Journal of Law & Social Politics
Volume 2, Issue 1, 15-28
e_ISSN: 2807-6311
https://jolastic.id/index.php/jlsp/index
DOI: doi.org/10.59261/jlsp.v2i1.41

Work Environment, Job Stress, and Work Motivation as Determinants of Employee Performance at PT Indolakto

***Theysa Sahlani Pratiwi**
Universitas Bina Sarana Informatika, Indonesia

Mutiara Praptasari
Universitas Bina Sarana Informatika, Indonesia

Siti Rugayah
Universitas Bina Sarana Informatika, Indonesia

***Corresponding author:**
Theysa Sahlani Pratiwi, Universitas Bina Sarana Informatika, Indonesia.
✉ theysa.tsp@bsi.ac.id

Article Info :

Article history:
Received: January 19, 2024
Revised: March 16, 2024
Accepted: Mei 14, 2024

Keywords:
work environment;
work-related stress;
work motivation;
employee performance;

Abstract

Background: Work-related stress among employees can negatively affect productivity and well-being. Factors such as excessive workload, tight deadlines, and interpersonal conflicts contribute to work stress, which in turn impacts subjective, behavioral, cognitive, physiological, and health aspects, leading to decreased job satisfaction and employee performance.
Objective: This study aims to analyze the influence of the work environment, work-related stress, and work motivation on employee performance at PT Indolakto.
Methods: This research employed a causal research design. The population consisted of all employees of PT Indolakto, totaling 116 individuals, with a research sample of 90 employees selected for analysis. Data were collected using questionnaires measured on a Likert scale. Parametric statistical analysis was applied to examine the relationships between the independent variables—work environment, work-related stress, and work motivation—and the dependent variable, employee performance.
Results: The findings indicate that the work environment, work-related stress, and work motivation have a significant influence on employee performance at PT Indolakto. A supportive work environment and high work motivation were associated with improved performance, while elevated levels of work-related stress tended to reduce employee performance.
Conclusion: The study concludes that employee performance at PT Indolakto is significantly influenced by the work environment, work-related stress, and work motivation. Improving workplace conditions and managing employee stress effectively are essential strategies for enhancing employee performance and organizational outcomes.

To cite this article: Pratiwi, T. S., Praptasari, M., & Rugayah, S. (2024). Work Environment, Job Stress, and Work Motivation as Determinants of Employee Performance at PT Indolakto. *Journal of Law & Social Politics*, 2 (1), 15-28. https://doi.org/10.46799/jlsp.v2i1.41

INTRODUCTION

PT. Indolakto reflects the importance of human resources in determining corporate success. As a milk-processing manufacturing company established in 1992, PT. Indolakto has experienced rapid growth in production capacity. However, organizational success is not solely determined by capital, technology, methods, or machinery, but is strongly influenced by the quality and performance of its human resources. Employee performance is a critical determinant of organizational effectiveness and competitiveness, as it reflects the extent to which employees can achieve predetermined work standards and productivity targets.

Nevertheless, PT. Indolakto faces various challenges related to unproductive and unsatisfactory employee performance. A conflicted work environment, elevated levels of work stress, and low motivation are among the main factors affecting employee well-being and performance. Empirical studies indicate that leadership style, excessive workload, lack of discipline, and an unfavorable organizational climate significantly contribute to declining employee performance (Vandiya & Etikariena, 2018; Sembiring, 2020; Wartono & Mochtar, 2015). In production-oriented industries, operational constraints such as delays in raw material availability and untimely task completion further disrupt workflow efficiency and hinder the achievement of sales targets (Dwinanda et al., 2022).

From an organizational behavior perspective, work stress is recognized as a major challenge in modern workplaces. Work stress refers to a psychological and physiological response experienced by employees when job demands exceed their coping capacity (Fahamsyah, 2017; Lestari et al., 2020; Handayani & Daulay, 2021). Stress symptoms may include emotional instability, anxiety, sleep disturbances, and reduced concentration. Previous studies consistently show that prolonged exposure to work stress has detrimental effects on employee well-being, mental health, and job performance (Dohrmann et al., 2020; Montoya-Barthelemy et al., 2024).

