INTEGRATION: Journal of Multidisciplinary Studies
ISSN 3123-6928 (online)
Vol. 2 Iss. 1 Pg. 172-189
https://ejournal.scmdigi.id/index.php/integration

Balancing workload and workplace conditions: unlocking employee performance in Indonesia's service sector

Asep Achmad Rifa'i[1*], **Asep Suryana**[2]
[1]STIE Pasim Sukabumi, Jawa Barat, Indonesia
[2]Universitas Linggabuana PGRI Sukabumi, Jawa Barat, Indonesia
*Correspondence author: aseprifai1975@gmail.com
DOI: https://doi.org/10.65881/integration.v2i1.245

ARTICLE INFO

History:
Received: 10-22-2026
Revised: 10-27-2026
Accepted: 10-28-2026
Published: 11-06-2026

Keywords:
workload;
work environment;
employee performance;
job demands–resources theory;
service sector.

ABSTRACT

Purpose: to examine how workload and work environment affect employee performance in service-sector companies in Indonesia.
Method: this study employed a quantitative survey approach involving 117 employees from service-sector companies in West Java, Indonesia, selected through purposive sampling. Data were collected using a structured questionnaire with a seven-point Likert scale and analyzed using regression analysis, including validity, reliability, collinearity, and hypothesis testing.
Findings: workload and work environment have positive and significant effects on employee performance. Workload emerges as a stronger predictor than work environment, while both variables collectively explain a substantial proportion of variations in employee performance. These results highlight the importance of balanced workload distribution and a conducive work environment in improving employee performance in Indonesia's service sector.
Implications: organizations should optimize workload distribution according to employee competencies and improve physical and non-physical workplace conditions to strengthen employee performance, productivity, and organizational effectiveness.
Originality: lies in providing empirical evidence on the relationships between workload, work environment, and employee performance by integrating job demands–resources theory in the context of service-sector companies in West Java, Indonesia, and highlighting the complementary roles of job demands and workplace resources in supporting employee performance.

Open access article under CC–BY-SA license.

Introduction

Human resources (HR) are one of an organization's most fundamental strategic assets because they drive organizational activities, operational effectiveness, and the

achievement of corporate objectives (Agha et al., 2025; Gunawan & Mikhail, 2025). In an increasingly competitive business environment shaped by globalization, digitalization, and continuous organizational transformation, managing and developing human resources has become essential to maintaining organizational sustainability and competitive advantage (Budiarti & Firmansyah, 2024; Nastase et al., 2025). Organizational success depends not only on financial resources, technological capabilities, or business strategies but also on the quality, competencies, and performance of employees in executing their responsibilities (Alkhawaldah et al., 2025). Employees who perform optimally contribute to effective strategy implementation, operational productivity, and organizational development (Wahdiniwaty et al., 2026). Therefore, employee performance has become a key concern in human resource management, particularly in the service sector, where organizational effectiveness depends heavily on employees' ability to deliver services efficiently, consistently, and responsively (Mulyono et al., 2024; Poljašević et al., 2025).

From a theoretical perspective, this study is grounded in job demands–resources (JD-R) theory, which explains that employee performance is influenced by the interaction between job demands and job resources in the workplace. Job demands refer to physical, psychological, social, and organizational aspects of work that require sustained effort (Li et al., 2025). In contrast, job resources represent factors that facilitate work achievement, reduce job demands, and support employee development (Demerouti, 2025). Within this framework, workload is an important job demand, while the work environment is an essential organizational resource (Mandala et al., 2025). Excessive job demands may consume employees' physical and psychological energy, potentially reducing their capacity to perform optimally (Rudolph et al., 2026). Conversely, adequate workplace resources can facilitate task accomplishment, improve work effectiveness, and support positive employee outcomes (Asamani et al., 2025). This theoretical perspective aligns with the broader human resource management view that employee performance is shaped not only by individual competencies but also by an organization's capacity to allocate resources, manage job demands, and establish supportive working conditions (Jiang et al., 2026). Accordingly, workload and the work environment provide two complementary perspectives for explaining variations in employee performance (Zebua & Nugraheni, 2025).

Workload is an important organizational factor because it reflects the volume, complexity, and time requirements of tasks assigned to employees (Giotopoulos et al., 2025). Workload as an accumulation of work activities involving task demands that must be completed within a specified period and require physical, mental, and psychological effort (Harahap & Triastuti, 2026). Workload can be evaluated across several dimensions, including the amount of work, time available, task complexity, and the fit between job requirements and employees' capabilities (Bassi et al., 2025). When workload exceeds employees' capacity, it may create work pressure, fatigue, and difficulty maintaining work quality and productivity. In contrast, an appropriately distributed workload can encourage employees to utilize their competencies effectively and complete their responsibilities efficiently. Bruggen (2015) emphasizes that the relationship between workload and performance is an important organizational issue because workload conditions can influence employees' ability to achieve expected performance outcomes. Therefore, workload management should consider not only the quantity of assigned tasks but also employees' competencies, working time, and available organizational resources.

Beyond workload, the work environment is another key determinant of employee performance. The work environment includes the equipment and materials employees use, the physical conditions of the workplace, and work methods and arrangements, both individually and collectively (Vinberg et al., 2026). The work environment can generally be classified into two dimensions: the physical work environment, which includes workplace facilities, equipment, lighting, temperature, and spatial conditions; and the non-physical work environment, which includes interpersonal relationships, communication, organizational support, and social interactions among employees and management. A conducive work environment gives employees a sense of comfort, security, and support, enabling them to focus on their responsibilities and perform their work effectively. Conversely, inadequate facilities, uncomfortable working conditions, and unsupportive workplace relationships can hinder task completion and reduce employee effectiveness. The importance of organizational conditions in shaping employee performance also highlights management and leadership's broader role in establishing supportive workplace practices (Suparman et al., 2024).

These issues are especially relevant in Indonesia's service sector, where employee performance is closely linked to operational efficiency, service quality, and customer satisfaction. Employees in service organizations frequently face demanding work schedules, diverse customer expectations, time-sensitive responsibilities, and the need to maintain consistent service standards. These conditions require organizations to balance workload distribution with adequate facilities and supportive workplace conditions. However, the preliminary survey for this study indicates that employees are dissatisfied with their current workloads and work environments and perceive their performance as not yet optimal. This preliminary finding suggests a potential mismatch between assigned responsibilities, employees' available capabilities, workplace infrastructure, and the organizational support required to accomplish their tasks. These circumstances raise an important managerial concern: employees may be unable to perform at their best when work demands are disproportionate to their capacity or when workplace conditions fail to support effective task execution. Nevertheless, the extent to which workload and the work environment explain employee performance in the Indonesian service sector requires further empirical examination.

