

Workload, Work Environment and Employee Performance of Housekeeping

Sri Harini, Sudarijati, and Niken Kartiwi

Departement of Management, Djuanda University, Jl. Tol Ciawi No. 1, Bogor, Indonesia

Abstract: This study aims to determine the effect of workload and work environment on employee performance housekeeping. The population and sample are 40 employees of the housekeeping section of LORIN Sentul Hotel Bogor. Data collected through questionnaires and interviews. The instrument test is performed with validity and reliability. Analysis of research data includes multiple regression analysis, correlation as well as signification test simultaneously and partially. Based on the results of multiple regressions analysis workload and work environment have a positive and significant impact on performance and results F-test, states that simultaneously workload and work environment effect on employee performance housekeeping. While the t-test results indicate that workload and work environment partially affect a positive significant the employee performance of housekeeping. Increased workload within the limits of the ability of employees can improve employee performance. Work environment improvements can improve housekeeping performance.

Keywords: Workload, Work Environment, and Employee Performance.

Introduction

Human Resources are a very valuable asset that is owned by the company, because its existence is crucial to the success. The use of directed and effective labor is a determining factor in efforts to improve employee performance. Because of this, it requires a company policy that is able to move the workforce to want to work more optimally. The workload and the work environment can affect employee performance.

Workload is an individual's assessment of a number of task demands or activities that require mental activities such as remembering things needed, concentration, detecting problems, overcoming unexpected events and making decisions quickly work related. If the individual has a positive perception, then the employee will consider the workload as a challenge in working so that employees are more serious in working and produce something that is beneficial for them and the company where they work. Conversely, if negative perceptions, the workload is considered as work pressure so that it can affect individual performance, has a negative impact on himself and the company (Robbins, 2010). The performance decreased and workload increased as the tasks became more complex (Oron, et.al., 2008).

Other factors that affect employee performance are the work environment. A non-conducive work environment will make employees easily fall ill, easy to stress, difficult to concentrate and decreased work productivity, (Irsyandi, 2008). Performance is generally defined as a person's success in carrying out a job. Employee performance is the result of work achieved by a person in carrying out the tasks assigned to him (Hasibuan, 2010). Decreased performance will certainly greatly affect the stability of the company.

Customer satisfaction is the main goal of the hotel; it requires employees with the best performance who are able to provide customers satisfaction. The one that most influences the satisfaction level of hotel visitors is the housekeeping. Housekeeping is one part of the hotel that handles matters relating to beauty, neatness, cleanliness and completeness of all rooms as well as other public areas such as office space, lobby, terrace, elevator, toilet, public area, garden, swimming pool and hotel parking area so that all guests and employees can feel comfortable and safe in the hotel. In the past year, many hotel customers have been found against housekeeping services.

Housekeeping employee performance during 2017 decreased, based on the number of complaints that increased every month. The highest level of compilation of cleanliness starting from the room is toilet, swimming pool, lobby, garden and public area. Hotel sets minimum complaint standards that can be accepted by the hotel, which is under 3% per month, but in reality the number of complaints regarding hotel cleanliness per month exceeds 3%. Decreased performance of housekeeping employees is caused by excessive workloads, and inadequate work environments.

A standard room boy cleans 10 rooms per day, but in reality one roomboy must clean 15 rooms per day. And employees in the public area attendant must clean 125 meters above the 25 meter standard (Sulastiyono, 2011). The limited number of cleaning supporting equipment causes housekeeping performance to be less than optimal. Therefore, a research is needed on the workload and work environment of employees which has implications for improving the performance of employees of the Hotel.

Literature Review

Workload

Workload is the average frequency of activity from each job within a certain period. According to Munandar (2011: 385), workload is the tasks assigned to employees to be completed at a certain time by using the skills and potential of the workforce.

