
THE EFFECT OF WORKLOAD AND WORK ENVIRONMENT ON EMPLOYEE PERFORMANCE AT PT. XYZ IN TANGERANG

Aprilia¹, Aidil Amin Effendy^{2*}

Universitas Pamulang, Tangerang Selatan, Banten, Indonesia

aprilia.aprilialia0204@gmail.com, aidil00967@unpam.ac.id

Article Info

Article history:

Received: May 25, 2025

Revised: June 15, 2025

Accepted: June 25, 2025

Keywords:

Workload,
Environment,
Performance

Work
Employee

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to determine the effect of workload and work environment on employee performance at PT. XYZ both partially and simultaneously. The method used is the associative quantitative method. The sampling technique used is saturated sampling using a sample of 68 respondents. Data collection techniques through primary and secondary data. Data analysis techniques use descriptive statistics, validity tests, reliability tests, normality tests, multicollinearity tests, heteroscedasticity tests, autocorrelation tests, simple linear regression analysis, multiple linear regression analysis, correlation coefficient analysis, determination coefficient analysis, t-test and f-test. The results of this study are that the workload does not significantly influence employee performance with the regression equation $Y = 58.934 - 0.408X_1$, the correlation value of -0.398 means that the relationship between the two variables is negative with a low level of relationship with a coefficient of 15.9%. Hypothesis testing obtained $t_{count} < t_{table}$ (-3.529 < 1.996) then H_0 is accepted and H_1 is rejected meaning that workload does not have a significant effect on employee performance. Work environment affects employee performance with $Y = 1.953 + 0.953X_2$, the correlation value of 0.897 means that the two variables have a very strong level of relationship with a coefficient of 80.5%. Hypothesis testing obtained $t_{count} > t_{table}$ (16.491 > 1.996) then H_0 is rejected and H_2 is accepted meaning that work environment has a significant effect on employee performance. Workload and work environment have a significant effect on employee performance with the regression equation $Y = 9.619 - 0.140X_1 + 0.908X_2$. The correlation value of 0.906 means that the independent variable with the dependent variable has a strong relationship level with a determination coefficient of 81.6% while the remaining 18.4% is influenced by other factors. The hypothesis test obtained the calculated F value > F table (149.662 > 3.14) then H_0 is rejected and H_3 is accepted, meaning that there is a significant simultaneous influence between workload and work environment on employee performance at PT. XYZ in Tangerang.

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



Corresponding Author:

Aidil Amin Effendy

Universitas Pamulang, Tangerang Selatan, Banten, Indonesia

Email: aidil00967@unpam.ac.id

INTRODUCTION

Competition in retail and electronics companies is very tight and can affect the growth of the industry. In Indonesia, the potential for retail and electronics companies is very large, driven by several key factors that make this market very promising. However, without having competitive human resources, a company will experience decline and eventually be eliminated because it is unable to face competitors. As the business world becomes more competitive, every company needs the ability of its employees and other members to strive to achieve the company's strategic goals.

Based on the opinion of Suci R. Mar'ih (2017:22) workload is the quantity of tasks that must be completed, including high work duration, high work pressure, or significant responsibility for the tasks carried out. Excessive workload can have negative impacts, such as physical and mental fatigue, which often trigger negative emotional reactions and lead to decreased employee performance. When the workload is not balanced with individual abilities, these tasks tend to be carried out under duress, which ultimately affects the quality of work results. This will overall have an impact on decreased performance in the related work unit.

There is one aspect that improves employee work performance in an effort to improve performance is the work environment. The work environment affects employee work performance because the condition of the workplace can directly affect comfort and enthusiasm in completing tasks. This statement is in line with that expressed by Sutrisno (2017:32) who stated that the work environment includes all facilities and infrastructure around employees while working, which can affect the implementation of employee tasks.

PT. XYZ is a company engaged in the electronics retail sector by selling products from various well-known brands for household and industrial electrical needs. PT. XYZ has also developed branches in Indonesia. Therefore, it requires workers who are able to help companies or organizations achieve their goals and carry out their functions. There are challenges in managing workloads and targets that may not be realistic or proportional to employee capacity. This condition reflects the need for an evaluation of work time management, distribution of task loads, and the implementation of more consistent SOPs. By making appropriate improvements, the company is expected to create a more conducive work environment, increase employee efficiency, and achieve company targets more effectively. An unsupportive work environment can directly affect employee performance. Environmental problems that interfere with physical, mental and emotional comfort can make employees feel stressed, exhausted, and demotivated. The impact will be very clear on the decline in performance, work efficiency, and quality of employee work results. In addition, this problem can increase employee turnover, which ultimately harms the company.

