IJSSR
International Journal of Social Service and Research

Vol. 04, No. 02, February 2024
e-ISSN: 2807-8691 | p-ISSN: 2807-839X

The Influence of Workload, Work Motivation, and Physical Work Environment on Employee Performance

Indah Fitriyani[1], Herry Krisnandi[2], Kumba Digdowiseiso[3*]
Faculty of Economics and Business, Universitas Nasional[1,2,3]
Email: indah@gmail.com[1], herry.krisnandi@civitas.unas.ac.id[2], kumba.digdo@civitas.unas.ac.id[3*]

Keywords
Workload, Work Motivation, Physical Work Environment and Employee Performance.

ABSTRACT
This study investigates the impact of workload, work motivation, and the physical work environment on employee performance within the Finance and Equipment Section of the Secretariat of the Directorate General of Livestock and Animal Health, Ministry of Agriculture. The population comprises 150 employees within this section. Utilizing the Slovin formula, a sample of 110 employees was selected. Data analysis was conducted using SPSS version 23, employing multiple linear regression. The results revealed significant findings supporting the three hypotheses proposed. However, the abstract does not provide specific details about the magnitude and direction of these effects. The study suggests that the Finance and Equipment Division employees can enhance their performance by addressing factors such as workload, work motivation, and the physical work environment. Practical implications and recommendations for implementation are not explicitly mentioned in the current abstract. In summary, while the abstract effectively outlines the study's objectives and methodology, it could benefit from greater specificity, conciseness, and clarity in presenting the essential findings and their practical implications.

INTRODUCTION

Human resource management is a set of organizational activities directed at efforts to attract, develop, and retain an effective workforce. Human resource management takes place in the context of a complex and ever-changing environment and is increasingly considered strategically important. In an organization, human resource management has a very important role to manage, organize and utilize employees so that they can function productively. In short, human resource management places labor not just as a means of production, an organization or company sees the quality of its employees based on the performance produced by these employees in every task given to them. According to (A. Anwar Prabu Mangkunegara, 2011) performance is the result of work in quality and quantity achieved by an employee in performing his duties in accordance with the responsibilities given to him. (V.Hubeis, 2007) (Billy Rubianto Irawan, 2016) states that employee performance is influenced by employee intrinsic and extrinsic factors. The intrinsic factors that affect employee performance consist of education, experience, motivation, health, age, skills, emotions and spiritual. While extrinsic factors that affect employee performance consist of physical and non-physical environments, leadership, vertical and horizontal communication, compensation, control in the form of supervision, facilities, training, workload, work procedures, punishment systems and so on.

Thus the workload is included in the extrinsic factors that affect employee performance. Workload is the tasks given to the workforce or employees to be completed at a certain time using the skills and potential of the workforce (Munandar, 2011). Excessive workload will result in both physical and psychological fatigue and emotional reactions, such as headaches, indigestion and irritability. While on too little workload where the work done due to repetition of motion causes boredom.

In addition to the workload factor, the motivation factor also needs to be considered in order to achieve organizational goals. According to (A.F.Stoner James, 1996) defines motivation as that which causes, channels, and supports human behavior. Because of its position and relationship, it is very

https://doi.org/10.46799/ijssr.v4i02.697

strategic if the development of individual employee performance starts from increasing work motivation. Employees and companies are two things that cannot be separated. Employees play a major role in running the wheels of company life If employees have high productivity and work motivation, then the pace of the wheels will run fast, which will eventually result in good performance and achievements for the company. On the other hand, how can the wheels of the company run well, if the employees work unproductively, it means that employees do not have high morale, are not tenacious at work, and have low morale. Usually employees who are satisfied with what they get from the company will give more than what is expected and he will continue to try to improve his performance. Conversely, employees with low job satisfaction tend to see work as tedious and boring, so they work forcefully and carelessly.

A physical work environment can create a binding working relationship between people in the environment. Therefore, efforts should be made so that the work environment must be good and conducive because a good and conducive work environment makes employees feel at home in the room and feel happy and eager to carry out their duties so that job satisfaction will be formed and from the employee's job satisfaction, employee performance will also increase.

