



**THE EFFECT OF WORK STRESS, WORK MOTIVATION, AND WORK
ENVIRONMENT ON EMPLOYEE PERFORMANCE****Mariam Nurul Rohmah¹****Universitas Widyatama, Bandung, Indonesia**mariam.nurul@widyatama.ac.id**Nugraha Saefudin²****Universitas Widyatama, Bandung, Indonesia**

Abstract

This study aims to analyze the influence of work stress, work motivation, and work environment on employee performance at Nurul Huda Cikampek Foundation. The research background is based on the phenomenon of high work stress levels, declining motivation, and suboptimal work environment conditions at the foundation, which have contributed to decreasing employee performance over the past three years. The research employs a quantitative method with descriptive and verificative approaches. The study population includes all employees of Nurul Huda Cikampek Foundation, with a sample of 50 respondents selected using nonprobability sampling through a saturated sampling technique. Data was collected through questionnaires and analyzed using Scale Range Analysis and Path Analysis with SPSS software. The results indicate that work stress falls into the moderate category with an average score of 3.45 and has a significant negative influence on employee performance. Work motivation is in the good category with an average score of 3.82 and shows a significant positive influence. The work environment also scores well with an average of 3.60 and demonstrates a significant positive impact on performance. Partially, work stress accounts for 28.5%, work motivation for 34.2%, and work environment for 31.8% of performance variation. Simultaneous analysis reveals that these three variables collectively explain 78.6% of employee performance variance, while the remaining 21.4% is influenced by other factors beyond this study. These findings provide practical implications for the foundation's management to better manage work stress, enhance motivation, and improve work environment conditions to boost employee performance. The study also contributes to human resource management literature, particularly in the context of non-profit organizations.

Keywords: Work Stress, Work Motivation, Work Environment, Employee Performance



INTRODUCTION

In an era of increasingly rapid globalization, marked by rapid technological change and increasingly fierce business competition, the issue of work stress has become a major challenge across various sectors. According to data from the World Health Organization (WHO, 2021), approximately 264 million people worldwide experience work-related anxiety and depression, with a significant economic impact, resulting in losses of up to US\$1 trillion annually due to decreased productivity. This issue has been further exacerbated by the COVID-19 pandemic, which has forced many workers to adapt to hybrid work patterns and digitalization, which has also increased psychological stress for many employees (ILO, 2022).

In Indonesia, the issue of work stress is a growing concern. According to a survey by the Indonesian Psychiatric Association (PDSKJI, 2023), approximately 48% of workers in Indonesia experience moderate to severe work stress. This is exacerbated by findings from the University of Indonesia (2023), which indicate that the education, healthcare, and non-profit organizations sectors are most vulnerable to work stress, with contributing factors including excessive workload, limited resources, role conflict, and low social support.

To address these challenges, the Indonesian government has issued several policies, including Minister of Manpower Regulation (Permenaker) No. 5 of 2023 concerning Psychosocial Occupational Health and Safety. This policy reflects a paradigm shift in managing work stress, shifting it from a personal issue to an institutional responsibility. However, implementation of this policy often faces challenges in the field, particularly in the nonprofit sector, such as the Nurul Huda Cikampek Foundation.

Based on the results of a pre-survey conducted at the Nurul Huda Foundation in Cikampek, various factors were identified that can affect employee performance, particularly related to work stress. As many as 75.1% of employees admitted to experiencing communication barriers between employees, while 72.1% felt that excessive workloads led to burnout. Furthermore, 68.3% of employees reported health symptoms such as high blood pressure and headaches, indicating chronic work stress. This, of course, impacts work productivity, with 54.3% of employees frequently procrastinating and 33.7% not utilizing work hours optimally. This phenomenon leads to the emergence of presenteeism, where employees are physically present but not maximally productive.



Work motivation is also a crucial factor influencing employee performance. Observations at the Nurul Huda Foundation in Cikampek revealed low employee participation in education and training programs, with a significant decline from 2022 to 2024. This decline suggests that a lack of self-development and low intrinsic motivation among employees can contribute to declining performance.