Previous empirical studies have examined the relationship between workload and employee performance, although their findings indicate that this relationship remains context-dependent. Research by Irawati & Carollina (2017); Rolos et al. (2018); Dendeng et al. (2020); Neksen et al. (2021); Siburian et al. (2021); and Silva et al. (2021) provides empirical evidence concerning the relevance of workload in explaining employee performance across different organizational settings. Other studies have also shown that workload is associated with employee satisfaction, motivation, and work achievement, indicating that its consequences extend beyond immediate task completion (Hardono et al., 2019; Talo et al., 2020; Uma & Swasti, 2024). Nevertheless, workload should not automatically be interpreted as uniformly negatively related to performance because its effects may depend on task characteristics, employee capabilities, and the availability of organizational resources. This consideration reinforces the importance of investigating workload within a specific organizational and sectoral context rather than generalizing findings across different industries.

Similarly, the work environment has received considerable attention as a factor associated with employee performance and organizational effectiveness. Previous studies by Malik et al. (2011); Gunaseelan & Ollukkaran (2012); Hafeez et al. (2019);

Dendeng et al. (2020); Jannah & Pradana (2021); Rahmawati et al. (2021); and Salsabiila & Hidayati (2023) have examined the relationship between workplace conditions and employee-related outcomes. These studies generally emphasize that adequate physical facilities, comfortable working conditions, and positive workplace interactions can help employees complete their responsibilities effectively. Furthermore, research by Ardianti et al. (2018); Novita & Kusuma (2021); and Uma & Swasti (2024) indicates that workplace conditions also affect employee satisfaction, which may contribute to broader organizational outcomes. Although these findings establish the importance of the work environment, further investigation remains necessary to understand its contribution to employee performance in service organizations, particularly when considered alongside workload as a distinct organizational factor.

Despite the substantial literature on workload, the work environment, and employee performance, several research opportunities remain. First, previous studies have predominantly investigated these relationships in specific organizations or industries, including manufacturing companies, public institutions, healthcare facilities, and other individual organizational settings. Consequently, the extent to which their findings can explain employee performance across the broader Indonesian service sector remains insufficiently established. Second, although workload and the work environment have frequently been examined as predictors of employee performance, interpreting them within an integrated job demands–resources framework offers an opportunity to strengthen the theoretical explanation of how organizational demands and resources relate to performance outcomes. Third, differences in organizational characteristics, employee responsibilities, and workplace conditions indicate the importance of examining these relationships within a clearly defined empirical context. Accordingly, this study's novelty lies in its contextual application of the Job Demands–Resources perspective to examine workload as a job demand and the work environment as a job resource in explaining employee performance in Indonesia's service sector. Rather than claiming that the individual relationships have never been investigated, this study seeks to extend existing empirical knowledge through a sector-specific examination supported by preliminary evidence of employee dissatisfaction and suboptimal performance.

Based on these considerations, this study examines the influence of workload and the work environment on employee performance in Indonesia's service sector. The study has both theoretical and practical significance. Theoretically, it is expected to enrich the human resource management literature by providing empirical evidence on the relevance of job demands and organizational resources in explaining employee performance within the Indonesian service-sector context. It also seeks to strengthen the application of the job demands–resources theory by examining the distinct contributions of workload and the work environment to performance outcomes. Practically, the findings are expected to provide valuable insights for organizational managers and human resource practitioners to design more balanced workload distributions, improve workplace facilities, strengthen interpersonal relationships, and establish supportive working conditions. These efforts matter because employee performance is not merely an individual responsibility but also an outcome shaped by organizational decisions about work allocation and providing adequate resources. Ultimately, the study is expected to contribute to more effective human resource management practices that support employee productivity, service quality, and organizational sustainability.

The research hypotheses are based on the theoretical relationship between job demands, job resources, and employee performance, as well as findings from previous empirical studies. Regarding workload, the job demands–resources theory suggests that excessive job demands require greater physical and psychological effort, potentially depleting employees' energy and reducing their ability to perform optimally. When the volume and complexity of assigned tasks exceed employees' capacity and available work time, they may experience fatigue, work pressure, and reduced effectiveness. This theoretical argument is supported by empirical research examining workload and employee performance, including Irawati & Carollina (2017); Rolos et al. (2018); Dendeng et al. (2020); Neksen et al. (2021); and Silva et al. (2021). Therefore, workload is expected to influence employee performance significantly. Accordingly, the first hypothesis is formulated as follows: H_1: Workload has a positive and significant influence on employee performance.

Furthermore, the job demands–resources theory explains that adequate job resources facilitate task accomplishment, help employees manage work demands, and support organizational objectives. In this study, the work environment is positioned as an organizational resource encompassing physical facilities, workplace comfort, work arrangements, and supportive social relationships. A conducive work environment enables employees to concentrate, coordinate effectively, and perform their responsibilities more efficiently. Conversely, an inadequate work environment may create operational barriers and undermine employees' ability to achieve expected performance standards. This proposition is consistent with previous empirical studies by Malik et al. (2011); Gunaseelan & Ollukkaran (2012); Hafeez et al. (2019); Dendeng et al. (2020); Jannah & Pradana (2021); and Salsabiila & Hidayati (2023), which highlight the relevance of workplace conditions to employee performance. Thus, the work environment is expected to influence employee performance significantly. Based on this theoretical and empirical foundation, the second hypothesis is formulated as follows: H_2: The work environment has a positive and significant influence on employee performance.

Method

This study employs a quantitative research approach using a survey design to examine the relationships between workload, work environment, and employee performance. The survey method is considered appropriate for systematically collecting empirical data from respondents and examining theoretically established relationships among research constructs (Agranoff & Kolpakov, 2019). The research adopts a causal explanatory framework in which workload and work environment are independent variables, while employee performance is the dependent variable. The proposed relationships are examined through empirical parameter estimation and statistical hypothesis testing to determine how much the independent variables explain variation in employee performance (Wahdiniwaty et al., 2025).

The research respondents were 117 employees working in service-sector companies in West Java, Indonesia. Respondents were selected using a purposive sampling technique, whereby participants were included based on their relevance to the research objectives and their experience working in service-sector organizations. This technique enables researchers to obtain information from individuals with characteristics relevant to the variables being investigated (D. Firmansyah & Dede, 2022). The final dataset comprised 117 complete and valid questionnaires, all of which were retained for subsequent statistical analysis.