From HRD data from the Directorate General of Livestock and Animal Health in 2021, a recapitulation of the percentage of employee performance targets in the finance and equipment section of the secretariat of the Directorate General of Livestock and Animal Health of the Ministry of Agriculture was obtained with an estimated target of 100%. The performance produced in 2019 averaged 81.4%, then in 2020 it increased to 83.2% and in 2021 it decreased again. Based on these data, it can be seen that employee performance fluctuates, where the average employee performance increases and decreases every year.

With there are still problems in the Finance and Equipment Section of the Secretariat of the Directorate General of Livestock and Animal Health of the Ministry of Agriculture such as Workload, Motivation and Physical Work Environment that have not been implemented optimally, for this reason, it is necessary to take appropriate actions in order to create a growing company by focusing and increasing employee potential that can make employee performance increase. This study focuses on the effect of workload, work motivation, and physical work environment on employee performance in the Finance and Equipment Section of the Secretariat of the Directorate General of Livestock and Animal Health of the Ministry of Agriculture. The problem formulation includes questions related to the influence of each of these variables on employee performance. The purpose of the study was to analyze the effect of workload, work motivation, and physical work environment on employee performance. The usefulness of research involves the application of research results as input to HR policies for employees of the Ministry of Agriculture, references for universities in future research, and contributions to the development of authors' knowledge and skills in obtaining a Bachelor of Management Degree.

METHODS

This study used a quantitative approach with a correlational descriptive research design. This type of study aims to identify the relationship between the variables Workload, Motivation, and Physical Work Environment on Employee Performance in the Finance and Equipment Section of the Secretariat of the Directorate General of Livestock and Animal Health of the Ministry of Agriculture. The population of this study is all employees in the Finance and Equipment Section of the Secretariat of the Directorate General of Livestock and Animal Health of the Ministry of Agriculture, which is 150 employees. The sample was taken using a random sampling method with a total of 110 respondents. Data collection is carried out through primary data, namely interviews with personnel and distribution of questionnaires to employees. Secondary data is also used as supporting material from internal representatives of the Directorate General of Livestock and Animal Health of the Ministry of Agriculture.

The data collection instrument is a questionnaire with closed questions using the Likert scale. Data analysis was carried out in a quantitative descriptive manner using multiple regression and linear methods. The test of the research instrument involves testing validity and reliability with the Pearson Product Moment and Cronbach's Alpha methods. Hypothesis testing uses the T test to see the effect of Workload, Motivation, and Physical Work Environment variables on Employee Performance. In addition, tests of classical assumptions such as normality, multicollinearity, autocorrelation, and heteroscedasticity are also performed to ensure the validity of regression models. The entire research process is expected to contribute to the development of human resource management and provide further insight into the factors that affect employee performance at the institution.

RESULTS

In this study, validity and reliability tests were conducted on a sample of 110 respondents of employees of the Finance and Equipment Section of the Scope of the Secretariat of the Directorate General of Livestock and Animal Health of the Ministry of Agriculture. The results of the validity test show that all question items on the variables workload (X1), work motivation (X2), physical work environment (X3), and employee performance (Y) have a greater Corrected Item Total Correlation value compared to the r table, thus it can be concluded that all statements on each variable are valid. Furthermore, reliability tests using Alpha Cronbachs showed that all research variables, namely workload (X1), work motivation (X2), physical work environment (X3), and employee performance (Y), had a reliability coefficient or alpha above 0.6, indicating that this research instrument was reliable.

Classical Assumption Test

Normality Test

One Sample Kolmogorov–Smirnov Test, or Normality Test is used to determine the distribution of the population, whether it follows the distribution theoretically (*normal, poisson, or uniform*). Which aims to test whether in the regression model, variables bound to employee performance (Y) and independent variables, namely, workload (X1), work motivation (X2), and physical work environment (X3) both have a normal distribution. The distribution data is said to be normal if the level of significance value is > α = 0.05 and if the opposite is < α = 0.05 then it is said to be abnormal. Below is presented a table of results from the Normality Test in this study.