Factors Affecting Workload

In general there are two factors that affect workload, namely external factors and internal factors. Arika (2011: 85), states that workload is influenced by the following factors: (1) External factors, namely the burden from outside the worker's body, such as; Tasks that are physical: work situation, work attitude; and tasks that are psychological, such as: complexity of work, level of difficulty and job responsibilities. Work organizations: length of work time, rest time, work shift, night work, wage system, organizational structure model, assignment of tasks and authority. (2) Internal factors are factors that originate in the body itself due to the reaction of external workloads. Internal factors include somatic factors (gender, age, body size, nutritional status, and health conditions) and psychic factors (motivation, perception, trust, desire and satisfaction).

Workload Indicators

This study uses an indicators of workload are: targets to be achieved, work conditions, and work standards (Putra, 2012).

Work environment

The work environment can have an impact on work performance and can change a person's mood while working (Sarwono, 2008). Temperature, noise, air pollution, tightness and density can have an impact on a person's behavior.

Factors Affecting the Work Environment

The creation of a good work environment there are influencing factors, including: building workplaces, wide work spaces, ventilation of air exchanges, there are religious places of worship, and there are special transportation facilities or general for employees to be comfortable and easy (Siagian, 2008).

Work Environment Indicators

Work environment indicators are: lighting in the workspace, air circulation in the workspace, noise, color usage, humidity, and facilities (Sedarmayanti, 2011).

Employee performance

Employee performance in general is a work embodiment carried out by employees that is used as a reference for evaluating employees within an organization.

Performances is a result of work achieved by a person in carrying out his duties on skills, effort and opportunity (Hasibuan, 2010).

Factors Affecting Employee Performance

Good performance is a step towards achieving organizational goals.

Factors that affect employee performance consist of: (1) Intrinsic: personal or individual factors, namely knowledge, skills, abilities, confidence, motivation, and commitment that is owned by each individual employee, (2) Extrinsic: leadership factors, including the quality aspects of the manager and team leader in giving encouragement, enthusiasm, direction and work support to employees; and team factors, including aspects of support and enthusiasm given by colleagues in one team, trust in fellow team members, cohesiveness and closeness of team members; system factors, including the work system, work facilities or infrastructure provided by the organizational process and work culture in the organization; and situational factors, including internal and external pressures and changes (Mangkuprawira and Hubuis, 2007).

Employee Performance Indicators

Employee performance indicators according to are: quantity of work, quality of work, and timeliness (Dharma, 2008).

Effect of Workload and Work Environment on Employee Performance

The notion of performance is the result of the work given to employees both in quality and quantity (Mangkunegara, 2015). Low or high performance of employees can be caused by the workload received and the work environment that is obtained by the employee itself. a workload and work environment having a positive and significant effect on employee performance (Dewi,2017).

H₁: There is a positive and significant influence on workload and work environment simultaneously on employee performance.

Effect of Workload on Employee Performance

The negative positive workload is a problem of perception that is understood by employees. If the employee considers the workload to be a problem, the work will not be completed properly, but if the employee considers the workload as a challenge then the employee will be serious and enjoy all the tasks assigned to him (Robbins, 2010).

A work environment that has a positive and significant effect on employee performance.

H₂: There is a positive and significant influence on workload on employee performance (Tjiabrata,2017).

The Effect of the Work Environment on Employee Performance

He work environment can have an impact on work performance and can change a person's mood while working if the climate in the room works well, it can affect employees in carrying out their work (Sarwono, 2008). A positive and significant work environment for employee performance (Yunanda,2011).

H₃: There is a positive and significant influence on the work environment on employee performance.

