The Effect of Flexible Work System, Workload, Work Ability, Job Satisfaction, Employee Engagement and Work Stress On Employee Performance (Case Study at PT Mecoindo)

Tuti Irawati Suparman

Universitas Airlangga, Indonesia

Email: ira0172@gmail.com

*Correspondence: ira0172@gmail.com

ABSTRACT	
Keywords: flexible work system; workload; employability; job satisfaction; employee engagement	This study examines the effect of flexible work systems, workload, work ability, job satisfaction, employee engagement, and job stress on employee performance. The goal is to gain a comprehensive understanding of how these factors interrelate and affect overall employee performance within the organization. This study uses a quantitative survey method approach to collect data from a sample of employees at PT Mecoindo. Quantitative analysis involves statistical techniques such as regression analysis and correlation analysis to explore the relationship between the independent variable (flexible work system, workload, work ability, job satisfaction, employee engagement, and job stress) and the dependent variable (employee performance). The findings show that flexible work systems positively affect employee performance. In addition, workloads at moderate levels can improve employee performance. Job satisfaction was identified as a significant predictor of employee performance. Employee engagement also emerged as a key factor. On the other hand, high levels of job stress were found to negatively impact employee performance, underscoring the importance of managing stress levels in the workplace.

Introduction

During the COVID-19 pandemic, measures to reduce the spread of the virus increased drastically and companies were required to implement new ways of working (Brynjolfsson et al., 2020) (Ting, Carin, Dzau, & Wong, 2020). New ways of working are a set of human resource management practices that give employees more flexibility, autonomy, and freedom about when, where, and how they work (Gerards, van Wetten, & van Sambeek, 2021) (Peters, Oppenheimer, & Kyle, 2014). Under normal circumstances (pre-pandemic), new ways of working are known to be positively related to employee performance outcomes such as work engagement (Gerards et al., 2021), informal learning (Gerards et al., 2021) and intrapreneurial behavior (Gerards et al., 2021). Intrapreneurial behavior is usually conceptualized as innovative, proactive, and risk-taking employee

behavior (Neessen, Caniëls, Vos, & De Jong, 2019) (Rigtering & Weitzel, 2013) (Stam & Van Straaten, 2012).

In this era of rapid technological advancement and changing work dynamics, companies recognize the importance of fostering a healthy work-life balance and giving employees greater autonomy over their work schedules. One form of job autonomy is when employees can choose when, where, and how to engage in work-related tasks. The ability to exercise this form of control for employees is at the core of flexible work arrangements (Hill, Erickson, Holmes, & Ferris, 2010).

The demand for more flexible working arrangements is the result of societal changes through globalization, increased competition between companies, and the development of information technology. These changes have created somewhat reduced boundaries in society (Chandra, 2012). One thing that makes society even more limitless is that the line between work life and personal life has blurred. This increases the likelihood of individuals to work remotely, called off-site, for example working from home. This new way of working without borders is characterized by a more individualized approach to work arrangements (Allvin, Mellner, Movitz, & Aronsson, 2013). This means that an individual's capacity to influence their specific work situation and change work arrangements increases. It also shows that individuals have greater personal responsibility regarding the planning and execution of job duties (Allvin et al., 2013).

Modern organizations today seem to have a common interest in flexible work arrangements (flexible work systems), judging by the fact that the demand for flexible working arrangements is constantly increasing, and another reason is that it is considered positive especially for employers and employees to adapt to this flexible work arrangement structure (Theorell et al., 2003).

The next factor that can affect performance is workload. (Irawati & Carollina, 2017). Workload is one aspect that must be considered by every company because it can affect activities within the company related to the completion of tasks and work of each employee, it can also affect employee performance. Workload in quantity where the tasks that must be done too much or little while in quality where the tasks to be done require expertise. Physical workloads can usually be seen directly, such as fatigue, decreased levels of worker productivity, errors that occur, and others (Wijaya, Mustika, Bulut, & Bukhori, 2023).

If there is an imbalance between workload and work ability, it will be a source of stress. Work ability and workload not only directly or indirectly affect employee performance, but can also affect employee performance by mediating through work stress. Work stress also has a direct influence on employee performance (Mahfudz, 2017). Stress (coercion, demand, uncertainty, and importance) is a form of reaction to our environment due to certain pressures. Not only interpreted in negative values, stress can also mean or have a positive impact. When stress encourages individuals to bring out their best performance (Suwarto, 2020).

