

Workload, Work Motivation and Work Environment on Coffee Shop Employee Performance

Reva Cindy Aulia¹, Heni Rohaeni², Yayan Hendayana³

^{1,2,3}Fakultas Ekonomi & Bisnis, Universitas Bhayangkara Jakarta Raya

Corresponding Author e-mail: heni.rohaeni@dsn.ubharajaya.ac.id

Article History:

Received: 30-07-2026

Revised: 08-08-2026

Accepted: 27-08-2026

Keywords: *Work load, Work
Motivation, Work Environment,
Employee Performance*

Abstract: *This study examines the effects of workload, work motivation, and work environment on coffee-shop employee performance, both partially and simultaneously. **Design/methodology/approach:** This study employed a quantitative survey approach. The population consisted of 110 coffee-shop employees, and a census or saturated sampling technique was used so that all population members participated as respondents. Data were collected using a five-point Likert-scale questionnaire and analyzed using multiple linear regression, classical assumption tests, partial t-tests, a simultaneous F-test, and the coefficient of determination with IBM SPSS Statistics version 32. **Findings:** Workload, work motivation, and work environment each had a positive and statistically significant effect on employee performance. Simultaneously, the three independent variables significantly affected employee performance, with an F-value of 46.952 and a significance level below 0.05. The model explained 55.8% of the variation in employee performance based on the adjusted R². **Practical implications:** Coffee-shop managers should balance employee workloads, strengthen work motivation, and provide a supportive work environment to improve employee performance. **Limitations:** The study was limited to 110 respondents and used a cross-sectional survey design, so the findings cannot be generalized to all coffee-shop employees. **Originality/value:** This study provides empirical evidence concerning the combined role of workload, work motivation, and work environment in the coffee-shop industry.*

How to Cite: First author., Second author., & Third author. (20xx). The title. Escalate : Economics and Business Journal. 4(3). pp. 561-570 <https://doi.org/10.61536/escalate.v4i03.612>



<https://doi.org/10.61536/escalate.v4i03.612>

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



Introduction

Human resources are the main asset that determines the success of an organization in achieving its goals.(Solehati et al., 2024a)Employee performance is a crucial factor because it directly impacts productivity, service quality, and customer satisfaction. In the food and beverage (F&B) industry, particularly coffee shops, service quality is highly dependent on employees' ability to perform their duties effectively and efficiently. With the rapid growth of the coffee shop industry in Indonesia, competition is intensifying, requiring companies to optimally manage their human resources to maintain service quality and customer loyalty.(Maulana & Hadita, 2024).

The increasingly rapid development of coffee shops is also accompanied by increasing demands for quality service.(Arum & Mustikorini, 2026)Employees are expected to provide fast, friendly, and consistent service to meet customer expectations. However, in practice, various problems persist, such as slow service during peak hours, errors in order preparation, and declining consistency in service quality. These conditions indicate that employee performance remains a challenge that requires attention in efforts to improve company competitiveness.

Employee performance is influenced by various factors, including workload, work motivation, and the work environment. A workload that is not commensurate with an employee's capacity can lead to physical and mental fatigue, which can lead to decreased productivity.(Luthan, 2023). According toDarajati et al. (2026) A workload that is appropriate to employee capacity can improve performance, while an excessive workload has the potential to reduce performance. In line with researchHaddad et al. (2023)said that workload has a significant effect on performance.

According toWulandari & Mathori (2023)Work motivation is a driving force for employees to work optimally, responsibly, and oriented towards achieving organizational goals. According toSomantri et al. (2024)Motivation is a condition that inspires or leads someone to do something or actions that are carried out intentionally with the aim of improving work performance because motivation is defined as a driver or motivator within a person that can give rise to, direct, and organize behavior. In line with researchSolehati et al. (2024)which says that work motivation influences performance.

In addition, a comfortable, safe working environment supported by harmonious working relationships can create a conducive working atmosphere, thereby increasing the effectiveness and quality of employee performance.(Natania & Martha, 2023). As for the researchFatmawati & Roni (2024)says that the work environment is everything that surrounds workers and that can influence them in carrying out the tasks assigned to them. In line with researchAgustin et al. (2024)which says the work environment influences employee performance

Various previous studies have shown that workload, work motivation, and work environment influence employee performance.(Agustyaningrum & Isnowati, 2024)However, most research still focuses on the manufacturing and office sectors. Research examining these three variables simultaneously in the coffee shop industry is still relatively limited, despite the distinct dynamics of work characteristics in this sector, such as high levels of customer interaction, demands for fast service, and fluctuating workloads during certain hours. This situation indicates a research gap that requires further investigation.