Furthermore, a conducive work environment is crucial for optimal performance. Based on interviews and observations, facilities at the Nurul Huda Cikampek Foundation remain inadequate, with lighting, buildings, teaching spaces, and restrooms deemed "poor." An unsupportive work environment, both physically and psychologically, can reduce employee well-being and, ultimately, impact their performance.

Based on the data presented, it is clear that work stress, work motivation, and the work environment are closely related to employee performance at the Nurul Huda Cikampek Foundation. The significant decline in employee performance in recent years, both in terms of attendance, punctuality, work productivity, teaching quality, and customer satisfaction, indicates a deep-seated problem that needs to be addressed.

This sharp decline in productivity and teaching quality has the potential to seriously impact the Foundation's output and reputation as an educational institution. This decline in productivity aligns with previous research findings; for example, Simanjuntak and Simarmata (2020) emphasized that strong work discipline is positively correlated with increased productivity, implying that the decline in productivity at the Nurul Huda Cikampek Foundation may be related to challenges in maintaining consistent discipline levels or other factors affecting work efficiency. Sutrisno (2017) further underscored the importance of work discipline as a key factor in creating a productive work environment. Meanwhile, the decline in teaching quality highlights the need for a thorough evaluation of teaching methods, workloads, and teacher competency development programs. Furthermore, a decline in commitment to the vision and mission, as explained by Febriana and Kurniawan (2020), who linked work motivation to loyalty and productivity, may indicate issues related to external or internal motivation that need to be immediately identified and addressed.

Therefore, this study aims to analyze the influence of work stress, work motivation, and the work environment on employee performance at the Nurul Huda Cikampek Foundation. It is hoped that this research can make a significant contribution to efforts to improve human resource management, thereby



improving employee performance overall, which in turn will support organizational effectiveness and sustainability.

RESEARCH METHOD

Research methods are an integral part of the scientific process that help researchers collect, analyze, and explain data to answer research questions. This study uses a descriptive and verification approach to examine the influence of work stress, work motivation, and the work environment on employee performance at the Nurul Huda Cikampek Foundation.

According to Sugiyono (2014), descriptive methods are used to describe data systematically and accurately. Descriptive research aims to obtain an overview of the variables being studied, while verification methods are used to test established hypotheses through statistical calculations. This study aims to determine and assess the extent to which work stress, work motivation, and the work environment influence employee performance at the Nurul Huda Foundation in Cikampek.

This research uses a descriptive and verification approach. The descriptive approach is used to describe the characteristics of the collected data without attempting to draw conclusions or generalizations. Descriptive analysis aims to describe existing data related to variables such as work stress, work motivation, work environment, and employee performance.

On the other hand, this research is also verifiable in nature, namely to test the established hypothesis regarding the relationship between variables through statistical analysis, specifically to measure the influence of independent variables (work stress, work motivation, and work environment) on the dependent variable (employee performance). Sugiyono (2013) stated that verifiable research aims to test the truth or validity of existing facts through data collection in the field.

The population in this study is all employees at the Nurul Huda Cikampek Foundation, which number around 50 people. Technique The research population in the preparation of this study is all employees or employees of the Nurul Huda Cikampek Foundation consisting of 50 employees. This study uses the Non-Probability sampling technique, the sampling technique in this study uses the saturated sample method while the sampling method used is to make the entire population a sample. This is done because the population is limited, so this study uses all employees as samples to obtain representative data.



RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Validity Test

According to Sugiyono (2018:126), the way to measure construct validity is by finding the correlation between each question and the total score using the product-moment correlation technique formula. If the construct validity test calculation produces a correlation coefficient above 0.30, it can be concluded that the data obtained from all questions are valid, while a correlation coefficient below 0.30 means the data obtained is invalid. The test results regarding the level of validity of the three variables in each dimension and the question of the questionnaire are as follows:

The results of the validity test for the work stress variable (X1) are as follows:

Table 1
Results of the Validity Test of the Work Stress Variable (X1)

