



Journal Of Resource Management, Economics And Business

e-ISSN 2963-0266

<https://portal.xjurnal.com/index.php/REMICS/index>

Volume: 5 Issue: 1 Year: 2025

<https://doi.org/10.58468/remics.v5i1.235>



THE EFFECT OF WORK STRESS AND WORK ENVIRONMENT ON EMPLOYEE PERFORMANCE IN PUBLIC WORKS AND SPATIAL PLANNING (DPUPR) KARAWANG DISTRICT

Fikiana

Management Study Program, Faculty of Economics and Business, Buana Perjuangan University, Karawang
mn19.fikiana@mhs.ubpkarawang.ac.id

Abstract

Purpose: This study aims to examine the effect of work stress and work environment on employee performance at the Public Works and Spatial Planning Office of Karawang Regency.

Research Methodology: This study used a quantitative verification approach with a survey method. Primary data were collected through questionnaires using a five-point Likert scale. The population consisted of 100 employees, and all members of the population were selected using a saturated sampling technique. The data were analyzed using IBM SPSS Statistics 26 through validity testing, reliability testing, classical assumption testing, multiple linear regression, t-test, F-test, and coefficient of determination analysis.

Results: The results show that work stress has a negative and significant effect on employee performance, with a regression coefficient of -0.339 and a significance value of 0.001. Meanwhile, the work environment has a positive and significant effect on employee performance, with a regression coefficient of 0.574 and a significance value of 0.000. Simultaneously, work stress and work environment significantly affect employee performance, with an R-square value of 0.837, indicating that 83.7% of employee performance variation can be explained by the two independent variables.

Limitations: This study is limited to one public sector institution and uses cross-sectional self-reported data.

Contribution: This study contributes to human resource management studies, especially in explaining how work stress and work environment influence employee performance in local government institutions.

Keywords: *Work Stress, Work Environment, Employee Performance, Human Resource Management, Public Sector, Local Government.*



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/)

1. INTRODUCTION

Employee performance is a central concern in human resource management because it determines the ability of an organization to achieve its strategic and operational objectives. In public sector organizations, employee performance is even more critical because public institutions are responsible for delivering administrative services, infrastructure programs, and community-oriented development outcomes. The Public Works and Spatial Planning Office is one of the government institutions that requires employees to work accurately, responsively, and consistently, especially because its tasks are closely related to infrastructure planning, public service delivery, and regional development. Therefore, understanding the factors that influence employee performance in this institutional context is important for improving organizational effectiveness.

In recent years, public sector employees have faced increasing work demands, administrative complexity, public accountability, and pressure to complete tasks within limited time and resources. These conditions may create work stress when employees perceive that job demands exceed their ability, capacity, or available organizational support. Work stress is generally understood as a psychological and physical response that occurs when employees experience pressure, tension, or imbalance in carrying out their work responsibilities. Previous studies have shown that excessive work stress can reduce concentration, motivation, emotional stability, and work productivity, which ultimately weakens employee performance (Chen et al., 2022; Ekhsan & Septian, 2021). In this sense, work stress is not only an individual psychological issue but also an organizational problem that must be managed by public institutions.

Besides work stress, the work environment is also an important determinant of employee performance. A supportive work environment provides employees with physical comfort, adequate facilities, harmonious relationships, clear communication, and organizational support. Conversely, an unfavorable work environment may reduce work enthusiasm, increase psychological pressure, and create barriers to completing work effectively. In human resource management, the work environment is viewed as one of the organizational resources that can encourage employees to perform better. Employees who work in a comfortable, safe, and supportive environment tend to show higher responsibility, discipline, and work achievement. Therefore, improving the quality of the work environment is a strategic effort to strengthen employee performance in public organizations.

Although many studies have examined the relationship between work stress, work environment, and employee performance, several gaps remain. First, previous studies have often focused on private companies, banking institutions, manufacturing firms, or healthcare organizations, while studies in local government institutions remain relatively limited. Second, some studies have examined work stress or work environment separately, whereas employee performance is usually influenced by both psychological and organizational factors simultaneously. Third, the contextual evidence from local public sector institutions in Indonesia, particularly in the Public Works and Spatial Planning Office, is still underexplored. This creates a contextual and empirical gap that needs to be addressed.