Primary data served as the main source of information for testing the proposed research hypotheses. Data were collected through observation, interviews, and the administration of structured questionnaires. The research instrument used a seven-point Likert scale, ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree), to measure respondents' perceptions of workload, work environment, and employee performance. The questionnaire was distributed through Google Forms between April and June 2026. The distribution process was conducted through WhatsApp and direct face-to-face interactions with eligible respondents during the survey and data collection period. These procedures were intended to facilitate respondent participation and obtain sufficiently complete empirical information for the research analysis.

This study examines three principal constructs: workload (WL), work environment (WE), and employee performance (EP). Workload is measured using ten indicators (WL1–WL10), organized into three dimensions that reflect the demands and responsibilities associated with employees' assigned tasks. Work environment is operationalized through fourteen indicators (WE1–WE14), grouped into two dimensions representing the physical and non-physical aspects of workplace conditions. Meanwhile, employee performance is measured using twelve indicators (EP1–EP12), classified into four dimensions that represent different aspects of employees' work outcomes and task accomplishment. All indicators are measured using the same seven-point Likert scale to ensure consistency in the assessment of the research constructs.

Before hypothesis testing, researchers evaluate the research instrument's quality and the suitability of the collected data through validity and reliability assessments. Indicator validity is examined using the item-total correlation approach, with a correlation coefficient above 0.30 as the minimum acceptance criterion (I. Firmansyah et al., 2023; Gujarati, 2021; Suparman et al., 2024). Construct reliability is assessed using Cronbach's alpha (Cα), with a coefficient exceeding 0.70 indicating an acceptable level of internal consistency among the measurement indicators (Black & Babin, 2019; Budiarti & Firmansyah, 2025; Hair et al., 2020). Furthermore, a full collinearity assessment is conducted to identify potential multicollinearity and common method bias concerns, using a Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) threshold below 3.3 as the recommended criterion (Kock, 2023; Kock & Dow, 2025). The relationships among the research variables are also examined through correlation analysis, with an absolute correlation coefficient below 0.80 considered indicative of the absence of excessively high bivariate correlations.

The data analysis procedure consists of descriptive and inferential statistical assessments, followed by hypothesis testing. The regression model's explanatory power is evaluated using the coefficient of determination (R^2), which indicates the proportion of variance in employee performance explained by the independent variables. The interpretation of R^2 follows the classification adopted in this study: values below 0.25 indicate very low explanatory power, values from 0.25 to below 0.50 indicate low explanatory power, values from 0.50 to below 0.75 indicate moderate explanatory power, and values of 0.75 or higher indicate strong explanatory power (Marselia & Firmansyah, 2025). Finally, the proposed hypotheses are evaluated using t-statistics to determine the significance of the individual relationships between workload and employee performance (H_1) and between work environment and employee performance (H_2). Statistical significance is determined at the 5% significance level ($\alpha = 0.05$), with a critical t-value of 1.96 for a two-tailed test. The hypotheses are supported when the estimated effects satisfy the applicable statistical significance criteria.

Results and discussion

Instrument testing and research data quality assessment

The results of the instrument assessment indicate that all measurement indicators used to operationalize the three research constructs, workload, work environment, and employee performance, meet the established validity and reliability requirements. These findings show that the research instruments can measure the intended constructs consistently and adequately, providing a sound basis for subsequent statistical analysis and hypothesis testing. Furthermore, the collinearity assessment indicates that the relationships among the independent latent variables meet the recommended statistical criteria, with all variance inflation factor (VIF) values below the threshold of 3.3 (VIF < 3.3). This finding suggests that the research model does not exhibit problematic levels of multicollinearity or full collinearity concerns. Overall, the instrument quality and data assessment results confirm that the collected data meet the required preliminary statistical criteria and are suitable for proceeding to the subsequent stage of structural model evaluation and hypothesis testing.

Predictive correlation analysis

Predictive correlation analysis was conducted to examine the strength, direction, and significance of the relationships among the three research constructs: workload (WL), work environment (WE), and employee performance (EP). This assessment was performed at the construct level using Pearson's correlation coefficients. To identify potentially excessively high correlations among the constructs, we applied a threshold of 0.80; correlation coefficients below this value indicate that the relationships do not exceed the established criterion. The results of the correlation analysis are presented in Table 1.

Table 1 correlation analysis results for WL, WE, and EP

Variables	WL	WE	EP
WL	-	<0.80**	0.718**
WE	<0.80**	-	0.585**
EP	0.718**	0.585**	-

Source: primary data, processed

As presented in Table 1, all observed correlation coefficients among the research constructs remain below the established threshold of 0.80, indicating that no excessively high correlations are identified. Specifically, workload (WL) shows a positive and statistically significant correlation with employee performance (EP), with r = 0.718 (p < 0.01). This result indicates a strong positive association, suggesting that variations in workload are accompanied by corresponding variations in employee performance. Furthermore, workload (WL) also demonstrates a positive association with the work environment (WE), although the specific correlation coefficient is not reported in the available results. Meanwhile, the correlation between work environment (WE) and employee performance (EP) is positive and statistically significant, with r = 0.585 (p < 0.01), indicating a moderate positive relationship. Overall, these findings show that the three constructs are positively related, but none of the reported correlation coefficients exceed the specified threshold. The results also provide preliminary evidence that workload and the work environment help explain employee performance. Nevertheless, correlation coefficients indicate associations rather than causal effects; therefore, the proposed research hypotheses require further examination through regression analysis.

Hypothesis testing

Hypothesis testing was conducted to examine the individual effects of workload (WL) and work environment (WE) on employee performance (EP). The analysis evaluated the direction, magnitude, and statistical significance of the estimated relationships using regression coefficients (β), t-statistics, and significance values (p-values). Statistical decisions were made at a 5% significance level (α = 0.05), with a critical t-value of 1.96 for a two-tailed test. In addition, the coefficient of determination (R^2) was examined to assess the explanatory power of the regression model. The results of the hypothesis testing and model evaluation are presented in Table 2.