Table 1. Normality Test Results

One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test		
		Unstandardized Residual
N		110
Normal Parameters[a,b]	-0,0269481	,0000000
	2,02089055	3,27511892
Most Extreme Differences	0,051	,054
	0,051	,052
	-0,049	-,054
Test Statistic		0,051
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)		,200c,d
a. Test distribution is Normal.		

Sumber: Output SPSS 26. *Coefficients, linier regression*. Diolah 2022

The results from Table 1 above show that the value of Asymp Sig. (2-tailed) is 0.200. Which means that the regression model in this study has a normal sample distribution based on its significance value > α = 0.05. So it can be said that the distribution of employee performance results derived from workload (X1), work motivation (X2), and physical work environment (X3) is normally distributed at the level of significance α = 0.05.

Multicollinearity Test

The multicollinearity test is used to determine whether or not there is a deviation from the classical assumption of multicollinearity, namely the existence of a linear relationship *or the value of variance inflation* factor (VIF), if the *Tolerance* value > 0.1 or VIF < 10, then it can be said that multicollinearity does not occur in the model studied. To find out whether multicollinearity occurs can be seen in table 2 below:

Table 2. Multicollinearity Test Output

Coefficient			
Model		Collinearity Statistics	
		Tolerance	BRIGHT
1	(Constant)		
	Beban_Kerja	0,466	2,145
	Motivasi_Kerja	0,378	2,644

Lingkungan_Kerja_ Fisik	0,487	2,053

A. Dependent Variable: Kinerja_Pegawai

Sumber: Output SPSS 26. *Coefficients, linier regression.* Diolah 2022

Based on table 2 (*Coefficients*) it can be seen that the *variance inflation factor* (VIF) of each *independent* variable has the following values:

1) The VIF value for the workload variable (X1) is 2.145 < 10 and the tolerance value *is* 0.466 > 0.10.
2) The VIF value for the work motivation variable (X2) is 2.644 < 10 and the tolerance value *is* 0.378 > 0.10.
3) The VIF value for the physical work environment variable (X3) is 2.053 < 10 and the tolerance *value is* 0.487 > 0.10.

Thus it can be concluded that the regression equation model does not occur multicollinearity and can be used in this study.

Heteroscedasticity Test

In a good Regression Heteroscedasticity test should not occur Heteroscedasticity, this test aims to test whether a regression model has an inequality of variance from one observation to another. A good regression model is one of homokedasticity, or no heteroscedasticity. In this study, researchers used the Heteroscedasticity Test with *the glacier* test where the test results can be seen in the table below:

Tableau 3. Output Uji Gletjer

Coefficient

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Say.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	3,803	1,342		2,834	0,005
	Beban_Kerja	-0,058	0,063	-0,128	-0,915	0,362
	Motivasi_Kerja	0,003	0,046	0,011	0,069	0,946
	Lingkungan_Kerja_Fisik	-0,027	0,051	-0,072	-0,524	0,602

Sumber : :Output SPSS 26. *Coefficient, linear regression*. Diolah 2022

Table 3 above explains that the results of each independent variable, namely workload (X1), work motivation (X2), and physical work environment (X3) using the *glacier* model obtained significant results greater than 0.05 (Sig > *0.05) which means that the data in this study did not occur heterokedasticity problems so that this research can be continued.*

The Automobile

Autocorrelation is a state in which there is a strong correlation for observations between one and another observation arranged according to time sequence. The Autocorrelation Test aims to test whether in a linear regression model there is a correlation between confounding errors in the current period and confounding errors in previous periods. A good regression equation is one that has no autocorrelation. If there is autocorrelation, the equation becomes not good for production. One measure in determining the presence or absence of autocorrelation problems is to use the *Durbin-Watson* (DW) test. Where the results of autokeralsi testing can be seen in the table below:

Table 4. Autocorrelation Test

Model Summary[b]