The Public Works and Spatial Planning Office of Karawang Regency provides a relevant context for this study because the institution is required to maintain employee performance while handling complex administrative and technical responsibilities. Employees in this institution may experience pressure related to workload, deadlines, coordination, and public expectations. At the same time, the quality of the work environment may influence how employees respond to these pressures and complete their tasks. Therefore, examining work

stress and work environment together can provide a more comprehensive explanation of employee performance in this public sector setting.

The novelty of this study lies in its contextual focus on a local government institution and its simultaneous examination of work stress and work environment as predictors of employee performance. While the topic has been discussed in previous human resource management research, this study contributes by providing empirical evidence from the Public Works and Spatial Planning Office of Karawang Regency. The findings are expected to enrich public sector human resource management literature and provide practical insights for improving employee performance through better stress management and work environment improvement.

Based on the research background and gap, this study aims to analyze the effect of work stress and work environment on employee performance at the Public Works and Spatial Planning Office of Karawang Regency. Specifically, this study addresses the following research questions: (1) Does work stress affect employee performance? (2) Does the work environment affect employee performance? and (3) Do work stress and work environment simultaneously affect employee performance?

This article is organized as follows. The first section presents the introduction, research background, research gap, novelty, and objectives of the study. The second section discusses the literature review and hypothesis development. The third section explains the research methodology, including research design, population, sample, data collection, and data analysis technique. The fourth section presents the results and discussion. The final section provides the conclusion, limitations, and suggestions for future research.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW AND HYPOTHESIS DEVELOPMENT

2.1. Literature Review

This study is grounded in the Job Demands–Resources (JD-R) theory, which explains that employee well-being and performance are influenced by the balance between job demands and job resources. Job demands refer to aspects of work that require continuous physical, psychological, or emotional effort, while job resources refer to organizational, social, and physical aspects that help employees achieve work goals, reduce job demands, and stimulate personal growth. In this perspective, work stress can be understood as a negative consequence of excessive job demands, while the work environment can be viewed as an organizational resource that supports employees in performing their duties. JD-R theory is relevant to this study because public sector employees often face administrative pressure, deadlines, coordination demands, and public accountability, while their performance also depends on the availability of supportive workplace conditions.

Work stress is a psychological condition that occurs when employees perceive that job demands exceed their abilities, resources, or control. In organizational settings, work stress may arise from excessive workload, role conflict, time pressure, unclear responsibilities, limited support, and high expectations from supervisors or service users. Work stress is not only related to emotional discomfort but also affects employees' concentration, decision-making ability, motivation, and work behavior. Chen et al. (2022) explain that work stress can influence employees' psychological condition, which in turn may reduce their performance. Therefore, when employees experience high levels of stress, they may find it difficult to maintain accuracy, productivity, and consistency in completing work tasks.

In public sector organizations, work stress is particularly important because employees are expected to provide reliable services while operating within bureaucratic procedures, formal regulations, and public expectations. Employees in government institutions must often

deal with work targets, administrative documentation, coordination among units, and accountability demands. If these demands are not managed properly, work stress can reduce employee performance. From the JD-R perspective, stress represents a form of job demand that consumes employees' psychological and physical energy. When job demands become excessive, employees may experience fatigue, reduced motivation, and lower work achievement.

The work environment refers to the physical, social, and organizational conditions surrounding employees while they perform their jobs. A good work environment includes adequate facilities, comfortable workspace, proper lighting, cleanliness, safety, supportive communication, harmonious relationships, and organizational support. The work environment is an important factor because employees do not work in isolation; their performance is shaped by the conditions and interactions around them. Zhenjing et al. (2022) found that workplace environment is strongly related to employee task performance through employee commitment and achievement-striving ability. This means that a supportive work environment can strengthen employees' willingness and ability to perform better.