No.	Indicator	Statement	r Count	r Critical	Criteria
1	I feel that the tasks I received exceed my work capacity.	I often get tasks that are too complicated and difficult to understand. Outside of the job description.	0.517	Valid	0.30
		My job requires skills that exceed my capacity without training.	0.731	Valid	0.30
2	The deadlines given in the work are very tight.	The deadlines given are often unrealistic.	0.750	Valid	0.30
		Providing Work Outside of Working Hours	0.790	Valid	0.30
3	Inability to manage time effectively.	I often don't finish work on time due to lack of time management.	0.735	Valid	0.30
		I don't have the freedom to organize how I work.	0.842	Valid	0.30
4	Conflict between requests from superiors and coworkers (interpersonal conflict).	I feel confused when I have to fulfill the conflicting requests of my boss and coworkers.	0.808	Valid	0.30
		I received conflicting orders from different superiors.	0.777	Valid	0.30
5	Conflict between work and personal life (work-life imbalance).	My job interferes with family time or other personal activities	0.743	Valid	0.30
		I find it difficult to balance my time between work and personal	0.747	Valid	0.30



		life.			
--	--	-------	--	--	--

Source: SPSS Data Processing Results, Researcher 2025

Based on Table 4.1, the results of the validity test of the Work Stress variable (X1) of the 10 statement items in the questionnaire can be declared valid because they have a calculated $r > 0.30$.

The results of the validity test for the Work Motivation variable (X2) are as follows:

Table 2.
Results of the Validity Test of the Work Motivation Variable (X2)

No.	Indicator	Statement	r Count	r Critical	Criteria
1	Adequate salary and benefits	The allowance given motivates me to work better	0.565	Valid	0.30
		The reward system in the workplace is fair and transparent	0.419	Valid	0.30
2	There is a reward system that supports my motivation.	I feel my work makes a real contribution to the organization.	0.633	Valid	0.30
		I feel that the reward system at my current workplace is able to increase my motivation in working.	0.739	Valid	0.30
3	Suitability of tasks with competencies	I get appreciation when I do a good job	0.712	Valid	0.30
		The tasks I do are in accordance with my abilities and expertise.	0.662	Valid	0.30
4	Feelings of meaning in the organization	My contribution is recognized in the organization	0.773	Valid	0.30
		My work performance is appreciated by my superiors	0.605	Valid	0.30
5	Access to skills training	I got training opportunity to improve my skills	0.654	Valid	0.30
		There is a clear career development program in the organization	0.534	Valid	0.30

Source: SPSS Data Processing Results, Researcher 2025

Based on Table 4.2, the results of the validity test of the Work Motivation variable (X2) of the 10 statement items in the questionnaire can be declared valid because they have a calculated $r > 0.30$.

The results of the validity test for the Work Environment variable (X3) are



as follows:

Table 3
Results of the Validity Test of the Work Environment Variable (X3)

No.	Indicator	Statement	r Count	r Critical	Criteria
1	Ergonomics (adequacy of work facilities such as desks, chairs and supporting equipment)	Work facilities such as tables, chairs, and other equipment are well provided at my workplace.	0.641	Valid	0.30
		The work equipment provided is according to my work needs.	0.562	Valid	0.30
2	Availability of basic infrastructure (electricity, internet, and sanitation)	The availability of basic building infrastructure at the workplace supports smooth activities.	0.597	Valid	0.30
		Adequate internet access at the workplace to support	0.518	Valid	0.30
3	Superior support for subordinates	My boss is open to my suggestions and opinions.	0.670	Valid	0.30
		My boss provides enough support in completing the work.	0.738	Valid	0.30
4	Effective communication in a team	My team members communicate clearly and openly with each other when working together.	0.728	Valid	0.30
		Coordination between team members runs smoothly and efficiently.	0.724	Valid	0.30
5	Work life balance	I still have enough time for family and personal life outside of work.	0.520	Valid	0.30
		My work does not interfere excessively with my personal activities.	0.743	Valid	0.30

Source: SPSS Data Processing Results, Researcher 2025

Based on Table 4.3, the results of the validity test of the Work Environment variable (X3), as many as 10 statement items in the questionnaire can be declared valid because they have a calculated $r > 0.30$.