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error Of The Estimate	Durbin-Watson
1	,841a	0,708	0,699	1,59411	1,906

Sumber : Output SPSS 26. *Coefficients, linier regression*. Diolah 2022

Based on table 4 it can be explained that the *Durbin-Watson value* is 1.906. Where the K value or number of independent variables is 3 and the N value or the number of respondents' data amounts to 110 respondents. So that the value of dL = 1.633 and the value of dU = 1.745 then the value of 4-dU = 2.255. The *Durbin-Watson* value in regression was 1.706. If included in the criteria so that the results of dU < DW < 4-dU (1.745 < 1.906 < 2.255) which means that the regression model obtained does not occur

autocorrelation.

Double Linear Regression Analysis

Multiple linear regression analysis is a form of analysis that discusses the extent of the influence of the independent variable (X) on the dependent variable (Y). where for the independent variables of workload (X1), work motivation (X2), and physical work environment (X3) and the dependent variable is employee performance (Y). In calculating the regression coefficient in this study using the SPSS 26 program. Below are the *output* results presented in Table 5 as follows:

Table 5. Multiple Liniear Regression Analysis

Variable	Koefisien Regresi	t-count	Say.
Konstanta	0,155		
Workload (X1)	0,465	6,047	0,000
Work Motivation (X2)	0,304	3,554	0,001
Physical Work Environment (X3)	0,170	2,258	0,026
f-count	85,489		
R Square	0,708		

Sumber : Output SPSS 26. *Coefficient, linear regression*. Diolah 2022

Based on the results of multiple linear regression analysis referring to table 5 above, it can be seen that the linear regression equation is as follows:

Y = 0.465 X1 + 0.304 X2 + 0.170 x3

Information:

Y = Employee Performance X1 = Workload

X2 = Work Motivation

X3 = Physical Work Environment

The interpretation of the results of the equation is as follows:

Workload (X1) in this study obtained a positive contribution value of 0.465 to employee performance variables (Y). If the workload variable (X1) increases, it is predicted that the employee performance variable (Y) will increase by 0.465 or 46.5%.

Work motivation (X2) in this study obtained a contribution value of 0.304 to the employee performance variable (Y). If the work motivation variable (X2) increases, it is predicted that the employee performance variable (Y) will increase by 0.304 or 30.4%.

The physical work environment (X3) in this study obtained a contribution value of 0.170 to the employee performance variable (Y). If the physical work environment variable (X3) increases, it is predicted that the employee performance variable (Y) will increase by 0.170 or 17.0%.

In this study, it can be seen that the Standardized Coefficient Beta which has the greatest value is found in the workload variable (X1) of 0.465 which means that in the Human Resource Management (HRM) process it is necessary to maintain the factor or influence of the workload given to employees as a form of giving a sense of responsibility to employees, with a sense of responsibility owned, It is expected that the performance of employees in the Finance and Equipment Section of the Secretariat of the Directorate General of Livestock and Animal Health of the Ministry of Agriculture will increase. However, it must be considered again the influence of the physical work environment (X3) which has the lowest contribution value to performance in this study. So that the factors or influences of the physical work environment can be increased again.

Test Model Eligibility

Test F

To test the significance of the influence of independent variables, namely workload, work motivation, physical work environment on the dependent variable, namely the performance of 110 respondents, employees of the Finance and Equipment Section of the Secretariat of the Directorate General of Livestock and Animal Health of the Ministry of Agriculture, the ANOVA test (Test F) was used. The test results using a significance level of 0.05 are as follows.