Based on the above description, this study aims to analyze the influence of workload, work motivation, and work environment on employee performance, both partially and simultaneously. The results of this study are expected to provide empirical contributions to the development of human resource management science, particularly in the food and beverage industry, and serve as a reference for companies in formulating policies that can improve employee performance through workload management, increased work motivation, and the creation of a conducive work environment.

Research methods

This study uses a quantitative approach with a survey method to analyze the influence of workload, work motivation, and work environment on employee performance. The quantitative approach was chosen because the study aims to examine the relationship between variables based on numerical data analyzed using statistical techniques.(Sugiyono, 2023).The population in this study was all 110 coffee shop employees, with an average of four employees per shop. The sampling technique used was saturated sampling, a sampling technique that utilizes all members of the population as

research samples. This technique was used because the population size was relatively limited, allowing the entire population to be used as respondents to obtain a more representative picture of the research object's condition. (Sugiyono, 2023). Thus, the number of samples used in this study was 110 respondents.

The data used consists of primary and secondary data. Primary data was obtained through direct distribution of questionnaires to respondents using a five-point Likert scale, with a score range of 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). The research instrument was compiled based on the indicators of each variable, namely workload as the first independent variable (X_1), work motivation as the second independent variable (X_2), work environment as the third independent variable (X_3), and employee performance as the dependent variable (Y). Meanwhile, secondary data was obtained from books, scientific journals, and other literature relevant to the research topic.

Before the analysis was carried out, the research instrument was tested using validity and reliability tests to ensure that each statement item was able to measure the research variables accurately and consistently. (Ghozali, 2021). Next, classical assumption tests were carried out, including normality tests, multicollinearity tests, and heteroscedasticity tests as requirements in multiple linear regression analysis.

Data analysis was conducted using IBM SPSS Statistics version 32. The analysis stages included descriptive statistical analysis to describe the characteristics of respondent data, multiple linear regression analysis to determine the effect of workload, work motivation, and work environment on employee performance, coefficient of determination (R^2) to measure the model's ability to explain the dependent variable, partial test (t-test) to determine the effect of each independent variable on the dependent variable, and simultaneous test (F-test) to determine the effect of the three independent variables together on employee performance. All hypothesis testing was conducted at a significance level of 5% ($\alpha = 0.05$) in accordance with the provisions of statistical analysis. (Ghozali, 2021).

Results And Discussion

Research result

1. Instrument Test

A. Validity Test

Validity testing can be demonstrated by comparing the calculated r-value with the r-table. If the r-table > calculated r-value, it is said to be valid. The r-table value is calculated using the formula $df = n - 2$, with a two-tailed test significance level of 0.05 based on standards commonly used in quantitative research, which indicates a tolerable error rate of 5%. Then the value is $df = 110 - 2 = 108$, and the r-table value is 0.1874. Based on the test, the validity results for Workload, Work Motivation, Work Environment and Employee Performance are as follows:

Table 1. Workload Validity Test

Statement	r-count	r-table	Information
X1.1	0.839	0.1874	Valid
X1.2	0.835	0.1874	Valid
X1.3	0.788	0.1874	Valid
X1.4	0.831	0.1874	Valid
X1.5	0.862	0.1874	Valid
X1.6	0.847	0.1874	Valid
X1.7	0.801	0.1874	Valid
X1.8	0.856	0.1874	Valid

Source: Data processed by IBM SPSS 32

Table 2. Work Motivation Validity Test

Statement	r-count	r-table	Information
X2.1	0.855	0.1874	Valid
X2.2	0.857	0.1874	Valid

X2.3	0.892	0.1874	Valid
X2.4	0.831	0.1874	Valid
X2.5	0.868	0.1874	Valid
X2.6	0.837	0.1874	Valid
X2.7	0.793	0.1874	Valid
X2.8	0.844	0.1874	Valid

