

## Original Research Article

# Analysis of Workload, Work Environment Adaptability, and Employee Performance in the Fish Safety Industry Sector

Basmi Said<sup>1</sup>, Lilik Kustiani<sup>1</sup>, Maxion Sumtaky<sup>1\*</sup><sup>1</sup>University of Merdeka Malang, Jalan Terusan Dieng No. 62-64 Klojen, Pisang Candi, Kec. Sukun, Kota Malang, Jawa Timur 65146, Indonesia**Article History**

Received: 14.10.2022

Accepted: 10.11.2022

Published: 13.11.2022

**Journal homepage:**<https://www.easpublisher.com>**Quick Response Code**

**Abstract:** This study aimed to describe and analyze the effect of workload and work environment adaptability on employee performance in the Fish Canning Industry of Bitung City. This research is under the umbrella of causal associative research with quantitative methodology. The location of this research was carried out in a fish canning industrial company in Bitung City, with the object of employees being fish canning companies. The results of this study indicate that the workload and adaptability of the work environment affect the performance of employees in the fish canning industry sector in Bitung City, which means that the lower the workload and the better the adaptability of an employee will improve employee performance. Based on the results of descriptive analysis of the data, it can be explained that the workload is formed by the use of time, targets to be achieved, and working conditions. The most significant role in forming an employee's workload is reflected in the feeling that using time is essential in the production process. The adaptability of the work environment is shaped by changes in legislation, technological developments and changes in market tastes. The most significant role in forming an employee's work environment adaptability is market changes reflected in the work that continuously adapts to the surrounding work environment. Performance is shaped by quality, quantity, timeliness, effectiveness and independence. The most significant role in the formation of employee performance is independence, which is reflected in employees always paying attention to the instructions given by their superiors in completing tasks.

**Keywords:** Workload, adaptability, work environment, employee performance.

**Copyright © 2022 The Author(s):** This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution **4.0 International License (CC BY-NC 4.0)** which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium for non-commercial use provided the original author and source are credited.

## INTRODUCTION

Bitung is one of the fisheries development areas in North Sulawesi Province and significantly contributes to Indonesia's fish canning industry. Infrastructure in this area facilitates the loading and unloading of cargo from and to Bitung City and Bitung Sea Fishing Port (PPS). This infrastructure plays a vital role in the ability of the Bitung fisheries sector to produce fishery products for both the domestic and international markets (Anonymous, 2010). The fishing sector of Bitung City has grown thanks to the support of adequate infrastructure. Most fish raw materials are shipped to the islands to be used as industrial raw materials in Surabaya and Jakarta, which presents a challenge for the sector. The lack of fish in the fishing industry hubs of Surabaya and Jakarta. The infrastructure and facilities needed to support the fishing industry in Bitung include paved access roads, ship ports, large anchoring ponds, access to sufficient

clean water, fish auction buildings (TPI), and cold storage facilities. Cold storage facilities with a capacity of 25–60 tons, an ice factory with a daily production rate of 1,000 ice blocks, a ship dock, and a refuelling station with a capacity of 500–1,000 kiloliters of fuel per month for fishing vessels are all required. In addition, 20 fish processing businesses are essential in encouraging investment in the region. The principal catches on land in Bitung are tuna, skipjack and tuna marine fishery products collected at Bitung PPS. While other fish only about 10,894.46 tons (20.38%) of all fish production landed at Bitung PPS in 2020, tuna, skipjack, and tuna reached 42,567.85 tons (79.62%) of the total fish landed in Bitung. Six (six) fishing companies that use various fishing gear assist in developing the fisheries sector in the Bitung area.

Therefore, various actions must be taken in addition to the construction of facilities and

\*Corresponding Author: Maxion Sumtaky

University of Merdeka Malang, Jalan Terusan Dieng No. 62-64 Klojen, Pisang Candi, Kec. Sukun, Kota Malang, Jawa Timur 65146, Indonesia

infrastructure to maintain Bitung as the location of the fishing industry. Employees are a precious asset that must be carefully managed from hiring to firing to contribute as effectively as possible to the business in achieving its goals. People in management are not a common occurrence, so it is essential to manage them properly to improve employee performance. This phenomenon is also caused by the workload and adaptability of the work environment, which is less conditional and affects job satisfaction and employee performance. Low job satisfaction of employees is possible due to a lack of understanding of the needs and workload of employees, in addition to the excessive workload of employees and the adaptability of the work environment that always occurs; according to him, the performance of employees in the fish canning industry in Bitung City, North Sulawesi.

Employees feel that their compensation is not in line with employee expectations. Most employees are satisfied with the current income received from the company; this makes employees complain about the compensation that employees receive so that employee performance also decreases, such as laziness in going to the office, spending more time outside the office and procrastination. Employees feel their workload is not balanced with their income from the fish canning industry in Bitung City, North Sulawesi, which impacts employee satisfaction and performance. It is recognized that company employees play an essential role in determining organizational development and future performance. This is very important because effective employee performance will determine whether the business is booming in achieving its goals. Consequently, four factors: workload, adaptability to the work environment, job happiness, and employee performance, have taken special significance for this dissertation research and deserve significant consideration from business executives. Based on the problems described, the objectives to be achieved from this research are to describe the workload, adaptability of the work environment and employee performance in the Fish Canning Industry of Bitung City.

