
THE EFFECT OF WORKLOAD AND WORK ENVIRONMENT ON EMPLOYEE PERFORMANCE AT PT MEGATAMA ABADI IRS SERANG CITY

Dias Ayu Prawesty¹, Ahmad Syukri^{2*}

Pamulang University, South Tangerang, Banten, Indonesia

*dosen01772@unpam.ac.id

Article Info

Article history:

Received: May 25, 2025

Revised: June 15, 2025

Accepted: June 25, 2025

Keywords:

Workload, Work
Environment, Employee
Performance

ABSTRACT

This study aims to analyze the effect of workload and work environment on employee performance at PT Megatama Abadi IRS (Industrial Rotating Service) with an associative quantitative approach. The research sample consisted of 60 employees selected using saturated sampling techniques. Data analysis was carried out through descriptive statistics, validity tests, reliability, classical assumptions, and simple and multiple linear regressions. The results showed that workload and work environment simultaneously had a positive and significant effect on employee performance with an F-count value (37.559) greater than the F-table (4.01) and a significance of $0.000 < 0.05$. The coefficient of determination (R^2) of 56.9% indicates that the workload and work environment variables contribute to employee performance, while 43.1% is influenced by other factors.

This is an open access article under the [CC BY-SA](#) license.



Corresponding Author:

Ahmad Syukri.

Universitas Pamulang, Tangerang Selatan, Banten, Indonesia

Email: dosen01772@unpam.ac.id

INTRODUCTION

In today's era of globalization, every organization needs different aspects of excellence to achieve its goals. These goals can be achieved by utilizing existing resources such as human resources. Human resources are an important role that has a big influence in the organization. In every organizational activity that runs well, human resources are needed who have high knowledge and competence in order to achieve the goals of an organization and improve employee performance.

Improving the quality of human resources needs to be done in order to produce good performance from employees and in this case the company management must be able to manage existing human resources, so that employees can continue to provide good performance that can support the success of a company. Basically, the workforce such as in terms of mastering new technology, tighter limitations or time, and changes in demands on situations that put pressure on the workforce concerned. If employees as individuals cannot immediately adapt, then employees can perceive this as a burden that threatens them and in the long run can cause stress for the employees concerned.

This research was conducted at PT Megatama Abadi IRS (Industrial Rotating Service) located on Jalan Raya Serang-Cilegon KM 7 Kemranggen Taktakan Kota Serang. PT Megatama Abadi IRS (Industrial Rotating Service) is engaged in the service workshop, such as electrical rotation and mechanical services. One of its services is the Rewinding Electric Engine AC / DC service, Generator AC / DC Slip Ring Engine, Brake Engine, etc. This company has a vision of becoming a pioneer and leader in the field of electrical rotation services and reliable oriented towards the best service for customers with the best results. PT Megatama Abadi IRS (Industrial Rotating Service) also has a mission in its company, namely reliable, leading, professional, and innovative to become the best service in its field, and continue to innovate to provide the best service.

Performance is the result of work in terms of quantity and quality of an employee in the process of carrying out tasks in accordance with the responsibilities given (AP Mangkunegara, 2017).

In this regard, the performance of employees of PT Megatama Abadi IRS (Industrial Rotating Service) is known to have decreased employee performance which can be seen and indicated by the image below, namely as follows:

Table 1. Employee Performance Assessment 2021-2023

No.	Performance assessment	2021	2022	2023
1.	Collaborating with Employee Teams	85%	78%	85%
2.	Discipline In Productivity	83%	77%	84%
3.	Orientation in Service	84%	86%	90%
4.	Responsible In Work	80%	78%	86%
5.	Commitment to K3	77%	83%	85%
	Average	82%	80%	86%

Source: PT Megatama Abadi IRS (Industrial Rotating Service)

Table 1 shows the results of the performance assessment at PT Megatama Abadi IRS (Industrial Rotating Service), where it can be seen that assessing employee performance in 2021 and 2023 shows that the assessment is classified as good. In 2022, it shows that employee performance assessments have decreased so that they are classified as less good, this is due to the lack of employee teamwork, discipline in productivity, and responsibility in work assessment results. This can affect employee performance which has an impact on losses in the company.

One solution that can be done to improve performance is to reduce the workload received by employees. As a result of excessive workload, employees often work overtime or more hours. Based on research conducted by Altangerel et al (2017) shows that excessive work or workload is the main reason for stress among employees.