Table 1. Operational Variables

Variable	Concept	Indicators	Scale of measurement	Item
Workload (X ₁)	a number of task demands imposed on employees that must be completed based on a predetermined time, (Putra, 2012)	targets	Ordinal	1,2
		work conditions	Ordinal	3,4
		work standards	Ordinal	5,6
Work environment (X ₂)	the entire tool and material equipment faced by the surrounding environment in which a person works, his working methods and work arrangements both as individuals and as a group,(Sedarmayanti, 2011)	lighting	Ordinal	1,2
		air circulation	Ordinal	3,4
		noise	Ordinal	5,6
		color usage	Ordinal	7,8
		Humidity	Ordinal	9,10
		Facilities	Ordinal	11,12,13
Performance (X ₃)	something achieved by employees, work performance that is considered by employees, work ability related to the use of office equipment, (Dharma, 2008)	Quantity	Ordinal	1,2
		Quality	Ordinal	3,4
		Timeliness	Ordinal	5,6

Sources: Putra (2012), Sedarmayanti (2011), and Dharma (2008).

Method

Population, Technique Sampling

The population in this study is housekeeping employees. The sampling technique in this study uses probability sampling techniques.

Test Validity and Reliability

Validity test is to determine the level of validity of the instruments used in data collection. Valid instruments can be used to measure what should be measured (Sugiyono, 2013: 137). Validity test shows that all indicators of variables workload, work environment and employee performance are declared valid because the calculated r value is greater than 0.3.

A reliable instrument is an instrument that will produce the same or consistent data from time to time. The reliability test results with Cronbach Alpha technique showed that all research variables were declared reliable because the Cronbach Alpha value was greater than 0.6(Sugiyono, 2013).

Classic assumption test

The classic assumption test used in this study is multicollinearity test, heteroscedasticity test, and normality test. Multicollinearity test results show that the regression model does not occur in multicollinearity problems. Heteroscedasticity test results of regression models do not occur heteroscedasticity. The test results for the normality of the regression model have normal data distribution.

Data analysis

The collected data were analyzed by descriptive and verification using statistical tests. To find out whether there is an influence between workload and work environment on the performance of housekeeping employees, the following formula is used:

$$Y = a + \beta_1 X_1 + \beta_2 X_2 + \square \quad (1)$$

Y:employee performance

X₁:workload

X₂: work environment

a:constanta

β:coefficient of regression

□:other factors

The correlation coefficient (r) measures the strength and direction of the relationship linearly from the variables studied. Correlation coefficients only measure the strength of linear relationships and not in non-linear relationships (Yuliardi and Nuraeni, 2017).

Contribution of the influence of workload (X₁) and work environment (X₂) on employee performance (Y), used coefficient of determination (r²) with the formula:

$$KD = r^2 \times 100\% \quad (2)$$

KD: Coefficient of Determination

r: Correlation Coefficient

Hypothesis Testing

F statistic test is used to test whether the variable workload and work environment have a simultaneous effect on employee performance variables. With a significance level of 5% or a degree of freedom of 95%. Statistical test t is used to test whether the variable workload and work environment have a partial effect on employee performance variables of 5% significance level.

Results and Discussion

The majority of housekeeping employees are male (95%), aged 26-30 (50%), have high school education (82.5%).

Employee responses with workloadvariables.

Table 3 Employee Responses Workload Variables (X₁)

No	Statement	Average	Criteria
1	Job demands	3,80	High
2	Working time	4,18	High
3	Job decision making	4,18	High
4	Overcoming work	4,10	High
5	Workload	4,13	High
6	Job standard	3,90	High
Average		4,04	High

Employee responses to workload variables have an average value of 4.04 which is included in the high category. The workload given is not in accordance with housekeeping work standards, the time given is appropriate, the workload provided supports in achieving the work standard and employees enjoy the standard of work provided within a certain period. Lnearity, results show that 75% of health workers perceived moderate workload assignment would increase their performance, (Asamani, Amertil, and Cheebere, 2015).

Recapitulation of employee respons work environment variables.

