

WORKLOAD, WORK ENVIRONMENT, AND SELF EFFICACY ITS INFLUENCE ON EMPLOYEE PERFORMANCE PT BPR SUKAWATI PANCAKANTI

Ida Ayu Komang Juniasih¹, Ida Bagus Radendra Suastama², Ni Luh Indah Cahyaningsih³
¹²³ Sekolah Tinggi Ilmu Manajemen Indonesia Handayani
dayukomangjuniasih@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

There are several factors that can influence employee performance, such as workload and work environment, which are external factors for each individual employee, as well as self-efficacy, which is an internal factor for each individual employee. This study aims to analyze the influence of workload, work environment, and self-efficacy on the performance of employees at PT BPR Sukawati Pancakanti. The types of data used are qualitative data and quantitative data. The data sources are primary and secondary data. The research results indicate that workload partially has a positive but not significant effect on the performance of employees at PT BPR Sukawati Pancakanti, the work environment partially has a positive and significant effect on the performance of employees at PT BPR Sukawati Pancakanti, and self-efficacy partially has a positive and significant effect on the performance of employees at PT BPR Sukawati Pancakanti. Simultaneously, workload, work environment, and self-efficacy affect the performance of employees at PT BPR Sukawati Pancakanti.

Keywords: *Workload, Work environment, Self-efficacy, and Employee performance*

INTRODUCTION

An organization in the process of achieving its predetermined goals must certainly pay attention to employee performance, as employees are the main drivers of the organization. According to Hamizar (2020), to assess the progress of a company, it can be evaluated based on employee performance achievements. If the company has high-performing employees, it will impact the achievement of the company's goals. Employee performance will be optimal if individuals or groups carry out their work well; therefore, it is necessary to appreciate employee performance by assigning workloads that match their capabilities (Maghfirah et al, 2023). One of the factors that contributes to influencing employee performance is the workload.

Workload is a technique for analyzing the time used by human resources to complete a task in a work unit under normal conditions (Edison, 2016). Workload is often associated with something burdensome for employees if the amount of work assigned is excessive and requires abilities beyond the employees' capacity. Not infrequently, in several cases, performance is greatly influenced by the level of workload assigned by the supervisor to employees, which tends to exceed the employees' capabilities or even their reasonable working hours. With the occurrence of such a situation, it can be concluded that the workload has a negative impact on employee performance. There are studies that support this theory, namely the research conducted by Santoso and Rijanti (2022), Hermawan (2022) which

shows that workload has a negative and significant impact on employee performance. This is in contrast to the research conducted by Ahmad, Tewal, and Taroreh (2019), which stated that workload partially does not significantly affect employee performance. The study is also supported by the research conducted by Polakitang, Koleangan, & Ogi (2019), which shows that partially, workload does not have a positive and significant effect on employee performance.

The work environment plays an important role in the continuity of an organization. The work environment encompasses everything related to the workplace, equipment layout, workspaces, lighting, ventilation or air circulation, and occupational safety and health equipment (Simanjuntak, 2011). The work environment is the entire set of facilities and infrastructure surrounding employees who are performing their tasks, which can influence the execution of their work (Sutrisno, 2013). Employees who work with complete facilities and infrastructure are able to complete their tasks smoothly. Especially if the work environment is conducive, it will affect the mood and mindset of the employees. The more conducive the work environment, the greater the potential to create a good working atmosphere for the employees. This is evidenced by research conducted by Sihaloho & Siregar (2020) and Marisya (2022), which shows that the work environment has a positive and significant impact on employee performance.

The internal aspect of self-efficacy is the individual's belief in facing and solving problems encountered in various situations and their ability to determine actions to resolve these problems. According to Luthan (2014:338), self-efficacy refers to the self-belief regarding one's ability to motivate cognitive resources and actions necessary to succeed in performing a specific task. The higher the self-efficacy, the more it will contribute to achieving good performance because the individual has strong motivation, clear goals, and stable emotions. Motivation and leadership factors are important factors in improving employee performance (Juniasih et al., 2022). Several empirical studies show that employee performance is influenced by several factors, including self-efficacy, as found by Khaerana (2020), that self-efficacy has a positive and significant impact on employee performance. Based on the observations at PT BPR Sukawati Pancakanti, it can be concluded that the financial report for September 2023 shows good financial performance. However, there is an issue regarding the credit achievement target in the report on the plan and realization of targets for the period ending November 30, 2023. In the report, the credit achievement target was only reached at 81.51%, whereas during the planning phase, it was targeted at 100%. Of course, there are several factors that influenced the failure to achieve that target.