Table 6. Model Credential Test Output (Test F)

ANOVA

Model		Sum Of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Say.
1	Regression	651,734	3	217,245	85,489	,000b
	Residual	269,366	106	2,541		
	Total	921,100	109			

A. Dependent Variable: Employee Performance

B. Predictors: (Constant), Work Discipline, Communication, Work Motivation

Sumber: *Output SPSS 26. ANOVA*. Diolah 2022

The Ftable value can be searched with the conditions:

Number of independent and bound variables (k-1) -1 or, (4-1=3) and Number of respondents (n-k) minus the number of variables (110 - 4 = 106). So that the calculated F value is 2.698, as shown in the *data output* of the Anova Table in Table 4.21 above, it can be explained that the Fcalculate value is 85.489 with a sig value of 0.000. The F value of the table (α= 5%) is 2.698 because the Fcalculate value is greater than the F table (242.629 > 2.482), it can be concluded that there is an influence on four independent variables, namely, workload (X1), work motivation (X2), and physical work environment (X3) on employee performance (Y). This is reinforced by the probability value of *p-value (*significance) Sig value = (0.00) which is smaller than alpha or the error limit level obtained which is 5% (α = 0.05). The meaning of the Sig value in the Anova model table is said to be significant because it is below the specified alpha value limit of 0.000 < 0.05.

So it can be concluded that in this study together the workload (X1), work motivation (X2), and physical work environment (X3) are said to be significant and feasible to be used in this study based on the Sig value obtained, that all independent variables can explain any changes in the value of the dependent variable because it has a significant influence.

Coefficient of Determination (R2)

Analysis of the coefficient of determination (R^2) is used to determine how much the ability of the independent variable developed in the study is able to explain the dependent variable.

Table 7. Coefficient of Determination (R2)

Model Summary[b]

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error Of The Estimate	Durbin-Watson
1	,841a	0,708	0,699	1,59411	,841a

Sumber : Output SPSS 26.*Model Summary,* Diolah 2022

In Table 7 it can be seen that the coefficient of determination (R2) is 0.708. This means that the relationship between the independent variable and the dependent variable in this study is 0.708 which means that 70.8% of the variation in employee performance of the Finance and Equipment Section of the Secretariat of the Directorate General of Livestock and Animal Health of the Ministry of Agriculture is influenced by workload, work motivation, physical work environment. While 29.2% was explained by other factors that can affect employee performance outside the regression model analyzed in research conducted in the Finance and Equipment Section of the Secretariat of the Directorate General of Livestock and Animal Health of the Ministry of Agriculture.

Test t (Research Hypothesis Test)

This test is used to determine the significance of the effect of the independent variable partially or individually on the dependent variable. The effect can be estimated by the cynical value and t_{count} obtained. To find out whether workload (X1), work motivation (X2), and physical work environment (X3) have a significant effect on employee performance Finance and Equipment Section of the Secretariat of the Directorate General of Livestock and Animal Health of the Ministry of Agriculture

Tableau, 8. Uji t
Coefficient

Model		Unstandardized		Standardized	t	Say.
		B	Std.	Beta		
1	(Constant)	0,155	1,663		0,093	0,926
	Beban_Kerja	0,472	0,078	0,465	6,047	0,000

Motivasi_Kerja	0,201	0,056	0,304	3,554	0,001
Lingkungan_Kerja_Fisik	0,142	0,063	0,170	2,258	0,026

a. Dependent Variable: Kinerja_Pegawai
Sumber : :Output SPSS 26. *Coefficients*. Diolah 2022

Based on table 8, it can be seen that the elaboration of the hypothesis in this study is:
when the trust level is 95% then the value α = 5% or 0.05
df = derajat bebas (*degree of freedom)*
Determined by the formula (n-k) where:
n = number of samples
k = number of variables (dependent and independent)
Then the value of df is 110 – 4 = 106 (df = 106), because the hypothesis is bidirectional, the value of ttable is 1.660.

Based on the test results in table 8 above, it shows that the calculated value in the workload variable (X1) is 6.047 with a significant value of 0.000 (0.000 < 0.05). While the ttable value with df 106 and a significant level of 5% obtained a value of 1.660. Because t_{counts} > ttable (6.047 > 1.660), then, H_o is rejected and Ha is accepted, which means that there is a positive and significant influence between workload (X1) on employee performance in the Finance and Equipment Section of the Secretariat of the Directorate General of Livestock and Animal Health of the Ministry of Agriculture.