## LITERATURE REVIEW

### Employee performance

Employee performance (job performance) results from the quality and volume of Work completed while carrying out the tasks assigned to employees (Mangkunegara, 2015, p. 67). Performance, according to Prawirosentono (2014: 87), namely the result of Work that people or groups in an organization can do by complying with certain rights and obligations to promote the goals of the organization concerned ethically, without violating the law and by morals and ethics. Suhardi (2014) argues that "employee performance is strongly influenced by the skills, motivation, excitement, and expectations of each individual towards a person, group, and company. Performance strongly emphasizes how effectively

resources are used to achieve goals. On the other hand, performance is the output of an individual, group, or organization, considered superior and successful if the desired goals of the individual, group or organization are successfully achieved. Employee performance is defined as "work performance" or "outputs of both quality and quantity produced by an employee by the tasks assigned to him", according to Mangkunegara (2015).

According to Tangkilisan (2007), monitoring employee performance includes understanding implementers and the metrics used for achievement. Ensure the implementation of the agreed achievement program. Track and assess performance by comparing the implementation of the work plan with it. Establish fair rewards and punishments for implementation success that has been measured using agreed measurement techniques. In addition, it aims to be used as a means of communication between leaders and followers to boost business performance. Determine whether customer needs have been met. Assistance in business operations, ensuring that decisions are made impartially. Finally, it aims to identify areas that need improvement and identify problems that arise.

The following are some aspects that, according to Robbins (2016), have an impact on employee performance: the basics of individual behaviour, which consists of learning, talent, and biographical, moral, disposition, and job happiness traits. Dedication, personal judgment and decision-making, and inspiration. According to Robbins (2016: 263), there are six indications to measure the performance of each employee, including work quality, quantity, timeliness, effectiveness, independence, and work commitment.

### Workload

The workload is the volume of work results or records of work results that demonstrate the volume produced by multiple personnel in a specific section (Moekijat, 2010). Objectively and objectively, the amount of work a group or individual must perform within a given timeframe or workload can be determined. Objectively measures the overall amount of time spent or the number of activities performed. Simultaneously, the subjective workload is a measure used by an individual to express feelings of being overworked, a measure of work pressure and job satisfaction. Workload as a source of discontent is the result of work overload. According to Meshkati in Astianto and Suprihhadi (2014), the workload is the difference between a worker's capacity or aptitude and the Work demands to be met. Facts and empirical facts demonstrate that an excessive workload cannot be regarded as usual because its effects are incredibly terrifying, impacting not only the performance of employees or employees but also the mortality rate.

Munandar (2014) divides the workload into inherent job characteristics: Physical claims, first. In addition to influencing employee performance, physical factors affect employee mental health. Certain working conditions can produce maximum work performance. His physical health influences the physiological and psychological state of a person. Employees' health should be in good condition during Work, and employees should have adequate relaxation and assistance from appropriate and comfortable workplace facilities—task demands. Employees who work shifts or at night are often exhausted due to heavy tasks. Excessive and understated workload levels can affect how well employees function.

According to (Koesomowidjojo, 2017), several workload indicators are used in this study, including Work Situation, namely how well a worker understands the employee's position. For example, employees in the production department will naturally interact with production equipment to help meet set output goals. Use of Working Time: The amount of work that employees must do will be reduced if employees work according to SOPs. However, the implementation of working time for employees is minimal or tends to be excessive if the company lacks SOPs or is inconsistent in carrying out SOPs. Goals that must be met: The workload of employees will undoubtedly be directly influenced by the company's work goals.

### **Work Environment Adaptability**

According to Superman (2012), Adaptation is primarily a process to meet the basic needs of human survival. Adaptation aims to help humans meet the demands of their environment in a conscious, realistic, impartial, and logical manner. Subordinates are all considered part of the work environment. Sedarmayati (2015) states, "The work environment includes the entire spectrum of equipment and materials encountered, the setting in which employees work, work habits, and work arrangements both individually and collectively". The work environment is an external factor that significantly impacts achieving optimal work performance in each profession. A hostile work atmosphere reduces employee performance because employees who want to do a good job are less motivated.

Salmones (2014) claims that a company's competitive advantage is its advantage over competitors in generating more sales or profits. However, no collective agreement is known about the causes of this competitive advantage. The three main streams that contribute to competitive advantage, as seen from the structure of the industry (Porter, 2008), the resources a business should develop and own (Barney, 2010), and the relational view, are all discussed in the strategy

literature (Dyer & Singh, 2010 & 1998). According to Clanton (2002) and McGinnis (1995), the following changes in the work environment are markers of adaptability: changing laws and regulations; changing technological progress; changing consumer preferences, cooperation skills, and positive relationships with coworkers.

