

## THE EFFECT OF WORKLOAD AND WORK ENVIRONMENT ON THE PERFORMANCE OF CIVIL SERVANTS (PNS) IN THE MINISTRY OF COOPERATIVES

Deina Febriana Tjahyadi 1); Jakfar 2); Atik Sekianti 3); Asep Saepullah 4\*)

1) [deinafebi27@gmail.com](mailto:deinafebi27@gmail.com) (Faculty of Economics and Business, Jayabaya University)

2) [Jakfar1@gmail.com](mailto:Jakfar1@gmail.com) (Faculty of Economics and Business, Jayabaya University)

3) [atiksekianti77@gmail.com](mailto:atiksekianti77@gmail.com) (Faculty of Economics and Business, Jayabaya University)

4) [saepullah69@gmail.com](mailto:saepullah69@gmail.com) (Faculty of Economics and Business, Jayabaya University)

### Article Info:

#### Keywords:

Workload;  
Work Environment;  
Employee Performance;  
SmartPLS4;

#### Article History:

Received : October, 04, 2025  
Revised : December 15, 2025  
Accepted : March 25, 2026

#### Article Doi:

<http://dx.doi.org/10.22441/jfm.2020.v13i1.001>

### Abstract

*This study examines the influence of workload and work environment on the performance of Civil Servants (PNS) in the Ministry of Cooperatives. A cross-cutting quantitative survey was conducted on active civil servants. The research population was 451 employees; Invitations to fill out questionnaires were distributed throughout the organization in five work units, and 82 complete responses were analyzed. The minimum response target was initially calculated using the Slovin formula with a 10% degree of precision, then re-examined using a statistical power benchmark for a moderate effect size. Data were analyzed using partial least squared structural equation modeling (PLS-SEM) with SmartPLS 4. Workload had a positive and statistically significant relationship with employee performance ( $\beta = 0.474$ ,  $t = 5.923$ ,  $p < .001$ ), and the work environment also had a positive and statistically significant relationship with employee performance ( $\beta = 0.302$ ,  $t = 3.652$ ,  $p < .001$ ). The model describes a 41.7% variance in performance ( $R^2 = 0.417$ ). The workload positive coefficient should not be interpreted as evidence that excessive workload improves performance; The coefficient shows that, in this sample, higher perceived demands are related to performance based on higher self-reports, which may be the case because some demands are seen as a responsibility or a challenge. These findings underscore the importance of maintaining a realistic workload while strengthening physical facilities, communication, and employer support.*

**Keywords:** Workload, Work Environment, Employee Performance, SmartPLS4.

## INTRODUCTION

Human resources are a strategic factor that determines the success of an organization, including in the public sector. In facing the demands of bureaucratic reform and improving service quality, government agencies are required to have professional, integrity, and high-performance apparatus. The Ministry of Cooperatives as a government institution has an important role in the implementation of public policies and services, so that the performance of Civil Servants (PNS) is a crucial element in achieving organizational goals.

Employee performance is not only influenced by individual abilities, but also by organizational

factors, particularly workload and work environment. Unbalanced workloads, such as excessive workloads, high targets, and limited completion times, can lead to burnout and decreased productivity. On the other hand, the work environment that includes physical and non-physical aspects, such as facilities, workspace comfort, working relationships, and leadership support, plays an important role in shaping employee motivation and work effectiveness. Less conducive work environment conditions have the potential to hinder the performance and quality of work results.

The initial evidence from the thesis underlying this article shows the existence of concrete organizational problems. In the pre-workload survey, 83% of respondents stated that job targets were too high and 81% stated that they often receive sudden tasks with short deadlines. In the pre-survey of the work environment, 42% stated that work facilities and equipment were inadequate, while 36% stated that the support and direction of the supervisor were not clear enough. The performance pre-survey also showed that 32% had difficulty completing work on time and 34% were unable to consistently perform optimally when workload was high. The findings suggest that workloads and workplace conditions require systematic empirical testing, not just conceptual discussions.

Previous research has reported an inconsistent relationship between workload and performance. Yunanti and Putri (2022) found a positive and significant relationship, while Amelia et al. (2025) also reported a positive influence of workload. On the contrary, Putra et al. (2026) found that workload has a negative and significant effect on performance. The *challenge-hindrane* framework helps explain these inconsistencies: demands interpreted as meaningful challenges can encourage motivation and effort, while demands experienced as obstacles or overloads can increase pressure and decrease performance (LePine et al., 2005). The job *demands-resources* theory also explains that workload drains physical and psychological resources, while supportive organizational conditions can mitigate these impacts and promote effective functioning (Bakker & Demerouti, 2017).