Workload according to Sutrisno (25:2014) is a number of processes or activities that must be completed by a worker within a certain period of time. If a worker is able to complete and adjust to a number of tasks given, then it does not become a workload. However, if the worker is not successful, then the tasks and activities become a workload. The results also showed that the absence of free time given to employees during working hours and excess workload statistically had a significant negative impact on employee performance.

The company sets standard working hours for 8 hours a day in a week, 07.30-16.30 WIB. Some staff employees have a lot of work, some employees even work to complete their tasks until 20.30 at night and on holidays have to come in to complete their unfinished tasks. The following is a table of overtime working hours data based on PT Megatama Abadi IRS (Industrial Rotating Service) employees which focuses on employees from 2021 to 2023.

Table 1. PT Megatama Abadi IRS Employee Overtime Data(Industrial Rotating Service)

Month	Year 2021	Year 2022	Year 2023
	Amount of overtime/month (in days)	Amount of overtime/month (in days)	Amount of overtime/month (in days)
January	13	10	20
February	9	11	15
March	11	11	14
April	12	12	12
May	14	15	17
June	10	17	12
July	11	19	11
August	10	14	13
September	11	11	15
October	10	13	10
November	12	9	11
December	9	11	12
Total Days Overtime/Year	132 days/overtime work in 1 year	153 days/overtime work in 1 year	162 days/overtime work in 1 year

Source: PT Megatama Abadi IRS (Industrial Rotating Service) 2021-2023

Based on table 2, it can be seen that employees of PT. Megatama Abadi IRS (Industrial Rotating Service) who worked overtime in 2021 if totaled in 1 year as many as 132 days/overtime work, the most of which was in May, which was 14 days in 1 month, in the following year 2022 employee overtime if totaled in 1 year as many as 153 days/overtime work, the most of which was in July, which was 19 days in 1 month, experienced a significant increase due to increased orders resulting in more working hours. In 2023 if totaled for 1 year as many as 162 days/overtime work, the most of which was in January, which was 20 days/work in 1 month. Thus, in terms of quantity there has been no increase in employee performance at PT Megatama Abadi IRS (Industrial Rotating Service). Employee overtime data is a benchmark for the workload received by employees. If the workload received by employees increases, the more often employees work overtime hours so that employees work longer than the working hours set by the company.

Unlike workload, the work environment is a factor that influences performance and needs to be considered. A healthy work environment and area certainly have an important role in increasing the ability of workers in the industry because of comfort, a sense of security, and even increasing the enthusiasm of workers so that they can work optimally. The work environment is everything that is around workers while working, in terms of physical or non-physical areas and can

have an influence on themselves to carry out the work they get. This is an important component for carrying out work activities. A peaceful work environment and area will display a sense of optimizing worker security and in carrying out their duties, because this can affect the emotional state of workers. The condition of the worker's area is considered good if humans can carry out work activities comfortably, safely, healthily and optimally. According to Sunarsi et al. (2022), a conducive work environment plays an important role in improving employee performance. A comfortable and safe work environment can increase work enthusiasm, so that employees can work optimally. The work environment includes everything that is around employees while working, both physically and non-physically, which can affect their performance. A good working environment will provide a sense of security and comfort for employees in carrying out their duties, which in turn can affect their emotional condition. A working environment is considered good if humans can interact well in it.

According to Afandi (2018:65), states that the work environment is everything that is around employees and can affect them in carrying out the tasks assigned to them, for example with air conditioning (AC), adequate lighting and so on. The work environment can also be said to be everything that is around workers and can affect them in carrying out the tasks assigned. Therefore, the company must strive to ensure that the work environment is good and meets standards. If working conditions are not as expected, this will have a major impact on employee performance. The working environment is said to be good or appropriate if it can carry out activities optimally, healthily, and comfortably.

Table 2. Infrastructure Data at PT Megatama AbadiIRS (Industrial Rotating Service)

Work Tools	Amount
Computer	12
Chair	18
Workbench	16
Printer	4
air conditioning	8
Fan	3
Workspace Lights (downlights)	20
Dispenser	2
Workspace	4
Office	4
Toilet	4
Indoor Trash Can	10

Source: PT Megatama Abadi IRS (Industrial Rotating Service)

Based on table 1.2 above, it can be concluded that the facilities and infrastructure needed by employees are still lacking. Thus, this causes problems in the work environment due to the lack of facilities and infrastructure needed so that employees cannot work optimally at PT Megatama Abadi IRS (Industrial Rotating Service). The benefits obtained by having a comfortable work environment are about creating enthusiasm to improve employee performance, so that it can increase employee work productivity. Performance is an individual thing, so that

management measures the performance of its employees based on the abilities of each employee.