## **RESEARCH METHODS**

### **Research Design**

This research is under the umbrella of causal associative research with quantitative methodology. The purpose of causal associative studies is to ascertain the relationship between two or more variables. The impact and impact of the considered variables will be explained in this study. "A quantitative approach is a way in which every social phenomenon is characterized in terms of various components of problems, variables, and indicators, with more emphasis on the objective measurement of social phenomena" (Echdar, 2017).

### **The Scope of Research**

By the research design described above, the scope of this research was carried out in a fish canning industry company in Bitung City, with the object of employees being a fish canning company. The object of this research is the employees of the production division in the Fish Canning Industry. A case study occurred of employees in six fish canning units in Bitung City.

### **Population and Sample**

The term "population" refers to an area of generalization consisting of people or objects with specific traits and features that the researcher will examine to conclude. At the same time, the sample represents a representation of the size and composition of the population. As of December 2020, 2,751 people are working in Bitung city's fish canning industry. The pre-cooking, lining and packing sectors of the fish canning factory in Bitung City are the samples of this study, which involved 118 workers from that department. The Slovin method determined that 118 employees were employed as the research sample. Simple random sampling was used for the sampling process (random techniques in the Pre-cooking, Lining and Packing sections). After validation, reliability, and traditional assumption testing.

## **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

### **Descriptive Employee Performance Variables**

The frequency distribution of employee performance variables is obtained from the tabulation results of respondents' answer scores which are presented in the following table.

**Table 1: Description of Employee Performance Variables**

Items	Respondent's Answer Score										Average
	Strongly disagree		Disagree		Neutral		Agree		Strongly agree		
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	
Carry out tasks by procedures and by expected quantity target	0	0.0	0	0.0	4	3.4	82	69.5	32	27.1	4.24
The average score of Quantity of Work (Y2.1)											4.24
Has reached the standard performance set by the company that the result/quality is satisfactory	0	0.0	0	0.0	11	9.3	75	63.6	32	27.1	4.18
Average Work Quality score (Y2.2)											4.21
Completing tasks by the specified time / on time	0	0.0	0	0.0	7	5.9	83	70.3	28	23.7	4.18
Average Punctuality score (Y2.3)											4.18
Doing job tasks effectively	0	0.0	0	0.0	7	5.9	81	68.6	30	25.4	4.19
Effectiveness is an essential factor for all employees at Work	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	2.5	80	67.8	35	29.7	4.27
Mean Effectiveness score (Y2.4)											4.23
Always pay attention to instructions given by superiors in completing tasks	0	0.0	0	0.0	7	5.9	63	53.4	48	40.7	4.35
Work independently	0	0.0	0	0.0	5	4.2	81	68.6	32	27.1	4.23
Always responsible for what I do in the company	0	0.0	0	0.0	5	4.2	70	59.3	43	36.4	4.32
Mean Independence score (Y2.5)											4.30
Average Employee Performance score (Y2)											4.24

Source: Primary data processed, 2022.

Based on Table 1, it can be seen that from the distribution of employee answers about doing tasks according to procedures and according to the target quantity that is expected to be reliable is obtained by the most responses stating agree as many as 82 employees (69.5 %), followed by 32 employees (27.1%) stating strongly agree, four employees (3.4%) saying neutral, but no employees stating neither agree nor strongly agree. The average value of the work quantity indicator is 4.24, indicating that employees agree to carry out tasks according to procedures and the expected quantity target. Distribution of employee answers about having achieved the work standards set by the company that the results/quality are satisfactory, the most responses stating agree, namely 75 employees (63.6 %), followed by 32 employees (27.1%) saying strongly agree, 11 employees (9.3%) saying neutral. However, no employee mentioned either agreeing or strongly agreeing. The average value of the work quality indicator is 4.21, indicating that employees agree that employees have reached the standard performance set by the company and that the results/quality is satisfactory.

The distribution of employee answers about completing tasks by the specified time / on time obtained the most responses stating agree as many as 83 employees (70.3%), followed by 28 employees (23.7%) stating strongly agree, seven employees (5.9 %) stating that it was neutral. However, there were no employees who stated that they did not agree or strongly disagreed. The average score with the punctuality indicator value of 4.18 indicates that the employee agrees that the employee completes the task by the specified time/on time. The distribution of employee answers about doing work assignments effectively obtained the most responses stating agree as many as 81 employees (68.8

%), followed by 30 employees (25.4%) saying strongly agree, seven employees (5.9%) saying neutral, and none of the employees stated neither agree nor strongly disagree. The average score of 4.19 indicates that employees agree that they are doing work tasks effectively.

The distribution of employee answers about effectiveness is an essential factor for all employees at Work; most responses stated that 80 employees (67.8%) agreed, followed by 35 employees (29.7%) who said strongly agreed. Three employees (2.5%) said neutrally, but none of the employees stated that they neither agreed nor strongly disagreed. The average score of 4.27 indicates that employees agree that effectiveness is essential for all employees at Work. The mean value of the effectiveness indicator is 4.23, which means that employees agree that effectiveness contributes to employee performance. The statement of effectiveness is essential for all employees at Work and is most appreciated in describing employee performance.