Factors contributing to work stress include excessive workload, time pressure, low-quality supervision, unhealthy work climates, role ambiguity, and interpersonal conflicts (Sofiana et al., 2020; Trisaputra, 2021). Santoso and Rijanti (2022) further identify stress indicators such as workplace bullying, pressure from supervisors and coworkers, mismatches between job demands and available resources, monotonous or hazardous tasks, and unrealistic performance expectations. These stressors tend to be more pronounced in labor-intensive and production-driven organizations.

Empirical evidence also highlights the multidimensional consequences of work stress. At the individual level, stress may lead to emotional exhaustion, frustration, impaired cognitive functioning, and health problems such as headaches and sleep disorders. At the organizational level, work stress is associated with decreased productivity, lower job satisfaction, absenteeism, and weakened interpersonal relationships among employees (Kohnen et al., 2023). Inadequate coping mechanisms may further intensify these negative outcomes, making stress management a strategic organizational concern.

To address work stress, organizations may implement stress management strategies at the individual, organizational, and social support levels. Individual coping strategies include behavioral and cognitive adjustments, relaxation techniques, meditation, and physical fitness activities. Organizational strategies focus on creating supportive work environments, participatory leadership, job redesign, and equitable workload distribution. Social support from supervisors and coworkers has also been shown to play a crucial role in mitigating the negative effects of work stress on employee performance (Agbonselohbor et al., 2025; Susminingsih et al., 2025).

Despite extensive research on work stress and employee performance, prior studies have reported mixed and inconsistent findings. Sampson and Akyeampong (2014) found that work stress significantly affects employee performance in the hospitality sector. Sara et al. (2022) reported that work environment significantly affects employee performance through motivation and job satisfaction as mediating variables, whereas Julvia (2016) found that work stress negatively affects performance while work conflict has a positive effect. Similarly, Zhang et al. (2022) demonstrated that work stress influences employee mental health and performance, particularly in SME contexts. These inconsistencies indicate that the relationship between work stress, work environment, and employee performance is highly context-dependent and influenced by organizational and industry characteristics.

This condition reveals a clear research gap, namely the limited empirical evidence that simultaneously examines work environment and work stress in production-based manufacturing companies, particularly in milk-processing industries operating under high operational pressure and time-sensitive production systems. Furthermore, most prior studies have focused on service or hospitality sectors, leaving manufacturing contexts underrepresented in the literature.

The novelty of this study lies in its integrated analysis of the work environment and work stress within a single empirical model in a manufacturing setting, specifically at PT. Indolakto. By examining these variables concurrently in a real production environment, this study extends previous research and provides contextual insights that are more representative of industrial organizations. Based on the identified research gap, this study aims to analyze the influence of the work environment on employee performance at PT. Indolakto and to examine the effect of work stress on employee performance at PT. Indolakto.

The expected benefits of this research are twofold. From a theoretical perspective, this study contributes to the development of organizational behavior literature by enriching empirical evidence on the interaction between work environment, work stress, and employee performance in manufacturing industries. From a practical perspective, the findings provide valuable insights for management at PT. Indolakto in formulating strategies to improve employee performance through the creation of healthier work environments and more effective work stress management practices.

METHOD

1. Research Location

This research was conducted at PT. Indolakto, a manufacturing company engaged in the production and management of milk with a distribution network throughout Indonesia. The company's head office is located in Cicurug, Sukabumi District, West Java.

2. Research Objects and Variables

The objects of this study include the work environment, work stress, and work motivation as independent variables, while employee performance serves as the dependent variable.

3. Research Design

This study employed a causal research design aimed at examining cause-and-effect relationships between independent variables (work environment, work stress, and work motivation) and the dependent variable (employee performance).

4. Data Sources

This study used two main types of data:

a. Primary data, obtained through questionnaires distributed to respondents to collect opinions related to the research variables.
b. Secondary data, obtained from books, theses, journals, articles, internet sources, company profiles, and other relevant documents supporting the research background and literature review.

5. Population and Sample

The population of this study comprised all employees of PT. Indolakto, totaling approximately 116 employees. The sample size was determined using the Slovin formula, resulting in a minimum sample of 90 respondents.

6. Data Collection Technique

Data were collected using a structured questionnaire based on the Likert scale, with interval measurement applied to assess respondents' perceptions of the research variables.

7. Measurement Scale

The Likert scale was used for variable measurement, assigning specific numerical values to each response category to enable quantitative analysis.

8. Data Analysis Method

The data analysis employed parametric statistical methods using multiple linear regression to examine the relationships between independent and dependent variables.