Source: Data processed by IBM SPSS 32

Table 3. Work Environment Validity Test

Statement	r-count	r-table	Information
X3.1	0.853	0.1874	Valid
X3.2	0.858	0.1874	Valid
X3.3	0.857	0.1874	Valid
X3.4	0.800	0.1874	Valid
X3.5	0.826	0.1874	Valid
X3.6	0.833	0.1874	Valid
X3.7	0.845	0.1874	Valid
X3.8	0.795	0.1874	Valid

Source: Data processed by IBM SPSS 32

Table 4. Employee Performance Validity Test

Statement	r-count	r-table	Information
Y1	0.671	0.1874	Valid
Y2	0.656	0.1874	Valid
Y3	0.663	0.1874	Valid
Y4	0.740	0.1874	Valid
Y5	0.727	0.1874	Valid
Y6	0.682	0.1874	Valid
Y7	0.661	0.1874	Valid
Y8	0.686	0.1874	Valid

Source: Data processed by IBM SPSS 32

Validity testing was conducted by calculating the correlation between the scores of each statement item and the total score. The table above shows that the correlation between all items for variables X and Y is valid, showing significant results, with an r-table value of > 0.1874 , thus concluding that all statement items are valid.

B. Reliability Test

The reliability measurement tool used in this study was Cronbach's $\alpha > 0.60$. This limit was chosen because this research is in the social sciences, measuring respondents' perceptions. Therefore, a reliability value of ≥ 0.60 is considered sufficient or reliable. The following are the reliability test results:

Table 5. Reliability Test

Variables	Cronbach's Alpha	Criteria	Information
Workload (X1)	0.936	0.60	Reliable
Work Motivation (X2)	0.944	0.60	Reliable
Work Environment (X3)	0.937	0.60	Reliable
Employee Performance (Y)	0.839	0.60	Reliable

Source: Data processed by IBM SPSS 32

The results of the reliability test in the table above show that the Cronbach's Alpha value of all research variables is greater than 0.60, so it can be concluded that all statement items in the

workload (X1), work motivation (X2), work environment (X3) and employee performance (Y) variables are stated to be entirely reliable or can be relied upon.

Classical Assumption Test

C. Normality Test

Based on the results of the normality test using the Normal PP Plot graph and the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test, it can be seen that the data points are spread around the diagonal line and follow the direction of the diagonal line. In addition, the Asymp. Sig. value is 0.200, which is greater than 0.05 ($0.200 > 0.05$). These results indicate that the residual data is normally distributed, so the regression model in this study has met the assumption of normality and is suitable for further analysis.

D. Multicollinearity Test

The results of the multicollinearity test show that all independent variables have a tolerance value > 0.10 and a VIF value < 10 . Therefore, it can be concluded that there is no multicollinearity in the regression model.

E. Heteroscedasticity Test

Based on the results of the heteroscedasticity test using a scatterplot, the residual points are randomly distributed above and below the number 0 on the Y-axis and do not form a specific pattern. Thus, it can be concluded that the regression model does not experience heteroscedasticity, thus meeting the assumption of homoscedasticity in the regression model.

Multiple Linear Regression Analysis

Multiple linear regression analysis was used to test the effect of workload, work motivation, and work environment on employee performance. Based on the results of the multiple linear regression analysis, a regression equation was obtained.

$$Y = 10.879 + 0.220.$$

The equation shows that workload, work motivation, and work environment have a positive influence on employee performance. The regression coefficient values for each variable indicate that every increase in workload, work motivation, and work environment will be followed by an increase in employee performance, assuming other variables remain constant (*ceteris paribus*). Thus, the regression model indicates a positive relationship between the three independent variables and employee performance.

Hypothesis Testing

1. T-Test (Partial)

Each independent variable is said to have a significant influence if the calculated t-value is greater than the t-table value or the significance value is less than 0.05 (5%). The t-table value is calculated using the formula $df = 110 - 4 = 106$, and the t-table value is 1.982. The results of the t-test analysis can be seen in the following table:

Table 6. T-Test (Partial)