METHOD

This study uses a descriptive quantitative method to analyze the effect of workload and work environment on employee performance at PT Megatama Abadi IRS (Industrial Rotating Service). According to Sugiyono (2016), descriptive quantitative research aims to measure the value of variables independently without making direct comparisons with other variables. The population in this study consisted of 60 employees who were taken as samples using a saturated sampling technique. Data collection techniques were carried out through observation, literature studies, and questionnaires measured using a Likert scale. Data analysis involved validity, reliability tests, and classical assumption tests to ensure the validity of the data before simple and multiple linear regression analysis was carried out. Priadana & Sunarsi (2021) emphasized that a good work environment and appropriate workload can significantly increase employee productivity. Thus, the results of this study are expected to provide recommendations for companies in increasing work effectiveness by improving working conditions and workload management.

RESEARCH RESULT

Simple Linear Regression Analysis

Simple linear regression analysis is used to determine whether or not there is an influence of variable X on variable Y. The following are the results of simple linear regression processing with SPSS version 27 which can be seen in the following table:

Table 4 Results of Simple Linear Regression Testing of Workload Variable (X1) on Employee Performance (Y)

Coefficients ^a					
Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	1,006	4.480	.224	.823
	Workload	1,067	.133	.724	.000

a. Dependent Variable: Employee Performance

Source: Data processed by the author 2024

Based on the results of the regression test in table 4 above, the regression equation $Y = 1.006 + 1.067 X_1$ can be obtained.

Table 5 Results of Simple Linear Regression Testing of Work Environment Variables (X2) on Employee Performance (Y)

Coefficients ^a					
Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	8,886	4.357	2,040	.046

<i>Work environment</i>	.767	.119	.644	6,417	.000
-------------------------	------	------	------	-------	------

a. Dependent Variable: Employee Performance

Source: Data processed by the author 2024

Based on the results of the regression test in table 5 above, the regression equation $Y = 8.886 + 0.767 X_2$ can be obtained.

Multiple Linear Regression Analysis

To find out the prediction of changes in the value of the dependent variable (Y) caused by the influence of several independent variables (X_1) and (X_2), multiple linear regression analysis is used. The following are the results of processing multiple linear regression data with SPSS version 27 which can be seen in the following table.

Table 6 Results of Multiple Linear Regression Testing of Workload (X_1) and Work Environment (X_2) Variables on Employee Performance (Y)

Coefficients ^a					
		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	
Model		B	Std. Error	Beta	t
1	(Constant)	-1,784	4.457		-.400
	Workload (X)	.783	.174	.532	4,501
	Work Environment (X)	.339	.141	.285	2.414

a. Dependent Variable: Employee Performance (Y)

Source: Data processed by the author 2024

Table 6 shows that the magnitude of the regression coefficient for the workload variable is 0.783 and the work environment is 0.339, and the constant is -1.784.

Correlation Coefficient Analysis

The correlation coefficient is intended to measure the strength of the relationship between three variables with certain scales and the direction of the correlation that occurs, then a correlation analysis is carried out. To interpret the results of the correlation coefficient, you can refer to the following table:

Table 7 Interpretation of Correlation Coefficient

Correlation coefficient value interval	Relationship level
0.000-0.199	Very Low
0.200-0.399	Low
0.400-0.599	Currently
0.600-0.799	Strong
0,800-1,000	Very strong

Source: Sugiyono (2017:184)

From the results of the SPSS version 27 calculations, the correlation coefficient (R) value is obtained in the following table:

Table 8 Correlation Coefficient Test Results (X_1), (X_2) and (Y)

Correlations		Workload	Work environment	Employee performance
Workload	Pearson Correlation	1	.676**	.724**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.000
	N	60	60	60
Work environment	Pearson Correlation	.676**	1	.644**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.000
	N	60	60	60
Employee performance	Pearson Correlation	.724**	.644**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	
	N	60	60	60

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Source: Processed data, 2024

Based on table 8, the correlation value of X1 with Y is 0.724, while the correlation value of variable X2 with Y is 0.644. So, it can be concluded that Workload (X1) with (Y) is included in the interval category of 0.600 - 0.799, meaning that both variables have a "strong" level of relationship, while Work Environment (X2) with Performance (Y) is included in the interval category of 0.600 - 0.799, meaning that both variables have a "strong" level of relationship.