Table 4 Employee responses work environment (X₂)

No	Description	Average	Criteria
1.	Room lighting	4,18	Good
2.	Work lighting	4,00	Good
3.	Ventilation	4,18	Good
4.	Sirkulation	4,13	Good
5.	Noise	3,38	Moderate
6.	Sound	3,83	Good
7.	Colouring	4,03	Good
8.	Work arrangement	4,08	Good
9.	Temperature	4,13	Good
10.	Humidity	4,23	Very Good
11.	Equipment	4,00	Good
12.	Condition of equipment	3,45	Good
13.	Uniform	4,18	Good
Average		3,98	Good

Respons of employee to work environment variables have an average value of 3.98 (High performance). Good work environment such as lighting, air ventilation, and workplace is not noisy, coloring, available equipment in quality and quantity, and uniformly supports employees in working.

Recapitulation of employee respons Performance Variables.

Table 5 Employee Responses Performance Variables (Y).

No	Description	Average	Criteria
1.	Output	4,10	High
2.	Process	4,13	High
3.	Outcome	3,95	High
4.	Finishing	3,35	Moderate
5.	Standart	3,83	High
6.	Time	3,80	High
Average		3,85	High

Source: Data research, 2017.

Respons of employee to performance variables have an average value of 3.85 (High performance). High performance measured by output, proses, outcome, finishing, standart, and time work. Finishing of work must be increasing to achieve performance.

Multiple regression analysis

Multiple regression (SPSS, 21 version):

$$Y = 8,144 + 0,420 X_1 + 0,335 X_2 + e \quad (3)$$

The influence of each of these variables can be explained as follows:

1. Workload has a positive effect on employee performance, meaning that if the workload increases, employee performance increases, where the work environment variable is fixed.
2. The work environment has a positive effect on employee performance, meaning that if the work environment is better, employee performance increases where the variable workload is fixed. This is consistent with study that the work environment has a positive effect on employee performance, (Bushiri's, 2014).

Multiple corellation and determination coefficient analysis

The correlation between workload, work environment and employee performance is strong (0.725). This shows that the higher the workload (X_1) and the better the work environment (X_2), the higher the performance of Housekeeping employees. R Square (0.526), this shows that the percentage of contributions from workload variables (X_1) and work environment (X_2) to employee performance (Y) is 52.6%, 47.4% is influenced by other variables not included in This research model is like motivation, ability, leadership and organizational commitment (Mangkuprawira and Hubuis, 2007).

Test of hypotesis (F-test)

F test is to determine the effect of workload (X1) and work environment (X2) simultaneously on employee performance (Y).

Ho: $\beta_{1,2} \leq 0$; workload and work environment simultaneously have not a positive and significant effect on employee performance.

Ha: $\beta_{1,2} > 0$; workload and work environment simultaneously have a positive and significant effect on employee performance.

Because F_{value} is greater than F_{table} ($20.524 > 3.25$), it can be concluded that H_0 is rejected and H_a is accepted, it means that with a 95% confidence level, simultaneous workload variables (X_1) and work environment (X_2) have a positive and significant effect on performance variables (Y). This is consistent with the results of Pradipta's research (2016:10), Hafni (2016:15) and Rahayu (2016) which states that workload (X1) and work environment (X2) simultaneously have a positive and significant effect on employee performance (Y). Job stress, workload, and work environment have significant effect on employee turnover simultaneously and partially at PTHasjrat Abadi Manado, (Ngantung, Saerang, and Pandowo, 2015).

T-test

Partial Regression Testing (t-test), obtained:

1. Effect of Workload (X1) on Employee Performance (Y)

The influence of workload (X_1) on employee performance (Y) will be tested statistically, as follows:

Ho: $\beta_1 \leq 0$; then the workload does not have a positive and significant effect on employee performance.

Ha: $\beta_1 > 0$; then the workload has a positive and significant effect on employee performance.