Table 2 result of hypothesis testing

Hypothesis	β	R^2	t-Statistics	Sig.
H_1: WL → EP	0.495	0.516	6.031***	0.000
H_2: WE → EP`	0.295	0.342	3.525**	0.001
R-Square		0.607		
F-Statistics			78.052***	0.000[b]

Source: primary data, processed

As shown in Table 2, both proposed hypotheses are statistically supported, indicating that workload and work environment have positive, significant relationships with employee performance. First, workload has a positive and statistically significant effect on employee performance, with a regression coefficient of β = 0.495, a t-statistic of 6.031, and p < 0.001. Since the t-statistic exceeds the critical value of 1.96 and the significance level is below 0.05, H_1 is supported. This finding indicates that workload is positively associated with employee performance, suggesting that variations in workload are accompanied by corresponding changes in employees' performance levels. Second, work environment also exhibits a positive and statistically significant effect on employee performance, as indicated by a regression coefficient of β = 0.295, a t-statistic of 3.525, and a significance value of p = 0.001. These results satisfy the established statistical criteria; therefore, H_2 is also supported. This finding demonstrates that a more supportive work environment is positively associated with employee performance.

Furthermore, the coefficient of determination (R^2) for the overall regression model is 0.607, indicating that workload and work environment collectively explain 60.7% of the variation in employee performance. The remaining 39.3% is attributable to other factors not included in the present research model. The F-statistic of 78.052, with a significance value of p < 0.001, additionally indicates that the overall regression model is statistically significant. This result provides supplementary evidence that the regression model has explanatory relevance. Overall, the findings confirm that both workload and work environment significantly predict employee performance, with workload showing a larger estimated regression coefficient than work environment. Nevertheless, interpreting their relative contributions should account for the measurement scales and the standardization of the regression coefficients.

The effect of workload on employee performance

This study's findings confirm that workload positively and significantly influences employee performance. This result indicates that workload represents an important organizational factor in determining how effectively employees perform their assigned responsibilities and achieve established work objectives. The positive relationship suggests that an appropriately structured workload can encourage employees to optimize their competencies, demonstrate greater responsibility, and

maintain productivity in completing their tasks. In this context, workload should not necessarily be interpreted as a factor that reduces employee performance, since its influence depends on how responsibilities are designed, distributed, and managed within an organization. Rather, workload can become a productive mechanism through which employees utilize their knowledge, skills, experience, and available resources to accomplish organizational objectives. These findings emphasize that employee performance is not determined solely by individual capabilities but is also influenced by the extent to which organizational demands are aligned with employees' capacities and working conditions.

Furthermore, the findings indicate that the relationship between workload and employee performance should be understood in terms of the appropriateness of assigned responsibilities rather than simply the quantity of work employees must complete. A manageable workload can provide employees with sufficient challenges to develop their capabilities, improve task completion, and achieve better work outcomes. Conversely, excessive responsibilities, unrealistic deadlines, and overlapping tasks may create physical and psychological pressure that interferes with employees' ability to maintain performance quality. This interpretation is consistent with Bruggen (2015), who explains that the relationship between workload and performance is influenced by the characteristics and intensity of work demands. Optimal performance requires a balance between the quantity and quality of completed work, as well as employees' ability to manage their responsibilities within available working time. Therefore, the positive relationship identified in this study suggests that workload can contribute to employee performance when work demands remain proportionate to employees' competencies, qualifications, and available working resources.

The findings are also supported by previous empirical studies conducted by Rolos et al. (2018); Irawati & Carollina (2017); Surijadi & Musa (2020); and Neksen et al. (2021), which identify workload as an important factor associated with employee performance. Similarly, Firmansyah & Wahdiniwaty (2017) emphasize the importance of considering workload alongside individual characteristics and workplace conditions when examining employee performance. These studies show that workload management is closely related to organizational effectiveness because employees must complete their responsibilities within specific operational requirements. Nevertheless, the present findings also highlight the importance of distinguishing between productive workload and excessive workload. Productive workload gives employees opportunities to use their capabilities and contribute to organizational targets, whereas excessive workload may exceed their physical, mental, and psychological capacities. Thus, the present study reinforces previous empirical evidence by emphasizing that effective workload management should focus on the compatibility between assigned responsibilities and employee capabilities rather than indiscriminately reducing or increasing workloads.

From the perspective of the job demands–resources (JD-R) theory, workload represents an important job demand because employees must allocate physical, cognitive, and psychological resources to complete their assigned responsibilities. However, job demands do not necessarily generate negative consequences in every organizational situation. When employees possess adequate competencies and receive sufficient organizational support, manageable job demands can stimulate effort, encourage work engagement, and facilitate the achievement of performance objectives. Conversely, excessive job demands that are not accompanied by adequate resources may generate fatigue, work-related stress, and declining performance. This theoretical

perspective explains the positive relationship identified in the present study: workload can function as a performance-related demand when employees have sufficient capacity and resources to manage their responsibilities. This interpretation aligns with Firmansyah et al (2023), who emphasizes the importance of considering work complexity, effective working hours, and employee qualifications in workload management. It also complements Bruggen (2015), whose findings demonstrate that the relationship between workload and performance depends on the characteristics of work demands. Accordingly, this study reinforces the application of JD-R theory by illustrating the importance of balancing organizational demands with employee capabilities and available resources to achieve sustainable performance.

In Indonesia's service sector, workload management is especially important because employees often face changing customer expectations, tight deadlines, multiple responsibilities, and demands for consistent service delivery. Employees may be required to perform several activities simultaneously while maintaining responsiveness, accuracy, and service quality. These circumstances require organizations to ensure that responsibility distribution aligns with employees' educational backgrounds, professional experience, job specifications, and individual working capacities. The preliminary survey in this study identified employee dissatisfaction with current workload conditions, suggesting that responsibility distribution may not always match employees' expectations and available capacity. This situation indicates that organizations need to evaluate not only how much work employees receive but also whether the nature and complexity of assigned tasks are appropriate. For example, employees with clearly defined responsibilities, realistic deadlines, and adequate operational support may be better positioned to maintain productivity than those with overlapping responsibilities and insufficient time to complete their tasks. Therefore, the positive relationship identified in this research should not be interpreted as evidence that continuously increasing workload will improve employee performance. Instead, it emphasizes the importance of creating a balanced workload system that supports productivity while protecting employees from excessive work pressure.

These findings have important managerial implications for organizations seeking to improve employee performance through effective human resource management. Management should establish systematic workload evaluation practices by considering task volume, task complexity, effective working hours, employee competencies, and job specifications. Clear job descriptions and appropriate task allocation are necessary to minimize overlapping responsibilities and ensure that employees understand their individual obligations. Organizations should also provide relevant training, sufficient operational resources, and opportunities for employees to communicate difficulties associated with their assigned workloads. Furthermore, workload monitoring should be conducted periodically to identify imbalances in task distribution and potential sources of excessive work pressure. In the context of digital transformation, organizations can utilize appropriate digital technologies to facilitate task coordination, monitor work distribution, and improve operational efficiency. These initiatives should be paired with ongoing employee development to keep individual competencies aligned with evolving organizational requirements. Ultimately, the findings suggest that improving employee performance does not necessarily require reducing workload across the organization; rather, it requires developing a proportionate workload management system that balances organizational demands with employee capabilities, thereby supporting productivity, employee well-being, and sustainable organizational performance.