The failure to achieve the credit targets set by the organization can be caused by an excessive workload, where employees feel that the tasks assigned to them are too heavy in terms of both quality and quantity. From the perspective of the work environment, it can also have an impact, which can be seen from the surroundings where employees work, whether in the office or in the field, as well as the relationship between employees and their superiors. Then, from the perspective of self-efficacy, employees who feel less confident in fulfilling and carrying out the tasks assigned to them.

Based on this phenomenon, a study was conducted with the aim of understanding and analyzing the influence of workload, work environment, and self-efficacy on the performance of employees at PT BPR Sukawati Pancakanti.

METHODOLOGY

The type of research is associative causality research. The objects of the research are workload, work environment, self-efficacy, and employee performance. The subjects of the research are the employees of PT BPR Sukawati Pancakanti. The research population consists of 151 people divided into 7 divisions, and the sample size was determined using the Slovin formula and the Stratified Random Sampling technique (Sugiyono, 2015). amounting to 60 samples. The types of data are qualitative data and quantitative data, sourced from primary data and secondary data. Data is processed using SPSS (Statistical Package for Social Science) version 20 software.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

1. Characteristics of Research Respondents

The characteristics of the research respondents based on gender are 68.33% male and 31.6% female. Based on age, 46.67% fall within the 36-45 year age range, which is considered a productive age. 75% of the respondents have a bachelor's/master's degree, while the rest have a high school/vocational school education (23.33%) and a diploma (1.6%). 48.33% of the respondents have work experience of 1-5 years, and 16.67% have more than 10 years, 25% have work experience of 6-10 years, and 10% have less than 1 year of work experience.

2. Descriptive Analysis

The workload variable in this study was measured using 3 indicators (Koesomowidjojo, 2017), namely work conditions, time usage, and targets to be achieved. Shows an average of 3.53 and falls within the interval of 3.43 – 4.23, categorizing it as good. The work environment variable is measured using indicators from Soetjipto (2009), consisting of

physical work environment indicators such as lighting, air circulation, noise, color, air humidity, facilities, and non-physical work environment indicators such as harmonious relationships, opportunities for advancement, and job security. Based on the research results, the average score is 4.00, categorized as good. This means that both the physical and non-physical work environments are very good for the employees of PT BPR Sukawati Pancakanti.

Employee performance variables are measured using 5 indicators from Mathis and Jackson (2013), namely work quantity, work quality, time utilization, cooperation, and attendance. Based on the research results, the average score is 4.10, categorized as good. This can be interpreted as all indicators being responded to well and the employees of PT BPR Sukawati Pancakanti having given their best performance and dedication.

3. T-test

a. The Influence of Workload (X1) on Employee Performance (Y)

Based on the test results through the T-test, it shows that the workload (X1) has a positive but not significant effect on the employee performance variable at PT BPR Sukawati Pancakanti. This can be interpreted that a heavy or light workload does not significantly impact employee performance at PT BPR Sukawati Pancakanti. This research is supported by a study conducted by Ahmad, Tewal, and Taroreh (2019) which states that workload partially does not significantly affect employee performance. The results of this study certainly contradict the theory that states that a high workload will cause work stress, which has the potential to decrease employee performance. There are several factors that may cause the theory to contradict this research, where the workload has a positive and significant impact on employee performance at PT BPR Sukawati Pancakanti. Motivation has a significant impact on employee performance (Juniasih and Artini, 2021).

b. The Influence of Work Environment (X2) on Employee Performance (Y)

Based on the test results through the T-test, it shows that the work environment (X2) has a positive and significant effect on the employee performance variable at PT BPR Sukawati Pancakanti. This means that the more conducive the work environment is for employees, both physically and non-physically, the more it has the potential to improve employee performance. Because if the physical work environment, viewed from the aspect of work necessities such as facilities, equipment, and complete and easily accessible work supplies, is conducive, employees will be motivated to perform their tasks. Furthermore, from the aspect

of the non-physical work environment, where relationships among coworkers and with supervisors are well-established, it will provide comfort for employees while they are at work. Employees can share and help each other in the process of completing their work. This is in line with the research conducted by Sihaloho & Siregar (2020), which shows that the work environment has a positive and significant impact on employee performance.

c. The Influence of Self Efficacy (X3) on Employee Performance (Y)

Based on the test results through the T-test, it shows that self-efficacy (X3) has a positive and significant effect on the employee performance variable at PT BPR Sukawati Pancakanti. This can be interpreted to mean that the higher the self-efficacy, the greater the potential for employees to contribute to the performance of the company where they dedicate their efforts and thoughts. Additionally, it can be interpreted that the employees of PT BPR Sukawati Pancakanti have a high level of self-efficacy, allowing them to complete their work and responsibilities well.