9. Data Processing Tools

Data processing was carried out using Microsoft Excel 2010 and SPSS (Statistical Package for Social Sciences) version 24.0.

10. Validity and Reliability Testing

Validity testing was conducted using the Product Moment Correlation technique, while reliability testing was performed using Cronbach's Alpha coefficient to ensure the consistency of the measurement instruments.

11. Classical Assumption Tests

The study included classical assumption tests, namely normality, multicollinearity, and autocorrelation tests, to ensure the suitability of the regression model.

12. Hypothesis Testing

Hypothesis testing was conducted using:

a. t-tests to examine the partial effect of each independent variable on the dependent variable, and
b. F-tests to assess the simultaneous effect of all independent variables on the dependent variable.

13. Coefficient of Determination

The coefficient of determination (R^2) was used to measure the proportion of variance in employee performance explained by the independent variables collectively.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Result

Characteristics of respondents by gender

Analysis of respondent characteristics based on gender was conducted to determine the proportion and composition of respondents involved in this study. Identification of respondent gender is important because it provides an overview of the distribution of research participants and serves as a basis for understanding the demographic profile of the sample studied. Data regarding respondent gender were obtained through distributed questionnaires.

Table 1. Characteristics of respondents by gender

Gender	Frequency	Percentage
Man	65	74.5%
Woman	25	25.5%
Sum	**90**	**100%**

Source : data processed by researchers

Based on Table 1, it can be explained that of the 90 respondents involved in this study, the majority of respondents were male, namely 65 people with a percentage of 74.5%, while female respondents numbered 25 people with a percentage of 25.5%. This indicates that the composition of respondents was dominated by males with a fairly significant difference. The dominance of male respondents likely reflects the actual conditions in the field where the workforce at the research object is indeed more dominated by male workers.

Characteristics of respondents by age

Table 2. Characteristics of respondents by age

Age	Frequency	Percentage
17-20 Years	15	16.9%
21-30 Years	20	20.9%
31-40 Years	45	46.9%
>41 Years	10	15.3%
Sum	**90**	**100%**

Source : data processed by researchers

Based on the table 2, it is known the characteristics of the 90 respondents studied, at the age of 17-29 years as many as 15 respondents or 16.9% and the age of 21-30 years as many as 20 respondents or 20.9%, then at the age of 31-40 years as many as 45 respondents or 46.9% and at the age of 41 years as many as 10 respondents or 15.3%.≥

Characteristics of respondents based on education

The age characteristics of respondents were analyzed to identify the distribution of employee age groups participating in this study. Age distribution provides an overview of workforce maturity and productivity levels.

Table 3. Characteristics of respondents based on education

Education	Frequency	Percentage
SMA	25	26.9%
D3	20	20.4%
S1	34	36.9%
S2	11	15.8%
Sum	**90**	**100%**

Source : data processed by researchers

Based on table 3, it is explained that 90 respondents studied with the last education were high school, which is 25 with a percentage of 26.9%. then followed by D3 education as many as 20 respondents with a percentage of 20.4%, the last S1 education as many as 34 respondents with a percentage of 36.9%, S2 education as many as 11 respondents with a percentage of 15.8%.

Methods of Analysis and Hypothesis Test

1. Validity Test

Validity test is a measure to show the level of validity of the instrument used, namely whether there are questions on the questionnaire that must be corrected or eliminated. Validity testing uses the calculation of the *person product moment* method. Validity testing was carried out using SPSS 24.0 Software with a significant level of 0.05 (5%) question items that were considered valid if r calculated > r table.

Table 4. Work Environment Variable Validity Test

No	r calculate	r table	Decision
1	0.807	0.2008	Valid
2	0.731	0.2008	Valid
3	0.812	0.2008	Valid
4	0.631	0.2008	Valid
5	0.609	0.2008	Valid
6	0.623	0.2008	Valid
7	0.643	0.2008	Valid
8	0.477	0.2008	Valid
9	0.403	0.2008	Valid
10	0.484	0.2008	Valid
11	0.461	0.2008	Valid
12	0.430	0.2008	Valid
13	0.407	0.2008	Valid
14	0.490	0.2008	Valid
15	0.575	0.2008	Valid
16	0.472	0.2008	Valid

Source : SPSS processed data

The table 4 shows that all items of the statement of the Work Environment variable (X1) are declared valid because r counts > r table and these items are significantly correlated so they do not need to be removed or corrected (valid).