The distribution of employee answers about always paying attention to instructions given by superiors in completing tasks obtained the most responses saying agree as many as 63 employees (53.4 %), followed by 48 employees (40.7%) saying strongly agree, seven employees (5.9%) stated neutral, but no employee stated neither agree nor strongly disagree. The average score of 4.35 indicates that employees agree that they always pay attention to the instructions given by their superiors in completing tasks. The distribution of employee answers about working with complete independence obtained the most responses stating agree as many as 81 employees (68.6%), followed by 32 employees (27.1%) stating strongly agree, five employees (4.2%) stating neutral, but not

some employees say they do not agree or strongly disagree. The mean score of 4.23 indicates that employees agree that employees work with complete independence.

In the distribution of employees' answers about always being responsible for what I do at the company, most responses stated that they agreed as many as 70 employees (59.3%), followed by 43 employees (36.4%) who said firmly agreed, five employees (4.2%) stated neutrally. However, no employee stated neither agree nor strongly disagree. The average score with a value of 4.32 indicates that employees agree that employees are always responsible for what they do in the company. The mean value of the independence indicator is 4.30, which means that employees agree that independence contributes to employee performance. Statements that always pay attention to instructions given by superiors

in completing tasks are most appreciated in describing employee performance.

Overall, the average value of employee performance is 4.24, which means that employees agree that employee performance is determined by the quantity of Work, quality of Work, timeliness, effectiveness and independence. The most appreciated independence in describing employee performance is reflected in always paying attention to instructions given by superiors in completing tasks.

**Variable Descriptive Workload**

The frequency distribution of the workload variable is obtained from the tabulation results with the employee answer values presented in the following table.

**Table 2: Description of Workload Variables**

Items	With Employee Answer value										Average
	Strongly disagree		Disagree		Neutral		Agree		Strongly agree		
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	
Able to carry out tasks within the available time	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	1.7	79	66.9	37	31.4	4.30
Feeling the use of time is essential in the production process	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.8	72	61.0	45	38.1	4.37
Using the right time according to work rules	0	0.0	0	0.0	4	3.4	71	60.2	43	36.4	4.33
Average Time Usage score (X1.1)											4.33
Work according to the targets set by the company	0	0.0	0	0.0	7	5.9	76	64.4	35	29.7	4.24
The existing working environment conditions allow all Work to be completed on time	0	0.0	0	0.0	12	10.2	67	56.8	39	33.1	4.23
Can perform tasks according to work targets	0	0.0	0	0.0	7	5.9	79	66.9	32	27.1	4.21
Average Target Score To Use (X1.2)											4.23
Working conditions in the company require Work profound and full responsibility	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	2.5	78	66.1	37	31.4	4.29
Feeling happy with my current working conditions	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	1.7	72	61.0	44	37.3	4.36
Feeling that superiors give work authority according to responsibilities	0	0.0	0	0.0	4	3.4	68	57.6	46	39.0	4.36
The average score of Working Conditions (X1.3)											4.33
Average Workload (X1)											4.30

**Source:** Primary data processed, 2022

Based on Table 2, it can be seen that from the distribution of employees' answers about being able to carry out tasks according to the available time, most responses stated that they agreed as many as 79 employees (66.9%), followed by 37 employees (31.4%) who said strongly agree, two employees (1.7%) stated that they were neutral. However, no employees said they either agreed or strongly disagreed. The average score of 4.30 indicates that employees agree that employees can carry out tasks according to the available time. The distribution of employee answers about feeling the use of time is essential in the production process obtained the most responses saying agree, namely 72 employees (61%), followed by 45 employees (38.1%) saying strongly agree, one employee (0.8%) saying neutral. However, none of the employees stated that they neither agreed nor strongly disagreed. The

average score of 4.37 indicates that employees agree that employees feel that time is essential in the production process.

The distribution of employee answers about using the right time according to work rules obtained the most responses saying agree as many as 71 employees (60.2%), followed by 43 employees (36.4%) saying strongly agree, four employees (3.4%) saying neutral. However, none of the employees stated that they neither agreed nor strongly disagreed. The average score of 4.33 indicates that employees agree that employees use the right time according to work rules. The average value of the time use indicator is 4.33, meaning that employees agree that using time contributes to the workload. The statement that using time is essential in the production process is most

appreciated in describing the workload. The distribution of employee answers about working according to the targets set by the company got the most responses saying agree as many as 76 employees (64.4 %), followed by 35 employees (29.7%) saying strongly agree, seven employees (5.9%) saying neutral. However, none of the employees stated that they did not agree or strongly disagreed. The average score with a value of 4.24 indicates that employees agree that employees work according to the targets set by the company.

The distribution of employee answers about the conditions of the existing work environment allows all Work to be completed on time. Most responses stated they agreed with as many as 67 employees (56.8 %), followed by 39 employees (33.1%) stating strongly agree, and 12 employees (10, 2%) stated that it was neutral. However, no employees stated that they neither agreed nor strongly disagreed. The average score of 4.23 indicates that employees agree that the existing work environment allows all Work to be completed on time. The distribution of employee answers about being able to perform tasks according to work targets obtained the most responses stating agree as many as 79 employees (66.9%), followed by 32 employees (27.1%) stating strongly agree, seven employees (5.9%) stating neutral. However, none of the employees stated that they did not agree or strongly disagreed. The average score of 4.21 indicates that employees agree that they can perform tasks according to work targets.