The effect of work environment on employee performance

This study's findings show that the work environment positively and significantly influences employee performance. This result indicates that workplace conditions are an important organizational factor in supporting employees' ability to carry out their responsibilities and achieve expected performance outcomes. A conducive work environment provides employees with the physical facilities, operational support, interpersonal relationships, and organizational conditions necessary to perform their tasks effectively. The positive relationship suggests that improvements in workplace conditions are associated with improvements in employee performance because employees can concentrate more effectively, coordinate their activities, and complete their responsibilities with fewer operational obstacles. Consequently, the work environment should not be regarded merely as a supporting element of organizational operations but as an essential component of human resource management that facilitates employee effectiveness and organizational productivity. These findings emphasize that employee performance depends not only on individual competencies and workload distribution but also on the quality of the environment in which employees perform their daily responsibilities.

The findings further indicate that the work environment influences employee performance through both physical and non-physical workplace conditions. The physical work environment includes workplace facilities, equipment, lighting, ventilation, spatial arrangements, cleanliness, and technological infrastructure that support organizational activities. Meanwhile, the non-physical work environment involves interpersonal relationships, communication, teamwork, supervisory support, and the overall organizational atmosphere. Both dimensions help create working conditions that enable employees to perform their responsibilities effectively. An adequate physical environment can reduce operational obstacles and support employee concentration, while a positive non-physical environment can encourage cooperation, communication, and constructive interactions among organizational members. This interpretation is particularly relevant to Vinberg et al. (2026), who explains that the work environment includes the equipment and materials employees use, the physical workplace, work methods, and the organization of work, including individual and group arrangements. Therefore, the findings suggest that organizations should approach workplace improvement comprehensively by considering both physical facilities and the social conditions that shape employees' daily work experiences.

The results are supported by previous empirical research conducted by Malik et al. (2011); Gunaseelan & Ollukkaran (2012); Rahmawati & Wajdi (2014); Hafeez et al. (2019); Jannah & Pradana (2021); Rahmawati et al. (2021); and Silva et al. (2021), which demonstrate the relevance of workplace conditions to employee performance. Together, these studies indicate that a supportive work environment can help employees complete their responsibilities, maintain work effectiveness, and achieve organizational targets. Furthermore, the findings complement Ardianti et al. (2018) and Novita & Kusuma (2021), which emphasize the relationship between workplace conditions and employee satisfaction. Although employee satisfaction and employee performance are different organizational outcomes, both matter for understanding how workplace conditions shape employees' attitudes and behavior. A comfortable, supportive work environment can encourage employees to stay focused, build positive working relationships, and show greater commitment to their responsibilities. In addition, Hafeez et al. (2019) highlight the relevance of workplace conditions to employee health, offering further insight into how physical and organizational

conditions may support sustained employee performance. Thus, the present study reinforces previous findings by demonstrating that the work environment remains an important organizational factor in explaining employee performance, particularly within the Indonesian service-sector context.

The relationship between the work environment and employee performance can be further explained through the job demands–resources (JD-R) theory, which positions the work environment as an important source of job resources. Job resources refer to organizational conditions that facilitate task accomplishment, reduce the difficulties associated with job demands, and help employees achieve their work objectives. In this study, the physical work environment represents resources such as adequate facilities, operational equipment, comfortable working spaces, and supporting technological infrastructure. Meanwhile, the non-physical work environment includes resources such as effective communication, positive interpersonal relationships, teamwork, supervisory support, and constructive organizational interactions. These resources help employees manage their responsibilities more effectively, particularly when they encounter demanding operational situations. This theoretical explanation aligns with Hafeez et al. (2019), who emphasize the importance of workplace conditions for employee health and performance, and Gunaseelan & Ollukkaran (2012), who highlight the work environment's contribution to employee performance. It also complements Vinberg et al. (2026) perspective concerning the physical and non-physical dimensions of workplace conditions. Accordingly, these findings strengthen the application of JD-R Theory by showing that organizational resources embedded in the work environment are positively associated with employee performance. A supportive work environment enables employees to use their competencies more effectively while managing the demands of their responsibilities.

In the practical context of Indonesia's service sector, the work environment has substantial implications because employees are required to interact continuously with customers, colleagues, supervisors, and other organizational stakeholders. Adequate facilities, comfortable workspaces, reliable equipment, and appropriate technological support can facilitate operations and improve the consistency of service delivery. Equally important, a positive non-physical environment characterized by effective communication, mutual respect, teamwork, and supportive leadership can encourage employees to coordinate their responsibilities and resolve workplace challenges constructively. Nevertheless, the preliminary survey conducted in this study identified employee dissatisfaction with existing workplace conditions. This suggests that some organizational environments may not fully accommodate employees' operational needs and expectations. Inadequate facilities, uncomfortable working conditions, communication barriers, and interpersonal conflicts may create unnecessary obstacles that interfere with employees' concentration and effectiveness. These conditions become particularly relevant when employees must maintain service quality while responding to changing customer expectations and operational requirements. Therefore, the positive relationship identified in this research highlights the importance of improving both physical and non-physical workplace conditions to help employees achieve optimal performance. Organizations should recognize that workplace conditions are not merely operational considerations but also strategic resources that influence the effectiveness of their human resources.

From a managerial perspective, these findings suggest that organizations should view a conducive work environment as a strategic investment in employee performance and organizational sustainability. Management should prioritize the availability,

adequacy, and maintenance of workplace facilities, operational equipment, comfortable working spaces, and supporting digital infrastructure. In addition, organizations need to strengthen the non-physical work environment through effective communication, collaborative working relationships, employee participation, supportive leadership, and constructive conflict management. Supervisors should actively identify workplace barriers and encourage employees to communicate their concerns regarding the conditions under which they perform their responsibilities. Regular workplace evaluations are also necessary to ensure that organizational facilities and working arrangements remain aligned with employees' operational requirements.

Furthermore, developing digital capabilities and integrating appropriate technologies can improve coordination and support more effective organizational processes. These initiatives are increasingly important in the context of digital transformation, where employee competencies, technological resources, and organizational adaptability contribute to business competitiveness (Budiarti & Firmansyah, 2024; Purnama et al., 2022). Collaboration and organizational alignment also become increasingly important in responding to changing business conditions (Saepuloh, 2022; Suparman & Purnama, 2025). Ultimately, the findings emphasize that improving employee performance requires more than individual effort; it also requires an organizational environment that provides adequate resources, promotes collaboration, and supports employees in achieving shared organizational objectives.