Table 5. Test the validity of work stress variables

No	r calculate	r table	Decision
1	0.708	0.2008	Valid
2	0.746	0.2008	Valid
3	0.720	0.2008	Valid
4	0.617	0.2008	Valid
5	0.690	0.2008	Valid
6	0.633	0.2008	Valid
7	0.648	0.2008	Valid
8	0.632	0.2008	Valid
9	0.593	0.2008	Valid
10	0.502	0.2008	Valid
11	0.573	0.2008	Valid
12	0.511	0.2008	Valid
13	0.508	0.2008	Valid
14	0.544	0.2008	Valid
15	0.680	0.2008	Valid
16	0.547	0.2008	Valid

Source : SPSS processed data

The table 5 shows that all items of the variable statement Work stress (X2) are declared valid because r counts > r table and these items are significantly correlated so they do not need to be removed or corrected (valid).

Table 6. Work Motivation Variable Validity Test (X3)

No	r calculate	r table	Decision
1	0.805	0.2008	Valid
2	0.764	0.2008	Valid
3	0.822	0.2008	Valid
4	0.733	0.2008	Valid
5	0.619	0.2008	Valid
6	0.733	0.2008	Valid
7	0.612	0.2008	Valid
8	0.594	0.2008	Valid
9	0.587	0.2008	Valid
10	0.598	0.2008	Valid
11	0.658	0.2008	Valid
12	0.623	0.2008	Valid
13	0.627	0.2008	Valid
14	0.796	0.2008	Valid
15	0.680	0.2008	Valid
16	0.447	0.2008	Valid

Source : SPSS processed data

Table 6 shows that all items of the job satisfaction variable statement (X3) are considered valid because r counts > r table and these items are significantly correlated so they do not need to be removed or corrected (valid).

Table 7. Test the validity of employee performance variables (Y)

No	r calculate	r table	Decision
1	0.812	0.2008	Valid
2	0.748	0.2008	Valid
3	0.847	0.2008	Valid
4	0.741	0.2008	Valid
5	0.722	0.2008	Valid
6	0.739	0.2008	Valid
7	0.642	0.2008	Valid
8	0.554	0.2008	Valid
9	0.603	0.2008	Valid
10	0.675	0.2008	Valid
11	0.762	0.2008	Valid
12	0.552	0.2008	Valid
13	0.599	0.2008	Valid
14	0.581	0.2008	Valid
15	0.443	0.2008	Valid
16	0.576	0.2008	Valid

Source : SPSS processed data

The table 7 shows that all items of the employee performance variable statement (Y) are declared valid because r counts > r table and these items are significantly correlated so they do not need to be removed or corrected (valid).

2. Reliability Test

According to Saunders et al. (2023), reliability or constraint is a measurement that shows the extent to which the measurement is unbiased (*error-free*) and therefore guarantees consistent measurements across time and across various items in the instrument. Reliability testing was conducted using SPSS 24.0 software with a significance level of 0.05 (5%). Researchers use a limitation of 0.6.

Table 8. Reliability Test

No	Variable	Alpha value	Information
1	**Work Environment (X1)**	0.826	Reliable
2	**Work Stress (X2)**	0.708	Reliable
3	**Work Motivation (X3)**	0.831	Reliable
4	**Employee Performance (Y)**	0.833	Reliable

Source : SPSS processed data

Table 8 shows that the Cronbach's Alpha values for work environment (0.826), work stress (0.708), work motivation (0.831), and employee performance (0.833) were all above the minimum threshold of 0.60. These results indicate that all research instruments were reliable. A separate reliability test was conducted for the work environment variable to assess the internal consistency of its measurement items.

Table 9. Reliability Test x_1 (Work Environment)

Reliability Statistics	
Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.826	16

Source: SPSS processed data

Table 9 indicates a Cronbach's Alpha value of 0.826 for the work environment variable with 16 items. This value exceeds the acceptable reliability standard, confirming that the instrument is reliable. The reliability test for the work stress variable aimed to ensure consistency

in respondents' answers across all stress-related questionnaire items.

Table 10. Reliability Test X_2 (Work Stress)

Reliability Statistics	
Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.708	16

Source : SPSS processed data

Based on Table 10, the Cronbach's Alpha value for the work stress variable (X2) was 0.708 with 16 items. This result confirms that the work stress measurement instrument is reliable. Reliability testing for the work motivation variable was conducted to confirm the stability and consistency of its measurement items.