Research from (Boy, 2021) states that workload is one of the factors that affect employee performance. In employee perception, workload is an individual's assessment of a number of demanding tasks or activities that require mental activity such as to remember necessary things, concentrate, detect problems, cope with unexpected events and make decisions quickly related to work and physical strength that must be completed within a certain period of time. Furthermore, research by (Dewiyani, Rahmi, & Herlina, 2020) also states that employee workload affects employee performance.

The Effect of Flexible Work System, Workload, Work Ability, Job Satisfaction, Employee Engagement and Work Stress On Employee Performance (Case Study at PT Mecoindo)

Management comes from the word to manage in English which means to manage, organize, and implement. Management is a form of utilizing resources, both human resources and other resources that are arranged in such a way as to achieve certain goals effectively and efficiently (Hasibuan & Hasibuan, 2016). Meanwhile, Hani Handoko (Arifin, Desrani, Ritonga, & Ibrahim, 2023) defines that "management is the process of planning, organizing, directing, and supervising the efforts of organizational members and the use of other organizational resources in order to achieve predetermined organizational goals".

Previous research (Andrulli & Gerards, 2023) "How new ways of working during COVID-19 affect employee well-being via technostress, need for recovery, and work engagement" Online panel data collection techniques, Bootstap method for mediation analysis, SPSS. The results showed that higher NWW levels were associated with higher JAWS, with more positive feelings of well-being (PAWS), and fewer negative feelings of well-being (NAWS). Many of these relationships are indirect, through reduced technostress and the need for recovery, as well as increased work engagement. Distinguishing separate NWW facets and their relationship to PAWS/NAWS, the results show that facets.

Based on the background and problem formulation described above, this research was conducted with the following objectives:
1. Analyze the effect of flexible work system on the performance of PT Mecoindo employees
2. Analyze the effect of workload on the performance of PT Mecoindo employees
3. Analyze the effect of work ability on the performance of PT Mecoindo employees
4. Analyze the effect of job satisfaction on the performance of PT Mecoindo employees
5. Analyze the effect of employee involvement on the performance of PT Mecoindo employees
6. Analyze the effect of work stress on the performance of PT Mecoindo employees
7. Analyze the simultaneous effect of flexible work system, workload, work ability, job satisfaction, employee engagement and work stress on PT Mecoindo employee performance.

Research Methods

This research is descriptive and verifiative. Descriptive research is research that aims to obtain variable characteristics, which in this study is aimed at obtaining a picture of the variables of flexible work systems, workload, work ability, job satisfaction, employee involvement and work stress and employee performance. Verifiative research is aimed at testing hypotheses through data collection in the field, which in this study will test the extent of the effect of flexible work systems, workload, work ability, job satisfaction, employee engagement and work stress on employee performance.

Variable measurement

Research instruments are tools used to measure a variable in research (Sugiyono, 2018). Measurement of variables (research instruments) in this study, namely measuring variables of flexible work systems, workload, work ability, job satisfaction, employee engagement, work stress and employee performance. According to (Sugiyono, 2021), the Likert scale is used to measure the attitudes, opinions, and perceptions of a person or group of people about social phenomena. In research, this social phenomenon has been specifically established by the researcher, hereinafter referred to as research variables.

The research instrument is scored with a Likert scale, then the variables to be measured are translated into variable indicators. Then the variable indicator is used as a starting point for compiling instrument items which can be statements or questions. According to (Sugiyono, 2018), research instruments using the Likert scale can be made in the form of a checklist. Here are the categories of the Likert scale:

Category:

ST   = Strongly Agree with the score = 5
S   = Agree with score = 4
RR   = Undecided with score = 3
TS   = Disagree with score = 2
STS   = Strongly Disagree with score = 1

Population

Population is a generalized area consisting of objects or subjects that have certain qualities and characteristics determined by research to be studied and then drawn conclusions (Sugiyono, 2018). The population in this study is PT Mecoindo Staff level employees totaling 132 employees.

Sample

Sample is an element found in the population (Sekaran & Bougie, 2017). (Cooper & Schindler, 2014) define that a sample is a subset of a target population, carefully selected to represent that population. The huge population makes it impossible to study as a whole, either because of limited funds, time or energy. Therefore, that part of the population is called a sample. "Sample is a subset of element from a population" (Aaker, 2014).

