for personal growth, more responsibilities, and improved social status. Workers felt satisfied when promotion decisions were made fairly. Dynamic net job satisfaction, which meant that the employee satisfaction changed according to the conditions experienced by the individual. Third, supportive working conditions. For every individual who entered the work environment, they had needs that the company wanted to fulfill. The needs then became an incentive for employees to try to achieve goals. When the needs expected by the employees from the job were fulfilled, the employee felt satisfied. Vice versa when the needs were not fulfilled, then employees experienced dissatisfaction. Satisfaction had important meaning for employees and the company, especially because it created a positive situation in the work environment. The last, supportive coworking who were friendly encouraged the increase in job satisfaction, including providers who were friendly and gave praise for good employee performance increased job satisfaction. For some employees, in working as well as filling the need for social interaction and not just to get money or achievements from work. Supporting and cooperative work coworking, who was very helpful when working had an impact on satisfaction feeling.

Based on Robbins & Judge (2008), Supporting working conditions in organizations where employees cared about the work environment both for personal comfort and to facilitate the task. Employees prefer harmless physical surroundings. For example, Temperature, light, noise, and other environmental factors should not be extreme (too much or too little). As revealed by Komaruddin (2001), working conditions or what was often referred to as the work environment was psychological and physical social life in organizations that affected the work of employees in carrying out their duties. While Prabu (2005), revealed that working conditions or work environment were all aspects of physical work, psychological work and work regulations that affected job satisfaction and achieved work productivity.

Luthans (2006), said that besides the influence of coworking, there was an influence from superiors on job satisfaction. Such as superiors' attention to the level of employee welfare, guidance, and assistance in carrying out work, communicative, and willing to involve themselves in work will lead to job satisfaction. Supporting work coworking, where employees can get something more than just money or tangible achievements from work. In general, the research found that employee satisfaction improved when the supervisor was friendly and able to respond, gave praise to employees for their good performance, listened to their opinions, and showed a personal interest in employees.

According to Vedder (2005), there were several types of coworking viewed from work, first was the active type where this type was always diligent and full of initiative. As a result of being active, anything was done and handled. He always wanted in every job, especially important work related to the promotion. However, sometimes he was also emotional, so he did not think long enough in making decisions. Therefore, for this active type, it was necessary to explain in detail the limits of his authority in working and making decisions. Second, the passive type which was diligent in working. However, usually, employees did not want to do other work for fear of making mistakes. It was true that initiatives to start were passive and tended to below, but that did not mean they refused when being asked to help do something. It's just that they tended to wait for instructions or orders from superiors.

For this type of passive work system, clear targets, rules, and guidelines were needed to be made. Third, employees with the type of thinkers, where in work these employees liked to investigate, observe and analyze events and find solutions. Unfortunately, this type of thinker was lazy and did not want to help other coworking. Especially when they had to tell and convey knowledge to other friends. Their intelligence and expertise were only for personal consumption. For this type of thinker friend, it was important to be aware that collaboration was important in the working environment, directed to actively help solve problems at the office. Fourth, employees with the type of washing hands, this type actually had a pretty good ability to work. The washing hands were less responsible for what became their responsibilities. If they did a mistake they tended to blame other people or the situation. This type of person always saved themselves, even it was the condition that involved many people. This type of friend should be made aware of and understand the commitment to a certain task. Emphasize that each individual should be responsible for the task and mistake they did. At the same time emphasize those good relations with coworking needed to be fostered. The last type was director type which was a coworking that commonly clever in arranging a plan and work system. They were quite capable to look at a problem, process it, and love to explain a certain task that was quite confusing for the others. Unfortunately, they assumed themselves as the most clever and capable. Therefore, sometimes they were so patronized to the others. To this kind of friend, involve them in every step of the task progress, if there was a problem; invite them into a discussion and sharing. Balance their thought and ideas with an excellent opinion. Therefore, this director type friend not only patronized and underestimated their coworking but also could be a good coworking. The hypothesis of this research was:

H1: Working conditions positively affected the employee job satisfaction

H2: Coworking positively affected the employee job satisfaction

METHODS

The data collection method of this research was done by distributing a questionnaire to the respondents. Questionnaire was a data collection method through questions that had been prepared by the researcher to be proposed to the respondents as the sample. By taking note of the provided data related to the existing research problem. The use of a Likert scale to measure attitude, opinion, and perception of somebody or group toward a social phenomenon, Sugiyono (2010). By using the Likert scale, the results of measurement had gradation ranged from strongly agree to strongly disagree consisted of: (1) strongly disagree, (2) disagree, (3) neutral, (4) agree, (5) strongly agree. The object of this research was taken from PT Enggang Karunia Abadi employees through respondents' characteristic selection of permanent employees. The sample of this research was taken by using permanent employees as many as ninety people of PT Enggang Karunia Abadi employees to obtain valid data.