Table 9 Results of Multiple Correlation Coefficient Test

Model Summary				
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.754a	.569	.553	3.716

a. Predictors: (Constant), Work Environment (X), Workload (X)
b. Dependent Variable: Performance

Source: Data processed 2024

Based on table 9, the results of the multiple correlation coefficient test obtained an R value of 0.754. Thus, it is concluded that the results of the study indicate that the multiple coefficient is included in the interval category of 0.600 - 0.799 which has a "strong" relationship level.

Coefficient of Determination

The determination coefficient is intended to determine the magnitude of the influence between independent variables on dependent variables, both partially and simultaneously. The following are the results of the determination coefficient calculation processed by the SPSS version 27 program, as follows:

Table 10 Results of the Test of the Coefficient of Determination (R^2) of X_1 Against Y

Model Summary				
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.724a	.524	.516	3,867

a. Predictors: (Constant), Workload (X)

Source: Data processed 2024

Based on table 10 above, the R-Square value (Coefficient of Determination) of 0.524 can be concluded that the Workload variable (X_1) has an effect on the employee performance variable (Y) of 52.4%, while the remaining 47.6% is influenced by other variables not studied by the author.

Table 11 Results of the Test of the Coefficient of Determination (R^2) of X_2 Against Y

<i>Model</i>	<i>R</i>	<i>R Square</i>	<i>Adjusted R Square</i>	<i>Std. Error of the Estimate</i>
1	.644a	.415	.405	4.289
a. Predictors: (Constant), Work Environment (X)				

Source: Data processed 2024

Based on the data in table 11 above, the R-Square value (Coefficient of Determination) was obtained as 0.415. It can be concluded that the work environment variable (X_2) has an effect on the employee performance variable (Y) of 41.5%, while the remaining 58.5% is influenced by other variables that are not researched by the author.

Table 12 Determination Coefficient (R^2) of Workload (X_1) and Work Environment (X_2) on Performance (Y)

Model Summary				
<i>Model</i>	<i>R</i>	<i>R Square</i>	<i>Adjusted R Square</i>	<i>Std. Error of the Estimate</i>
1	.754a	.569	.553	3.716
a. Predictors: (Constant), Work Environment, Workload				

Source: Data processed 2024

Based on the data in table 12 above, the R-Square value (Coefficient of Determination) is 0.569. It can be concluded that the workload (X_1) and work environment (X_2) variables have an effect on the employee performance variable (Y) of 56.9%, while the remaining 43.1% is influenced by other variables not studied by the author.

Hypothesis Testing

Hypothesis testing is carried out to make it easier to analyze data, all data processing will be done with SPSS version 27.

1. t-Test (Partial)

The t-test aims to determine whether the independent variable partially affects the dependent variable. Hypothesis testing of workload variables (X_1) and work environment (X_2) on employee performance (Y) is carried out using a t-test (partially). The criteria for this test have the following provisions:

- 1) If the calculated t value < t table: it means H_0 is accepted and H_a is rejected.
- 2) If the calculated t value > t table: this means H_0 is rejected and H_a is accepted.

The provisions for the t table are obtained by how to compare the number of samples with the significance rate. the actual value used is $\alpha = 0.05$. the rule for finding out the t table is obtained through, the number of respondents $dk = 60 - 2 = 58$, and the t table value is 1.67155.

2. The Influence of Workload (X_1) on Employee Performance (Y)

The results of data processing using the SPSS version 27 program, with the following results:

Table 13 Results of Hypothesis Testing (t-Test) of Workload Variable (X1) on Employee Performance (Y)

		Coefficients^a				
<i>Model</i>		<i>Unstandardized Coefficients</i>		<i>Standardized Coefficients</i>		
		<i>B</i>	<i>Std. Error</i>	<i>Beta</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>Sig.</i>
1	(Constant)	1,006	4.480		.224	.823
	Workload	1,067	.133	.724	7,998	.000

a. Dependent Variable: Employee Performance

Source: Data processed 2024

Based on the results of data processing in table 13 above, the calculated t value is $> t$ table or $(7.998 > 1,67155)$. This is also reinforced by the value of ρ value $< \text{Sig } 0.05$, or $(0.000 < 0.05)$. So the hypothesis is declared acceptable, meaning that there is a positive and significant influence partially between workload and employee performance. Thus, H_0 is rejected and H_a is accepted, this shows that there is a significant influence between workload and employee performance partially at PT Megatama Abadi IRS (Industrial Rotating Service).