The work environment can be divided into physical and non-physical dimensions. The physical work environment includes office layout, equipment, lighting, temperature, cleanliness, and supporting facilities. Meanwhile, the non-physical work environment includes interpersonal relationships, leadership support, communication, cooperation, and organizational climate. Both dimensions are important in supporting employee performance. In the context of public institutions, a supportive work environment helps employees complete administrative and technical tasks more effectively. When employees feel comfortable, supported, and valued, they are more likely to show discipline, responsibility, and work commitment.

Employee performance refers to the extent to which employees accomplish tasks, responsibilities, and organizational targets. Performance can be reflected in work quality, work quantity, timeliness, responsibility, cooperation, and initiative. Koopmans et al. (2014) explain that individual work performance generally includes task performance, contextual performance, adaptive performance, and counterproductive work behavior. In public sector organizations, employee performance is not only measured by how many tasks are completed, but also by accuracy, service orientation, compliance with procedures, and contribution to institutional goals.

Based on the theoretical synthesis, employee performance is influenced by both psychological and organizational factors. Work stress represents a psychological pressure that can reduce employee ability to perform optimally. Meanwhile, the work environment represents an organizational resource that can support employees in carrying out their work effectively. Therefore, examining work stress and work environment simultaneously provides a more comprehensive understanding of employee performance in public sector organizations. In this study, the Public Works and Spatial Planning Office of Karawang Regency is used as the research context to explain how these two factors influence employee performance in a local government institution.

2.2 Hypothesis Development

Work stress is expected to have a negative effect on employee performance. Theoretically, excessive work stress reduces employees' psychological energy, concentration, and motivation. Employees who experience high stress may face difficulty in completing tasks accurately and on time. From the JD-R perspective, work stress is a job demand that can create strain and reduce performance when it is not balanced with sufficient resources. Previous research also shows that work stress is associated with lower employee performance because stress affects mental

condition and work behavior (Chen et al., 2022). Therefore, the first hypothesis is formulated as follows:

H1: Work stress has a negative and significant effect on employee performance.

The work environment is expected to have a positive effect on employee performance. A supportive work environment provides employees with comfort, facilities, social support, and organizational conditions that help them complete their duties effectively. Employees who work in a positive environment tend to show higher motivation, responsibility, and commitment. From the JD-R perspective, the work environment functions as a job resource that supports employees in achieving work goals and reducing the negative impact of job demands. Empirical findings also indicate that a positive workplace environment can improve employee task performance (Zhenjing et al., 2022). Therefore, the second hypothesis is formulated as follows:

H2: Work environment has a positive and significant effect on employee performance.

Work stress and work environment are also expected to simultaneously affect employee performance. Employee performance is not determined by one factor alone, but by the interaction between psychological pressure and organizational support. High work stress may reduce performance, while a supportive work environment may improve performance. When analyzed together, both variables can explain how internal pressure and external workplace conditions shape employee performance. In public sector organizations, employees need not only manageable work demands but also supportive working conditions to achieve optimal performance. Therefore, the third hypothesis is formulated as follows:

H3: Work stress and work environment simultaneously have a significant effect on employee performance.

3. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This study employed a quantitative research design with a verificative approach. A quantitative design was considered appropriate because the study aimed to examine the causal relationship between work stress, work environment, and employee performance using numerical data and statistical analysis. The verificative approach was used to test the hypotheses developed from the theoretical framework and previous empirical findings.

The research was conducted at the Public Works and Spatial Planning Office of Karawang Regency, Indonesia. This institution was selected because it plays an important role in infrastructure planning, public works administration, and regional spatial management. Employees in this institution are required to perform administrative and technical duties under formal procedures, deadlines, and public service expectations. Therefore, this context is relevant for examining how work stress and work environment influence employee performance in a local government organization.

The population of this study consisted of all employees at the Public Works and Spatial Planning Office of Karawang Regency, totaling 100 employees. Since the population size was relatively small and accessible, this study used a saturated sampling technique, in which all members of the population were selected as respondents. Therefore, the final sample size was 100 respondents. This technique was used to obtain a complete representation of the population and to reduce sampling bias.