In analyzing the obtained data from this research, the linear regression method was an analysis of the correlation between one dependent variable and two or more independent variables were used, Arikunto (2005). Validity test was useful for knowing whether or not there were questions that should be eliminated or replaced because irrelevant, Umar (2004). A questionnaire was said to be valid if the questions were able to reveal something measured from the questionnaire. If the correlation between each variable indicator toward the total construct score or variable showed significant results, then the indicator was shown with a star. This said that each question of the indicator was valid. Reliability test measures how far the measurement tool can be trusted, Azwar (2008). The reliability test showed a definition that an instrument was quite trusted to be used as a data collection tool because the instrument was good.

In conducting data analysis, the researcher used multiple linear regression method equations with the SPSS program (Statistical Product and Service Solution). The independent variable is a variable that becomes the cause of independent variable changes, Sugiyono (2010). Independent variable in this research was working conditions and coworking. The dependent variable is a variable that influenced or becomes the consequence, by the existence of the dependent variable, Sugiyono (2010). The dependent variable in this research was employee job satisfaction.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This research used a quantitative approach, emphasized the data consisted of numbers and could be analyzed by using statistical procedures. Data collection was done by giving a questionnaire to 90 respondents. The entire questionnaire was returned in a good condition and proper to be used in data analysis. Hypotheses testing explained the results of data analysis and the researcher used the equation of multiple linear regression methods. This research aimed at knowing the effect of working conditions to the employee job satisfaction.

Descriptive statistic analysis was used to give preview toward the variables used in this research without comparing or relating to other variables. Measurements used were mean and standard deviation of each variable. Descriptive statistic summary of the variables can be seen in Table 1 as follow:

Table 1. Research descriptive variables

Variables	Mean	Standard deviation
Working conditions	3,390	0,116
Coworking	3,080	1,802

The mean score of the working conditions variable was 3.390 with a standard deviation of 0.016. This showed that the level of data distribution of working conditions had a variance of 3.42%. Due to the level of variation <100%, then it can be concluded that the data were homogenous, where this meant that the level of working conditions had relative the same number. The mean score of the colleague variable was 3.080 with a standard deviation of 1.802. This showed that the distribution of colleague data had a variance of 58.50%. Due to the level of variance <100%, then it can be concluded that the data was homogenous, where this meant that the level of working conditions had relative the same number.

In this research, the researcher conducted validity and reliability tests on the research model. The researcher expected to find out how well the questionnaire items in measuring the nature and concept of variables measured and know the consistency of questionnaire items in measuring similar variables in different time and place. The validity and reliability testing for each indicator in each research variable were explained in table 2, as follows:

Table 2. Results of validity and reliability tests

Variable	Valid	Invalid	Question	Reliability coefficient	Description
Working Conditions	5	0	5	0.754	Reliable
Coworking	4	0	4	0.733	Reliable

A validity test was carried out by comparing the Product Moment Correlation Coefficient with $\alpha = 0.05$ as the critical value. If the probability of correlation result < 0.05, therefore the instrument declared valid. For working conditions and coworking values, the results were reliable because the values fulfilled the requirement test or above 0.60 so that from this data, further analysis by using SPSS was performed. While the reliability test was used to know the consistency of the instrument (measuring instrument). Reliability testing was done by using construct reliability where the variables declared reliable if the construct reliability ≥ 0.70 .

The next step that must be done was analyzing the data by using the regression method analysis. The aim of using the regression equation was to estimate the variation of the dependent variable caused by the variation of the independent variable. Based on the data collected, it obtained the following processed results:

Table 3. Results of multiple regression analysis

Variable	Coefficient	T	Significance
Working Conditions	0.175	2.743	0.004
Coworking	0.284	2.153	0.023
R	= 0.845		
R ²	= 0.645		
Sig	= 0.000		

Based on the results of data processing by using SPSS, in table 3 it was known that the regression results showed that working conditions and coworking variables had a positive and significant influence on job satisfaction. This was seen from the value of each variable had a significant value under 0.05. It was known from the value of working conditions value with the regression coefficient as much as 0.284 which means that the greater the working place condition, the more employee job satisfaction increased. This result is in line with the research by Aleksić et al., (2013), who stated that the conducive working environment improved the employee working spirit. Good working environment was the availability of supporting facilities to implement the tasks to achieve the organizational goals. The fulfillment of working conditions gave a better working performance. Conducive working conditions enhanced spirit and passion to work, in other words, a good working environment such as the arrangement of working place, good spatial planning, and office equipment helped the process of task implementation. By the fulfillment of physical working conditions that they expected to get higher job satisfaction.