Meanwhile, in employee performance, there is a need to evaluate work strategies in divisions that have not consistently achieved targets, as well as to maintain the performance of divisions that have succeeded in achieving maximum results. This provides an important picture of the company's performance conditions, which can be used as a basis for improvement and more effective decision-making in the future. Thus, the company needs to take the right steps to maximize performance and maintain sustainability amidst increasingly tight business competition.

The purpose of this study is to determine the effect of workload and work environment on employee performance at PT. XYZ both partially and simultaneously.

Workload

According to Koesomowidjojo (2017:21) "workload is any form of work given to human resources to be completed within a certain period of time". Furthermore, according to Vanchapo (2020:1) "workload is a process or activity that must be completed immediately by a worker within a certain period of time. If a worker is able to complete and adapt to a number of tasks given, then it does not become a workload. However, if the worker is unsuccessful, then the tasks and activities become a workload".

Work environment

According to Sedarmayanti (2017:23) "work environment is a place where there are a number of groups where there are several supporting facilities to achieve company goals according to the company's vision and mission". Meanwhile, according to Afandi (2018:65) "work environment is everything that is around employees and can influence them in carrying out the tasks assigned to them, for example with air conditioning (AC), adequate lighting and so on". Furthermore, according to Nurmansyah (2018:207) "work environment is a place where employees carry out their activities and everything that can help them in carrying out their work according to their authority and responsibilities".

Performance

According to Robbins (2016:260) "performance is a result achieved by employees in their work according to certain criteria that apply to a job". Meanwhile, according to Hasibuan (2017:138) "employee performance is a result achieved by someone in carrying out the tasks assigned to him". Furthermore, according to Sedarmayati (2016:260) "performance is a translation of performance which means it comes from the work results of a worker, a management process or an organization as a whole, where the results of the work must be able to be shown concretely and can be measured".



Figure 1 Thinking Framework

Research Hypothesis

H1: There is an influence of workload on employee performance at PT. XYZ in Tangerang

H2: There is an influence of the work environment on employee performance at PT. XYZ in

Tangerang

H3: There is an influence between workload and work environment on performance employees at PT. XYZ in Tangerang

RESEARCH METHODS

The type of research used in this study is the associative quantitative research method. According to Sugiyono (2016:11) "associative research method is a research that aims to determine the influence or relationship between two or more variables. This research is used to find the relationship between several variables with other variables".

In this study, the population is employees at PT. XYZ, totaling 68 employees. Therefore, the sample to be taken from the population must be truly representative. The sample in this study was 68 people. In this case, the researcher used a saturated sample because it was less than 100. The data collection techniques used in this study are: Primary Data and Secondary Data.

RESEARCH RESULT

Linear Regression Analysis

Table 1. Simple Linear Regression Test X1 Against Y

Coefficientsa					
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t
		B	Std. Error	Beta	
1	(Constant)	58,934	4,884		12,066
	Workload	-.408	.116	-.398	-3,529

a. Dependent Variable: Employee Performance

Source: Results of processing SPSS 26

From the test results listed in the table, the regression equation $Y = 58.934 - 0.408X_1$ is obtained. Based on this equation, the following conclusions can be drawn:

- The constant of 58.934 means that if the workload variable (X_1) does not exist, then there is an employee performance value (Y) of 58.934 points.
- The workload regression coefficient (X_1) of -0.408, which has a negative value, shows that if the constant remains the same and there is no change in the work environment variable (X_2), then every 1 unit increase in workload (X_1) will cause a decrease in employee performance (Y) of 0.408 points.

Table 2. Simple Linear Regression Test X_2 Against Y

Coefficients ^a						
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	1,953	2,467		.791	.432
	Work environment	.953	.058	.897	16,491	.000
a. Dependent Variable: Employee Performance						

Source: Results of processing SPSS 26

Based on the test in the table above, the regression equation $Y = 1.953 + 0.953X_2$ is obtained. From this equation, it can be concluded as follows:

- The constant of 1.953 means that if the work environment variable (X_2) does not exist, then there is an employee performance value (Y) of 1.953 points.
- The work environment regression coefficient (X_2) of 0.953 shows that if the constant remains and there is no change in the workload (X_1), every 1 unit increase in the work environment (X_2) will increase employee performance (Y) by 0.953 points.