The higher someone's self-efficacy, the greater the likelihood that they will successfully achieve their predetermined goals because they have a high level of confidence in their ability to achieve what they want to accomplish. If someone's self-efficacy is low, it will cause doubt within themselves, especially when faced with situations and conditions that tend to be difficult and very exhausting, testing their level of self-confidence in their own abilities. This is supported by the research conducted by Khaerana (2020), which found that self-efficacy has a positive and significant impact on employee performance.

4. Results of the Simultaneous Regression Test (F-test)

The F-test analysis in this study is used to determine simultaneously or collectively the effect of the workload variable (X1), work environment (X2), and self-efficacy (X3) on the dependent variable of employee performance (Y). The results of the F test can be seen in the following Table.

Table 1. Results of the regression test Simultaneous (F-test)

ANOVA ^a

	Model	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	493,158	3	164,386	39,664	.000 ^b
	Residual	232,092	56	4.145		
	Total	725,250	59			

- a. Dependent Variable: Employee performance
- b. Predictors: (Constant), Self efficacy, Workload, Environment Work

Source : Primary Data Processed, 2024

The test results through the F test, it shows that simultaneously or together the workload variables (X1), work environment (X2), and self-efficacy (X3) have a significant effect on employee performance variables at PT BPR Sukawati Pancakanti. The more stable the workload level, the more conducive the work environment and the increasing employee self-efficacy, it will contribute well to employee performance. Therefore, to improve employee performance, a company must pay attention to the level of workload given, ensure a conducive employee work environment and stable employee self-efficacy so that they can contribute to their performance for the company. The results of this study are in line with research conducted by Azhar, Sumantri, & Suhardi, (2023) which shows that Self-efficacy (X3) has a significant effect on employee performance variables.

Table 2. Results of the Determination Coefficient Test (R^2)

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.825 ^a	.680	.663	2,036

a. Predictors: (Constant), Self efficacy, Workload, Environment Work

Source : Processed Primary Data, 2024

Based on Table 2, can seen that coefficient determination (R^2) is of 0.680 or 68%. This is own meaning that variable independent or variable free burden work (X1), environment work (X2), and self efficacy (X3) affects variable dependent or variable bound that is performance employee by 68%, while the rest namely 32% is influenced by other variables.

CONCLUSIONS AND SUGESTIONS

Based on the results of the previous research and discussion, the conclusions in this study are:

1. Workload has a positive but insignificant effect on employee performance at PT BPR Sukawati Pancakanti. This was concluded based on the results of the T-Test regression where the regression coefficient value was positive at 0.016 with a significance value of 0.842 which was much greater than the significance level of 0.05. So hypothesis 1 is rejected. In addition,

it can be interpreted that a large or small workload does not have a significant impact on the performance of PT BPR Sukawati Pancakanti employees

2. The work environment has a positive and significant influence on the performance of PT BPR Sukawati Pancakanti employees. This is concluded based on the results of the T-test regression where the regression coefficient value is positive at 0.214 with a significance value of 0.006 which means it is less than the significance level of 0.05. Therefore, hypothesis 2 is accepted. In addition, it can be interpreted that if the work environment is good or positive, it will improve employee performance. If the work environment is not good and not conducive, it will affect the condition of employees both physically and mentally and has the potential to reduce employee performance because a non-conducive work environment causes discomfort in working.

3. Self-efficacy has a positive and significant influence on the performance of PT BPR Sukawati Pancakanti employees. This is concluded based on the results of the T-test regression where the regression coefficient value is positive at 0.340 with a significance value of 0.000 which is much lower than the significance level of 0.05. So hypothesis 3 is accepted. In addition, it can be interpreted that the higher the self-efficacy of employees, the greater the possibility of increasing employee performance because they have a high level of confidence in their ability to complete work and problems. If employee self-efficacy is low, it has the potential to contribute to low employee performance.

4. Workload, work environment, and self-efficacy have a significant influence on employee performance. This is concluded based on the results of the F-test regression where the regression significance value is 0.000, much smaller than the significance level value of 5% or 0.05. In other words, it can be interpreted that workload (X1), work environment (X2), and self-efficacy (X3) together or simultaneously have a significant effect, and therefore the hypothesis is accepted.