Research on the work environment in general shows that adequate physical conditions, supportive supervision, and constructive social relationships can facilitate performance. For example, Al-Omari and Okasheh (2017) show that environmental constraints, such as noise, inadequate furniture, ventilation, and lighting, can interfere with performance. Nonetheless, evidence from private sector organizations cannot be automatically generalized to civil servants, as their work is shaped by formal procedures, public accountability, and coordination between units. Therefore, this study provides evidence from the Indonesian public sector, especially the Ministry of Cooperatives, and examines two direct structural relationships using PLS-SEM.

On this basis, this study aims to find out whether workload affects the performance of civil servants and whether the work environment affects the performance of civil servants in the Ministry of Cooperatives.

## LITERATURE REVIEW

### Employee Performance

Employee performance is defined as the results of work achieved by an employee both in quality and quantity in accordance with the responsibilities given. Mangkunegara (2017:67) explained that performance is the result of work achieved by employees both in terms of quality and quantity in accordance with the responsibilities given. Robbins and Judge in Silaen et al. (2021:31) state that performance is the result of employee work achieved based on certain criteria that apply in a job. In line with that, Gibson et al. (2012) explained that performance is the level of success of an individual or group in carrying out tasks measured based on certain standards. Armstrong (2020) emphasized that performance is not only related to what is achieved, but also how the process of achievement is carried out by employees.

The employee performance dimension is explained by Pradhan and Jena (2017) as a multidimensional construct consisting of three main aspects, namely *task performance*, *contextual performance*, and *adaptive performance*. *Task performance* is related to the implementation of the employee's core tasks in accordance with the job responsibilities given by the organization. *Contextual performance* reflects the employee's prosocial behavior that supports the work environment, such as helping colleagues and obeying organizational rules. Meanwhile, *adaptive performance* is related to the

ability of employees to adapt to changes in working conditions, technology, and dynamic organizational demands.

Employee performance indicators are used to objectively measure the level of employee work achievement. According to Mathis and Jackson (2016), employee performance indicators include work quantity, work quality, time utilization, attendance rate, cooperation, and responsibility. Guritno and Waridin in Silaen et al. (2021) added that employee performance can also be seen from the ability to achieve targets, timeliness of job completion, creativity, innovation, and the ability to minimize work errors. Robbins (2016) emphasizes punctuality as an important indicator in assessing performance, while Armstrong (2014) highlights initiative as part of work behavior that reflects the quality of employee performance.

### Workload

Workload is a work demand that employees must complete within a certain period of time. Budnick in Ilyasa (2023) defines workload as the number of tasks that workers must perform in a given period of time which includes speed, accuracy, and quality of work. Koesomowidjojo (2021) states that workload is the determination of the number of working hours of human resources used to complete work, while Gawron in Firdaus (2023) views workload as a set of demands of tasks and efforts that must be expended in the work process.

The workload dimension is described by Hart and Staveland in Debora S (2018) through the NASA-TLX model which consists of *mental demand, physical demand, temporal demand, performance, effort, and frustration level*. These dimensions reflect the cognitive demands, physical, time pressure, perception of work success, level of effort, and emotional state of employees. In addition, Budiasa (2021) groups the dimensions of workload into three main aspects, namely mental load, time load, and physical load.

Workload indicators are used to measure the level of job demands that employees feel. Hart and Staveland (2020) mentioned that workload indicators include cognitive demands, time pressure, physical effort, and emotional stress. Some commonly used indicators include the number of tasks (Wilson & Corlett, 2020), time pressure (Wickens, 2021), task complexity (Hart & Staveland, 2020), work environment conditions (Sanders & McCormick, 2020), emotional demands (Hochschild, 2020), and limited work resources (Wilson & Corlett, 2020).

The *jobs-resources* theory predicts that persistently high demands can drain employee resources and lower performance, especially when the organization's recovery opportunities and support are limited (Bakker & Demerouti, 2017). However, the *challenge-hindrane* framework shows that not all demands have the same consequences. Responsibilities, complexity, and deadlines that can still be achieved can be experienced as challenges that encourage effort and learning, while role barriers, unmanageable time pressures, and excessive workload volumes serve as barriers (LePine et al., 2005). Because previous empirical findings were inconsistent, the hypothesis was formulated as a significant influence, rather than strictly as a positive influence.