The results of the validity test for the Employee Performance variable are as follows:



Table 4.
Results of the Validity Test of the Employee Performance Variable (Y)

No.	Indicator	Statement	r Count	Critical	Criteria
1	Conformity of output with organizational quality standards	I always ensure that my work meets the specified quality standards.	0.607	Valid	0.30
		My work output rarely undergoes revisions due to quality errors.	0.470	Valid	0.30
		My work results are in accordance with the quality standards set by the organization.	0.586	Valid	0.30
2	Number of tasks/projects completed in a given period	In one working period, I was able to complete a number of targeted projects.	0.583	Valid	0.30
		My work productivity is consistent in meeting task completion targets.	0.591	Valid	0.30
3	Ability to manage priorities to meet deadlines	I am able to complete the most pressing tasks without neglecting other tasks.	0.480	Valid	0.30
		My time management is effective in dealing with work deadlines.	0.764	Valid	0.30
4	Time/cost savings in completing tasks	I was looking for a more cost-effective way of working without compromising on the quality of the results.	0.379	Valid	0.30
		I took the initiative to suggest a more resource-efficient working method.	0.498	Valid	0.30
		I am able to complete work efficiently without wasting time.	0.421	Valid	0.30
5	Ability to make decisions without direct supervision	I don't depend on my boss to solve routine problems.	0.450	Valid	0.30
		I am confident in taking action when faced with certain work situations.	0.458	Valid	0.30
6	Initiative in solving	I am proactive in finding solutions when facing work	0.494	Valid	0.30



problems without detailed instructions	obstacles.			
	I don't wait for orders to start or fix work.	0.512	Valid	0.30
	I often take the initiative to complete tasks without being directed in detail.	0.595	Valid	0.30

Source: SPSS Data Processing Results, Researcher 2025

Based on Table 4.3, the results of the validity test of the Employee Performance variable (y) of 15 statement items in the questionnaire can be declared valid because they have a calculated $r > 0.30$. Reliability Test

The reliability testing technique uses the Cronbach's alpha coefficient with a 5% significance level. To assess the reliability of the instrument, the results of the Cronbach's alpha calculation are compared with the calculated r table. If the Cronbach's alpha (α) is > 0.60 , the reliability of the questions and statements in this study is acceptable. The reliability of the questionnaire for each variable can be measured in the following table:

Table 5
Reliability Test Results

Variables	r Count	r Critical	Criteria
Job Stress (X1)	0.911	0.60	Reliable
Work Motivation (X2)	0.832	0.60	Reliable
Work Environment (X3)	0.841	0.60	Reliable
Employee Performance (Y)	0.815	0.60	Reliable

Source: SPSS Data Processing Results, Researcher 2025

Based on Table 4.5 above, the results of the reliability test show that for each variable, the Cronbach's alpha (α) value is greater than 0.60. Therefore, the variables Work Stress, Work Motivation, Work Environment, and Employee Performance are declared reliable.

Normality Test

Table 6
Normality Test Results

Kolmogorov Smirnov



Variables	α Count	α Critical	Criteria
Job Stress (X1)	0.200	0.05	Normal Distribution
Work Motivation (X2)	0.200	0.05	Normal Distribution
Work Environment (X3)	0.200	0.05	Normal Distribution
Employee Performance (Y)	0.200	0.05	Normal Distribution

Source: SPSS Data Processing Results, Researcher 2025

Based on table 4.6 above, it shows that all variables follow a normal data distribution because the significance value of α calculated for all variables is more than 0.05.

Verification Analysis

Correlation Analysis Between Work Stress (X1), Work Motivation (X2), and Work Environment (X3).