The suggestion that can be given is that self-efficacy is something that supports an individual. Employees must have the confidence that they can complete the work and responsibilities given to them. In addition, leaders should also continue to provide motivation so that they can feel that they are appreciated and their existence is very meaningful for the continuity of the company so that they can continue to strive to give their best for the company.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Ahmad, Y., Tewal, B., & Taroreh, R.N. (2019). The Influence Stres Work, Workload, and Environment Work On Employee Performance at PT. Fif Group Manado. EMBA Journal : Journal of Economic, Management, Business and Accounting Research, 7 (3).
- Azhar, MF, Sumantri, BA, & Suhardi, S. (2023). The Influence of Workload, Environment Work, and Self Efficacy on Employee Performance BPJS Employment at the Kediri Branch Office (Doctoral Dissertation, Nusantara PGRI University, Kediri).
- Edison, Emron. Yohny anwar, Imas Komariyah. (2016). Management Human Resources. Bandung : Alfabeta.
- Hamizar, A. 2020. “ The Effect of Workload On Employee Performance (Case Study at BPS Maluku).” Journal of Islamic Economic and Business 2(1): 52–63.
- Hartati, Y., Ratnasari, SL, & Susanti, EN (2020). The Influence competence, communication, and environment Work to performance PT. Indotirta employees Asylum. Journal Dimensions, 9 (2), 294-306.
- Hernawan, E. (2022). The Influence Environment Work, Stress Work, and Workload On the Performance of PT. Sakti Mobile Jakarta. Journal of Scientific Studies, 22 (2), 173-180.
- Juniasih, IAK, & Artini, NLA (2021, January). Influence Motivation Intrinsic, Discipline Work and Environment Work on Employee Performance at PT. Bali Adventure Tours. In Management Forum (Vol. 19, No. 1, pp. 93-109).
- Juniasih , IA K, Suastama , IBR, and Ramli, TAY (2022). Motivation and Leadership Its influence on Employee Performance The Tusita Hotel Kuta. National Seminar Results Research, College of Science Indonesian Management Handayani. Proceedings. Pages 148-158.
https://scholar.google.com/citations?view_op=view_citation&hl=en&user=bTSbx2sAAAAJ&pagesize=80&citation_for_view=bTSbx2sAAAAJ:ufrVoPGSRksC
- Khaerana, K. (2020). Influence Self Efficacy On Employee Performance at the Secretariat Commission Regional General Election (KPUD) Regency East Luwu. Journal Ecoment Global, 5 (1), 80-89.
- Kholilah, K., Gergita, A., Puspasari, M., & Kohar, Z. (2021). The Influence Environment Work and Discipline Work On Employee Performance of PT. Anugrah Argon Medica Palembang. MOTIVATION, 6 (1), 38-44.
- Koesomowidjojo, SM 2017. Workload Analysis. Achieve Hope of Success, Jakarta.
- Luthans, Fred. 2014. Organizational Behavior, Singapore: Megraw HillBook co.

- Maghfira, A., Joesyiana, K., & Harahap, ARI (2023). The Influence of Workload and Occupational Health and Safety (K3) on Employee Performance at PT. Hokkan Deltapack Industri Kampar Branch. *Journal of Tax and Business*, 4 (1), 13-19.
- Marisya, F. (2022). The Influence Environment Work On Employee Performance at PT. Al Bilad Tour And Travel, South Sumatra. *MAMEN: Journal Management*, 1 (4), 576-585.
- Mathis, R.L., & Jackson, J.H. (2013). *Management Human Resources*, Book I. Jakarta: Salemba Four.lunen
- Polakitang, AF, Koleangan, R., & Ogi, IW (2019). The Influence of burden work, environment work, and work stress on Employee Performance at PT. Esta Group Jaya. *EMBA Journal : Journal of Economic, Management, Business and Accounting Research*, 7 (3).
- Sihaloho, RD, & Siregar, H. (2020). The Influence Environment Work On Employee Performance At PT. Super Setia Sagita Medan. *Journal Scientific Socio Secretum*, 9 (2), 273-281.
- Simanjuntak, PJ (2011). *Performance Management and Evaluation*. Jakarta: Faculty of Economics, University of Indonesia.
- Soetjipto, Budi W. 2009. *New Paradigm of Management Human Resources*, Yogyakarta : Amara Book.
- Sugiyono, PD (2015). *Educational Research Methods; Approach Quantitative, Qualitative, and R & D*, 11th ed. alphabeta.
- Sutrisno, E. (2013). *Management Human Resources*. Jakarta : Kencana Prenada Media Group.
- Zimmerman, M., Morgan, T. A., & Stanton, K. (2018). The severity of psychiatric disorders. *World Psychiatry*, 17(3), 258–275.