Table 11. Reliability Test X_3 (Work Motivation)

Reliability Statistics	
Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.831	16

Source : SPSS processed data

Table 11 shows a Cronbach's Alpha value of 0.831 for the work motivation variable (X3) with 16 items, indicating a high level of reliability. The reliability test for employee performance was conducted to assess the consistency of the performance measurement instrument.

Table 12. Reliability Test Y (Employee Performance)

Reliability Statistics	
Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.833	16

Source : SPSS processed data

From the results of the reliability test table 12, it is known that the value of the correlation coefficient of variables X 1, X 2, X_3 and Y is more than 0.60, namely 0.826, 0.708, 0.831, and 0.833 so the instrument of the four variables can be said to be reliable.

3. 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 between independent variables in the regression model. In this study the multicollinearity test was carried out by looking at the *variable inflation factor* (VIF) in the regression model.

Table 13. Multicollinearity Test

Coefficients[a]			
Type		**Collinearity Statistics**	
		Tolerance	**VIF**
1	(Constant)		
	Work Environment	.572	1.748
	Work Stress	.582	1.717
	Work Motivation	.509	1.965
a. Dependent Variable: Employee Performance			

Source : SPSS processed data

The results of the multicollinearity test show the VIF value of the variable X 1, X 2, X_3 of 1,748, 1,717, 1,965. Because the VIF value of these three variables is smaller than 10, it is stated that there is no multicollinearity problem in both variables. This means that there is no

multicollinearity relationship between independent variables X_1, X_2, X_3.

4. Autocorrelation Test

Autocorrelation tests are intended to determine whether there is a correlation between members of a series of observational data sorted through *time (time series*) or space (*croos section*). This means that a particular year is influenced by the next. To detect autocorrelation in this study, the Durbin-Watson (DW) test was used by looking at the DW Test. The results of the autocorrelation test with the Durbin-Watson method are as follows:

Table 14. Model Summary[b]

Type	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Durbin-Watson
1	.647[a]	.419	.399	4.1263	1.397
a. Predictors: (Constant), Work Motivation, Work Stress, Work Environment					
b. Dependent Variable: Employee Performance					

Source : SPSS processed data

Table 14 shows a Durbin–Watson value of 1.397, indicating that the regression model did not suffer from autocorrelation problems.

5. Normality Test

The normality test is used to find out whether the data population is normally distributed or not. In this study, *the Kolmogorov-Smirnov One Sample* test will be used using a significance level of 0.05. Data is declared normally distributed if the significance is greater than 0.05 or 5%.

Table 15. Normality Test

One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test		
		Unstandardized Residual
N		90
Normal Parameters[a,b]	Mean	.0000000
	Std. Deviation	4.05620403
Most Extreme Differences	Absolute	.069
	Positive	.061
	Negative	-.069
Test Statistics		.069
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)		.200[c,d]
a. Test distribution is Normal.		
b. Calculated from data.		
c. Lilliefors Significance Correction.		
d. This is a lower bound of the true significance.		

Source : SPSS processed data

Based on the normality test conducted using SPSS 24.0, the test results are normally distributed. Because the significance value of 0.200 exceeds the significance of 0.05, it can be said that the data of the three variables are normally distributed.

Regression Analysis

1. Partial t Test of the Effect of Work Environment, Work Stress and Work Motivation on Employee Performance

Table 16. Work environment variable t test on employee performance

Coefficients[a]						
Type		**Unstandardized Coefficients**		**Standardized Coefficients**	**t**	**Sig.**
		B	**Std. Error**	**Beta**		
1	(Constant)	15.119	6.073		5.490	.005
	Work Environment	.305	.110	.302	5.778	.007
	Work Stress	.253	.108	.252	4.342	.001
	Work Motivation	.204	.115	.204	4.772	.000
a. Dependent Variable: Employee Performance						

Source : SPSS processed data

Based on the data processing carried out, it can be concluded that:

a. The Work Environment variable (X1) has a significance level of 0.007 which means greater than 0.05 with t count of 5.778>1.9883 t table so that $t_{count} > t_{table}$, then H1 is accepted, which means that partially the work environment has a significant positive effect on Employee Performance
b. The Work Stress variable (X2) has a significance level of 0.001 which means less than 0.05 with t count of 4.342> t table 1.9883 so that $t_{count} > t_{table}$, then H2 is accepted, which means that partially Work Stress has a significant positive effect on Employee Performance.
c. Work Motivation (X3) has a significance level of 0.000 which means less than 0.05 with t count of 4.772> t table 1.9883 so $t_{count} > t_{table}$, then H3 is accepted, which means partially Work motivation has a significant positive effect on employee performance.