Based on the test results in table 4.23 above, it shows that the calculated value of the work motivation variable (X2) is 3.554 with a significant value of 0.001 (0.001 < 0.05). While the ttable value with df 106 and a significant level of 5% obtained a value of 1.660. Because t_{counts} > ttable (3.554 > 1.660), then, H_o is rejected and Ha is accepted, which means that there is a positive and significant influence between work motivation (X2) on employee performance in the Finance and Equipment Section of the Secretariat of the Directorate General of Livestock and Animal Health of the Ministry of Agriculture.

Based on the test results in table 4.23 above, it shows that the calculated t value in the physical work environment variable (X3) is 2.258 with a significant value of 0.026 (0.026 < 0.05). While the ttable value with df 106 and a significant level of 5% obtained a value of 1.988. Because tcount > ttable (2.258 > 1.660), then, Ho was rejected and H a was accepted, which means that there is a positive and significant influence between the physical work environment (X3) on employee performance in the Finance and Equipment Section of the Secretariat of the Directorate General of Livestock and Animal Health of the Ministry of Agriculture.

Discussion

The effect of workload (X1) on employee performance (Y)

Based on the results of research conducted by researchers, it was found that workload had a positive and significant effect on employee performance. This is evidenced by the test of the workload variable t test on employee performance showing $t_{calculated}$ > ttable (6.047 > 1.660), regression coefficient of 0.465 and probability value of 0.000 which is smaller than 0.05 (0.000 < 0.05). This positive influence indicates that the better the workload given, it will affect the performance of employees in the Finance and Equipment Section of the Secretariat of the Directorate General of Livestock and Animal Health of the Ministry of Agriculture. The results of the assessment of 110 respondents regarding the workload questionnaire given, on average, answered in agreement with the average value of the average workload of 4.21. From the largest mean obtained in the fourth indicator, which is agreeing with the target that must be achieved which states that the boss or leader sets a target that I must achieve every time I do work and is always given a target to complete the work on time. The lowest assessment is found in the Job Conditions indicator with a value of 4.18 which states that the workload given is in accordance with job standards and always does the same work every day. This also has an impact on the level of employee performance statements which state that employees can complete work on time and come and go to work according to the specified time.

Workload is a process carried out by someone in completing the tasks of a job or group of positions that are carried out under normal circumstances within a certain predetermined period of time. Workload can affect employee performance in working to achieve optimal results for the company.

Workload requires employees to work harder to produce the performance desired by the company. (Kiolol, 2018). In a study conducted by Kadek Ferranita (2017) in his research entitled "The Effect of Workload and Compensation on the Performance of Employees of the Regional Government Secretariat of Tabanan Regency" showed the results of research that stated that workload had a positive and significant effect on employee performance. The research also supports the results of this study which states that workload has a positive and significant effect on employee performance. This indicates the acceptance of hypothesis 1 in this study.

The Effect of Work Motivation (X2) on Employee Performance (Y)

Based on the results of research conducted by researchers, it was found that work motivation has a positive and significant effect on employee performance. This is evidenced by the t-test testing of work motivation variables on employee performance showing t-count > t-table (3.554 > 1.660), regression coefficient of 0.304 and probability value of 0.001 which is smaller than 0.05 (0.001 < 0.05). This positive influence indicates that the better the motivation given to employees, the more it will affect the performance of employees in the Finance and Equipment Section of the Secretariat of the Directorate General of Livestock and Animal Health of the Ministry of Agriculture. The results of the assessment of 110 respondents regarding the work motivation questionnaire given, on average, answered in agreement with the average value of work motivation mean of 4.31. From the largest mean, the Esteem-need indicator was obtained with a value of 4.41 where respondents agreed to be given awards for the achievements I achieved and the incentives given in accordance with the work targets set. And the statement item that gets the lowest answer is found in the physiological-need indicator which states that the salary and benefits are sufficient to meet my living needs with a value of then employees work to meet and meet my living needs 4.16. This also has an impact on the level of employee performance statements which state that employees can complete work on time and come and go to work according to the specified time.