Conclusions

This study's findings confirm that workload and work environment have positive, significant relationships with employee performance in the service sector in West Java, Indonesia. Workload represents an important factor in supporting employee performance when assigned responsibilities are distributed proportionately and aligned with employees' competencies, qualifications, and working capacities. Similarly, a conducive work environment, encompassing both physical facilities and non-physical workplace conditions, provides essential support for employees to accomplish their responsibilities effectively. These findings indicate that employee performance is not determined solely by individual capabilities but also by how organizations manage work demands and provide adequate workplace resources. From the perspective of job demands–resources (JD-R) theory, the findings reinforce the importance of balancing job demands with available organizational resources to support employee effectiveness and sustainable performance.

This study provides theoretical, empirical, and practical contributions to human resource management, particularly in the context of service-sector organizations in Indonesia. Theoretically, it contributes to the application of JD-R theory by highlighting the relevance of workload as a job demand and the work environment as a job resource in explaining employee performance. Empirically, it provides additional evidence concerning the relationships between these organizational factors and employee performance within the Indonesian service-sector context. Practically, the findings suggest that organizational management should distribute workloads evenly, align job responsibilities with employee competencies, improve workplace facilities, strengthen interpersonal relationships, and establish supportive working conditions. Nevertheless, this study has several limitations. The research involved a relatively limited sample of 117 respondents selected through purposive sampling from service-sector companies in West Java, which may restrict the generalizability of the findings to other sectors and geographical contexts. Furthermore, the cross-sectional survey design and reliance on

self-reported questionnaire responses may limit the ability to capture changes in employee performance over time and establish causal relationships among the research variables.

Future research should address these limitations by including larger, more diverse samples from different geographical regions and industrial sectors to improve the generalizability of the findings. Researchers are also encouraged to employ longitudinal research designs to examine how changes in workload and workplace conditions influence employee performance over time. Furthermore, subsequent studies could incorporate additional variables, such as work motivation, job satisfaction, work engagement, leadership style, organizational culture, employee well-being, and digital competencies, to develop a more comprehensive understanding of the factors influencing employee performance. Including mediating and moderating variables may also provide deeper insights into the mechanisms through which workload and work environment relate to employee performance. In addition, future investigations could examine the role of digital transformation and technological support in facilitating workload management and creating more conducive working environments. Such research directions are expected to enrich the theoretical development of human resource management, provide stronger empirical evidence, and offer more comprehensive managerial recommendations for improving employee performance and organizational competitiveness in an increasingly dynamic business environment.

References

Agha, H. N. A., Eyupoglu, S. Z., & Tashtoush, L. (2025). The Relationship Between Human Resource Management Practices and Organizational Innovation: The Mediated Role of Human Capital Within the Banking Sector in North Iraq. *Sustainability*, *17*(14), 6330. https://doi.org/10.3390/su17146330

Agranoff, R., & Kolpakov, A. (2019). Researching networks through sequential explanatory design. In *Networks and Collaboration in the Public Sector* (pp. 20–44). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315544939-2

Alkhawaldah, R. A., Alshalabi, F. S., Alshawabkeh, Z. A. E., Almarshad, M. N., Al-Tahrawi, M. H., & Alshawabkeh, T. Z. A. (2025). The role of e-government in organizational effectiveness: The mediating role of administrative empowerment. *Human Systems Management*, *44*(3), 432–447. https://doi.org/10.1177/01672533241295510

Ardianti, F. E., Qomariah, N., & Wibowo, Y. G. (2018). Pengaruh Motivasi Kerja, Kompensasi Dan Lingkungan Kerja Terhadap Kepuasan Kerja Karyawan (Studi Kasus Pada PT. Sumber Alam Santoso Pratama Karangsari Banyuwangi). *Jurnal Sains Manajemen Dan Bisnis Indonesia*, *8*(1), 13–31. https://doi.org/10.32528/smbi.v8i1.1764

Asamani, L., Coleman, R. A., Senayah, W. K., & Oppong, S. (2025). Interactive roles of resource availability, role clarity and employee motivation in enhancing organisational effectiveness through employee performance and job satisfaction. *Discover Psychology*, *5*(1), 12. https://doi.org/10.1007/s44202-025-00333-8

Bassi, G., Orso, V., Salcuni, S., & Gamberini, L. (2025). Understanding Workers' Well-Being and Cognitive Load in Human-Cobot Collaboration: Systematic Review. *Journal of Medical Internet Research*, *27*, e75658. https://doi.org/10.2196/75658

Black, W., & Babin, B. J. (2019). Multivariate Data Analysis: Its Approach, Evolution, and Impact. In *The Great Facilitator* (pp. 121–130). Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-06031-2_16

Bruggen, A. (2015). An empirical investigation of the relationship between workload and performance. *Management Decision*, *53*(10), 2377–2389. https://doi.org/10.1108/MD-02-2015-0063

Budiarti, I., & Firmansyah, D. (2024). Innovatoion capability: Digital transformation of human resources and digital talent in SMEs. *Journal of Eastern European and Central Asian Research (JEECAR)*, *11*(3), 621–637. https://doi.org/10.15549/jeecar.v11i3.1709

Budiarti, I., & Firmansyah, D. (2025). *Sustainable SMEs Performance: Knowledge Management, Human Resources Digital Transformation, and Innovation Capabilities – A Practical Approach to Business in the Digital Age*. https://doi.org/10.20944/preprints202502.1713.v1

Demerouti, E. (2025). Job demands-resources and conservation of resources theories: How do they help to explain employee well-being and future job design? *Journal of Business Research*, *192*, 115296. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2025.115296

Dendeng, R. C. V., Adolfina, A., & Uhing, Y. (2020). Pengaruh Beban Kerja Dan Lingkungan Kerja Terhadap Kinerja Karyawan Pada Pt. Unilever. Tbk Di Manado. *Jurnal EMBA: Jurnal Riset Ekonomi, Manajemen, Bisnis Dan Akuntansi*, *8*(4). https://doi.org/10.35794/emba.v8i4.30436

Firmansyah, D., & Dede, D. (2022). Teknik Pengambilan Sampel Umum dalam Metodologi Penelitian: Literature Review. *Jurnal Ilmiah Pendidikan Holistik (JIPH)*, *1*(2), 85–114. https://doi.org/10.55927/jiph.v1i2.937