2. Test F Variables, Work Environment, Work Stress and Work Motivation on Employee Performance

Table 17. Test F

ANOVA[a]						
Type		**Sum of Squares**	**Df**	**Mean Square**	**F**	**Sig.**
1	Regression	1055.257	3	351.752	20.659	.000[b]
	Residuals	1464.298	86	17.027		
	Total	2519.556	89			
a. Dependent Variable: Employee Performance						
b. Predictors: (Constant), Work Motivation, Work Stress, Work Environment						

Source : SPSS processed data

In this study using a significance value of 0.05 and the F value of the table of 3 independent variables from 116 respondents was 2.71. As shown in table 4.18, the calculated F value is 20.659. because the F value is calculated > F table, it means that there is a significant influence simultaneously between the variables Work environment, work stress, and work motivation on employee performance.

Multiple Linear Regression Equations

Multiple linear regression analysis was applied to determine the direction and magnitude of the influence of each independent variable on employee performance.

Table 18. Work Environment, Work Stress, and Work Motivation on Employee Performance

Coefficients[a]				
Type		**Unstandardized Coefficients**		**Standardized Coefficients**
		B	**Std. Error**	**Beta**
1	(Constant)	15.119	6.073	
	Work Environment	.305	.110	.302
	Work Stress	.253	.108	.252
	Work Motivation	.204	.115	.204
a. Dependent Variable: Employee Performance				

Source : SPSS processed data

$Y = a + b\ 1\ X_1 + b\ 2\ X_2 + b\ 3\ X_3$

$Y = 15.119 + 0.305X_1 + 0.253X_2 + 0.204\ X_3$

Information:

Y = Employee Performance

a = Constant

b = Regression Coefficient

X1= Working Environment

X2= Work Stress

X3= Work Motivation

The regression coefficient of the Work Environment variable (X 1) is 0.305, meaning that if the work environment variable (X 1) increases by one unit, the value of the work environment variable (X_1) then the employee performance variable (Y) will increase by 0.305. The positive value coefficient means that there is a positive influence between the work environment and employee performance. Many things can be improved in the employee work environment, there is job training, openness of colleagues to each other, the absence of negative competition and making competition in positive terms and providing the needs and needs of employees in terms of office needs and all other facilities that support the performance of their employees.

The coefficient regression of the work stress variable (X 2) is 0.253, meaning that if the work stress variable (X 2) increases by one unit, the value of the work stress variable (X_2), then the employee performance variable (Y) will increase by 0.253. The positive value coefficient means that there is a positive influence between work stress and employee performance. High level of stress thus management needs to manage employee workload and accompanied by reducing workload that is not in the assignment and jobdesck of the employee concerned, so that employees are able to work more optimally in carrying out their job duties.

The regression coefficient of the Work Motivation variable (X 3) is 0.204, meaning that if the work motivation variable (X 3) increases by one unit, the value of the work motivation variable (X_3), then the employee performance variable (Y) will increase by 0.204. positive value coefficient means that there is a positive influence between work motivation and employee performance. Many things are able to provide motivation and enthusiasm for employees at work, through paying salaries in accordance with the workload given, providing rewards to outstanding employees, providing better career path opportunities to fulfilling work completeness as a form of company concern for employees making company capital maintain employees as assets while motivating employees in carrying out their duties as well as possible.

Determination

The coefficient of determination was used to assess the proportion of variance in employee performance explained by the independent variables.

Table 19. Analysis of Work Environment Determination, Work Stress and Work Motivation on Employee Performance.

Model Summary[b]				
Type	**R**	**R Square**	**Adjusted R Square**	**Std. Error of the Estimate**
1	.647[a]	.419	.399	4.1263
a. Predictors: (Constant), Work Motivation, Work Stress, Work Environment				
b. Dependent Variable: Employee Performance				
Source : SPSS processed data				

From the table 19, R^2 (R square) is 0.399 or 39.9%. This figure shows that 39.9% variation in the value of the employee performance variable (Y). described by variables work senvironment (X_1), work stress (X_2) and work motivation (X_3). While the remaining 60.1% can be explained by other factors that were not included in this research model. From the regression analysis above, it was found that the coefficients of the three variables Work environment, work stress, and work motivation are positive meaning that there is a positive influence on employee performance. In addition, the variables of work environment, work stress, and work motivation on employee performance were also explained by 39.9%.