Primary data were collected through a structured questionnaire distributed to the respondents. The questionnaire was designed based on the operational indicators of each variable. Respondents were asked to evaluate each statement using a five-point Likert scale,

ranging from 1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree. The use of a Likert scale allowed the researcher to measure respondents' perceptions quantitatively and convert them into statistical data for further analysis.

This study consisted of two independent variables and one dependent variable. The independent variables were work stress (X1) and work environment (X2), while the dependent variable was employee performance (Y). Work stress refers to the psychological pressure experienced by employees due to job demands, workload, time pressure, role conflict, and work-related tension. The work environment refers to the physical and non-physical conditions surrounding employees, including facilities, comfort, communication, interpersonal relationships, and organizational support. Employee performance refers to the extent to which employees complete their duties effectively, accurately, responsibly, and on time. The operational definition of the variables is presented as follows.

Table 1. Operational Definition of Variables

Variable	Operational Definition	Indicators	Scale
Work Stress (X1)	Psychological pressure experienced by employees when job demands exceed their perceived ability or resources.	Workload, time pressure, role conflict, emotional tension, work fatigue, and job demand pressure.	Likert 1-5
Work Environment (X2)	Physical and non-physical workplace conditions that support or hinder employees in performing their duties.	Workplace comfort, facilities, cleanliness, safety, communication, cooperation, and supervisor support.	Likert 1-5
Employee Performance (Y)	The level of employee achievement in carrying out work duties and responsibilities.	Work quality, work quantity, timeliness, responsibility, cooperation, initiative, and task completion.	Likert 1-5

Before conducting hypothesis testing, the research instrument was evaluated using validity and reliability tests. The validity test was conducted by comparing the item correlation value with the minimum critical value of 0.30. An item was considered valid if the correlation coefficient was greater than 0.30. The reliability test was conducted using Cronbach's Alpha. A variable was considered reliable if the Cronbach's Alpha value was greater than 0.60. These tests were used to ensure that the questionnaire items were appropriate and consistent in measuring the research variables.

The collected data were analyzed using IBM SPSS Statistics 26. The data analysis process included validity testing, reliability testing, classical assumption testing, multiple linear regression analysis, partial hypothesis testing using the t-test, simultaneous hypothesis testing using the F-test, and coefficient of determination analysis. The classical assumption tests included normality, heteroscedasticity, multicollinearity, and autocorrelation tests. Multiple linear regression was used because this study examined the effect of two independent variables on one dependent variable.

The regression model used in this study is formulated as follows:

$$Y = \alpha + \beta_1 X_1 + \beta_2 X_2 + \varepsilon$$

Where:

Y = Employee Performance

α = Constant

β_1 = Regression coefficient of Work Stress

β_2 = Regression coefficient of Work Environment

X1 = Work Stress

X2 = Work Environment

ε = Error term

The hypotheses were tested at a significance level of 5% or 0.05. If the significance value was less than 0.05, the hypothesis was accepted. The t-test was used to examine the partial effect of work stress and work environment on employee performance, while the F-test was used to examine the simultaneous effect of work stress and work environment on employee performance. The coefficient of determination was used to determine the proportion of employee performance variance explained by work stress and work environment.

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

4.1 Results

This section presents the results of instrument testing, classical assumption testing, multiple linear regression analysis, and hypothesis testing. The analysis was conducted using IBM SPSS Statistics 26 with 100 respondents.

4.1.1 Validity and Reliability Testing

The validity test was conducted by comparing the item correlation value with the minimum critical value of 0.30. The results show that all questionnaire items had correlation values above 0.30. Therefore, all items measuring work stress, work environment, and employee performance were declared valid.

Table 2. Summary of Validity Test

Variable	Number of Items	Correlation Range	Criteria	Result
Work Stress	10	0.660–0.861	> 0.30	Valid
Work Environment	10	0.712–0.871	> 0.30	Valid
Employee Performance	10	0.742–0.880	> 0.30	Valid

The reliability test was conducted using Cronbach's Alpha. The results show that all variables had Cronbach's Alpha values above 0.60, indicating that the research instruments were reliable.