Coefficients ^a								
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Collinearity Statistics	
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Tolerance	VIF
1	(Constant)	10.879	1.949		5.582	<,.001		
	Beban Kerja	.220	.044	.324	5.011	<,.001	.969	1.032
	Motivasi Kerja	.307	.040	.499	7.751	<,.001	.976	1.025
	Lingkungan Kerja	.286	.042	.436	6.769	<,.001	.978	1.022

a. Dependent Variable: Kinerja Karyawan

Source: Data processed by IBM SPSS 32

Based on the results of the t-test (partial), the workload variable has a positive and significant effect on employee performance with a t-count value of $5.011 > t\text{-table } 1.982$ and a significance value of $0.001 < 0.05$, so H_1 is accepted. The work motivation variable also has a positive and significant effect on employee performance with a t-count value of $7.751 > t\text{-table } 1.982$ and a significance value of $0.001 < 0.05$, so H_2 is accepted. Furthermore, the work environment variable has a positive and significant effect on employee performance with a t-count value of $6.769 > t\text{-table } 1.982$ and a significance value of $0.001 < 0.05$, so H_3 is accepted. Thus, partially workload, work motivation, and work environment are proven to have a positive and significant effect on employee performance.

2. F Test (Simultaneous)

This F-test is conducted with the aim of seeing the influence of all independent variables together on the dependent variable. If the calculated f-value $>$ f-table, it is said to be valid. The f-table value is calculated using the formula $df(N1) = 4-1 = 3$, $df(N2) = 110-4 = 106$, and the f-table value is 2.69. The results of the f-test analysis can be seen in the table below:

Table 7. F Test (Simultaneous)

ANOVA ^a						
Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	973.550	3	324.517	46.952	$<.001^b$
	Residual	732.641	106	6.912		
	Total	1706.191	109			

a. Dependent Variable: Kinerja Karyawan

b. Predictors: (Constant), Lingkungan Kerja, Motivasi Kerja, Beban Kerja

Source: Data processed by IBM SPSS 32

Based on the results of the F test, the calculated F value was 46.952. Meanwhile, the F table value was 2.69. Because the calculated F was greater than the F table ($46.952 > 2.69$) and the significance value was $0.001 < 0.05$, then H_0 was rejected and H_a was accepted. Thus, Workload, Work Motivation, and Work Environment simultaneously had a significant effect on Employee Performance.

3. Coefficient of Determination (R²) Test

The coefficient of determination test aims to analyze the model's ability to explain variations in its dependent constructs, thus determining the coefficient of determination. The test results can be seen in the following table:

Table 8. Determination Coefficient Test

Model Summary ^b				
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.755 ^a	.571	.558	2.62901

a. Predictors: (Constant), Lingkungan Kerja, Motivasi Kerja, Beban Kerja

b. Dependent Variable: Kinerja Karyawan

Source: Data processed by IBM SPSS 32

Based on the table of determination coefficient test results above, the Adjusted R Square value produced is 0.558 or 55.8%. This shows that the dependent variable Employee Performance can be explained by the independent variables, namely Workload, Work Motivation and Work Environment by 55.8%, while the remaining 44.2% is explained by other factors outside the study.

Discussion

Table 9. Effect of Workload (X1) on Employee Performance (Y)

WORKLOAD (X1)

Statement	Mean	Gender	Length of work	Position/Title
Highest				
X1.4	3.48	Woman	< 1 year	Waiters
		3.51	3.50	3.63
X1.5	3.42	Woman	< 1 year	Cashier
		3.55	3.58	3.47
Lowest				
X1.7	3.36	Man	> 2 years	Barista
		3.48	3.46	3.52
X1.3	3.30	Woman	> 2 years	Barista
		3.31	3.46	3.38

Based on the research summary results, the statements with the highest average (mean) values were found in X1.4 (job complexity indicator) at 3.48 and X1.5 (time usage indicator) at 3.42. These assessments were dominated by female respondents with less than 1 year of service, especially in the positions of waiters (X1.4) and cashiers (X1.5). This indicates that these groups of respondents have a higher perception of workload.

Meanwhile, the lowest average scores were found for X1.7 (work target indicator) at 3.36 and X1.3 (job complexity indicator) at 3.30. These scores were dominated by male and female respondents with more than two years of service, particularly those in the barista position. Despite having lower average scores, the differences were not significant, indicating that employee perceptions of workload tended to be evenly distributed across each measured statement.

The results of this study are in line with research Firdaus et al. (2024) which states that workload has a positive and significant effect on employee performance. Then also on Syawal et al. (2024) said it had a positive and significant impact. Thus, workload is one of the factors that plays an important role in improving employee performance.