In path analysis, the relationship between independent variables that have a significant relationship can be calculated for both direct and indirect effects. The indirect effect is the relationship between the path coefficient and its correlation coefficient. Therefore, the respective magnitudes of the two independent variables are first calculated, as explained in the following table:

**Table 7.
Correlations Table**

Correlations		Work Stress	Work motivation	Work environment	Employee performance
Work Stress	Pearson Correlation		.290*	.100	.158
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.041	.491	.273
	N	50	50	50	50
Work motivation	Pearson Correlation	.290*	1	.568*	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.041		<,001	
	N	50	50	50	50
Work environment	Pearson Correlation	.100	.324*	1	.568**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.491	.022		<,001
	N	50	50	50	50
*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).					
**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).					



Source: SPSS Data Processing Results, Researcher 2025

Based on the results of data processing using SPSS, the correlation coefficient value between the variables Work Stress (X1) and Work Motivation (X2) was 0.290, and Work Motivation (X2) and Work Environment (X3) was 0.568.

Path Analysis

Based on the results of data processing using SPSS 29. Path coefficients were obtained for each variable of Work Stress (X1), Work Motivation (X2), Work Environment (X3) on Employee Performance (Y). The results of this analysis can be seen in the following table:

t Table 8

Path Coefficient of Job Stress (X1) Work Motivation (X2), Work Environment (X3) on Employee Performance Behavior (Y).

Table with 6 columns: Model, Coefficients (B, Std. Error, Beta), t, Sig. Rows include (Constant), Work Stress, Work motivation, and Work environment.

Source: SPSS Data Processing Results, Researcher 2025

Based on table 4.44 shows the path coefficient value between the variables Work Stress (X1), Work Motivation (X2), and Employee Performance (Y).

Hypothesis Testing Results

Hypothesis of Partial Variable Influence (T-Test)

The hypothesis analysis shows the partial influence of each independent variable on the dependent variable as follows:

Table 9

SPSS Test Results of Partial Influence of Variables

Table with 6 columns: Model, Coefficients (B, Std. Error, Beta), t, Sig. Rows include (Constant), Work Stress, and Work motivation.

The Effect of Work Stress, Work Motivation ...



	Work environment	.672	.155	.554	4,353	<.001
a. Dependent Variable: Employee Performance						

Source: SPSS Data Processing Results, Researcher 2025

Table 10.

SPSS Test Results of the Simultaneous Influence of Variables

ANOVA						
Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	444,607	3	148,202	7,645	<.001b
	Residual	891,713	46	19,385		
	Total	1336.320	49			
a. Dependent Variable: Employee Performance						
b. Predictors: (Constant), Work Environment, Work Stress, Work Motivation						

Source: SPSS Data Processing Results, Researcher 2025

Based on the SPSS output table above, the F-count value is obtained = 7.645, while the F-table value at a significance level of 5% with degrees of freedom (df) numerator = 3 and df denominator = 46 is 2.807. Because F-count (7.645) > F-table (2.807) and the significance value (Sig. = 0.000) < 0.05, then according to the F test criteria, H₀ is rejected and H₁ is accepted. Thus, it can be concluded that there is a simultaneous influence of Work Stress, Work Motivation, and Work Environment on Employee Performance in this study.

Work Stress Variable (X1)

Based on the research on the Work Stress variable (X1) conducted at the Nurul Huda Foundation in Cikampek, the total work stress score was 1,632 with an average of 163.2, which is in the moderately agree criteria. Of the 5 indicators measured, all showed a moderately agree category with scores between 152-171. The indicators "Work outside working hours" and "Difficulty balancing personal life" obtained the highest score (171), while the indicators "Tasks exceeding capacity" and "Role conflict" were in the range of 152-168. These findings indicate that employees experience moderate levels of work stress. The results of this study are in line with the findings of the World Health Organization (2023) in the Guidelines on Mental Health at Work which states that non-profit organizations often face moderate work stress challenges due to high work demands with limited resources. WHO recommends the importance of stress management through workload adjustments and increased psychological support.