Table 3. Multiple Regression Test X_1 and X_2 Against Y

Coefficients ^a						
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	9,619	3.900		2,467	.016
	Workload	-.140	.056	-.136	-2,480	.016
	Work environment	.908	.058	.855	15,540	.000
a. Dependent Variable: Employee Performance						

Source: Results of processing SPSS 26

Based on the test results in the table above, the regression equation $Y = 9.619 - 0.140X_1 + 0.908X_2$ can be obtained. From the equation above, it can be concluded as follows:

- The constant of 9.619 means that if the workload (X1) and work environment (X2) variables do not exist, then there is an employee performance value (Y) of 9.619 points.
- The workload coefficient (X1) of -0.140, which has a negative value, indicates that if the constant remains the same and there is no change in the work environment variable (X2), then every 1 unit increase in workload (X1) will cause a decrease in employee performance (Y) of 0.140 points.
- The work environment regression coefficient (X2) of 0.908 shows that if the workload (X1) remains constant, every 1 unit increase in the work environment (X2) will increase employee performance (Y) by 0.908 points.

Correlation Coefficient Analysis

Table 4. Partial Correlation Coefficient Between X1 and Y

Correlations			
		Workload	Employee performance
Workload	Pearson Correlation	1	-.398**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.001
	N	68	68
Employee performance	Pearson Correlation	-.398**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.001	
	N	68	68

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

Source: Results of processing SPSS 26

From the test results in the table above, the correlation coefficient value is -0.398, which is included in the interval of 0.20 to 0.399. This shows that the relationship between the two variables is negative with a low level of relationship.

Table 5. Partial Correlation Coefficient Between X2 and Y

Correlations			
		Work environment	Employee performance
Work environment	Pearson Correlation	1	.897**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	68	68
Employee performance	Pearson Correlation	.897**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	68	68

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

Source: Results of processing SPSS 26

From the test results in the table above, the correlation coefficient value is 0.897 which is included in the interval of 0.80 to 1.00. This shows that the relationship between the two variables has a very strong level of relationship.

Table 6. Simultaneous Correlation Coefficient Between X1 and X2 Against Y

Model Summary									
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of	Change Statistics				
					R	F	df1	df2	Sig. F

				the Estimate	Square Change	Change			Change
1	.906a	0.822	0.816	3.47522	0.822	149,662	2	65	0,000
a. Predictors: (Constant), Work Environment, Workload									

Source: Results of processing SPSS 26

From the test results in the table above, a correlation coefficient value of 0.906 was obtained. This value is also in the interval of 0.80 to 1.00, which indicates that the two variables have a very strong relationship with employee performance.

Determination Coefficient Analysis

Table 7. Partial Determination Coefficient Between X1 and Y

Model Summary									
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics				
					R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change
1	.398a	.159	.146	748,904	.159	12,451	1	66	.001
a. Predictors: (Constant), Workload									

Source: Results of processing SPSS 26

Based on the test results shown in the table, the coefficient of determination (R Square) value is 0.159, which means that the workload variable (X1) contributes to employee performance (Y) by 15.9%. Meanwhile, the remaining 84.1% is influenced by other factors.

Table 8. Partial Determination Coefficient Between X2 and Y

Model Summary									
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics				
					R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change
1	.897a	.805	.802	360,821	.805	271,963	1	66	.000
a. Predictors: (Constant), Work Environment									

Source: Results of processing SPSS 26

Based on the test results shown in the table, the coefficient of determination (R Square) value is 0.805, which means that the work environment variable (X2) contributes to employee performance (Y) by 80.5%. Meanwhile, the remaining 19.5% is influenced by other factors.

Table 9. Simultaneous Determination Coefficient Between X1 and X2 Against Y

Model Summary									
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics				
					R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change
1	.906a	.822	.816	347,522	.822	149,662	2	65	.000
a. Predictors: (Constant), Work Environment, Workload									

Source: Results of processing SPSS 26

Based on the test results shown in the table, the coefficient of determination value is 0.816. This shows that the two variables affect employee performance by 81.6%, while the remaining 18.4% is influenced by other factors.

Hypothesis Testing

T-test

Table 10. Partial Test (T-Test)X1 Against Y

Coefficients ^a						
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	58,934	4,884		12,066	.000
	Workload	-.408	.116	-.398	-3,529	.001

a. Dependent Variable: Performance

Source: Results of processing SPSS 26

Based on table 4.28, it can be seen that the t-value is $-3.529 < t\text{-table } 1.996$ with a significant value of $0.001 < 0.05$, so H_0 is accepted and H_1 is rejected. This shows that there is no significant influence between workload and employee performance at PT. XYZ.