**H1: Workload has a significant effect on the performance of Civil Servants in the Ministry of Cooperatives.**

### Work Environment

The work environment is all the conditions around employees that affect the way they work and behave in the organization. Armstrong (2020) states that the work environment plays an important role in shaping employee attitudes, engagement, and performance. Sedarmayanti (2017) defines the work environment as a whole of tools, materials, and working conditions around employees that can affect the implementation of work. Furthermore, Zhang et al. (2018) explain that the work environment includes internal and external elements that affect the physical comfort, mental health, and work behavior of employees.

The dimension of the work environment consists of physical and non-physical aspects. Chandrasekar (2015) explained that the work environment includes physical, psychological, and social dimensions that together affect employee well-being and productivity. The physical work environment

includes lighting, temperature, noise, spatial planning, ventilation, and work safety, which have a direct effect on work comfort and concentration (Nduka & Okonkwo, 2017). Meanwhile, the non-physical work environment includes relationships between employees, supervisor support, communication, organizational culture, and psychological climate that affects employee satisfaction and performance (Oswald, 2019).

Work environment indicators are used to assess the quality of working conditions felt by employees. Bakotić and Babić (2016) stated that work environment indicators reflect employees' perceptions of the workplace and its impact on productivity. Commonly used indicators include lighting and physical comfort (Efendi & Mardiana, 2020), temperature and ventilation (Hashim et al., 2017), noise level (Sharma & Singh, 2018), workspace layout (Awan & Tahir, 2015), occupational safety and security (Martins, 2020), employee relations (Chen & Tang, 2018), supervisor support (Ahmad & Manzoor, 2017), and workplace communication (Khalid, 2021).

The work environment includes both physical and non-physical conditions around employees. Physical conditions include temperature, ventilation, noise, workspace layout, safety, and facilities, while non-physical conditions include relationships with co-workers, support from superiors, communication, mutual respect, and social harmony. These conditions serve as a work resource because they reduce unnecessary effort, support coordination, and strengthen employee attachment (Bakker & Demerouti, 2017). Empirical evidence also shows that physical environmental constraints can lower concentration and performance (Al-Omari & Okasheh, 2017).

**H2: The work environment has a positive effect on the performance of Civil Servants in the Ministry of Cooperatives.**

### **Hypothesis Formulation**

The research hypothesis is formulated as follows:

1. H<sub>1</sub>: Workload has a significant effect on the performance of Civil Servants (PNS) in the Ministry of Cooperatives.
2. H<sub>2</sub>: The work environment has a significant effect on the performance of Civil Servants (PNS) at the Ministry of Cooperatives.

## **RESEARCH METHODS**

### **Place and Time of Research**

This research was carried out at the Ministry of Cooperatives located on Jl. H. R. Rasuna Said No. Kav. 3–4, RT 6/RW 7, Kuningan, Karet Kuningan, Setiabudi District, South Jakarta, DKI Jakarta 12940. The implementation of the research will take place from November 2025 until this research is declared complete.

### **Research Variables**

The research variable is the main element used to explain the focus of the study and test the relationship between the concepts studied. In this study, variables are differentiated into independent variables and bound variables. The free variable consists of the workload (X<sub>1</sub>) and the work environment (X<sub>2</sub>), while the bound variable is employee performance (Y).

Workload (X<sub>1</sub>) is defined as the level of work demands that must be met by employees both mentally, timely, and physically in completing their tasks, while the work environment (X<sub>2</sub>) includes all physical and non-physical conditions that affect the comfort, safety, and effectiveness of employees' work. Both variables are measured through relevant dimensions and indicators to objectively describe working conditions. Employee performance (Y) describes the level of achievement of employee work results which is assessed from the aspects of task performance, contextual performance, and adaptive performance. Employee performance reflects the employee's ability to complete core work, behave positively in the work environment, and adapt to change, so that it becomes an indicator of individual success in supporting the achievement of organizational goals.