Firmansyah, D., & Wahdiniwaty, R. (2017). Pengaruh Karakteristik Individu, Beban Kerja dan Lingkungan Kerja Terhadap Kinerja Karyawan Pada PT. Sinar Sosro Kantor Penjualan Wilayah (KPW) Jawa Barat Selatan. *Jurnal Ilmiah Magister Manajemen*, *2*(2), 1–6. https://repository.unikom.ac.id/51305/

Firmansyah, I., Rijanto, R., & Pitri, T. (2023). Impact of Organizational Culture and Discipline on Employee Performance: A Study of Cooperative Members. *Jurnal Bisnis, Manajemen, Dan Ekonomi*, *4*(2), 176–191. https://doi.org/10.47747/jbme.v4i2.1126

Giotopoulos, K. C., Michalopoulos, D., Vonitsanos, G., Papadopoulos, D., Giannoukou, I., & Sioutas, S. (2025). Dynamic Workload Management System in the Public Sector: A Comparative Analysis. *Future Internet*, *17*(3), 119. https://doi.org/10.3390/fi17030119

Gujarati, D. N. (2021). *Essentials of econometrics* (4th ed.). Sage Publications.

Gunaseelan, R., & Ollukkaran, B. A. (2012). A study on the impact of work environment on employee performance. *Namex International Journal of Management Research*, *71*, 1–16. https://www.academia.edu/download/51691117/2012_july_dec_10.pdf

Gunawan, W. Ben, & Mikhail, L. (2025). Strategic and sustainable human resource management: Twin weapon for achieving competitive advantage in organization. *Priviet Social Sciences Journal*, *5*(6), 45–58. https://doi.org/10.55942/pssj.v5i6.401

Hafeez, I., Yingjun, Z., Hafeez, S., Mansoor, R., & Rehman, K. U. (2019). Impact Of Workplace Environment On Employee Performance: Mediating Role Of Employee Health. *Business, Management and Education*, *17*(2), 173–193. https://doi.org/10.3846/bme.2019.10379

Hair, J. F., Howard, M. C., & Nitzl, C. (2020). Assessing measurement model quality in PLS-SEM using confirmatory composite analysis. *Journal of Business Research*,

109, 101–110. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2019.11.069

Harahap, F. A., & Triastuti, N. (2026). Workload as a hindrance demand: Resource depletion, competence, and employee performance in Indonesian Treasury Agency. *Priviet Social Sciences Journal*, *6*(8), 585–601. https://doi.org/10.55942/pssj.v6i8.2170

Hardono, I., Nasrul, H. W., & Hartati, Y. (2019). Pengaruh Penempatan Dan Beban Kerja Terhadap Motivasi Kerja Dan Dampaknya Pada Prestasi Kerja Pegawai. *Jurnal Dimensi*, *8*(1), 28–43. https://doi.org/10.33373/dms.v8i1.1846

Irawati, R., & Carollina, D. A. (2017). Analisis Pengaruh Beban Kerja Terhadap Kinerja Karyawan Operator Pada Pt Giken Precision Indonesia. *Inovbiz: Jurnal Inovasi Bisnis*, *5*(1), 51. https://doi.org/10.35314/inovbiz.v5i1.171

Jannah, R. F., & Pradana, B. I. (2021). Pengaruh Beban Kerja Dan Lingkungan Kerja Terhadap Kinerja Karyawan (Studi Pada Perumda Air Minum Tirta Dhaha Kota Kediri). *Jurnal Ilmiah Mahasiswa FEB*, *9*(2), 1–10. https://jimfeb.ub.ac.id/index.php/jimfeb/article/view/7326

Jiang, Z., Wu, C., Xu, A. J., & van de Voorde, K. (2026). Thriving at Work: A Synthesis of Human Resource Management Perspectives and a Future Research Agenda. *Human Resource Management*, *65*(1), 133–149. https://doi.org/10.1002/hrm.70017

Kock, N. (2023). Using logistic regression in PLS-SEM: Dichotomous endogenous variables. *Data Analysis Perspectives Journal*, *4*(4), 1–6. https://scriptwarp.com/dapj/2023_DAPJ_4_4/Kock_2023_DAPJ_4_4_LogRegrDichotEndog.pdf

Kock, N., & Dow, K. E. (2025). Statistical Significance and Effect Size Tests in SEM: Common Method Bias and Strong Theorizing. In *Advances in Management Accounting* (pp. 95–105). https://doi.org/10.1108/S1474-787120250000037005

Li, Y., Chen, C., & Yuan, Y. (2025). Evolving the job demands-resources framework to JD-R 3.0: The impact of after-hours connectivity and organizational support on employee psychological distress. *Acta Psychologica*, *253*, 104710. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.actpsy.2025.104710

Malik, M. I. (2011). A study of work environment and employees' performance in Pakistan. *African Journal Of Business Management*, *5*(34). https://doi.org/10.5897/AJBM11.1502

Mandala, A. S., Kisman, Z., Kanto, R. D. S., & Trisilo, R. B. (2025). The Effect Of Workload And Work Environment On Employee Performance With Job Satisfaction As A Mediator. *Islamic Banking: Jurnal Pemikiran Dan Pengembangan Perbankan Syariah*, *11*(1), 171–182. https://doi.org/10.36908/isbank.v11i1.1570

Mulyono, M., Hendarsyah*, D., & Bahri, S. (2024). Compensation and Working Time in relation to Employee Performance. *JURISMA: Jurnal Riset Bisnis & Manajemen*, *14*(1), 33–48. https://doi.org/10.34010/jurisma.v14i1.12477

Nastase, C., Adomnitei, A., & Apetri, A. (2025). Strategic Human Resource Management in the Digital Era: Technology, Transformation, and Sustainable Advantage. *Merits*, *5*(4), 23. https://doi.org/10.3390/merits5040023

Neksen, A., Wadud, M., & Handayani, S. (2021). Pengaruh Beban Kerja dan Jam Kerja terhadap Kinerja Karyawan pada PT Grup Global Sumatera. *Jurnal Nasional Manajemen Pemasaran & SDM*, *2*(2), 105–112. https://doi.org/10.47747/jnmpsdm.v2i2.282

Novita, R., & Kusuma, M. (2021). Pengaruh Beban Kerja Dan Lingkungan Kerja Terhadap

Kepuasan Kerja Karyawan (Studi Kasus Pada Karyawan Koperasi Nusantara Cabang Bengkulu Dan Curup). *Jurnal Manajemen Modal Insani Dan Bisnis (JMMIB)*, *1*(2), 164–173. https://jurnal.imsi.or.id/index.php/jmmib/article/view/18