3. The Influence of Work Environment (X2) on Employee Performance (Y)

The results of data processing using the SPSS version 27 program, with the following results:

Table 14 Results of Hypothesis Testing (t-Test) of Work Environment Variables (X2) on Employee Performance (Y)

		Coefficients^a				
<i>Model</i>		<i>Unstandardized Coefficients</i>		<i>Standardized Coefficients</i>		
		<i>B</i>	<i>Std. Error</i>	<i>Beta</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>Sig.</i>
1	(Constant)	8,886	4.357		2,040	.046
	Work environment	.767	.119	.644	6,417	.000

a. Dependent Variable: Employee Performance

Source: Data processed 2024

Based on the results of data processing in table 14 above, the value of t count $> t$ table or $(6.417 > 1.67155)$ is obtained. This is also reinforced by the value of ρ value $< \text{Sig } 0.05$, or $(0.000 < 0.05)$. So the hypothesis is declared acceptable, meaning that there is a positive and significant influence partially between the work environment and employee performance. Thus, H_0 is rejected and H_a is accepted, this shows that there is a significant influence between the work environment and employee performance partially at PT Megatama Abadi IRS (Industrial Rotating Service).

f-test (Simultaneous)

The F statistical test is a joint test of all independent variables (workload and work environment) against the dependent variable (employee performance). The calculation of the F statistic from ANOVA is done by comparing the crisis value obtained from the F distribution table at a certain significant level. To display the f

value, there needs to be a degree of freedom for the numerator and a degree of freedom for the denominator, the formula can be seen as follows:

$$DF (\text{numerator}) = k - 1$$

$$DF (\text{denominator}) = n - k - 1$$

n = number of respondents / research sample

k = number of independent variables.

$$DF (\text{numerator}) = 2 - 1 = 1$$

$$DF (\text{denominator}) = 60 - 2 - 1 = 57$$

So, the F table value is = 4.01

Table 15 Simultaneous Test Results (f Test)

ANOVA						
Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	1037.174	2	518,587	37,559	.000b
	Residual	787.009	57	13,807		
	Total	1824.183	59			
a. Dependent Variable: Employee Performance (Y)						
b. Predictors: (Constant), Work Environment (X), Workload (X)						

Source: Data processed 2024

Based on table 15 above, the calculated F value is obtained > F table or (37.559 > 4.01). This is also reinforced by the p value < sig 0.05 or (0.000 < 0.05). So it can be concluded that there is a significant influence between workload and work environment simultaneously having a positive impact on performance at PT Megatama Abadi IRS (Industrial Rotating Service).

DISCUSSION

After the findings are known in this case, it is then analyzed how well the data presents the research results raised, especially the ability to explain how well Work is related to Employee Performance. Furthermore, the results of this study will be discussed as follows:

1. The Effect of Load on Performance

Based on the results of the simple linear regression test, the calculation results are $Y = 1.006 + 1.067X_1$, which means that the constant value of 1.006 means that if the workload variable (X_1) does not exist, then there is an employee performance value (Y) of 1.006. The workload regression coefficient value (X_1) of 1.067 indicates that every 1 unit change in the workload variable (X_1) will result in a change in employee performance (Y) of 1.067 points. The correlation value of Workload (X_1) with Employee Performance (Y) is 0.742. So, it can be concluded that Workload (X_1) on Performance (Y) is included in the interval category 0.600 -0.799 means that both variables have a "strong" level of relationship. The R value = 0.754 and the Determination Coefficient is displayed through the RSquare value of 0.524. It can be concluded that the Workload variable (X_1) has an effect on the employee performance variable (Y) of 52.4% while 47.6% is influenced by other factors. Judging from the t-test, the Workload value (X_1) is $4.501 > 1.67155$ and the significant value is $0.000 < 0.05$, so H_a is accepted and H_o is rejected. So it can be concluded that

Workload (X_1) has a positive and significant partial effect on Employee Performance (Y) of PT Megatama Abadi IRS (Industrial Rotating Service). The results of this study are supported by research by Siska Yunanti et al., (2022) There is a positive and significant influence between workload on the performance of employees at RSIA Asyifa Depok, then research conducted by Gusti Ayu Amandawati et al., (2022) workload has a significant partial effect on the performance of employees at the Plataran Ubud Hotel.