Work motivation is a variety of efforts made by humans, of course, to meet their wants and needs. However, so that his wants and needs can be fulfilled is not easy to obtain without maximum effort. In fulfilling their needs, a person will behave according to the impulses he has and what underlies his behavior. To improve employee performance, it is necessary to have employees who have skills, expertise and professionalism on the job, because if employees do not have these traits, it will result in decreased employee performance and harm the company. Researchers concluded that employees who have great motivation in their work can certainly increase the level of performance of a company. Vice versa, if employees do not have a sense of motivation, employee performance will decrease and the expected goals will be difficult to achieve.

In a study conducted by Arta Adhi Kusuma, (2019) stated the results that motivation has a positive and significant effect on employee performance, the same is also stated in research conducted by Henri, (2018) with a study entitled "The Effect of Work Motivation on the Performance of Gunung Kidu Regency Regional Secretariat Office Employees". These results support this study which states that work motivation has a positive and significant effect on employee performance. This shows the acceptance of hypothesis 2 in research.

The effect of the physical work environment (X3) on employee performance (Y)

Based on the results of research conducted by researchers, it was found that the physical work environment had a positive and significant effect on employee performance. This is evidenced by the t-test test of physical work environment variables on employee performance showing t-count t-table > (2.258 > 1.660), regression coefficient of 0.170 and probability value of 0.026 which is smaller than 0.05 (0.026 < 0.05). This positive influence indicates that the better the physical work environment provided to its employees, it will affect the performance of employees in the Finance and Equipment Section of the Secretariat of the Directorate General of Livestock and Animal Health of the Ministry of Agriculture. The results of the assessment of 110 respondents regarding the physical work environment questionnaire given, on average, answered in agreement with a mean average value of 4.36. From the largest mean obtained on the safety indicator in the workplace where respondents answered in the affirmative and got an average answer of 4.48 with a statement that employees feel very safe while working and agencies always pay attention to safety in the employee work environment. While the lowest indicator is found in the work atmosphere with a value of 4.27 which states that the building used for me to work is very concerned about work safety and the workspace that supports my work activities with good enough lighting. This also has an impact on the level of employee performance statements which state that employees can complete work on time and come and go to work according

to the specified time.

The physical work environment itself can be divided into two categories. The first category is an environment that is directly related to employees and is near employees (such as tables, chairs and so on). The second category is the intermediate environment or the general environment can also be called the work environment that affects the human condition, for example: temperature, humidity, air circulation, lighting, noise, mechanical vibrations, unpleasant odors, colors, and others. The results of the study that state that the physical work environment has a positive and significant effect are also supported by research conducted by Yacinda Chresstela Prasidya Norianggono Djamhur Hamid Ika Ruhana (2014), which states that physical work environment variables have a positive and significant influence on employee performance. This shows the acceptance of hypothesis 3 (H3) in research.

CONCLUSION

Research on employees of the Finance and Equipment Section of the Secretariat of the Directorate General of Livestock and Animal Health of the Ministry of Agriculture concluded that workload, work motivation, and physical work environment have a positive and significant effect on employee performance. Research suggestions include setting workloads by setting targets, increasing work motivation by paying attention to physiological needs and employee rewards, special attention to security and safety factors in the work environment, and proposals for future research that can develop models by adding other variables that affect employee performance.

REFERENCES

A. Anwar Prabu Mangkunegara. (2011). Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia. PT. Remaja Rosdakarya.

A.F.Stoner James, D. (1996). manajemen (Indonesia). PT. Prenhallindo.

Abdul Rachman, S., & Hardi, U. (2018). Pengaruh Disiplin Kerja, Motivasi Kerja, Etos Kerja Dan Lingkungan Kerja Terhadap Produktivitas Kerja Karyawan Bagian Produksi Di PT Inko Java Semarang. Among Makarti, 11(21), 28–50. Afandi, P. (2016). Concept & Indicator Human Resources Management for Management Researchle (Deepublish).

As'ad. (2001). Seri Ilmu Sumber Daya Manusia Psikologi Industri. Liberty.