Poljašević, B. Z., Gričnik, A. M., & Žižek, S. Š. (2025). Human Resource Management in Public Administration: The Ongoing Tension Between Reform Requirements and Resistance to Change. *Administrative Sciences*, *15*(3), 94. https://doi.org/10.3390/admsci15030094

Purnama, R. A., Rifai, A. A., Firmansyah, I., & Rijanto, R. (2022). Model Kinerja Kewriausahaan di Industri 4.0: Kompetensi Inti dan Transformasi Digital. *SEIKO: Journal of Management & Business*, *4*(2), 121–137. https://journal.stieamkop.ac.id/index.php/seiko/article/view/3010

Rahmawati, N., & Wajdi, F. (2014). *Analisis Pengaruh Lingkungan Kerja Dan Motivasi Terhadap Kinerja Karyawan Di PKU Aisyiyah Boyolali*. Universitas Muhammadiyah Surakarta.

Rahmawati, R., Mitariani, N. W. E., Cempaka, N. P., & Atmaja, D. (2021). Pengaruh Lingkungan Kerja, Stres Kerja Dan Motivasi Kerja Terhadap Kinerja Karyawan Pada PT. Indomaret Co Cabang Nangka. *EMAS: Jurnal Ekonomi, Manajemen Dan Bisnis*, *2*(3), 191–201. https://doi.org/10.36733/emas.v2i3.1832

Rolos, J. K. R., Sambul, S. A. P., & Rumawas, W. (2018). Pengaruh Beban Kerja Terhadap Kinerja Karyawan Pada PT. Asuransi Jiwasraya Cabang Manado Kota. *Jurnal Administrasi Bisnis*, *6*(4), 19–27. https://ejournal.unsrat.ac.id/v3/index.php/jab/article/view/21074

Rudolph, C. W., Breevaart, K., & Zacher, H. (2026). When are Job Autonomy and Workload "Too Much of a Good Thing" for Job Crafting? *Journal of Business and Psychology*, *41*(3), 601–623. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10869-025-10048-1

Saepuloh, D. (2022). Quadruple Helix Collaboration Concept As An Economic Recovery Solution After Covid-19. *Economica*, *10*(2), 110–124. https://doi.org/10.22202/economica.2022.v10.i2.4636

Salsabiila, A. K., & Hidayati, R. A. (2023). Pengaruh Lingkungan Kerja, Kedisiplinan, dan Beban Kerja Terhadap Kinerja Karyawan PERUMDA Aneka Usaha Lamongan. *Master: Jurnal Manajemen Dan Bisnis Terapan*, *2*(2), 137. https://doi.org/10.30595/jmbt.v2i2.15370

Siburian, M. S., Pio, R. J., & Sambul, S. A. P. (2021). Pengaruh Beban Kerja dan Lingkungan Kerja Terhadap Kinerja Karyawan Kantor Pelayanan Pajak Pratama Balige Sumatera Utara. *Productivity*, *2*(5), 370–377. https://ejournal.unsrat.ac.id/v3/index.php/productivity/article/view/35853

Silva, Y. O. Da, Aurelia, P. N., & Edellya, M. (2021). Pengaruh Beban dan Lingkungan Kerja terhadap Kinerja Karyawan PT. Karya Cipta Buana Sentosa di Maumere Flores. *Gema Wiralodra*, *12*(1), 139–150. https://gemawiralodra.unwir.ac.id/index.php/gemawiralodra/article/view/173

Suparman, D., & Purnama, R. A. (2025). Does Leadership Style Improve Employee Performance? The Mediating Role of Incentives. *International Journal of Business, Law, and Education*, *6*(2), 1391–1405. https://doi.org/10.56442/ijble.v6i2.1183

Suparman, D., Rahayu, S. W., & Firmansyah, D. (2024). Leadership Style and Performance in Higher Education Institutions (PHEI): the Mediating Role of Organizational Culture. *Jurnal Ilmiah Manajemen Kesatuan*, *12*(4), 925–938. https://doi.org/10.37641/jimkes.v12i4.2661

Surijadi, H., & Musa, M. N. D. (2020). Dampak Beban Kerja dan Lingkungan Kerja

Terhadap Kinerja Pegawai. *PUBLIC POLICY (Jurnal Aplikasi Kebijakan Publik & Bisnis)*, *1*(2), 101–114. https://doi.org/10.51135/PublicPolicy.v1.i2.p101-114

Talo, S. L., Timuneno, T., & Nursiani, N. P. (2020). Pengaruh Beban Kerja Terhadap Kepuasan Kerja Karyawan Pada PT. Pos Indonesia (Persero) Cabang Kupang. *GLORY: Jurnal Ekonomi Dan Ilmu Sosial*, *1*(2), 73–91. https://doi.org/10.35508/glory.v1i2.3374

Uma, A. T., & Swasti, I. K. (2024). Pengaruh Beban Kerja dan Lingkungan Kerja Terhadap Kinerja Karyawan Melalui Kepuasan Kerja pada PT. X. *Ekonomis: Journal of Economics and Business*, *8*(1), 181. https://doi.org/10.33087/ekonomis.v8i1.1295

Vinberg, S., Ejnebrand, R., & Löfstrand, P. (2026). New forms of leadership in activity-based work environments in combination with working from home—A qualitative study of managers in Swedish public sector workplaces. *Frontiers in Organizational Psychology*, *3*. https://doi.org/10.3389/forgp.2025.1699712

Wahdiniwaty, R., Firmansyah, D., Syafei, M. Y., & Astillero, M. R. (2026). Management Accounting Application Model and Business Strategy: The Context of SMEs in Indonesia. *Australasian Accounting, Business and Finance Journal*, *20*(1). https://doi.org/10.14453/aabfj.v20i1.05

Wahdiniwaty, R., Soegoto, E. S., Syafei, M. Y., Firmansyah, D., Abdirahman, A., & Pranata, S. (2025). The Mediating Role of Innovation Capability on the Relationship Between Digital Transformation and Economic Competitiveness. *African Journal of Hospitality, Tourism and Leisure*, *14*(2), 526–536. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/395334631

Zebua, Y., & Nugraheni, K. S. (2025). The Relationship between Workload and Work Environment on Employee Performance: A Study at PT MOD. *LITERACY: International Scientific Journals of Social, Education, Humanities*, *4*(2), 245–252. https://doi.org/10.56910/literacy.v4i2.2438