Table 3. Reliability Test Results

Variable	Cronbach's Alpha	Number of Items	Result
Work Stress	0.923	10	Reliable
Work Environment	0.935	10	Reliable
Employee Performance	0.942	10	Reliable

4.1.2 Classical Assumption Testing

The normality test using the P-P Plot showed that the data points were distributed around the diagonal line. This indicates that the regression model met the normality assumption. The heteroscedasticity test using the scatterplot showed that the data points were randomly distributed above and below the zero point on the Y-axis, indicating that heteroscedasticity was not detected.

The multicollinearity test showed that both independent variables had tolerance values of 0.169 and VIF values of 5.920. Since the tolerance values were greater than 0.10 and the VIF values were less than 10, the model was free from multicollinearity. The Durbin-Watson value was 1.891, which was between dU and 4-dU. Therefore, autocorrelation was not detected in the regression model.

4.1.3 Multiple Linear Regression Analysis

Multiple linear regression analysis was used to examine the effect of work stress and work environment on employee performance. The results are presented in Table 4.

Table 4. Multiple Linear Regression Results

Variable	B	Std. Error	Beta	t-value	Sig.
Constant	3.456	1.634	-	2.115	0.037
Work Stress	-0.339	0.100	-0.338	-3.384	0.001
Work Environment	0.574	0.096	0.596	5.971	0.000

Based on the regression results, the regression equation is:

$$Y = 3.456 - 0.339X_1 + 0.574X_2$$

The equation indicates that work stress has a negative effect on employee performance, while work environment has a positive effect on employee performance. The coefficient of work stress is -0.339, meaning that an increase in work stress tends to decrease employee performance. Meanwhile, the coefficient of work environment is 0.574, meaning that improvement in the work environment tends to increase employee performance.

4.1.4 Coefficient of Determination

The coefficient of determination was used to determine how much employee performance can be explained by work stress and work environment.

Table 5. Coefficient of Determination

R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
0.915	0.837	0.833	2.67159

The R Square value of 0.837 indicates that 83.7% of the variation in employee performance can be explained by work stress and work environment. Meanwhile, the remaining 16.3% is explained by other factors not examined in this study, such as leadership, motivation, compensation, organizational culture, job satisfaction, or employee competence.

4.1.5 Hypothesis Testing

The t-test was used to examine the partial effect of each independent variable on employee performance. The results show that work stress had a negative and significant effect on employee performance, with a t-value of -3.384 and a significance value of 0.001. Therefore, H1 is supported. Work environment had a positive and significant effect on employee performance, with a t-value of 5.971 and a significance value of 0.000. Therefore, H2 is supported. The F-test was used to examine the simultaneous effect of work stress and work environment on employee performance.

Table 6. F-Test Results

Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Regression	3547.311	2	1773.656	248.501	0.000
Residual	692.329	97	7.137	-	-
Total	4239.640	99	-	-	-

The F-test result shows that the F-value was 248.501 with a significance value of 0.000. Since the significance value was less than 0.05, work stress and work environment simultaneously had a significant effect on employee performance. Therefore, H3 is supported.

4.2 Discussion

The first finding shows that work stress has a negative and significant effect on employee performance. This means that higher work stress tends to reduce employee performance at the Public Works and Spatial Planning Office of Karawang Regency. This finding supports the Job Demands–Resources theory, which explains that excessive job demands may drain employees' psychological and physical energy and reduce their ability to perform effectively. When employees experience pressure, workload, time constraints, and emotional tension, their concentration and motivation may decrease. As a result, employees may find it more difficult to complete tasks accurately, responsibly, and on time.

This result is also consistent with previous studies which explain that work stress can reduce employee performance by affecting psychological conditions and work behavior. In the public sector context, work stress may arise from administrative complexity, public accountability, coordination demands, and pressure to complete tasks according to formal procedures. Therefore, stress management is important for maintaining employee performance in government institutions.