Workload (X_1) with a t_{value} of 3.693 greater than t_{table} ($3.693 > 2.026$), so H_a is accepted and H_0 is rejected. It is meaning that the workload (X_1) has a positive and significant effect on employee performance (Y). This is consistent with the results of Adityawarman's research (2015:11), Astinto (2014:15) and Khasifah (2016: 11) which states that workload variables partially have a positive and significant effect on employee performance. In addition there are results of research conducted by Ferrania (2017:13) which states that the variable workload partially has a negative and significant effect on employee performance. The effect of workload and job complexity on employee job performance, with the mediating role of job stress and moderating effect of social support on employees of travel agencies in Rawalpindi, Islamabad, and AJK (Shabbir, and Raza, 2017).

3. Effect of Work Environment (X2) on Employee Performance (Y)

To see whether or not the influence of the work environment (X_2) on employee performance (Y) will be tested statistically as follows:

Ho: $\beta_2 \leq 0$; then the work environment does not have a positive and significant effect on employee performance.

Ha: $\beta_2 > 0$ then the work environment has a positive and significant effect on employee performance. Work environment (X_2) with a t_{value} of 3.368 is greater than the value of t_{table} ($3.368 > 1.687$). So that H_a is accepted and H_0 is rejected, meaning that the work environment (X_2) has a positive and significant effect on employee performance (Y). This is in accordance with the results of Swasto's research (2014:12), Untari (2014:13) and Budianto (2015:14) which states that work environment variables partially have a positive and significant effect on employee performance. The survey results revealed that the job aids, supervisory support and physical work environment as positively influential for the employee's performance and job aid as the most critical predictor. Implications of the findings and recommendations are offered (Lankeshwara P., 2016). Findings revealed that the situational constraints constituted of factors such as noise, office furniture, ventilation and light, are the major work environment conditions that have negative impact on job performance (Khaled, and Haneen, 2017).

Conclusions and Implications

Based on the results of the study, it can be concluded:

1. The workload conditions on average are in the high category, the average work environment is in the good category and employee performance the housekeeping section at the Lorin Sentul Bogor Hotel is on average in the high category.
2. Workload and work environment simultaneously have a positive and significant effect on the performance of the Housekeeping staff of Lorin Sentul Bogor Hotel.

3. Workload and work environment partially have a positive and significant influence on the employee performance of the Housekeeping section of the Lorin Sentul Bogor Hotel.

The suggestions given in this study are as follows:

1. To improve the performance of housekeeping employees, the company should increase the number of workloads within the limits of the employee's ability and increase the workforce if the workload has exceeded the employee's ability limit.
2. For the work environment, the company should continue to improve employee comfort in the work environment. It is such as paying attention to noise in the work environment of employees so that employees are not disturbed in carrying out the work.
3. For the performance of employees, the company should improve the performance of employees not only pay attention to the achievement of targets and timeliness, but in terms of the quality of the work so as not only to satisfy the management but also to satisfy the guests. For this reason employees should be given a manual in working as a reference for carrying out the work so that the results achieved meet the standards and high quality.
4. For further research can be added other variables that can affect employee performance in addition to workload and work environment including motivation, ability, leadership, organizational commitment and so forth so that the percentage value of influence on employee performance is higher.