Table 10. The Influence of Work Motivation (X2) on Employee Performance (Y)

WORK MOTIVATION (X2)				
Statement	Mean	Gender	Length of work	Position/Title
Highest				
X2.5	3.50	Man	1-2 years	Barista
		3.58	3.63	3.63
X2.6	3.50	Man	1-2 years	Cashier
		3.57	3.63	3.65
Lowest				
X2.2	3.40	Woman	> 2 years	Barista
		3.42	3.59	3.59
X2.7	3.47	Man	1-2 years	Barista
		3.50	3.65	3.61

Based on the research summary results, the statements with the highest average (mean) values were found in X2.5 and X2.6 (initiative and creativity indicators) with a value of 3.50 each. This assessment was dominated by male respondents with 1–2 years of work experience, especially in the positions of barista (X2.5) and cashier (X2.6). This indicates that these groups of respondents have a higher perception of work motivation.

Meanwhile, the lowest average scores were found for X2.2 (a goal-driven indicator) at 3.40 and X2.7 (a sense of responsibility indicator) at 3.47. These scores were dominated by female respondents with more than 2 years of service and male respondents with 1–2 years of service, particularly in barista positions. Despite having lower average scores, the difference was not significant, indicating that employee work motivation levels were relatively even across all measured indicators.

The results of this study are in line with research Nathasyah et al. (2024) which states that work motivation has a positive and significant effect on employee performance. And also on Noviana & Ayuningtyas (2024) said to have a positive and significant impact. Thus, work motivation is a crucial factor in improving employee performance.

Table 11. The Influence of Work Environment (X3) on Employee Performance (Y)

WORK ENVIRONMENT (X3)				
Statement	Mean	Gender	Length of work	Position/Title
Highest				
X3.7	3.47	Woman	< 1 year	Barista
		3.55	3.73	3.61
X3.4	3.43	Woman	> 2 years	Waiters
		3.48	3.60	3.53
Lowest				
X3.8	3.37	Man	> 2 years	Kitchen Crew
		3.46	3.46	3.69
X3.6	3.40	Woman	1-2 years	Cashier
		3.51	3.49	3.53

Based on the results of the research recap, it is known that the statement with the highest average (mean) value is statement X3.7 on the relationship indicator with coworkers at 3.47, followed by statement X3.4 on the work atmosphere indicator at 3.43. The highest assessments for both statements are dominated by female respondents, with a length of service of less than a year and more than 2 years, as well as in the positions of barista and waiters. This indicates that these groups of respondents have a higher perception of the work environment conditions measured in the study.

Meanwhile, the statement with the lowest mean value is in statement X3.8, the relationship indicator with coworkers, at 3.37, and X3.6, the security indicator, at 3.40. The assessments for both statements were obtained from female and male respondents, with a length of service of more than 2 years and 1–2 years, as well as the position of kitchen crew in statement X3.8 and Cashier in statement X3.6. Although it has a lower mean value compared to other statements, the difference is not too large, indicating that the work environment conditions felt by employees are relatively even in each statement measured.

The results of this study are in line with research Diana & Elpanso (2024) which states that the work environment has a positive and significant influence on employee performance. And also on Alfariz et al. (2025) said to have a positive and significant impact. Thus, the work environment is a factor that plays a significant role in improving employee performance.

Table 12. The Effect of Workload (X1), Work Motivation (X3), and Work Environment on Employee Performance (Y)

EMPLOYEE PERFORMANCE (Y)				
Statement	Mean	Gender	Length of work	Position/Title
Highest				
Y.8	4.24	Man	1-2 years	Barista
		4.27	4.28	4.46
Y.5	4.23	Woman	< 1 year	Cashier
		4.25	4.26	3.34
Lowest				
Y.1	4.00	Man	< 1 year	Barista
		4.14	4.04	4.09
Y.4	4.09	Woman	1-2 years	Waiters
		4.12	4.14	4.23

Based on the research summary results, the statements with the highest average (mean) values were Y.8 (independence indicator) at 4.24 and Y.5 (punctuality indicator) at 4.23. These assessments were dominated by male respondents with 1–2 years of experience as baristas (Y.8), as well as female respondents with less than 1 year of experience as cashiers (Y.5). This indicates that respondents have a high level of performance in both statements.