The average value of the target indicator that must be used is 4.23, meaning that employees agree that the target that must be used contributes to the workload. The statement of working according to the target set by the company is most appreciated in describing the workload. The distribution of employee answers about working conditions in the company requires working seriously and total responsibility. The most responses were that 78 employees (66.1%) said to agree, followed by 37 employees (31.4%) who said strongly agree, three employees (2.5%) said neutral, but no employee said neither agree nor strongly do not agree. The average score with a value of 4.29 indicates that employees

agree that the working conditions in the company require working seriously and fully responsibly.

The distribution of employee answers about feeling happy with my current work conditions obtained the most responses saying agree as many as 72 employees (61%), followed by 44 employees (37.3%) saying strongly agree, two employees (1.7%) saying neutral, however, none of the employees stated that they did not agree or strongly disagreed. The mean score of 4.36 indicates that employees agree they are happy with my current working conditions. The distribution of employee answers about feeling that their superiors have given work authority according to responsibilities obtained the most responses saying agree as many as 68 employees (57.6%), followed by 46 employees (39%) saying strongly agree, four employees (3.4%) saying neutral, however, none of the employees stated that they did not agree or strongly disagreed. The average score of 4.36 indicates that employees agree that their superiors have given work authority according to their responsibilities.

The average value of the working conditions indicator is 4.33, which means that employees agree that work conditions contribute to the workload. The statement that I am happy with my current work conditions and feel that my supervisor has given me work authority according to responsibilities is most appreciated in describing the workload. Overall the average workload of 4.30 means that employees agree that the workload is determined by the use of time, the target that must be used and the working conditions. The use of time and working conditions is most appreciated in describing the workload, which is reflected in feeling that time is essential in the production process, being happy with the current working conditions, and feeling that the supervisor has given the work authority according to responsibilities.

**Descriptive variable Adaptability to Work Environment**

The frequency distribution of the environmental adaptability variable is obtained from the tabulation results with the employee's answer values which are presented in the following table.

**Table 3: Description of Work Environment Adaptability Variables**

Items	With Employee Answer value										Average
	Strongly disagree		Disagree		Neutral		Agree		Strongly agree		
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	
With changes in legislation, it will encourage employees to work harder.	0	0.0	0	0.0	16	13.6	76	64.4	26	22.0	4.08
The working relationship between the leadership and employees has been quite harmonious	0	0.0	0	0.0	5	4.2	69	58.5	44	37.3	4.33
Companies need to build good relationships with outside parties/investors in business development	0	0.0	0	0.0	5	4.2	63	53.4	50	42.4	4.38
Average score Changes to laws and regulations(X2.1)											4.27
The ever-changing technological changes encourage employees to adapt quickly and	0	0.0	0	0.0	4	3.4	83	70.3	31	26.3	4.23

Items	With Employee Answer value										Average	
	Strongly disagree		Disagree		Neutral		Agree		Strongly agree			
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%		
Improve their work skills												
Must constantly improve abilities and skills according to technological advances	0	0.0	1	0.8	7	5.9	70	59.3	40	33.9	4.26	
Average score Technological developments are constantly changing(X2.2)											4.25	
Changes in market tastes need serious attention from employees in working to maintain quality	0	0.0	0	0.0	5	4.2	64	54.2	49	41.5	4.37	
Feeling that the working environment is quite conducive	0	0.0	0	0.0	4	3.4	79	66.9	35	29.7	4.26	
The ability to work together between employees so far is quite good	0	0.0	0	0.0	5	4.2	65	55.1	48	40.7	4.36	
At Work, constantly adapt to the surrounding work environment	0	0.0	0	0.0	5	4.2	63	53.4	50	42.4	4.38	
Average score changes in market tastes (X2.3)											4.35	
Average Environmental Adaptation (X2)											4.30	

Source: Primary data processed, 2022.

Based on Table 3, it can be seen that from the distribution of employees' answers about changing the legislation will encourage employees to work more actively; the response was found to be the most agreeable as many as 76 employees (64.4%), followed by 26 employees (22%) saying very agree, 16 employees (13.6%) stated that they were neutral. However, no employees said they either agreed or strongly agreed. The average score with a value of 4.08 indicates that employees agree that changes to the legislation will encourage employees to work harder. The distribution of employee answers about the working relationship between the leadership and employees so far is quite harmonious; the most response is that it says agree, namely 69 employees (58.5%), followed by 44 employees (37.3%) who say firmly agree, five employees (4.2%) stated neutrally. However, no employee stated neither agree nor strongly disagree. The average score of 4.33 indicates that employees agree that the working relationship between the leadership and employees has been quite harmonious.