Table 11. Partial Test (T-Test)X2 Against Y

Coefficients ^a						
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	1,953	2,467		.791	.432
	Work environment	.953	.058	.897	16,491	.000

a. Dependent Variable: Performance

Source: Results of processing SPSS 26

Based on table 4.29, it can be seen that the t-value is $16,491 > t\text{-table } 1.996$ with a significant value of $0.000 < 0.05$, so H_0 is rejected and H_2 is accepted. This shows that there is a significant influence between the Work Environment and Employee Performance at PT. XYZ.

F Test

Table 12. Simultaneous Test (F Test)

ANOVA						
Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	3614.984	2	1807.492	149,662	.000b
	Residual	785,016	65	12,077		
	Total	4400.000	67			

a. Dependent Variable: Employee Performance

b. Predictors: (Constant), Work Environment, Workload

Source: Results of processing SPSS 26

Based on the test shown in the table, it is known that $F_{count} > F_{table}$, namely $(149.662 > 3.14)$ with a significance value $(0.000 < 0.05)$. Therefore, it can be concluded that H_0 is rejected and H_3 is accepted. This shows that simultaneously there is a significant influence between Workload and work environment on employee performance at PT. XYZ.

RESEARCH DISCUSSION

Workload (X1) on Employee Performance (Y)

The results of the study indicate that the regression equation obtained is $Y = 58.934 - 0.408X_1$, with a correlation coefficient of -0.398 indicating a negative relationship with a low level of relationship between the two variables. The coefficient of determination value obtained is 0.159 , which means that the contribution of the influence of workload on employee performance is 15.9% , while the remaining 84.1% is influenced by other factors. In the hypothesis test, the t-count value is obtained which is smaller than the t-table $(-3.529 < 1.996)$, which causes H_0 to be accepted and H_1 to be rejected, so it can be concluded that there is no significant influence between workload and employee performance. The results of this study are in accordance with previous studies that have been conducted and studied by Yusuf Taufik, et al (2023) find results that there is no significant influence between workload and employee performance at PT. X meaning that the higher the workload experienced by employees in working, the lower the employee's performance. The driving factor on the indicator of tasks beyond potential is quite high, meaning that most employees do not always work according to their potential.

Work Environment (X2) on Employee Performance (Y)

The results show that the regression equation obtained is $Y = 1.953 + 0.953X_2$, with a correlation coefficient of 0.897 which indicates a very strong relationship between the two variables. The coefficient of determination value is 0.805 , which means that the contribution of the influence of the work environment on employee performance reaches 80.5% , while the remaining 19.5% is influenced by other factors. In the hypothesis test, the t-count value was obtained which was greater than the t-table $(16.491 > 1.996)$, which resulted in H_0 being rejected and H_2 being accepted, which means that this shows that there is a significant influence between the work environment and employee performance. The results of this study are in accordance with previous research that has been conducted and studied by Herwin Tri Munardi, et al. (2021) found that the work environment had a positive and significant effect on employee performance at PT. National Finance. This shows that the better the condition of the employee's work environment, the more it will improve employee performance.

Workload (X1) and Work Environment (X2) on Employee Performance (Y)

The results show that the workload variable (X_1) and work environment (X_2) have an effect on employee performance, with the regression equation $Y = 9.619 - 0.140X_1 + 0.908X_2$. The correlation coefficient obtained is 0.906 , which indicates a very strong relationship between the independent variable and the dependent variable. The coefficient of determination value obtained is 0.816 , which means that the contribution of the influence of both variables on employee performance reaches 81.6% , while the remaining 18.4% is influenced by other factors. In the hypothesis

test, the Fcount value is greater than Ftable ($149.662 > 3.14$), which causes H_0 to be rejected and H_3 to be accepted, so it can be concluded that simultaneously there is a significant influence between Workload and Work Environment on employee performance. The results of this study are in accordance with previous research that has been conducted and studied by Muh. Gibran Syahrums, et al. (2023) found that the results obtained from the workload and work environment variables simultaneously had a significant effect, so that the lower the workload and the higher the work environment, the higher the employee performance.

CONCLUSION

Based on the research results and discussion, the conclusions in this study are:

- a. Workload does not have a significant effect on Employee Performance at PT. XYZ in Tangerang,
- b. Work Environment has a significant influence on Employee Performance at PT. XYZ in Tangerang,
- c. Workload and Work Environment simultaneously have a significant effect on Employee Performance at PT. XYZ in Tangerang.