2. The Influence of Work Environment and Performance

From the results of the simple linear regression test, the calculation results are the value of $Y = 8,886 + 0.767$, which means that the value (a) or constant of then shows that the work environment (X_2) has a value of 0 or does not increase, so that performance (Y) remains with a value of 8.886. And the regression coefficient value (b) 0.767 is positive, meaning it shows a unidirectional effect. This means that each increase in the Work Environment variable by one unit will provide an increase in performance of 0.767. The correlation value between the Work Environment variable (X_2) and Performance (Y) is 0.644. X_2 with Performance (Y) is included in the interval category of 0.600 - 0.799, meaning that both variables have a "strong" level of relationship. This means that the level of relationship between the work environment and the performance of employees of PT Megatama Abadi IRS (Industrial Rotating Service) has a strong relationship. The R value = 0.644, and the coefficient of determination is displayed through the R-Square value of 0.415. This means that the work environment variable (X_2) has an effect on employee performance variables (Y) by 41.5% while the remaining 58.5% is influenced by other factors. Based on the t-test, the value shows that for the Work Environment (X_2) the t-value is $2.414 > 1.67155$ and the significant value is $0.019 < 0.05$, so H_a is accepted and H_o is rejected. It can be concluded that the work environment variable (X_2) partially has a significant effect on Performance (Y). This research is supported by research conducted by Fayola Zafira et al., (2022) The work environment has a positive and significant influence on the performance of employees of PT. Petrojaya Boral Plasterboard Gresik then research conducted by Siska Yunanti et al., (2022) there is a positive and significant influence between the work environment on the performance of employees of RSIA Asyifa Depok. 4.3.3

3. The Influence of Workload and Work Environment on Performance

The significance value of $0.000 < 0.05$ is obtained from the results of the f test/Simultaneous test. This means that Workload and Work Environment simultaneously have a positive and significant impact on performance. So it can be concluded that the independent variables, namely Workload (X_1) and Work Environment (X_2) together have a positive and significant impact on the Performance variable (Y). The results of the multiple linear regression model are $Y = -1.784 + 0.783 (X_1) + 0.339 (X_2)$, Constant value a = -1.784 can show that if the workload variable (X_1) and work environment (X_2) are negative, which means it shows a negative influence between workload and work environment so that if X_1 and X_2 increase, the only one will be a decrease in performance of 1.784. The coefficient of (b1) = 0.783 coefficient has a positive value indicating that there is a positive influence between workload and performance, so that if X_1 and Y increase by one unit, there will be an increase in performance of 0.783. The coefficient of (b2)

= 0.339 coefficient has a positive value indicating that there is a positive influence between work environment and performance, so that if X_2 and Y increase by one unit, there will be an increase in performance of 0.339. The results of the multiple correlation coefficient test obtained an R value of 0.754, it can be concluded that the results of the study indicate that the multiple coefficient is included in the interval category of 0.600 - 0.799 which has a "strong" relationship level. The R -Squared determination coefficient value of 0.569 or 56.9% can be concluded that the workload variables (X_1) and work environment (X_2) affect employee performance (Y) by 56.9% while the remaining 43.1% is influenced by other factors. Then in the f Test or Simultaneous Test the f count value is 37.559 and the significant value is 0.000. So f count $>$ f table ($37.559 > 4.01$) and significant $0.000 < 0.05$, it can be concluded that the independent variables X_1 and X_2 simultaneously or have a positive and significant impact on the employee performance variable of PT Megatama Abadi IRS (Industrial Rotating Service). This study is supported by previous research conducted by Prima Yulianti et al., (2022). The results of this study prove that workload and work environment have a significant positive effect on the performance of employees of Bank Nagari Syariah Padang Branch, then research conducted by Siska Yunanti et al., (2022) There is a positive and significant influence between workload and work environment on the performance of employees of RSIA Asyifa Depok.