The second finding shows that work environment has a positive and significant effect on employee performance. This indicates that a better work environment leads to higher employee performance. A supportive work environment can provide comfort, facilities, cooperation, communication, and organizational support that help employees complete their duties effectively. From the perspective of Job Demands–Resources theory, the work environment functions as a job resource that supports employees in achieving work goals and reducing the negative effects of job demands.

The standardized beta value of work environment was higher than that of work stress. This indicates that work environment was the stronger predictor of employee performance in this study. This finding suggests that improving the quality of the work environment may be one of the most effective strategies for increasing employee performance at the Public Works and Spatial Planning Office of Karawang Regency. A comfortable and supportive work environment can encourage employees to be more disciplined, responsible, cooperative, and productive.

The third finding shows that work stress and work environment simultaneously have a significant effect on employee performance. This means that employee performance is influenced by both psychological pressure and organizational conditions. Work stress can weaken performance, while a supportive work environment can strengthen performance. Therefore, public sector organizations should not only focus on reducing work stress but also improve the workplace conditions that support employee productivity.

Theoretically, this study strengthens the application of Job Demands–Resources theory in public sector human resource management. Work stress represents job demands, while work environment represents job resources. The findings confirm that employee performance depends on how organizations manage job demands and provide sufficient workplace resources. Practically, the results suggest that the Public Works and Spatial Planning Office of Karawang Regency should improve stress management, strengthen coordination, clarify job responsibilities, provide adequate facilities, and develop a more supportive organizational climate.

Overall, the findings contribute to human resource management literature by providing empirical evidence from a local government institution in Indonesia. The study shows that employee performance in public organizations can be improved by managing work stress and creating a supportive work environment. This is important because public sector performance directly affects service quality, institutional effectiveness, and regional development outcomes.

5. CONCLUSION

This study aimed to examine the effect of work stress and work environment on employee performance at the Public Works and Spatial Planning Office of Karawang Regency. The findings show that work stress has a negative and significant effect on employee performance, while work environment has a positive and significant effect on employee performance. The results also confirm that work stress and work environment simultaneously influence employee performance.

These findings indicate that employee performance in public sector organizations is shaped by both psychological and organizational factors. Excessive work stress may reduce employees' ability to perform optimally, while a supportive work environment can improve employee motivation, responsibility, and task completion. Theoretically, this study supports the Job Demands–Resources perspective by showing that work stress represents job demands that may weaken performance, whereas the work environment functions as a job resource that supports employee performance. Practically, the findings suggest that public institutions should manage work stress and improve workplace conditions to strengthen employee performance.

This study has several limitations. First, the research was conducted only in one local government institution, so the findings may not be generalized to all public sector organizations. Second, the study used a cross-sectional design, which limits the ability to explain changes in employee performance over time. Third, the data were collected using self-reported questionnaires, which may contain respondent bias. Future studies are encouraged to examine similar models in different public institutions, use larger samples, apply longitudinal designs, and include additional variables such as leadership, job satisfaction, motivation, organizational culture, or employee engagement.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The author would like to express appreciation to the Public Works and Spatial Planning Office of Karawang Regency for supporting the data collection process. The author also thanks all respondents who voluntarily participated in this study.

DECLARATION ON THE USE OF AI-ASSISTED TECHNOLOGIES

The author declares that AI-assisted technology, namely ChatGPT by OpenAI, was used to assist in improving the academic language, structure, and clarity of several parts of this manuscript. The AI-assisted technology was not used to generate or manipulate research data, statistical results, or empirical findings. The author has reviewed, verified, and approved all AI-assisted content and remains fully responsible for the accuracy, originality, integrity, and ethical accountability of the manuscript.