The distribution of employee answers about companies needing to build good relations with outsiders/investors in business development obtained the most responses stating agree as many as 63 employees (53.4 %), followed by 50 employees (42.4%) stating strongly agree, five employees (4.2%) stated that it was neutral. However, there were no employees who stated that they did not agree or strongly disagreed. The average score with a value of 4.38 indicates that employees agree that the company needs to build good relations with outside parties/investors in business development. The mean value of the indicator of changes in legislation is 4.27, which means that employees agree that the use of time contributes to the adaptability of the work environment. The statement that the company needs to build good relations with outsiders/investors in business

development is most appreciated in describing the adaptability of the work environment.

The distribution of employee answers about technological changes that are constantly changing encourages employees to adapt and improve their work skills quickly. The most responses are saying agree as many as 83 employees (70.3%), followed by 31 employees (26.3%) saying strongly agree, and four employees (3.4%) stated that they were neutral. However, there were no employees who stated that they did not agree or strongly disagreed. The mean score of 4.23 indicates that employees agree that the ever-changing technological changes encourage them to adapt quickly and improve their work skills. The distribution of employees' answers about having to improve their abilities and skills according to technological advances continually got the most responses saying agree, as many as 70 employees (59.3%), followed by 40 employees (33.9%) saying strongly agree, seven employees (5.9%) stated neutral, one employee (0.8%) said they did not agree. However, no employee stated that they strongly disagreed. The average score with a value of 4.26 indicates that employees agree that employees must continuously improve their abilities and skills according to technological advances.

The mean value of the ever-changing technological development indicator of 4.25 means that employees agree that the ever-changing technological development contributes to the adaptability of the work environment. Statements must constantly improve abilities and skills according to technological advances, most appreciated in describing the adaptability of the work environment. The distribution of employee answers about changes in market tastes needs serious attention from employees in maintaining quality. The most responses are saying agree as many as 64 employees (54.2 %), followed by 49 employees

(41.5%) saying strongly agree, and five employees (4,2%) stated that it was neutral. However, there were no employees who stated that they did not agree or strongly disagreed. The average score with a value of 4.37 indicates that employees agree that changes in market tastes need serious attention from employees in working to maintain quality.

The distribution of employees' answers about feeling that the working environment is quite conducive got the most responses saying agree as many as 79 employees (66.9%), followed by 35 employees (29.7%) saying strongly agree, four employees (3.4%) saying neutral, however, none of the employees stated that they did not agree or strongly disagreed. The average score of 4.26 indicates that employees agree that the work environment is conducive. The distribution of employee answers about the ability to work together between employees so far has been quite good. Most responses stated that they agreed with as many as 65 employees (55.1%), followed by 48 employees (40.7%) who said they strongly agreed, five employees (4.2%) stated neutral, but no employee stated neither agree nor strongly disagree. The average score with a value of 4.36 indicates that employees agree that the ability to work together between employees has been quite good so far.

The distribution of employee answers about working always adapting to the surrounding work environment obtained the most responses saying agree as many as 63 employees (53.4 %), followed by 50 employees (42.4%) saying strongly agree, five employees (4.2%) saying neutral. However, there were no employees who stated neither agreed nor strongly disagreed. The average score of 4.36 indicates that employees agree that they constantly adapt to the surrounding work environment. The average value of the indicator of changes in market tastes is 4.35, which means that employees agree that changes in market tastes contribute to the adaptability of the work environment. The statement working always adapting to the surrounding work environment is most appreciated in describing the adaptability of the work environment.

Overall, the average adaptability of the work environment is 4.30, meaning that employees agree that the adaptability of the work environment is determined by changes in legislation, technological developments that are constantly changing and changes in market tastes. Changes in market tastes are most appreciated in describing the adaptability of the work environment as reflected in the Work constantly adapts to the surrounding work environment.

### **Description of workload, work environment adaptability, and employee performance**

#### **Workload**

The research analysis results show an overview of the workload contributed by time, targets

to be achieved and working conditions. The most appreciated time usage indicator in describing workload-reflected from feeling the use of time to be important in the production process. The measurement of the three factors of the use of time, the targets to be achieved, and the working conditions are by the prevailing theory put forward by Koesmowidjojo (2008), which states that the workload is the volume of Work completed by several people in a particular section, or a record of work results. So the employees must complete the tasks according to their duties. Indicators to measure workload are time, targets achieved and working conditions.

Utilizing work time for tasks directly relevant to production is a significant factor indicating workload. The number of work employees must be reduced if employees work according to SOPs. The second workload factor indicator is the target that must be met or a person's perception of the workload given to complete the job. The purpose of the company's Work will undoubtedly directly impact the burden that employees must bear. The number of jobs received and experienced by employees increases with the amount of time allocated to completing tasks or the disparity between the time to complete the implementation target and the volume of Work offered. Task conditions, or how well a worker understands the job, are the third key predictor of workload. Including how people interpret the employee's work environment, such as making quick decisions while working on products and surviving in unexpected situations. Like working longer than necessary.