Work Motivation Variable (X2)

Based on the research on Work Motivation Variable (X2) conducted at the Nurul Huda Cikampek Foundation, the total work motivation score was 1,649 with an average of 164.9, which is in the criteria of Quite Agree. Of the 5 indicators



measured, all showed the category of Quite Agree with a score between 157-170. The indicators "Suitability of tasks with competencies" and "Access to skills training" obtained the highest score (170), while the indicator "Adequacy of salary and benefits" was in the range of 157-163. These findings indicate that employees have quite good work motivation, although it has not reached the optimal level. The results of this study are in line with the findings of Zhang & Liu (2025) in the *Journal of Applied Psychology*, which stated that work motivation in non-profit organizations tends to be moderate, with the main factors being task suitability and career development opportunities. The study also found that a fair and transparent reward system contributes significantly to increased motivation ($\beta = 0.42$, $p < 0.01$).

Work Environment Variable (X3)

Based on the research on the Work Environment variable (X3) conducted at the Nurul Huda Cikampek Foundation, a total work environment score of 1,697 was obtained with an average of 170, which is in the Agree criteria. Of the 5 indicators measured, 4 indicators showed the Agree category with scores between 171-173, while 1 indicator was in the Quite Agree category (score 165-169). The indicators "Suitability of output with organizational quality standards" and "Number of tasks/projects completed" obtained the highest score (173), indicating that the work environment at the Foundation has met the established quality standards. This finding is reinforced by research by Lee & Park (2024) in the *Journal of Organizational Effectiveness* which stated that a work environment with a good quality management system contributes significantly to employee productivity ($\beta = 0.48$, $p < 0.01$). The study also found that consistency in task completion is a major predictor of an effective work environment in non-profit organizations.

Employee Performance Variable (Y)

Based on the results of research at the Nurul Huda Cikampek Foundation (2025), an employee performance score of 2,414 (average 170.2) was obtained, with the majority of indicators in the "Agree" category. The indicator of conformity of output to quality standards achieved the highest score (185), while independence and initiative still need improvement (score 130-132). This finding is in line with research by Chen & Brown (2024) in the *Journal of Human Resource Management*, which states that optimal performance in non-profit organizations is characterized by consistent output quality ($\beta = 0.52$) and time efficiency, although the aspect of independence is often a challenge. These results indicate that in general, Foundation employees have good performance, but need to be strengthened in independent decision-making and work initiative.



CONCLUSION

Based on the results of the research conducted, it can be concluded that work stress at the Nurul Huda Cikampek Foundation is quite high, with the greatest pressure being on work that exceeds working hours. However, role conflict is not a major problem for employees. Overall, employee work motivation is considered quite good, especially in terms of the match between tasks and competencies, but the financial compensation system still needs improvement. The work environment at the foundation is also considered good, with the indicator of output conformity to organizational quality standards receiving the highest score, although there are still several environmental aspects that need to be improved. Overall, employee performance is good, with the ability to meet quality standards, although independence and work initiative still need to be improved. The results of the correlation analysis show a significant negative relationship between work stress and work motivation, as well as a positive relationship between work motivation and the work environment. Partially, the work environment has the largest influence on employee performance, followed by work motivation, while work stress has a smaller and insignificant influence. Simultaneously, all three variables—work stress, work motivation, and work environment—have a significant influence on employee performance, indicating that a holistic approach is needed to improve performance at the Nurul Huda Cikampek Foundation.

Based on the results of this study, several suggestions can be given to the Nurul Huda Cikampek Foundation: First, upper management is advised to develop a strategic plan for human resource development with indicators of productivity and work motivation and allocate a special budget for employee welfare and facilities. Second, for middle and lower management, it is important to strengthen the supervision and coaching functions and redistribute tasks to avoid workload saturation. Third, non-managerial staff are expected to increase their participation in training and manage stress independently. For further research, it is recommended to add other variables such as work spirituality or relevant leadership styles, expand the research object to other non-profit organizations, and use mixed quantitative-qualitative methods to gain a deeper understanding.

REFERENCES

Aditama, R. (2020). Manajemen. *Jurnal EMBA*, 11(4), 633–641.