References

- [1]. Adityawarman, Yudha. 2015. Pengaruh Beban Kerja Terhadap Kinerja Karyawan PT. Bank Rakyat Indonesia Cabang Krekot. Program Pascasarjana Manajemen dan Bisnis Institut Pertanian Bogor. *Jurnal Manajemen dan Organisasi*. Vol 6 No. 1 April.
- [2]. Arika. 2011. Analisis Beban Kerja Ditinjau dari Faktor Usia dengan Pendekatan Recommended Weight Limit. Program Studi Pariwisata Sekolah Tinggi Pariwisata Bandung.
- [3]. Asamani, J.A., Amertil, N.P., and Chebere, M. 2015. The influence of workload levels on performance in a rural hospital. *British Journal of Health Care Management*, 21(12):577-586.
- [4]. Astianto, Anggit. 2014. Pengaruh Stres Kerja dan Beban Kerja Terhadap Kinerja Karyawan PDAM Surabaya. Sekolah Tinggi Ilmu Ekonomi Indonesia Surabaya. *Jurnal Ilmu dan Riset Manajemen*, Vol 2 No 7 Maret.
- [5]. Budianto, Tri. 2015. Pengaruh Lingkungan Kerja Terhadap Kinerja Karyawan PT. Gas Negara Tbk. Fakultas Ekonomi Universitas Pamulang. *Jurnal Ilmiah Prodi Manajemen* Vol 3 No 1 Oktober.
- [6]. Bushiri, Christabella. 2014. The Impact of Working Environment on Employee Performance the Case of Institute of Finance Management in Darus Salaam Region. A Dissertation Submitted In Partial Fulfilment Of The Requirement For Degree Of Master In Human Resources Management Of The Open University Of Tanzania. *International Journal of Management*, Vol 2 No 1 July.
- [7]. Dewi, Nugraheni. 2017. Pengaruh Beban Kerja dan Lingkungan Kerja Terhadap Kinerja Karyawan PT. ASKRINDO. Fakultas Ekonomi dan Bisnis Universitas Sulawesi. *Jurnal Ilmiah Ekonomi* Vol 3 No 2 June.
- [8]. Dharna, Surya. 2008. *Manajemen Kinerja*. Edisi ketiga. Pustaka Pelajar: Yogyakarta.
- [9]. Ferrani, Kadek. 2017. Pengaruh Beban Kerja dan Kompensasi Terhadap Kinerja Karyawan Sekretariat Pemerintah Daerah Kabupaten Tabanan. Fakultas Ekonomi dan Bisnis Universitas Udayana. *E-Jurnal Manajemen Unud* Vol 6 No 6 Maret.
- [10]. Hafni, Cholidah. 2016. Pengaruh Beban Kerja dan Lingkungan Kerja Terhadap Kinerja Karyawan BRI Syariah Cabang Bandung. Fakultas Ekonomi Universitas Islam Bandung. *Jurnal Ilmiah Ekonomi* Vol 2 No 3 Juni.
- [11]. Hasibuan, Malayu S.P. 2010. *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia*. PT. Bumi Aksara, Jakarta.
- [12]. Isyandi, Bagas. 2008. *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia Dalam Perspektif Global*. Pekanbaru : Unri Press.
- [13]. Khaled Al-Omari and Haneen Okasheh. 2017. The Influence of Work Environment on Job Performance: A Case Study of Engineering Company in Jordan. *International Journal of Applied Engineering Research*, 12 (24): 15544- 15550.
- [14]. Khasifah, Fikratunil. 2016. Pengaruh Beban Kerja dan Lingkungan Kerja Terhadap Kinerja Karyawan Balai Besar Wilayah Sungai Pemali. Fakultas Ekonomika dan Bisnis Universitas Diponegoro. *Jurnal Ilmu dan Riset Manajemen*, Vol 5 No 1 April.
- [15]. Lankeshwara P. 2016. A study on the impact of workplace environment on employee's performance: with reference to the Brandix Intimate Apparel – Awissawella. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Studies (IJMS)* 3(1):47-57.