#### **Work Environment Adaptability**

The adaptability of the work environment is determined by changing laws and regulations, ever-changing technological developments and changing market tastes. The indicator of market change is most appreciated in describing the adaptability of the work environment, which is reflected in working always adapting to the surrounding work environment. The study shows that changing legal requirements, rapidly evolving technology, and changing consumer preferences contribute to how flexible the workplace is. Workplace adaptability refers to one's capacity to adapt to changes in one's workplace, establish norms and beliefs that support this capacity, and understand the many signals from the environment to change one's cognition and behaviour at Work. The extent to which employees can internalize their environment will determine the company's success. Eko According to A *et al.*, (2011), Adaptation is the process of adjusting to the environment and environmental factors. Adaptation of the environment, workforce, and lessons (Great Dictionary of the Indonesian Language Drafting Team, 1997:6). Adaptation are a cumulative skill people acquire through experience and education (Sullivan & Sheffrin, 2003). According to Ployhart and Bliese (2006), workplace adaptation is the result of behaviour



that develops in response to environmental changes. There are two types of Adaptation: active Adaptation, where one's actions impact the environment, and passive Adaptation, where one's actions are influenced by the environment (Karta Saporta, 1987). The process of adapting to environmental changes helps humans respond to these changes,

The corporate environment is in a perpetual state of flux. Regulations, technical advancements, and consumer demand are a few of the potential causes of these alterations (given that so many factors influence consumer demand, then this indicator of consumer demand is generated by changes in consumer tastes because, in reality, changes in consumer tastes dominate in consumer demand influence consumer demand) whether it be customer desire or business strategy (Calantone, 1994). Unpredictable company development results from changing competitive environments (Dollinger, 1992). Managers face more ambiguous choices, fewer environmental evaluation criteria, and more environmental changes occur (Venkatraman, 1989). The results of employee perceptions show that they must be prepared for changes in legislation invitation which is constantly changing. Factor two indicator Work environment adaptability is a technological development that is constantly changing. In this contemporary era, technological and digital advances have made many people nauseous. How is it possible that no random changes occur every day?

In order to inspire each individual to think creatively and innovatively, adaptability and agility are required. Employees who work in organizations with a large number of adaptive attitudes will increase their ability to become outstanding leaders in the future. In addition, employees have considered future leadership tactics that will contribute to the company's development. In addition, all industries will develop in the future to incorporate innovation into employees' new products; consequently, nothing can survive without innovation. Companies must, however, consider factors other than product improvement if employees are to be competitive and survive in the long term. Everyone who aspires to be a superior HR in their respective companies must be adaptable. The third factor of the adaptability of the work environment is the change in consumer preferences, the third aspect that shows how flexible the workplace is; Adaptability itself is principally a change in behaviour during customer contact or interaction among consumers based on the learned knowledge of the actual sales situation (Wietz *et al.*, 1986). On the other hand, a salesperson is said to have a low level of adaptability if he consistently uses the same method when dealing with customers. A seller is said to have a high degree of adaptability if he can use various ways when dealing with customers and quickly make adjustments when dealing with customers

(Spiro & Weitz, 1990). If the benefits of adapting outweigh the costs,

### **Employee Performance**

The performance of an employee is determined by the quantity of Work, the quality of Work, punctuality, efficiency, and independence. When describing employee performance, the most valued measure of independence is employees who always pay close attention to the instructions issued by their superiors. An employee's performance is measured by how well he or she completes the tasks and labour assigned by specified work requirements. Performance is the result or degree of achievement of a worker throughout the stipulated period in carrying out the task relative to different possibilities, such as predetermined goals, work standards, or mutually agreed-upon criteria.

According to Robbins (2016), performance is a measure of expected work results in the form of something ideal. Work performance created by employees the employee's role in the organization is a natural behaviour shown by everyone (Rivai, 2015). According to Hariandja (2002), performance is the result of the Work completed by the employee or the actual behaviour that the employee shows in the employee's role in the company. From that point of view, it can be concluded that performance refers to the results achieved by a person (an employee) when completing his duties and obligations by the criteria set by each organization or company. Employee performance measures how well a person performs the tasks and labour delegated by specific job requirements. According to Robbins (2016), the following factors are used to measure employee performance: work quantity, work quality, punctuality, effectiveness, and independence.

Employees' views on the quality of the Work produced and the accuracy of tasks on the abilities and skills of employees can be used in determining the quality of employees' Work (Robbins, 2016, p. 260). The level of success and unsuccessful completion of Work by employees can be used to represent the quality of Work and the talents and competencies of employees in completing the tasks assigned to employees. Quantity is the amount measured by the number of units produced or activity cycles completed (Robbin, 2016, p. 260).

Employee performance is assessed using quantity, which measures the number of work unit outputs and the number of activity cycles completed by employees—for example, completing employee work quickly within the time frame specified by the organization.

Timeliness is the number of activities performed at the start of the allotted period in terms of synchronization with outputs and maximizing available

time for subsequent activities (Robbins, 2016, p. 261). To prevent interfering with other obligations required of the employee as part of the employee's job, productivity can also be measured by the speed with which employees perform assigned tasks. Effectiveness is the degree to which organizational resources (people, money, raw materials, and technology) are used to increase the performance of each unit in employing resources (Robbins, 2016, p. 261). Meanwhile, employees can use as many resources as possible, including human resources and resources in the form of information, capital, technology, and raw materials.

