The Effect of Workload, Work Environment and Work Discipline on Employee Performance at UD. Laksana Profile

Ni Putu Neska Kireina[1], Putu Lidia Marini[2], I Gusti Agung Sasih Gayatri[3]
Universitas Triatma Mulya
Email: neskakireina5@gmail.com

Abstract: This study aims to determine the effect of workload, work environment, and work discipline on employee performance. This study uses an associative quantitative approach with data collection through questionnaires distributed to 47 respondents in the UD. Laksana Profile environment. Data analysis techniques used include validity tests, reliability, classical assumptions, multiple linear regression, T-test, and F-test. The results of the study indicate that partially and simultaneously the variables of workload, work environment, and work discipline have a positive and significant effect on employee performance. This study implies the importance of paying attention to workload, work environment, and monitoring discipline to support optimal productivity and performance.

Keywords: *Workload, Work Environment, Work Discipline, Employee Performance.*

INTRODUCTION

Human resources are the single most important element in determining whether a company or organization achieves its goals. In a company, highly performing employees can help the company achieve its stated goals (Vania, 2022). To improve employee performance, companies need to understand the factors that influence human resource performance, including workload, work environment, and work discipline.

According to Juru & Wellem (2022), workload is defined as a working condition with a description of tasks that must be completed within a certain time limit. Employee workload can be calculated based on the job description *(job description)* which has been determined by the Yudhistira company (2024) *job description*. The compensation given must of course be in accordance with the field and expertise possessed by each employee in order to produce good performance for the company. On the other hand, if *job description* which is not in accordance with the field and expertise possessed by the employee will cause the employee's performance to be...will decrease and also have an impact on company performance and can result in a workload for employees.

The work environment is also a factor that can influence employee performance within a company. According to Ekawati

(2022), the work environment is the conditions surrounding workers while they perform their duties. This condition has an influence on workers when carrying out their work in order to carry out company operations, because the work environment plays a crucial role for workers in completing their tasks effectively and efficiently. Work discipline can also influence employee performance within a company. According to Arijanto (2019), work discipline is a process of employee training to shape employee behavior or attitudes in complying with applicable regulations in each company so that activities within the company can run effectively.

UD. Laksana Profile is a building materials shop established in 2023 located in Jembrana Regency. UD. Laksana Profile has 47 employees with an average education of high school/vocational school (SMA/SMK) and undergraduate degree (S1). Based on initial observations, several problems were found, such as a mismatch between job descriptions and employee fields and expertise, minimal teamwork in completing group tasks, and frequent delays in completing work within a short time period, resulting in less than optimal work results.

THEORETICAL BASIS

Employee performance

employee performance or the definition of performance or performance as the results of performance that can be achieved by a person or group of people in an organization both qualitatively and quantitatively, in accordance with the authority, duties and responsibilities of each in an effort to achieve the goals of the organization concerned legally, without violating the law and in accordance with morals or ethics. (Asaloei, et al. 2023). Employee performance indicators are: work quality, work quantity, timeliness, effectiveness, commitment. (Silaen, 2021).

Workload

Rohman & Ichsan (2021) define workload as a collection or number of activities that must be completed by an organizational unit or position holder within a certain time period. Juru & Wellem (2022) define workload as a work condition with a description of tasks that must be completed within a certain time limit. Workload indicators include: mental load *(mental effort load)*, Time load *(time load)*, Physical load *(physical load)*. (Budiasa, 2021:35).

Work environment

Darmadi (2020) emphasized that the work environment is everything surrounding employees that influences an individual in carrying out their assigned duties, such as air conditioning, good lighting, and so on. Indicators of the work environment include: work atmosphere, relationships with coworkers, and the availability of work facilities or equipment (Budiasa, 2021).

Work Discipline

Chewe & Taylor (2021) define work discipline as a person's ability or attitude to comply with established rules in a timely manner. Sari (2020) states that work discipline is a form of respect for the organization, adherence to rules, and willingness to accept punishment for violations. Indicators of work discipline include attendance, work procedures, obedience to superiors, work awareness, and responsibility (Agustini, 2019).