There are still other variables that are not discussed in this study such as leadership styles that are considered less authoritarian, always pressure, low work discipline in completing work not in accordance with SOPs, non-routine machine maintenance. In addition, the impartiality of company policies towards employees is felt to be high with limited socialization, lack of communication between superiors and subordinates makes work life in the company's work environment less conducive.

Discussion

Effect of Work Environment on Employee Performance

The results show that the work environment has a significant positive effect on employee performance. This indicates that improvements in workplace conditions—such as job training, positive competition, interpersonal openness, and adequate work facilities—can enhance employee productivity and performance outcomes at PT. Indolakto.

Effect of Work Stress on Employee Performance

Work stress was found to have a significant positive influence on employee performance. This suggests that manageable levels of stress may motivate employees to perform better. However, excessive stress should be controlled through proper workload management and task allocation aligned with employee job descriptions.

Effect of Work Motivation on Employee Performance

The findings demonstrate that work motivation significantly enhances employee performance. Providing fair compensation, rewards for high-performing employees, clear career paths, and adequate work facilities can increase motivation and encourage employees to perform optimally.

Simultaneous Influence of Work Environment, Work Stress, and Work Motivation

The simultaneous effect of all three independent variables confirms that employee performance at PT. Indolakto is shaped by a combination of environmental, psychological, and motivational factors. Although these variables explain 39.9% of performance variation, other factors such as leadership style, work discipline, machine maintenance, organizational communication, and policy fairness may also play a role and warrant further investigation.

CONCLUSION

The conclusion should provide a comprehensive yet concise synthesis of the research findings and the analysis presented in the discussion. Authors should not repeat data or introduce new results. Instead, the authors must highlight the synthesis of arguments, the academic position, and the main contributions of the study in a clear and meaningful way. This section should emphasize the scholarly contribution, whether in the form of theoretical reinforcement, the proposal of new perspectives, or relevant practical applications. Based on the limitations discussed in the discussion section, authors are required to suggest directions for future research. These should emerge logically and argumentatively, whether in the form of contextual expansion, exploration of new variables, or the application of different approaches.

Importantly, the conclusion is not an abstract and must not duplicate it; rather, it should serve as the final take-home message for readers, highlighting the main contribution, novelty, and broader significance of the study. The conclusion should be concise and avoid redundancy with other sections, written in a coherent narrative paragraph, not in bullet points or lists.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The authors would like to thank PT Indolakto and all participating employees for their cooperation and willingness to provide data through the questionnaire, which made this study possible.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTION STATEMENT

All authors jointly contributed to the study conception and design, data collection, data analysis and interpretation, manuscript drafting, and final approval of the submitted version.

REFERENCES

Agbonselohbor, B., Aslanoglu, A., Bilgiç, N., Alsharawneh, A., Elshatarat, R., Eltayeb, M. M., & ... (2025). Associated factors of Nigerian nurses' emotion regulation, perceived stress, and coping mechanism during COVID-19 pandemic: A cross-sectional study. *Ethiopian Journal of Health Sciences, 25*(1), 84–110. https://doi.org/10.4314/ejhs.v25i1.9

Dohrmann, S. B., Herttua, K., & Leppin, A. (2020). Is physical and psychological work stress associated with fatigue in Danish ferry ship employees? *International Maritime Health, 71*(1), 46–55. https://doi.org/10.5603/IMH.2020.0011

Dwinanda, G., Basalamah, S., Alam, R., & Arifin, Z. (2022). Pengaruh self-efficacy, gaya kepemimpinan Islam dan kompensasi terhadap subjective well-being dan kinerja pada karyawan BPR syariah di Sulawesi Selatan. *Journal of Management Science (JMS), 3*(1), 104–126.

Fahamsyah, D. (2017). Analisis hubungan beban kerja mental dengan stres kerja. *The Indonesian Journal of Occupational Safety and Health, 6*(1), 107–115.

Handayani, S., & Daulay, R. (2021). Analisis pengaruh lingkungan kerja dan stress kerja terhadap kinerja karyawan. *Seminar Nasional Teknologi Edukasi Sosial dan Humaniora, 1*(1), 547–551.