### **Population and Research Sample**

This study uses a quantitative explanatory design with a cross-sectional approach. The population consists of 451 Civil Servants in the Ministry of Cooperatives. The questionnaire was distributed through an invitation at the organization level to active civil servants in five work units. Responses are included if the participant is an active civil servant and fills out all required questionnaire items. A total of 82 responses that were worthy of analysis were used in the study.

The initial sample target was calculated using the Slovin formula with a 10% precision rate, which resulted in 81.85 respondents and rounded to 82. The 10% rate was pragmatically chosen because access to employees and the November-December 2025 data collection period is limited. Because such a level of precision is relatively broad, the results should not be viewed as highly accurate population estimates. As an additional check of sample adequacy, conventional power benchmarks for two predictors,  $\alpha = .05$ , power = .80, and moderate effect size ( $f^2 = .15$ ) required approximately 68 observations; the actual sample of 82 exceeded the benchmark (Cohen, 1988).

### Measurement Scale

The measurement of research data uses a Likert scale with five levels of assessment, namely:

**Table 1**  
**Likert scale**

| Statement         | Assessment Score |
|-------------------|------------------|
| Strongly agree    | 5                |
| Agree             | 4                |
| Disagree          | 3                |
| Disagree          | 2                |
| Strongly Disagree | 1                |

*Source: Sugiyono, 2018, p. 152*

### Data Analysis Techniques

The data analysis technique in this study uses *the Partial Least Squares–Structural Equation Modeling* (PLS-SEM) method with the help of SmartPLS software. This method was chosen because it is able to partially analyze the relationships between latent variables and does not require normal data distribution and large sample sizes. The analysis is carried out through two stages, namely the evaluation of the measurement model (*outer model*) and the evaluation of the structural model (*inner model*). The *evaluation of the outer model* aims to assess the validity and reliability of the research instrument through convergent validity tests using *loading factor* and *Average Variance Extracted* (AVE) values, discriminant validity using *the Heterotrait–Monotrait Ratio* (HTMT) criteria, and construct reliability tests through *Cronbach's Alpha* and *Composite Reliability values*.

Structural model evaluation (*inner model*) was carried out to test the relationship and influence between latent variables and test the research hypothesis. This stage includes multicollinearity testing using *the Variance Inflation Factor* (VIF) value, determination coefficient ( $R^2$ ) testing, and *path coefficient analysis*. The significance test was carried out through the bootstrapping technique with the criteria of t-statistic  $> 1.96$  and p-value  $< 0.05$ , which showed a statistically significant influence. In addition, effect size ( $f^2$ ) analysis was used to assess the contribution of independent variables to dependent variables, as well as predictive relevance ( $Q^2$ ) to assess the predictive ability of the research model.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### RESULTS

#### Description of Research Characteristics

This study involved 82 respondents of Civil Servants (PNS) within the Ministry of Cooperatives. Based on age, the majority of respondents were in the range of 25-35 years as many as 35 people (42.7%), followed by 36-45 years old 21 people 25.6%,  $< 25$  years 14 people 17.1%, and

age >45 years 12 people 14.6%. This composition shows the dominance of productive age groups with varying levels of work experience.

Based on gender, female respondents amounted to 47 people (57.3%) and 35 men 42.7%. The most respondents came from the Ministry Secretariat at 41.5%, followed by other work units with relatively balanced proportions. Judging from the length of employment, respondents with a working period of 1 year < 28.0% and 1–5 years of 1–5 years dominated, followed by a > 10-year working period of 25.6% and 6-10 years of 6-10 years of work 19.5%, reflecting the diversity of respondents' work experience.

### Measurement Model Analysis Results (*Outer model*)

The analysis of the measurement model (*outer model*) begins with a convergent validity test to ensure that the indicator is able to represent the measured construct.