RESEARCH METHODS

This study uses an associative quantitative approach. The population in this study was all 47 employees of UD. Laksana Profile, so the technique used was sampling saturated because the sample size is relatively small (>100). The research location was at UD. Laksana Profile, with implementation time from December 2024 to June 2025. The instrument was tested using SPSS version 22, with statistical tests used including validity and reliability tests, classical assumption tests (normality, multicollinearity, and heteroscedasticity), and multiple linear regression analysis. t-test.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION
Validity Test

Table 1. Validity Test Results

No	Variables	Indicator	R Count	R Table	Information
1		X1.1	0.871	0.2429	VALID
2	Workload	X1.2	0.902	0.2429	VALID
3		X1.3	0.921	0.2429	VALID
4		X2.1	0.880	0.2429	VALID
5	Work environment	X2.2	0.942	0.2429	VALID
6		X2.3	0.858	0.2429	VALID
7		X3.1	0.793	0.2429	VALID
8	Work Discipline	X3.2	0.719	0.2429	VALID
9		X3.3	0.752	0.2429	VALID

10		X3.4	0.806	0.2429	VALID
11		X3.5	0.726	0.2429	VALID
12		Y.1	0.892	0.2429	VALID
13	Employee	Y.2	0.884	0.2429	VALID
14	performance	Y.3	0.797	0.2429	VALID
15		Y.4	0.857	0.2429	VALID
16		Y.5	0.889	0.2429	VALID

Table 1 states that all indicators used in this study to measure the variables used have a correlation coefficient greater than r Table = 0.2429. So all indicators of the variables dependent and independent that are in this study are valid.

Reliability Test
Table 2. Reliability Test Results

Variables	Alpha Value	Reliability Standards	Information
Workload (X1)	0.878	0.6	Reliable
Work Environment (X2)	0.874	0.6	Reliable
Work Discipline (X3)	0.809	0.6	Reliable
Employee Performance (Y)	0.907	0.6	Reliable

Based on Table 2, it shows that Workload (X1), Work Environment (X2), Work Discipline (X3), and the dependent variable Employee Performance (Y) each have a value of *cronbach alpha* > 0.60. This indicates that all variables are reliable and can be used in further analysis.

Classical Assumption Test
Normality Test
Table 3. Normality Test Results
One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test

		Unstandardized Residual
N		47
Normal Parameters[a,b]	Mean	1,7185685
	Std. Deviation	1,71013587
Most Extreme Differences	Absolute	,115
	Positive	,102
	Negative	-,115
Test Statistic		,115
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)		,147[c]

a. Test distribution is Normal.
b. Calculated from data.
c. Lilliefors Significance Correction.

The results of the study show that the significance value is 0,147> 0.05, it can be concluded that the residual data is normally distributed. This indicates that the normality assumption in the regression model has been met, so the normality assumption is met and the linear regression analysis can proceed.

Multicollinearity Test
Table 4. Multicollinearity Test Results
Coefficients[a]

Model		Collinearity Statistics	
		Tolerance	VIF
1	X1	,458	2,184
	X2	,481	2,081
	X3	,839	1,192

a. Dependent Variable: Y

The results of the study show that the Tolerance value for the workload variable (X1) is 0.458 with a VIF of 2.184, the work environment (X2) has a Tolerance value of 0.481 with a VIF of 2.081, and work discipline (X3) has a Tolerance value of 0.839 with a VIF of 1.192. Because all variables have a Tolerance value > 0.10 and VIF < 10, it can be concluded that in this regression model there is no multicollinearity.

Heteroscedasticity Test

Table 5. Heteroscedasticity Test Results
Coefficients^a

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		
		B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Say.
1	(Constant)	2,780	1,558		1,784	,081
	X1	-,125	,113	-,240	-1,101	,277
	X2	,017	,116	,032	,149	,882
	X3	-,015	,075	-,033	-,204	,839

a. Dependent Variable: Abs_RES

The results of this study indicate that the workload variable is 0.277, the work environment is 0.882, and work discipline is 0.839. All significance values are greater than 0.05, which means that the regression model does not contain symptoms of heteroscedasticity.