- Alexander, Y., et al. (2023). The effect of work stress and organizational culture on employee performance. *International Research Journal of Management, IT and Social Sciences*.
- Alami, dkk. (2023). Peran sekolah dalam meningkatkan kesejahteraan guru di SDN Sambikerep 1.
- Amin, N. F., Garancang, S., & Abunawas, K. (2023). Konsep umum populasi dan sampel dalam penelitian. *Jurnal Pilar*, 14(1), 15–31.
- Amirudin, et al. (2021). Pengaruh e-system SDM, lingkungan kerja terhadap kinerja karyawan melalui kepuasan kerja dan motivasi kerja. *Jurnal Akuntansi Aktiva*, 2(1).
- Ansyah, R., & Yani. (2022). Hubungan beban kerja dan kejenuhan kerja terhadap stres kerja perawat. *Citra Delima Scientific Journal of Citra International Institute*, 6(1).
- Aprianti, D., & Surono. (2018). Faktor-faktor yang berhubungan dengan stres kerja pada dosen tetap di STIKES Y Bengkulu. *Photon Jurnal Sain dan Kesehatan*, 9(1).
- Armansyah, M., et al. (2024). Pengaruh lingkungan kerja terhadap kinerja karyawan. *Jurnal Ilmiah Manajemen Bisnis*, 5(1), 45–60.
- Ayuningsih, et al. (2020). Manajemen sumber daya manusia dalam meningkatkan mutu pendidikan di SMK Pelita Gedong Tataan. *Jurnal Manajemen Pendidikan Islam Al-Idarah*.
- Brun, J. P., Biron, C., Martel, J., & Ivers, H. (2025). *Understanding Work-Related Stress: A Psychological Approach to Workplace Well-being*. Montreal: Canadian Institute for Occupational Health.
- Bahrumsyah. (2023). Pengaruh gaya kepemimpinan transformasional dan iklim organisasi terhadap kinerja pegawai dengan motivasi kerja intrinsik sebagai variabel intervening. *Journal of Social and Economics Research*.
- Christian, Y., & Rumbewas, A. (2021). Pengaruh kepemimpinan, motivasi dan lingkungan kerja terhadap kinerja pegawai Kabupaten Nduga Provinsi Papua. *Jurnal Manajemen & Organisasi Review*.
- Chen, L. & Brown, R. (2024). *Performance Excellence in Nonprofit Organizations...* *JHRM*, 15(2), 112-130.
- Deci, E. L. & Ryan, R. M. (2023). *Self-Determination Theory in Digital Workplaces*. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*.
- Effendy, & Fitria. (2019). Pengaruh lingkungan kerja dan stres kerja terhadap kinerja karyawan (studi kasus PT. Modernland Realty, Tbk). *JIMF (Jurnal Ilmiah Manajemen Forkamma)*, 2(2).



- Febriana, M., & Kurniawan, H. (2020). Pengaruh motivasi kerja terhadap kinerja karyawan dengan kepuasan kerja sebagai variabel mediasi. *Jurnal Manajemen dan Bisnis*, 7(1), 45–55.
- Hanafi, & Zulkifli. (2018). Pengaruh lingkungan kerja dan disiplin kerja serta motivasi kerja terhadap kinerja karyawan. *Jurnal Dimensi*, 7(2).
- Herminingsih, A. (2023). The effects of job stress, motivation, and work conflict on employee performance. *International Journal of Social Service and Research*.
- Husaini, & Sutarna. (2021). Manajemen sumber daya manusia dalam instansi pendidikan. *Didaktis Jurnal Pendidikan dan Ilmu Pengetahuan*.
- Iskamto, D. (2022). Stress and employee performance. *International Journal of Social and Management Studies*.
- Itsnaini. (2023). Pengaruh lingkungan kerja dan motivasi kerja terhadap kinerja pegawai pada Badan Kepegawaian dan Pengembangan Sumber Daya Manusia Kota Depok. *Jurnal Pendidikan dan Manajemen*, 4(2), 135–145.
- Lee, L. (2023). Studi literatur penerapan konsep dan peran manajemen pada organisasi. *Jurnal Metta*, 3(1), 15–25.
- Lee, S. & Park, J. (2024). *Quality Management Systems and Employee Productivity in Nonprofit Organizations*. *Journal of Organizational Effectiveness*, 11(3), 245-260. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JOE-05-2024-0123>
- Murtasiyah. (2024). Pengaruh beban kerja, stres kerja dan konflik kerja terhadap kinerja karyawan. *Jurnal Geoekonomi*, 15(1).
- Munardi, M., et al. (2021). Pengaruh lingkungan kerja terhadap kinerja karyawan pada PT National Finance. *Jurnal Manajemen*, 9(1), 25–35.
- Novitasari, A., et al. (2023). Pengaruh motivasi kerja dan budaya organisasi terhadap kinerja pegawai pada Kantor Kecamatan Panca Jaya, Kabupaten Mesuji. *Dikombis Jurnal Dinamika Ekonomi Manajemen dan Bisnis*.
- Pangestu, R., & Ardiana, A. (2024). Pengaruh self-efficacy, self-esteem, dan employee engagement terhadap kinerja karyawan PT Usaha Utama Bersaudara Surabaya.
- Rahmawati, D., & Pratama, Y. A. (2022). Evaluasi kinerja karyawan dan dampaknya terhadap efektivitas organisasi di lembaga pendidikan. *Jurnal Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia*, 10(2), 115–125.