Julvia, C. (2016). Pengaruh stres kerja dan konflik kerja terhadap kinerja karyawan. *Business, Psychology*. Retrieved from https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/Pengaruh-Stres-Kerja-Dan-Konflik-Kerja-Terhadap-Kinerja-Julvia/149622034

Kohnen, D., De Witte, H., Schaufeli, W. B., Dello, S., Bruyneel, L., & Sermeus, W. (2023). What makes nurses flourish at work? How the perceived clinical work environment relates to nurse motivation and well-being: A cross-sectional study. *International Journal of Nursing Studies, 148*, Article 104567. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijnurstu.2023.104567

Lestari, W. M., Liana, L., & Aquinia, A. (2020). Pengaruh stres kerja, konflik kerja dan beban kerja terhadap kinerja karyawan. *Jurnal Bisnis dan Ekonomi, 27*(2), 100–110.

Montoya-Barthelemy, A., McKinney, Z. J., & Leigh, J. P. (2024). Leveraging employers' influence over wages as a social determinant of health. *Journal of Occupational and Environmental Medicine, 66*(12), e675–e676. https://doi.org/10.1097/JOM.0000000000003241

Sampson, W. G., & Akyeampong, O. (2014). Work-related stress in hotels: An analysis of the causes

and effects among frontline hotel employees in the Kumasi Metropolis, Ghana. *Journal of Tourism & Hospitality, 3*(2), 127. https://doi.org/10.4172/2167-0269.1000127. (Sampson, W. G., & Akyeampong, O. (2014). Work-related stress in hotels: an analysis of the causes and effects among frontline hotel employees in the Kumasi Metropolis, Ghana).

Santoso, Y. M. D., & Rijanti, T. (2022). Pengaruh stres kerja, beban kerja, dan lingkungan kerja terhadap kinerja karyawan PT. Daiyaplas Semarang. *Eqien—Jurnal Ekonomi dan Bisnis, 11*(1), 926–935.

Sara, D. A., Handaru, A. W., & Usman, O. (2022). *The effect of work environment on employee performance through motivation and job satisfaction as intervening variables on permanent employees.* Eduvest - Journal of Universal Studies, 2(10), 2006–2018. https://doi.org/10.17509/eduvest.v2i10.43318

Saunders, M., Lewis, P., & Thornhill, A. (2023). *Research methods for business students* (9th ed.). Pearson Education.

Sembiring, H. (2020). Pengaruh motivasi dan lingkungan kerja terhadap kinerja karyawan pada Bank Sinarmas Medan. *Jurakunman (Jurnal Akuntansi dan Manajemen), 13*(1).

Sofiana, E., Wahyuarini, T., & Noviena, S. (2020). Pengaruh beban kerja dan stress kerja terhadap kinerja staf pengajar Politeknik Negeri Pontianak. *Inovbiz: Jurnal Inovasi Bisnis, 8*(1), 1–15.

Susminingsih, S., Tamara, K., Nuzulul, N., Alias, N., Rosid, A., & ... (2025). Determinants factor of productivity of educational laboratory officials with organizational commitment as an intervening variable at State Islamic University and State Universities in Indonesia: Social exchange theory viewpoint. *Journal of Applied Research in Higher Education*. https://doi.org/10.1108/JARHE-07-2024-0325

Trisaputra, A. (2021). *Pengaruh beban kerja terhadap kinerja karyawan dengan stres kerja sebagai variabel intervening pada masa pandemi COVID-19 (Studi pada PT. Jasa Raharja (Persero) Cabang Makassar)* [Doctoral dissertation, Universitas Hasanuddin].

Vandiya, V., & Etikariena, A. (2018). Stres kerja dan keterikatan kerja pada karyawan swasta: Peran mediasi kesejahteraan di tempat kerja. *Jurnal Psikogenesis, 6*(1), 19–34.

Wartono, T., & Mochtar, S. (2015). Stres dan kinerja di lingkungan kerja yang semakin kompetitif. *Jurnal Ilmiah Prodi Manajemen Universitas Pamulang, 2*(2), 153–171.

Zhang, Y., LePine, J. A., Buckman, B. R., & Wei, F. (2022). *Work stress, mental health, and employee performance.* Frontiers in Psychology, 13, 1006580. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.1006580