Multiple Linear Regression Analysis

Table 6. Results of Multiple Linear Regression Analysis Test

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		
		B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Say.
1	(Constant)	-1,452	1,819		-,798	,429
	X1	-,978	,146	-,521	-6,689	,000
	X2	,396	,107	,254	3,707	,001
	X3	1,408	,103	1,026	13,646	,000

a. Dependent Variable: Y

Hypothesis Testing
Uji F

Table 7. F Test Results

ANOVAᵃ					
Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Say.
1 Regression	366,356	3	122,119	78,219	,000ᵇ
Residual	67,134	43	1,561		
Total	433,489	46			

a. Dependent Variable: Y
b. Predictors: (Constant), X1,X2,X3

The results of the study showed that the F $value_{count}$ of 78.219 with a significance value (Sig.) of 0.000. Because the F $value_{count}$ greater than F_{table} which is 2.82 and a significance value > 0.05. This shows that the multiple linear regression model consisting of the variables Workload (X1), Work Environment (X2), and Work Discipline (X3) simultaneously or together has a significant effect on the Performance variable (Y).

Uji T

Table 8. T-Test Results

Coefficientsᵃ

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		
	B	*Std. Error*	*Beta*	*t*	*Say.*
1 (Constant)	-1,452	1,819		-,798	,429
X1	-,978	,146	-,521	-6,689	,000
X2	,396	,107	,254	3,707	,001
X3	1,408	,103	1,026	13,646	,000

a. *Dependent Variable: Y*

1. Based on the t-test results table above, the workload variable has a regression coefficient of -0.978 with a t value of $_{count}$-6.689 and significance 0.000 (p < 0.05) then Ho is accepted and H1 is rejected meaning that the workload variable (X1) partially has a significant negative influence on employee performance (Y).
2. Based on the t-test results table above, the work environment variable has a regression coefficient of 0.396 and a t-value of 0.396.$_{count}$3.707 and significance 0.001 (p < 0.05) then Ho is rejected and H1 is accepted meaning that the work environment variable (X2) partially has a significant positive influence on employee performance (Y).
3. Based on the table of t-test results above, work discipline has a regression coefficient of 1.408 and a t-value of$_{count}$13.646 and significance 0.000 (p < 0.05) then Ho is rejected and H1 is accepted meaning that the work discipline variable (X3) partially has a significant positive influence on employee performance (Y).

Discussion
The Effect of Workload on Employee Performance

Hypothesis testing indicates that the workload variable has a negative and significant effect on employee performance at UD. Laksana Profile. This negative effect means that the greater the workload value, the Y value tends to decrease significantly. These results align with research conducted by Theresia Dewi (2023), which states that workload has a partial negative and significant effect on employee performance.

The Influence of Work Environment on Employee Performance

Hypothesis testing indicates that the work environment variable has a positive and significant effect on employee performance at UD. Laksana Profile. Therefore, the greater the work environment value, the greater the Y value. These results align with research conducted by Syada Chika (2024), Aflakha K.S & Roziana A.H (2022), Theresia Dewi (2023), Enti Juliani et al. (2023), and Astuti W & Ocky S (2021), which states that the work environment has a positive and significant effect on employee performance.

The Influence of Work Discipline on Employee Performance

Hypothesis testing indicates that work discipline has a positive and significant effect on employee performance at UD. Laksana Profile. This means that every 1-unit increase in work discipline will increase Y by 1.408, with other variables held constant. The effect of work discipline is the largest compared to other variables based on its coefficient value. These results align with research conducted by Saputri A & Hani G (2022) and Theresia Dewi (2023), which states that work discipline has a positive and significant effect on employee performance.

CONCLUSION

Based on the results of the study conducted by the author at UD. Laksana Profile as the research object, the following conclusions can be drawn:
1. Partial testing shows that workload has a negative and significant effect on employee performance at UD. Laksana Profile.
2. Partial testing shows that the work environment has a positive and significant influence on employee performance at UD. Laksana Profile.
3. Partial testing shows that work discipline has a positive and

significant impact on employee performance at UD. Laksana Profile.
4. Based on the results of multiple linear regression analysis and F test, it was found that the variables of workload (X1), work environment (X2), and work discipline (X3) simultaneously have a significant effect on employee performance (Y). Thus, the three independent variables together have a real influence on increasing or decreasing employee performance. This means that optimal workload management, a conducive work environment, and high work discipline can simultaneously improve employee performance at UD. Laksana Profile.