Besides that, the value of the colleague variable had a regression coefficient as much as 0.175 which means that the better the relationship with coworking, the higher the employee job satisfaction. This result is supported by the research done by Aleksić et al., (2013), who stated the positive and significant influence of coworking on employee job satisfaction. Coworking was the closest environment of the employee who influenced employee achievement. Basically, a human is a social creature who needs social interaction between individuals, as well as with employees when working, when working, the employees do not only need money but coworking. Therefore, it can be concluded if good and friendly coworking will increase the working satisfaction, conversely, if the relationship between coworking does not run well, it will have a negative impact on working satisfaction. Siagian (2002), asserted that humans worked not only for seeking money but also as a medium to raise their dignity. Where to meet the needs of self-esteem obtained among others from recognition and appreciation from others, such as from coworking.

CONCLUSION

Based on the result of the discussion that had been explained before, it can be concluded that the results of testing and analysis showed that working conditions had a positive and significant influence on employee job satisfaction. This means that the better the employee working environment, the employee job satisfaction got better as well. Conversely, the worse the employee working environment, job satisfaction decreased. As well as the variable of coworking had a positive and significant influence on employee job satisfaction. This means that the better the relationship between coworking occurred, the job satisfaction increased. Conversely, the worse the relationship between coworking occurred, job satisfaction decreased.

REFERENCES

- Akgün, A. E., & Keskin, H. (2014). Organizational resilience capacity and firm product innovativeness and performance. *International Journal of Production Research*, 52(23), 6918–6937.
- Aleksić, A., Stefanović, M., Arsovski, S., & Tadić, D. (2013). An assessment of organizational resilience potential in SMEs of the process industry, a fuzzy approach. *Journal of Loss Prevention in the Process Industries*, 26(6), 1238–1245.
- Arikunto. (2005). *Prosedur Penelitian Suatu Pendekatan Praktek*, Yogyakarta: Rineka cipta.
- Azwar, S. (2008). Kualitas Tes Potensi Akademik Versi 07A. *Jurnal Penelitian Dan Evaluasi Pendidikan*, 12(2).
- Baker, J. V. (2011). *The effects of change management on employee engagement: Using lean principles to increase engagement*. California State University, Long Beach.
- Costa, P. L., Graça, A. M., Marques-Quinteiro, P., Santos, C. M., Caetano, A., & Passos, A. M. (2013). Multilevel research in the field of organizational behavior: An empirical look at 10 years of theory and research. *Sage Open*, 3(3), 2158244013498244.

-
-
- Eldor, L. (2016). Work engagement: Toward a general theoretical enriching model. *Human Resource Development Review*, 15(3), 317–339.
- Hasibuan Malayu, S. P. (2008). Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia. edisi revisi. cetakan kesepuluh. Penerbit: Bumi Aksara, Jakarta.
- Komaruddin. (2001). Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia. Jakarta: Rineka Cipta.
- Luthans, F. (2006). Perilaku Organisasi (Edisi 10).(v. A. Yuwono, S. Purwanti, TA P, & W. Rosari, Trans.) Yogyakarta: ANDI.
- Prabu, M. A. (2005). Manajemen sumber daya manusia perusahaan. Bandung: PT. Remaja Rosdakarya.
- Robbins, S. P., & Judge, T. A. (2008). Perilaku Organisasi (Terjemahan) Edisi Keduabelas Buku Dua. Jakarta: PT. Salemba Empat.
- Rockström, J., Steffen, W. L., Noone, K., Persson, Å., Chapin III, F. S., Lambin, E., ... Schellnhuber, H. J. (2009). Planetary boundaries: exploring the safe operating space for humanity. *Ecology and Society*.
- Siagian, S. P. (2002). Kiat meningkatkan produktivitas kerja. Jakarta: Rineka Cipta.
- Sugiyono, P. (2010). Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif, Kualitatif, dan R&D. Bandung: CV Alfabeta.
- Umar, H. (2004). Metode Riset Ilmu Administrasi. Jakarta: Gramedia Pustaka Utama.