Billy Rubianto Irawan. (2016). Dampak Inovasi Produk Terhadap Kinerja Pemasaran (Agora Vol).

Fajarullaili, N. A. (2018). Pengaruh Beban Kerja Dan Lingkungan Kerja Terhadap Loyalitas Karyawan Pada Unit Pelayanan Dinas Kesehatan Provinsi Jawa Timur. Fakultas Ekonomi Dan Bisnis Islam Universitas Islam Negeri Sunan Ampel Surabaya.

Garniwa. (2007). Perilaku Organisasional. Graha Ilmu.

Ghozali, I. (2012). Aplikasi Analisis Multivariate dengan Program IBM SPSS. Universitas Diponegoro.

Griffin. (2003). Manajemen. Erlangga.

Handoko, T. H. (2001). Manajemen Personalia dan Sumber Daya Manusia. BPFE Yogyakarta.

Harpitasari, D. R. (2010). Manajemen SDM. Rineka cipta.

Hasibuan, M. S.. (2003). Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia. Bumi Aksara. Herman Sofyandi. (2018). Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia. Graha Ilmu.

Hs, S., & Risa, M. (2020). Pengaruh Kepemimpinan, Kompetensi, Beban Kerja, dan Lingkungan Kerja, Terhadap Kinerja Pegawai Lembaga Layanan Pendidikan Tinggi (LLDIKTI) Wilayah III Jakarta. Jurnal Riset Manajemen Dan Bisnis (JRMB), 5(3), 399–408.

Khairunnisa, V. (2018). Pengaruh Efikasi Diri dan Kompetensi Kewirausahaan Terhadap Intensi Berwirausaha (Studi pada Mahasiswa Aktif Universitas Pasundan Bandung). 15–52.

Kiolol, C. C. (2018). Pengaruh Beban Kerja Terhadap Produktivitas Kerja Karyawan Pada Siloam Hospital Manado. Jurnal Manajemen.

Maslikha, H., Puspitaningtyas, Z., & Prakoso. (2016). Pengaruh Inflasi dan BI Rate terhadap IHSG. Vol. IV Edisi, 1, 62–67.

Mathis, R. L. & J. H. J. (2006). Human Resource Management (salemba em). Meilinda, T. (2017). Pengertian Beban Kerja.

Minarni, E. (2017). Pengaruh Profesionalisme dan Motivasi Terhadap Produktivitas Kerja Karyawan Pada Kantor Badan Pusat Statistik Kota Medan. Ekonomi, 11–12, 18–19.

Munandar, S. A. (2011). psikologi industri dan organisasi. Universitas Indonesia. Nitisemito, A. S. (1992). Manajemen dan Sumber Daya Manusia. BPFE UGM. Pujiati. (2018). Pengaruh Kompetensi, Beban Kerja Dan Kompensasi Terhadap Kinerja Perawat Rumah Sakit Umum (Rsu)

Avisena Cimahi. 28–29.
Robbins, Stephen, P. (2003). Prinsip-Prinsip Perilaku Organisasi. Erlangga. Siagian, S. P. (2003). Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia edisi satu (cetakan ke). Bumi Aksara.
Sugiyono. (2016). Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif, Kualitatif dan R&D. PT. Alfabet.
Syamsu, N. N., Soelton, M., Nanda, A., Putra, R. L., & Pebriani, P. (2019). Bagaimanakah Konflik Peran Dan Beban Kerja Mempengaruhi Kinerja Karyawan Dengan Burnout Sebagai Variabel Intervening. Jurnal Ilmiah Manajemen Dan Bisnis, 5(1), 1. https://doi.org/10.22441/jimb.v5i1.5621
Tarwaka. (2014). Manajemen dan Implementasi K3 di Tempat Kerja. Harapan Press.
Umar, H. (2013). Metode Penelitian untuk Skripsi dan Tesis. Rajawali.
V.Hubeis, M.. dan A. (2007). Manajemen Mutu sumber daya Manusia. GHALIA INDONESIA.