#### *Loading factor*

**Table 2**  
**Outer Loading Values**

|                             | Outer loadings |
|-----------------------------|----------------|
| BK01 ← Workload             | 0,802          |
| BK02 ← Workload             | 0,883          |
| BK03 ← Workload             | 0,760          |
| BK04 ← Workload             | 0,858          |
| BK05 ← Workload             | 0,723          |
| BK06 ← Workload             | 0,814          |
| BK07 ← Workload             | 0,838          |
| BK08 ← Workload             | 0,809          |
| BK09 ← Workload             | 0,833          |
| BK10 ← Workload             | 0,840          |
| KK01 ← Employee Performance | 0,724          |
| KK02 ← Employee Performance | 0,786          |
| KK03 ← Employee Performance | 0,867          |
| KK04 ← Employee Performance | 0,763          |
| KK05 ← Employee Performance | 0,810          |
| KK06 ← Employee Performance | 0,790          |
| KK07 ← Employee Performance | 0,856          |
| KK08 ← Employee Performance | 0,739          |
| KK09 ← Employee Performance | 0,817          |
| KK10 ← Employee Performance | 0,824          |
| LK01 ← Work Environment     | 0,750          |
| LK02 ← Working Environment  | 0,737          |
| LK03 ← Work Environment     | 0,802          |
| LK04 ← Work Environment     | 0,738          |
| LK05 ← Work Environment     | 0,772          |
| LK06 ← Work Environment     | 0,856          |
| LK07 ← Work Environment     | 0,805          |
| LK08 ← Work Environment     | 0,808          |
| LK09 ← Work Environment     | 0,744          |
| LK10 ← Work Environment     | 0,828          |

*Source: compiled using smartpls4*

The test results showed that all indicators in each variable had a *loading factor* value above 0.70

#### Average Variance Extracted (AVE)

**Table 3**  
**AVE Value**

| <i>Average Variance Extracted (AVE)</i> |       |
|-----------------------------------------|-------|
| Workload                                | 0,668 |
| Employee Performance                    | 0,638 |
| Work Environment                        | 0,616 |

*Source: compiled using smartpls4*

The *Average Variance Extracted (AVE)* value is above 0.50. These findings show that the indicators used have a strong correlation with latent constructs and have met the criteria for convergent validity.

Furthermore, the validity of the discriminant is tested to ensure that each construct has a clear distinction from the others. The test was carried out through **Heterotrait–Monotrait Ratio (HTMT) analysis**

**Table 4**  
**HTMT Value**

|                                         | Heterotrait-monotrait ratio (HTMT) |
|-----------------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Workload Employee ↔ Performance         | 0,600                              |
| Workload Work ↔ Environment             | 0,364                              |
| Employee Performance Work ↔ Environment | 0,480                              |

*Source: compiled using smartpls4*

The entire HTMT value is below the 0.90 limit. Thus, all constructs are declared to meet the criteria of discriminant validity.

#### Reliability Test

**Table 5**  
**Cronbach's Alpha and Composite Reliability Value**

|                      | Cronbach's alpha | Composite Reliability (rho a) | Composite Reliability (rho c) |
|----------------------|------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Workload             | 0,944            | 0,948                         | 0,952                         |
| Employee Performance | 0,937            | 0,942                         | 0,946                         |
| Work Environment     | 0,931            | 0,939                         | 0,941                         |

*Source: compiled using smartpls4*

Significance testing is carried out through the reliability and internal consistency tests of the construct. The results of the analysis showed that *Cronbach's Alpha* and *Composite Reliability* values of all variables were above 0.70, which indicates a good level of internal consistency. With the fulfillment of these validity and reliability criteria, the research instrument is declared feasible and significant for use in structural model testing and research conclusion drawn.

#### Results of Structural Model Analysis (*Inner model*)

Structural models (*inner models*) are used to test the causal relationship between latent variables as well as the predictive ability of the research model.

### Coefficient of Determination (R-Square)

**Table 6**  
**R-Square Value**

|                      | R-square | R-square adjusted |
|----------------------|----------|-------------------|
| Employee Performance | 0,417    | 0,402             |

*Source: compiled using smartpls4*

The results of the determination coefficient analysis (R-Square) showed that the variables of workload and work environment were able to explain the variation in employee performance by 41.7% ( $R^2 = 0.417$ ), while the rest was influenced by other factors outside the model. The  $R^2$  adjusted value of 0.402 indicates that the model has a fairly good explanatory ability and is suitable for testing the relationship between the research variables.

### Variance Inflation Factor (VIF)

**Table 7**  
**VIF Value**

|                      | Workload | Employee Performance | Work Environment |
|----------------------|----------|----------------------|------------------|
| Workload             |          | 1,141                |                  |
| Employee Performance |          |                      |                  |
| Work Environment     |          | 1,141                |                  |

*Source: compiled using smartpls4*

Multicollinearity testing showed a *Variance Inflation Factor* (VIF) value of 1.141 for all independent variables, which is well below the 5.0 limit. This indicates the absence of symptoms of multicollinearity in the model.