CONCLUSION

Based on the results of the study conducted at PT Megatama Abadi IRS (Industrial Rotating Service), it can be concluded that workload and work environment have a positive and significant influence on employee performance. Workload shows a strong relationship with employee performance, with a determination coefficient of 52.4%, while the work environment also has a strong relationship with employee performance, with a determination coefficient of 41.5%. Simultaneously, these two variables contribute 56.9% to employee performance, indicating that workload and work environment factors have a significant impact on productivity. However, this study has limitations in the scope of the variables studied and limitations in data collection that can affect the accuracy of the results. Therefore, it is recommended that companies pay more attention to the mental burden aspect in the division of labor, improve the quality of the work environment, and develop employee competencies so that they can work more independently. In addition, further research with a wider scope can be conducted to strengthen these findings and develop more effective management strategies.

REFERENCES

- Afandi, P. (2018). *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia: Teori dan Aplikasi*. Yogyakarta: Penerbit ANDI.
- Agustini, R. (2019). *Manajemen Kinerja Karyawan*. Jakarta: Salemba Empat.
- Arikunto, S. (2016). *Prosedur Penelitian: Suatu Pendekatan Praktik*. Jakarta: Rineka Cipta.
- Erlangga, H., Setiawati, T., Riadi, F., Hindarsah, I., & Riani, D. (2024). Adaptive Strategies in Entrepreneurial Ventures: Navigating Uncertainty and Market Dynamics at MSMe. *Jurnal Ekonomi Utama*, 3(1), 1-9.

- Ghozali, I. (2018). *Aplikasi Analisis Multivariate dengan Program IBM SPSS 25*. Semarang: Badan Penerbit Universitas Diponegoro.
- Istijanto. (2018). *Aplikasi Metode Penelitian untuk Bisnis dan Ekonomi*. Jakarta: Gramedia Pustaka Utama.
- Kumala, D., Sunarsi, D., Haryadi, R. N., & Sukardi, D. (2023). The influence of work discipline on employee performance in manufacturing. *Pasundan Social Science Development*, 4(1), 72-77.
- Kusuma, B. W., et al. (2023). Pengaruh Lingkungan Kerja dan Stres Kerja Terhadap Kinerja Karyawan pada PT. Gema Perkasa Electronic Jakarta Barat. *Jurnal Ekonomi Utama*, 2(1), 6-9.
- Mangkunegara, A. P. (2017). *Evaluasi Kinerja Sumber Daya Manusia*. Bandung: Refika Aditama.
- Munandar, A., & Sunyoto, D. (2018). *Psikologi Industri dan Organisasi dalam Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia*. Jakarta: Salemba Empat.
- Mutaqin, A. Z., Shiddieqi, Z., & Firdaus, H. (2024). The Influence Of Training And Industrial Relations On Work Productivity And Its Impact On Employee Performance. *Jurnal Ekonomi Utama*, 3(1), 20-30.
- Priadana, M. S., & Sunarsi, D. (2021). *Metode penelitian kuantitatif*. Pascal Books.
- Priansa, D. J. (2018). *Perilaku Organisasi: Pengelolaan SDM dalam Organisasi*. Bandung: Alfabeta.
- Sedarmayanti. (2017). *Sumber Daya Manusia dan Produktivitas Kerja*. Jakarta: Mandar Maju.
- Silaen, A. (2018). *Teknik Sampling dan Penelitian Kualitatif-Kuantitatif*. Yogyakarta: Penerbit Gava Media.
- Siregar, S. (2017). *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif untuk Ilmu Sosial*. Jakarta: Kencana Prenada Media Group.
- Sugiyono. (2016). *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif, Kualitatif, dan R&D*. Bandung: Alfabeta.
- Sugiyono. (2017). *Statistika untuk Penelitian*. Bandung: Alfabeta.
- Sugiyono. (2018). *Metode Penelitian Bisnis*. Bandung: Alfabeta.
- Sugiyono. (2019). *Metode Penelitian Administrasi*. Bandung: Alfabeta.
- Sugiyono. (2022). *Metode Penelitian Pendidikan: Pendekatan Kuantitatif, Kualitatif, dan R&D*. Bandung: Alfabeta.
- Sutrisno, E. (2014). *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia*. Jakarta: Kencana.
- Wibowo. (2017). *Manajemen Kinerja*. Jakarta: Rajawali Pers.