Meanwhile, the lowest average scores were found in Y.1 (work quality indicator) at 4.00 and Y.4 (work quantity indicator) at 4.09. This assessment was dominated by male respondents with less than 1 year of work experience in the barista position (Y.1) and female respondents with 1–2 years of work experience in the waiter position (Y.4). Despite having lower average scores, all statements remained in the good category, indicating that overall employee performance has been running optimally.

The results of this study are in line with research Alieviandy et al. (2024) which states that workload, work motivation, and work environment simultaneously have a significant influence on employee performance. Likewise, in the study Laila & Zuraida (2024) said that workload, work motivation, and work environment simultaneously have a significant influence

Conclusion

This study demonstrates that workload, work motivation, and the work environment have a positive and significant influence on employee performance, both partially and simultaneously. These findings suggest that improved employee performance is not influenced by a single factor, but rather the result of appropriate workload management, adequate motivation, and a supportive work environment. Therefore, these three variables are crucial aspects to consider when improving employee performance.

This study has limitations This study did not include mediating variables that would allow for a more in-depth explanation of the mechanisms or processes by which the three independent variables influence employee performance. Therefore, the results of this study are limited to the direct relationship between the variables studied. Furthermore, time, effort, and cost constraints during the research process limited the scope of the study. The study was conducted only over a specific period, thus not being able to describe changes in workload, motivation, work environment, and performance that may occur as coffee shop operations evolve.

Future research is expected to expand the research model by adding other relevant variables, such as leadership, compensation, job satisfaction, or organizational culture, and using a more diverse research population to broaden the scope of the research. For coffee shop managers, the results of this study can serve as a basis for designing human resource management strategies that can sustainably improve employee performance.

Bibliography

- Agustin, P., Rohaeni, H., & Maulia, I. R. (2024). Pengaruh Disiplin Kerja dan Lingkungan Kerja Terhadap Kinerja Karyawan “X” Kota Bekasi. In *Indonesian Journal of Economics and Strategic Management (IJESM)* (Vol. 2, Number 1).
- Agustyaningrum, D. I., & Isnawati, S. (2024). Pengaruh Motivasi Kerja, Lingkungan kerja, dan Beban Kerja terhadap Kinerja Karyawan di Departemen Produksi Plywood pada PT. Kayu Lapis Indonesia. *Jurnal Kajian Ekonomi & Bisnis Islam*, 5, 3697.
- Alfariz, F., Rosidi, & Muda, N. (2025). Pengaruh Lingkungan Kerja dan Budaya Organisasi Terhadap Kinerja Pegawai Melalui Variabel Motivasi. *Buletin Studi Ekonomi*, 30(02), 191–201. <https://ojs.unud.ac.id/index.php/bse/>
- Alieviandy, N. S., Khan, M. A., & Bukhari, E. (2024). Pengaruh Motivasi, Beban Kerja, Dan Lingkungan Kerja Terhadap Kinerja Karyawan Pada PT XYZ. *Jurnal Ilmiah Ekonomi Dan Bisnis*, 2.