REFERENCES

- Atatsi, E. A., Stoffers, J., & Kil, A. (2019). Factors affecting employee performance: A systematic literature review. *Journal of Advances in Management Research*, 16(3), 329–351. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JAMR-06-2018-0052>
- Badrianto, Y., & Ekhsan, M. (2021). Pengaruh work-life balance terhadap kinerja karyawan yang dimediasi komitmen organisasi. *JESYA: Jurnal Ekonomi & Ekonomi Syariah*, 4(2), 951–962. <https://doi.org/10.36778/jesya.v4i2.460>
- Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2017). Job demands–resources theory: Taking stock and looking forward. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 22(3), 273–285. <https://doi.org/10.1037/ocp0000056>
- Bakker, A. B., Demerouti, E., & Sanz-Vergel, A. I. (2023). Job demands–resources theory: Ten years later. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 10, 25–53. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-120920-053933>
- Chen, B., Wang, L., Li, B., & Liu, W. (2022). Work stress, mental health, and employee performance. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13, Article 1006580. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.1006580>
- Demerouti, E., Bakker, A. B., Nachreiner, F., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2001). The job demands–resources model of burnout. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(3), 499–512. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.86.3.499>
- Ekhsan, M., & Septian, B. (2021). Pengaruh stres kerja, konflik kerja dan kompensasi terhadap kinerja karyawan. *MASTER: Jurnal Manajemen Strategik Kewirausahaan*, 1(1), 11–18.
- 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 Economics Engineering*, 17(2), 173–193. <https://doi.org/10.3846/bme.2019.10379>
- Koopmans, L., Bernaards, C. M., Hildebrandt, V. H., de Vet, H. C. W., & van der Beek, A. J. (2014). Measuring individual work performance: Identifying and selecting indicators. *Work*, 48(2), 229–238. <https://doi.org/10.3233/WOR-131659>

- Nurjaya, N. (2021). Pengaruh disiplin kerja, lingkungan kerja dan motivasi kerja terhadap kinerja karyawan pada PT. Hazara Cipta Pesona. *Akselerasi: Jurnal Ilmiah Nasional*, 3(1), 60–74. <https://doi.org/10.54783/jin.v3i1.361>
- Platania, S., Morando, M., Gruttadauria, S. V., & Koopmans, L. (2024). The Individual Work Performance Questionnaire: Psychometric properties of the Italian version. *European Journal of Investigation in Health, Psychology and Education*, 14(1), 49–63. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ejihpe14010004>
- Raziq, A., & Maulabakhsh, R. (2015). Impact of working environment on job satisfaction. *Procedia Economics and Finance*, 23, 717–725. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S2212-5671\(15\)00524-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2212-5671(15)00524-9)
- Sharma, J., Dhar, R. L., & Tyagi, A. (2016). Stress as a mediator between work–family conflict and psychological health among the nursing staff: Moderating role of emotional intelligence. *Applied Nursing Research*, 30, 268–275. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apnr.2015.01.010>
- van der Vaart, L. (2021). The performance measurement conundrum: Construct validity of the Individual Work Performance Questionnaire in South Africa. *South African Journal of Economic and Management Sciences*, 24(1), 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.4102/sajems.v24i1.3581>
- Zhenjing, G., Chupradit, S., Ku, K. Y., Nassani, A. A., & Haffar, M. (2022). Impact of employees' workplace environment on employees' performance: A multi-mediation model. *Frontiers in Public Health*, 10, Article 890400. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpubh.2022.890400>
- Hustia, A. (2020). Pengaruh motivasi kerja, lingkungan kerja dan disiplin kerja terhadap kinerja karyawan pada perusahaan WFO masa pandemi. *Jurnal Ilmu Manajemen*, 10(1), 81–91.
- Krisnawati, S., & Lestari, Y. T. (2018). Stres kerja dan konflik kerja pengaruhnya terhadap kinerja karyawan. *Jurnal Riset Manajemen dan Bisnis*, 3, 287–294.
- Wenur, G., Sepang, J., & Dotulong, L. (2018). Pengaruh beban kerja dan stres kerja terhadap kinerja karyawan pada PT. Bank Negara Indonesia (Persero) Tbk Cabang Manado. *Jurnal EMBA: Jurnal Riset Ekonomi, Manajemen, Bisnis dan Akuntansi*, 6(1), 51–60.