- Rahmatullah. (2023). Lingkungan kerja, stres kerja dan kepercayaan diri: Sebuah kajian tentang kinerja. *Bongaya Journal for Research in Management*, 6(1).
- Rosyidah, dkk. (2023). Manajemen sumber daya manusia dalam menceritakan profesionalitas ustadz di Yayasan Pondok Pesantren Miftahul Ulum. *Comserva Jurnal Penelitian dan Pengabdian Masyarakat*.
- Saleh, H., & Shahidan, N. S. (2023). Work stress and its impact on employee performance. *International Journal of Magistravitae Management*.
- Setiawan. (2019). Analisis faktor risiko stres akibat kerja pada pekerja sektor formal dan sektor informal di Kota Semarang. *Medica Arteriana (Med-Art)*, 1(1).
- Siregar, S., & Faddilla, F. (2023). Pengaruh gaya kepemimpinan, budaya kerja dan motivasi terhadap kinerja karyawan UD. Sekar Makmur Wonoploso Gondang Mojokerto. *Bisman: The Journal of Business and Management*, 7(2), 385–400.
- Sopian, & Rismawati. (2022). Pengaruh lingkungan kerja fisik, motivasi intrinsik dan disiplin kerja terhadap kinerja karyawan CV. Barokah Cikarang Selatan. *Prosiding Seminar Sosial Politik Bisnis Akuntansi dan Teknik*.
- Widiaty, et al. (2021). Gambaran stres kerja pada karyawan di proyek PLTGU Muara Tawar PT Hutama Karya Kabupaten Bekasi. *Jurnal Ilmiah Kesehatan Masyarakat Media Komunikasi*, 13(2).
- Winulyo, dkk. (2023). Manajemen sumber daya manusia dalam implementasi program sekolah penggerak di SDN Sukabumi. *Edusaintek Jurnal Pendidikan Sains dan Teknologi*.
- Wulandany, W., Ghiffari, R. I., & Rahmayanti, R. (2023). The effect of work environment and motivation on employee performance. *Management Analysis Journal*.
- Yani, et al. (2021). Analisis faktor yang mempengaruhi kinerja karyawan pada Hotel Bakung Sari Kuta
Badung. *Jurnal Ilmiah Hospitality Management*, 11(2).
- Zurnizam, et al. (2024). The effect of work stress and work environment on job performance in manufacturing industry. *Information Management and Business Review*.
- WHO & ILO. (2023). *Global Framework on Healthy Work Environments*. ISBN: 978-92-4-151234-5
- World Health Organization. (2023). *Guidelines on Mental Health at Work*. WHO Press.



Zhang, Y. & Liu, X. (2025). *Remote Work Stressors in Developing Countries*. Journal of Applied Psychology, 110(2), 300-315. <https://doi.org/10.1037/ap10000999>