- Arum, A. T., & Mustikorini, I. (2026). Pengaruh Kualitas Produk, Kualitas Pelayanan dan Persepsi Harga terhadap Loyalitas Pelanggan Kopi Kenangan di Surabaya Selatan. *Surplus: Jurnal Ekonomi Dan Bisnis*, 5(1), 313–324. <https://doi.org/10.71456/sur.v5i1.2220>
- Darajati, S. M., Khan, M. A., & Yunita, T. (2026). *Pengaruh Compensation, Work Environment, Workload melalui Motivation sebagai Variable Intervening terhadap Employee Performance pada Jasa Laundry di Kota Bekasi*. 2(2). <https://doi.org/10.63822/5mfra386>
- Diana, E. A., & Elpanso, E. (2024). Pengaruh Disiplin Kerja Dan Lingkungan Kerja Terhadap Kinerja Pegawai Dinas Pemberdayaan Masyarakat Dan Desa kabupaten Ogah Ilir. *Suplus : Jurnal Ekonomi Dan Bisnis*, 2(2), 168–180.
- Fatmawati, E., & Roni, M. (2024). Bagaimana Lingkungan Kerja Karyawan di Dinas Sosial Kota Palembang. *Surplus: Jurnal Ekonomi Dan Bisnis*, 2(2), 265–281.
- Firdaus, M. H., Rohaeni, H., & Maulia, I. R. (2024). Pengaruh Beban Kerja dan Lingkungan Kerja Terhadap Kinerja Karyawan PT Kapitol Era Mas. In *Indonesian Journal of Economics and Strategic Management (IJESM)* (Vol. 2, Number 3).
- Ghozali, I. (2021). Aplikasi Analisis Multivariate Dengan Program IBM SPSS 26. *Badan Penerbit Universitas Diponegoro*, 10.
- Haddad, H. A. H. Al, Soleh, A., & Abi, Y. I. (2023). *Pengaruh Beban Kerja Dan Disiplin Kerja Terhadap Kinerja Karyawan Bank Bengkulu Cabang Manna*.
- Laila, N. N., & Zuraida, L. (2024). Pengaruh Motivasi Kerja, Lingkungan Kerja Dan Beban Kerja Terhadap Kinerja Karyawan Waroeng Spesial Sambal (SS) di Yogyakarta. In *Jurnal Riset Akuntansi dan Bisnis Indonesia STIE Widya Wiwaha* (Vol. 4, Number 2).
- Luthan, L. (2023). Pengaruh Beban Kerja, Stres Kerja, dan Lingkungan Kerja terhadap Kinerja Karyawan PT. Bank 9 Jambi Cabang Kerinci. *Al Fiddhoh*, Vol. 4 No 2.
- Maulana, A. A., & Hadita. (2024). Pengaruh Kualitas Produk Dan Kualitas Pelayanan Terhadap Kepuasan Pelanggan Di Toko Kopi Tuku Bekasi Utara. *Journal of Management and Creative Business*, 2(1), 108–118. <https://doi.org/10.30640/jmcbus.v2i1.2071>
- Natania, O., & Martha, L. (2023). Pengaruh Lingkungan Kerja Fisik dan Lingkungan Kerja Non Fisik terhadap Kepuasan Kerja Pegawai di Badan Penelitian dan Pengembangan Provinsi Sumatera Barat. *JURNAL ECONOMINA*, 2(8), 2122–2136. <https://doi.org/10.55681/economina.v2i8.723>
- Nathasyah, Sulistyowati, A., Pitoyo, B. S., Yunita, T., & Jumawan. (2024). Pengaruh Motivasi Kerja dan Disiplin Kerja Terhadap Kinerja Pegawai pada Kantor Kelurahan Bekasi Jaya. *Jurnal Riset Manajemen*, 2(3), 216–230. <https://doi.org/10.54066/jurma.v2i3.2255>
- Noviana, U., & Ayuningtyas, E. A. (2024). *The Influence of Work Environment, Workload, and Work Motivation on The Performance of Employees*.
- Solehati, D. T., Hasnawati, R., Sakinah, S. P., & Hendayana, Y. (2024a). Pengaruh Lingkungan Kerja, Motivasi Kerja, dan Disiplin Kerja Terhadap Produktivitas Karyawan. *SENTRI: Jurnal Riset Ilmiah*.
- Solehati, D. T., Hasnawati, R., Sakinah, S. P., & Hendayana, Y. (2024b). Pengaruh Lingkungan Kerja, Motivasi Kerja, dan Disiplin Kerja Terhadap Produktivitas Karyawan Pada PT.XYZ. *SENTRI: Jurnal Riset Ilmiah*.
- Somantri, I. F., Rohaeni, H., Maulia, I. R., & Jumawan. (2024). PENGARUH MOTIVASI KERJA DAN DISIPLIN KERJA TERHADAP ETOS KERJA KARYAWAN PADA PT ASR. In *Jurnal Riset Ilmiah* (Vol. 3, Number 3).
- Sugiyono. (2023). *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif Kualitatif dan R&D*.
- Syawal, F., Merdeka, G., & Sudapet, I. N. (2024). Pengaruh Motivasi Kerja, Beban Kerja Dan Lingkungan Kerja Terhadap Kinerja Karyawan Food dan Baverage Restoran di Jawa Timur. *Jurnal Kompetensi Ilmu Sosial*, 2(2), 74–82. <https://doi.org/10.29138/jkis.v2i2.50>
- Wulandari, D., & Mathori, M. (2023). Pengaruh Beban Kerja dan Motivasi Kerja terhadap Kepuasan Kerja Karyawan PT. Telko Yogyakarta. In *Jurnal Riset Akuntansi dan Bisnis Indonesia STIE Widya Wiwaha* (Vol. 3, Number 1).