- [16]. Mangkunegara, Anwar Prabu AA. 2015. Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia Perusahaan. Bandung: PT Remaja Rosdakarya.
- [17]. Mangkuprawira, Sjafrri dan Hubuis. 2014. Bisnis, Manajemen dan Sumber Daya Manusia. Bogor: Ghalia Indonesia.
- [18]. Munandar, A, S. 2011. Psikologi Industri dan Organisasi. Jakarta : Universitas Indonesia.
- [19]. Ngantung, Saerang, and Pandowo. 2015. The Effect of Job Stress, Workload and Work Environment on Employee Turnover (Case Study at Pt Hasjrat Abadi Manado). *Jurnal Berkala Ilmiah Efisiensi*, 5(15):851-861.
- [20]. Oron-Gilad, T., Szalma, J., Stafford, S., and Hancock, P. 2008. The Workload and Performance Relationship in the Real World: A Study of Police Officers in a Field Shooting Exercise. *International journal of occupational safety and ergonomics*, 14(2):19-31. DO- 10.1080/10803548.2008.11076757.
- [21]. Pradipta, Dani. 2016. Pengaruh Beban Kerja dan Lingkungan Kerja Terhadap Kinerja Karyawan PT. Macan Jaya Klaten. Fakultas Ekonomi Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta. *Jurnal Ilmiah Ekonomi Bisnis Vol 6 No 3 Agustus*.
- [22]. Putra, A. 2012. Pengaruh Lingkungan Kerja Terhadap Kinerja Karyawan PT. Telekomunikasi Malang. Fakultas Ilmu Administrasi Universitas Brawijaya Malang. *Jurnal Administrasi Bisnis Vol 44 No.1 Maret*.
- [23]. Rahayu, Sri. 2016. Pengaruh Lingkungan Kerja dan Beban Kerja Terhadap Kinerja Karyawan Pada Dinas Pendapatan Kota Manado. Fakultas Ekonomi dan Bisnis Universitas Samratulangi Manado. *Jurnal Ilmiah Ekonomi Bisnis Vol 4 No 1 Maret*.
- [24]. Robbins, Stephen P. 2010. Prinsip-prinsip Perilaku Organisasi. PT. Erlangga Jakarta.
- [25]. Sarwono. 2008. Psikologi Remaja. Jakarta: Raja Grafindo Persada.
- [26]. Sedarmayanti. 2011. Sumber Daya Manusia dan Produktivitas Kerja. Bandung: CV Mandar Maju.
- [27]. Siagian, Sondang P. 2008. Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia. PT Bumi Aksara: Jakarta.
- [28]. Shabbir B, Raza Naqvi SMM. 2017. Impact of Workload and Job Complexity on Employee Job Performance with the Moderating Role of Social Support and Mediating Role of Job Stress: A Study of Travel agencies in Rawalpindi, Islamabad and AJK. *J Account Mark* 6:214. doi:10.4172/2168-9601.1000214
- [29]. Sugiyono. 2013. Metode Penelitian Pendidikan (Pendekatan Kuantitatif, Kualitatif dan R&D). Bandung : Alfabeta.
- [30]. Sulastiyono. Agus. 2011. Standar Kerja Pada Perhotelan. Jakarta: Raja Grafindo Persada.
- [31]. Swasto, Bambang. 2014. Pengaruh Lingkungan Kerja Terhadap Kinerja Karyawan Kantor Pelayanan Pajak Malang. Fakultas Ilmu Administrasi Universitas Brawijaya Malang. *Jurnal Administrasi Bisnis Vol 8 No.2 Maret*.
- [32]. Tjiabrata, Fernando. 2017. Pengaruh Beban Kerja dan Stress Kerja Terhadap Kinerja Karyawan PT. Sabar Ganda Manado. Fakultas Ekonomi Bisnis Universitas Negeri Manado. *Jurnal Ilmiah Ekonomi Bisnis ISSN 2303-1174*.
- [33]. Untari, Siti. 2014. Pengaruh Kompetensi dan Lingkungan Kerja Terhadap Kinerja Karyawan PT. Buana Mas Jaya Surabaya. Sekolah Tinggi Ilmu Ekonomi Indonesia Surabaya. *Jurnal Ilmu dan Riset Manajemen Vol 3 No 10 Maret*.
- [34]. Yunanda, Arika. 2011. Pengaruh Lingkungan Kerja Terhadap Kinerja Karyawan PT. Mandiri Abadi. Fakultas Ekonomi Universitas Pamulang. *Jurnal Ilmiah Ekonomi Bisnis Vol 6 No. 3 November*.