### Effect Size ( $f^2$ )

**Table 8**  
**Effect Size Value**

|                                         | f-square |
|-----------------------------------------|----------|
| Employee Performance → Workload         | 0,338    |
| Employee Work Environment → Performance | 0,137    |

*Source: compiled using smartpls4*

Effect size analysis ( $f^2$ ) showed that the effect of workload on employee performance had an  $f^2$  value of 0.338, which was classified as a moderate to strong effect, while the work environment had an  $f^2$  value of 0.137, which included a moderate effect. These findings show that workload makes a more dominant contribution in influencing employee performance than the work environment.

### Q-Square ( $Q^2$ )

**Table 9**  
**Q-Square Value**

|      | $Q^2$ predict |
|------|---------------|
| KK01 | 0,236         |
| KK02 | 0,198         |
| KK03 | 0,308         |
| KK04 | 0,168         |
| KK05 | 0,295         |



|      |       |
|------|-------|
| KK06 | 0,168 |
| KK07 | 0,344 |
| KK08 | 0,129 |
| KK09 | 0,219 |
| KK10 | 0,270 |

*Source: compiled using smartpls4*

The model's predictive ability was tested through the Q-Square ( $Q^2$ ) value, which shows that all employee performance indicators have positive values in the range of 0.129–0.344, so that the model is declared to have good predictive relevance.

### Goodness of Fit

**Table 10**  
**Goodness of Fit Value**

|            | Saturated model | Estimated model |
|------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| SRMR       | 0,075           | 0,075           |
| d_ ULS     | 2,618           | 2,618           |
| d_ G       | 1,272           | 1,272           |
| Chi-square | 501,267         | 501,267         |
| NFI        | 0,767           | 0,767           |

*Source: compiled using smartpls4*

The Goodness of Fit test showed an SRMR value of 0.075 ( $<0.08$ ) and an NFI of 0.767, indicating that the structural model has a good level of conformity with empirical data. Thus, the research model was declared fit and feasible to use to explain the relationship between workload, work environment, and employee performance.

### Significant Test (Bootsraping)

**Table 11**  
**Bootsraping Value**

|                                         | Original sample (O) | Sample mean (M) | Standard deviation (STDEV) | T statistics ( $ O/STDEV $ ) | P values |
|-----------------------------------------|---------------------|-----------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|----------|
| Employee Performance → Workload         | 0,474               | 0,478           | 0,080                      | 5,923                        | 0,000    |
| Employee Work Environment → Performance | 0,302               | 0,316           | 0,083                      | 3,652                        | 0,000    |

*Source: compiled using smartpls4*

The significance test was carried out using the bootstrapping method in SmartPLS 4.0 to determine the influence of independent variables on dependent variables. The relationship between variables is stated to be significant if the *t-statistical* value  $> 1.96$  and the *p-value*  $< 0.05$ .

The test results showed that workload had a significant effect on employee performance with a *t-statistic* value of 5.923 and a *p-value* of 0.000. The work environment has also been proven to have a significant effect on employee performance with a *t-statistic* value of 3.652 and a *p-value* of 0.000. Both variables have a real influence on employee performance, with workload showing a more dominant influence than the work environment.

## DISCUSSION

### Employee Workload and Performance

Workload had a positive and significant relationship with employee performance ( $\beta = .474$ ,  $p < .001$ ). These results are in line with Yunanti and Putri (2022) and Amelia et al. (2025), who both reported a positive association between workload and performance, but differed from Putra et al. (2026), who found a negative relationship. These inconsistencies reinforce the need to distinguish between the demands of challenges and the demands of obstacles. In the Ministry of Cooperatives, concentration, responsibility, task complexity, and deadlines can signify meaningful responsibility and encourage the efforts of employees who have adequate organizational competence and support. This interpretation fits the *challenge-hindrane framework* (LePine et al., 2005).

### Work Environment and Employee Performance

The work environment has a positive and significant relationship with employee performance ( $\beta = .302$ ,  $p < .001$ ). These findings are in line with the positive influence of the work environment reported by Yunanti and Putri (2022) and Putra et al. (2026), and also with evidence that physical constraints such as noise, ventilation, lighting, and office layout can interfere with performance (Al-Omari & Okasheh, 2017). In the context of the public sector, an effective environment includes the physical resources as well as the social infrastructure necessary for coordination, i.e. clear supervisory direction, reliable communication, respectful interaction, and cooperation between units.

## CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

### CONCLUSION

This research directly answers both objectives. First, workload has a significant effect on the performance of civil servants, with a positive path coefficient in this sample. Such positive relationships should be understood as context-specific relationships and not as evidence that excessive workload is beneficial. Second, the work environment has a positive effect on the performance of civil servants. The model explains a 41.7% variance in performance.

Practically, the Ministry of Cooperatives needs to conduct regular workload mapping, set realistic deadlines, distribute urgent tasks transparently, and monitor signs of burnout. The ministry also needs to improve noise control, workspace layout, equipment availability, supervisor communication, feedback, and cooperation between units. These interventions can maintain the motivational value of challenging work while preventing demands from turning into obstacles or having a detrimental impact.

### ADVICE

Based on the results of the study, workload is the most dominant factor in influencing employee performance. Therefore, the management of the Ministry of Cooperatives is advised to regulate the workload proportionally according to the capacity of employees, set realistic work targets, and provide time management training to reduce work pressure and increase employee effectiveness and productivity.

In addition to workload management, improving the work environment also needs to be a major concern. Organizations are advised to create a comfortable and conducive work environment through better spatial planning, noise level control, and strengthening work ethics and social relations between employees. These efforts are expected to improve concentration, comfort, and quality of employee performance in a sustainable manner.

## REFERENCES

- Amelia, Y. P., Marliani, S., & Yuliawati, J. (2025). The effect of workload on employee performance with the work environment as moderation at PT. Budi Nusa Tata Prima Cikarang. *Management Studies and Entrepreneurship Journal*, 6(3), 2941–2952. <https://journal.yrpiiku.com/index.php/msej>
- Armstrong, M. (2014). *Armstrong's Handbook of Human Resource Management Practice* (13th ed.). London: Kogan Page.
- Dessler, G. (2017). *Human Resource Management* (15th ed.). Pearson Education.

- Dessler, G. (2020). *Human Resource Management* (Indonesian edition). Jakarta: Salemba Four.
- Gibson, J. L., Ivancevich, J. M., Donnelly, J. H. (2012). *Organizations: Behavior, Structure, Processes*. McGraw-Hill.
- Guritno, B., & Waridin. (2005). The Influence of Employee Perception of Leadership Behavior, Job Satisfaction, and Motivation on Performance. *JRBI – Indonesian Business Research Journal*, 1(1), 63–74. Semarang: Faculty of Economics, Diponegoro University.
- Madiistriyatno, H., & Tunnufus, Z. (2023). *Human resource management: Managing the potential of individuals within the company*. Tangerang: Indigo Media.
- Mangkunegara, A. A. A. P. (2017). *Corporate Human Resource Management*. Teenager Rosdakarya.
- Mathis, R. L., & Jackson, J. H. (2011). *Human Resource Management* (13th ed.). South-Western Cengage Learning, USA.
- Mondy, R. W. & Martocchio, J. J. (2016). *Human Resource Management*. Pearson.
- Najib, M. Y. (2020). The influence of workload and work environment on employee performance was mediated by job satisfaction in MSMEs Maju Makmur Pandaan, Pasuruan [Thesis, Maulana Malik Ibrahim State Islamic University Malang]. Faculty of Economics, Department of Management.
- Putra, D. R., Ubaidillah, H., & Firdausi, V. (2026). The influence of workload, work stress, and work environment on CV employee performance. *Kirana Bahari Indonesia. PERMANA: Journal of Taxation, Management, and Accounting*, 17(3), 2530–2548. <https://doi.org/10.24905/permana.v17i3.1341>
- Robbins, S. P., & Judge, T. A. (2016). *Organizational Behavior* (17th ed.). Pearson Education.
- Serendipity. (2018). *Human Resource Management and Work Productivity*. Aditama Review.
- Silaen, N. R., et al. (2021). *Employee performance*. Widina Bhakti Persada.
- Siska, D. S. (2018). The role of workload perception on employee turnover intentions [Thesis, Universitas Brawijaya]. Faculty of Social and Political Sciences, Department of Psychology.
- Yunanti, S., & Putri, N. A. (2022). The Influence of Workload and Work Environment on the Performance of RSIA Asyifa Depok Employees. *Voice of Management (Finance, Marketing, and Human Resources)*, 2(4), 405–414. Pamulang University.