Independence is the extent to which employees can perform tasks without assistance from, direction from, or superiors (Robbins, 2016, p. 261). The quantity, quality and timeliness of employees' Work in all areas, as well as employee effectiveness and independence in the workplace, are all indicators of how well an employee is performing. This indicates that autonomous workers, or workers who can carry out their Work without supervision or a request for assistance from others or managers, do not require supervision while doing their Work.

## CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the results of the descriptive analysis of the data, it can be explained that the workload is formed by the use of time, targets to be achieved, and the condition of the profession. The most significant role in forming an employee's workload is reflected in the feeling that using time is essential in the production process. The adaptability of the work environment is shaped by changes in legislation, technological developments and changes in market tastes. The most significant role in forming an employee's work environment adaptability is market changes reflected in the Work that constantly adapts to the surrounding work environment. Workload and work environment adaptability affect employee performance in the sector industry of fish canning in Bitung city, which means that the lower the workload and the better the adaptability of an employee will improve employee performance. Workload has a dominant influence on employee job satisfaction. This shows that the workload formed by time, targets to be achieved, and working conditions play a more important role in improving employee work performance.

The research results will enrich the development of the concept of employee performance so that knowledge related to employee performance can contribute positively to employees. It is hoped that further studies can deepen and develop research related to employee performance by adding variables that can affect employee performance. Suggestions from this research for policymakers are that it is necessary to facilitate and bridge discussion between the employee and the company, so that common ground is obtained for both parties. Moreover, for policymakers, in this

case, the government can issue appropriate and profitable policies, or regulations split parties. For companies, it is recommended to improve employee performance; the company should see and treat employees as a precious company asset so that employees will feel valued and provide the best employee performance for the company's continuity.

## REFERENCES

- Ardana. (2012). *Human Resource Management*. Yogyakarta: Graha Ilmu. Bambang.
- Wahyudi. (2012). *Human Resource Management*, CV. Difficult, Bandung.
- Barney, B. (2010). Firm Resource and sustained competitive advantage: *Journal of Management*, 17, 99-129.
- Astuti, W., Supanto, A., & Supriadi B. (2019). Entrepreneurial Skills and SME's Business Performance: Empirical Study Culinary Business. *Journal of Economics and Sustainable Development*, 22(10), 160-166.
- Calantone, R. J., Cavusgil, S. T., & Zhao, Y. (2002). "Learning orientation, firm innovation capability, and firm performance", *Industrial Marketing Management*, 31(6), 515-524.
- Dyer, J., & Singh, H. (1998). "The relational view: cooperative strategy and sources of inter-organizational competitive advantage", *Academy of Management Review*, 23(4), 660-679.
- Mangkunegara., & Prabu. A. A. (2016). *Company Resource Management*. Jakarta: Arga.
- Meshkati, N., & Hancock, P A. (1988). *Human Mental Workload*. Netherland: Elsevier Science Publisher BV.
- Moekijat. (2012). *Human Resource Management*, CV Mandar Maju, Bandung.
- Moorhead, G., & Griffin, R. W. (2013). *Organizational Behavior: Human Resource Management and Organizations*. Jakarta: Salemba. Four.
- Munandar, A. S. (2014). *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*. Publisher University of Indonesia (UI-Press). Jakarta.
- Nafi, M., Supriadi, B., & Roedjinandari, N. (2018). Internal Marketing Impact On External Service Quality In Semeru Pine Forest ( Spf ) Tourist Atraction. *IOSR Journal of Business and Management (IOSR-JBM)*, 20(7), 66-72. <https://doi.org/10.9790/487X-2007016672>
- Porter, M. (2008). *Competitive advantage: Creating and Sustaining Superior Performance*. New York: Free Press
- Prawirosentono, S. (2011). *Performance*. Bandung: Alfabeta.
- Robbins, S. (2015). *Organizational Behavior*, Jakarta: PT Gramedia Pustaka Utama.
- Robbins., & Judges. (2015). *Organizational Behavior*. Edition 16. Jakarta. Salemba Four.

- Robbins, Stephen P. Dan Coulter, Mary. 2016. *Management, Tenth Edition*. Jakarta: Erlangga.
- Saban, E. (2017). *MethodStudyManagement and Business - A Comprehensive Step by Step Research Guide For Thesis, Thesis and Accompanied*. Bogor: Ghalia Indonesia.
- Sedarmayanti. (2013). *Human Resource Management*. Bandung: PT. Rafika Aditama.
- Superman, P. (1993). *Adaptation in Anthropology*. Jakarta: Torch Foundation. Indonesia.

---

**Cite This Article:** Basmi Said, Lilik Kustiani, Maxion Sumtaky (2022). Analysis of Workload, Work Environment Adaptability, and Employee Performance in the Fish Safety Industry Sector. *East African Scholars J Econ Bus Manag*, 5(10), 317-327.