REFERENCE

Agustini, F. (2019). Strategi manajemen sumber daya manusia. Medan: Uisu Press.

Arijanto, A. (2019). How the impact of work discipline, work environment and transformation leadership on employee performance dealer. European Journal of Business and Management.

Astuti, W., & Rahardjo, O. S. (2021). Pengaruh disiplin kerja dan lingkungan kerja terhadap kinerja karyawan (intervening: kepuasan kerja). Jurnal EMBA, 9(2), 1185–1196.

Budiasa, I. K. (2021). Beban kerja dan kinerja sumber daya manusia.Purwokerto: CV Pena Persada.

Chewe, B., & Taylor, T. K. T. (2021). Disciplinary procedures, employee punctuality and employee performance at Ndola City Council (Zambia). African Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities Research, 4 (2), 32– 48.

Darmadi. (2020). Pengaruh lingkungan kerja dan disiplin kerja terhadap

kinerja karyawan pada Indomaret Cabang Kelapa Dua Gading Serpong Kabupaten Tangerang. Jurnal Ilmiah Manajemen Forkamma, 3(3), 240– 247.

Dewi, T. (2023). Pengaruh disiplin kerja, beban kerja, dan lingkungan kerja terhadap kinerja karyawan pada PT. Sehati Prima Makmur (Warehouse) Tangerang.

Ekawati, Z. (2022). Pengaruh gaya kepemimpinan, motivasi kerja dan lingkungan kerja terhadap kinerja karyawan pada UD. Plastik Brontoseno di Kabupaten Nganjuk.

Enti, J. (2023). Pengaruh beban kerja, lingkungan kerja dan disiplin kerja terhadap kinerja karyawan PT. Tirtakencana. Jurnal Ekonomi & Bisnis Politeknik Negeri Jakarta, 22(2).

Paulus, J. W. I. (2022). The effect of workload on employee performance with job stress as intervening variable: The Land Agency Office of Sikka Regency. Proceedings of the 2nd International Conference on Business & Social Sciences (ICOBUSS), Surabaya, March 5–6, 2022.

Rohman, I. (2021). Pengaruh beban kerja dan stres kerja terhadap kinerja karyawan PT. Honda Daya Anugrah Mandiri Cabang Sukabumi, 2(1), 1– 22.

Sally, N. V., & Wahyu, S. (2022). Analisis pengaruh beban kerja terhadap kinerja karyawan PT. Perkebunan Nusantara IV Medan. Jurnal Kewarganegaraan, 6(2).

Salsabila, A. K., & Hidayati, R. A. (2022). Pengaruh lingkungan kerja, kedisiplinan dan beban kerja terhadap kinerja karyawan PERUMDA Aneka Usaha Lamongan. Jurnal Manajemen dan Bisnis Terapan, 2(2), 137– 145.

Saputri, A., & Gita, H. (2022). Pengaruh disiplin kerja terhadap kinerja karyawan PT. Arma Anugerah Abadi wilayah Kota Medan (Skripsi,

Universitas Telkom). Universitas Telkom.

Sari, D. P., Megawati, I., & Heriyanto, I. (2020). Pengaruh lingkungan kerja dan disiplin kerja terhadap kinerja karyawan PT. Infomedia Nusantara bagian Call Center TAM Telkom Bandung. Majalah Bisnis & IPTEK, 13(1), 31– 44.

Silaen, N. R., Syamsuriansyah, Chairunnisah, R., & Sari, M. R. (2021). Kinerja karyawan. In U. Taufik (Ed.), Widina Bhakti Persada Bandung (ed. pertama).

Vanchapo, A. R., Asaloei, S., Rondonuwu, F. A., & Rumawas, W. (2023). Pengaruh work-life balance terhadap kepuasan kerja karyawan pada Hotel Sintesa Peninsula Manado. Jurnal Administrasi Bisnis, 7(2), 30– 39.

Winoto Syada, C. N. C. R., & Perkasa, D. H. (2024). Pengaruh beban kerja, stres kerja dan lingkungan kerja terhadap kinerja karyawan UP PKB Pulogadung. Revenue: Lentera Bisnis Manajemen, 2(1), Februari. E-ISSN: 2986-1853.

Yudhistira. (2024). Cara menghitung beban kerja, analisa beserta contohnya. Bhinneka Update.