Some suggestions put forward by researchers for company development include the following:

- a. Companies can provide time management guidelines and set clear priorities for each task. In addition, companies can also review and redesign existing SOPs or work procedures to be more efficient, and reduce repetitive or unnecessary work. Thus, employees can focus more on the most important and urgent tasks first.
- b. Companies can consider decorations that make the office atmosphere fresher and more enjoyable. By creating an attractive work environment, employees will feel more comfortable and motivated, which can ultimately improve productivity and mood at work.
- c. To be more optimal, companies can set clear targets that can be achieved by each employee, so that they know the expected achievement standards. Conducting regular evaluations and providing feedback will also make employees feel supported and understand areas that need to be improved, so that their performance can be maximized.

REFERENCES

- Affandi, P. (2018). *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia (Teori, Konsep dan Indikator)*. Riau: Zanafa Publishing.
- Afriliani, F. (2020). Pengaruh Beban Kerja dan Lingkungan Kerja Terhadap Kinerja Dosen Tetap Fakultas Keguruan dan Ilmu Pendidikan Universitas Pamulang. *Jurnal Pendidikan, Hukum dan Bisnis*, 5 (1).
- Bela Mulya Oktavia, N. Y. (2024). Pengaruh Beban Kerja dan Lingkungan Kerja Terhadap Kinerja Karyawan PT Mitraida Nusantara Elektrik Divisi Produksi. *NAMARA: Jurnal Manajemen Pratama*, 1 (1).
- Fitria, A. A. (2019, Maret). Pengaruh Lingkungan Kerja dan Stres Kerja Terhadap Kinerja Karyawan (Studi Kasus PT Modernland Realty, Tbk). *Jurnal Ilmiah Manajemen Forkamma*, 49 - 61.

- Hasibuan, H. M. (2017). *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia*. Jakarta: Bumi Aksara.
- Herwin Tri Munardi, T. D. (2021, Agustus). Pengaruh Lingkungan Kerja Terhadap Kinerja Karyawan Pada PT National Finance. *Jurnal ARASTIRMA*, 1 (2), 336 - 346.
- Koesomowidjojo, S. R. (2017). *Panduan Praktis Menyusun Analisis Beban Kerja*. Jakarta: Raih Asa Sukses.
- Malik Abdul Rohman, R. M. (2021). Pengaruh Beban Kerja dan Stres Kerja Terhadap Kinerja Karyawan PT Honda Daya Anugrah Mandiri Cabang Sukabumi. *Jurnal Mahasiswa Manajemen*, 2 (1).
- Mangkunegara, A (2017). *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia*. Bandung: PT Remaja Rosdakarya.
- Meygiha Indrian Tari, A. A. (2024). Pengaruh Beban Kerja dan Stres Kerja Terhadap Prestasi Kerja Perawat di Unit Rawat Jalan Pada Rumah Sakit Umum Khidmat Sehat Afiat Kota Depok. *Cakrawala: Jurnal Ekonomi, Manajemen dan Bisnis*, 295-294.
- Muh. Gibran Syahrums, A. M. (2023, November). Pengaruh Beban Kerja Dan Lingkungan Kerja Terhadap Kinerja Karyawan Pada Rumah Sakit Akademis Jaury Jusuf Putera Makassar. *Jurnal Rimba : Riset Ilmu manajemen Bisnis dan Akuntansi*, 1 (4).
- Robbins. ((2016:260) dalam Bintoro dan Daryanto (2017:207)). *Manajemen Penilaian Kinerja Karyawan*. Penerbit Gaya Media.
- Rocky P Rindorindo, S. M. (2019, Oktober). Pengaruh Beban Kerja, Stres Kerja dan Kepuasan Kerja Terhadap Kinerja Karyawan Hotel Gran Puri. *Jurnal EMBA*, 7 (4).
- Sedermayanti.(2017). *Perencanaan dan Pengembangan SDM untuk Meningkatkan Kompetensi, Kinerja dan Produktivitas Kerja*. Bandung: PT Refika Aditama.
- Sugiyono. (2015). *Metode Penelitian Administrasi: dilengkapi dengan Metode R&D*. Bandung: Alfabeta.
- Sugiyono. (2017). *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif, Kualitatif, dan R&D*. Bandung: Alfabeta.
- Sugiyono. (2019). *Metode Penelitian Bisnis*, 51. Bandung: Alfabeta.
- Yusuf Taufik, F. J. (2023). Pengaruh Beban Kerja dan Perputaran Karyawan Terhadap Kinerja Karyawan. *Jurnal Manuhara: Pusat Penelitian Ilmu Manajemen dan Bisnis*, 230-244.