Data Collection Methods

The data collection method that the author used in this study was a list of questions (questionnaire), the author shared a list of questions that had been prepared in advance to be filled in answers by respondents in this study.

The measurement of data in this study was by using the Likert scale. Likert scale is a variation of the ranking scale that is collected, this scale requires respondents to agree or disagree regarding statements that express good or not attitudes towards objects (Cooper & Schindler, 2014).

Validity Test

The validity test is used to measure the validity or validity of a questionnaire. A questionnaire is said to be valid, if the questions on the questionnaire are able to reveal something that will be measured by the questionnaire (Sugiyono, 2018). The step to measure validity can be done by correlating the score of the question item with the total score of the construct or variable. The calculation of the validity of this research measuring instrument is carried out with the help of the SPSS for Windows computer program. Meanwhile, to find out the score of each question item is valid or not, the following statistical criteria are set:

a. If r counts > r table, then the variable is valid.
b. If r counts ≤ r table, then that variable is invalid.

Reliability Test

Reliability test is a tool to measure a questionnaire that has indicators of variables or constructs. A questionnaire is considered reliable or reliable, if a person's answers to statements are consistent or stable over time. The method that will be used to conduct a validity test is to correlate the score of the question item with the total score of the

The Effect of Flexible Work System, Workload, Work Ability, Job Satisfaction, Employee Engagement and Work Stress On Employee Performance (Case Study at PT Mecoindo)

construct or variable. As for the reliability test that will be used in this study is to use SPSS facilities, namely with the Cronbach Alpha statistical test. A construct or variable is considered reliable, if the value of Cronbach Alpha > 0.60 (Ghozali, 2016).

Descriptive Statistical Analysis

Descriptive analysis in this study is a description analysis of research variables that describe the answers in the form of minimum, maximum, mean, and standard deviation values for research variables which in this study are variables of flexible work system, workload, work ability, job satisfaction, employee engagement, work stress and employee performance of PT Mecoindo.

Classic Assumption Test

Before testing hypotheses using multiple regression analysis, it is necessary to test classical assumptions as a requirement in the analysis so that the regression model can be an unbiased estimation tool. Classical assumption tests include:

Normality Test

The normality test aims to test whether in the regression model the dependent variable and the independent variable have a normal distribution or not. A good regression model is to have a normal or near-normal data distribution. To test normality, you can analyze the spread of data on the diagonal axis of the Normal Probability Plot. The basis of decision making is that, if the data spreads around diagonal lines, then the regression model satisfies the assumption of normality.

Multicollinearity Test

The multicollinearity test aims to test whether in the regression model there is a correlation between independent variables. In a good regression model, there should be no correlation between independent variables. To detect multicollinearity in a model, it can be seen if the Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) value $\geq$ 10 or the Tolerance value $\leq$ 0.10.

Heteroscedasticity Test

The heteroscedasticity test aims to test whether in the regression model there is an inequality of variance from the residual of one observation to another. If the variance from the residual of one observation to another observation remains, then it is called homoscedasticity.

A good regression model is that heteroscedasticity does not occur. To detect the presence or absence of heteroscedasticity can be done by graph analysis through a Scatterplot graph, namely randomly spread points above and below the number 0 on the Y axis. Through statistical analysis carried out with the Glejser test, with the probability criterion of significance of > 0.05, a data is said to be free from heteroscedasticity deviations.

Results and Discussion

Instrument Validity Test Results

The following are the results of testing the validity of research instruments in Table 1 as follows:

Table 1 Validity Test Results of Independent Variable Items

Indicators	rxy	r-table	Sig	Information
Flexible Working System				
X1.1	0,735	0,1927	0,000	Valid
X1.2	0,676	0,1927	0,000	Valid
X1.3	0,580	0,1927	0,000	Valid
X1.4	0,590	0,1927	0,000	Valid

X1.5	0,682	0,1927	0,000	Valid
X1.6	0,778	0,1927	0,000	Valid
X1.7	0,653	0,1927	0,000	Valid
X1.8	0,640	0,1927	0,000	Valid
X1.9	0,676	0,1927	0,000	Valid
X1.10	0,574	0,1927	0,000	Valid
X1.11	0,667	0,1927	0,000	Valid
X1.12	0,774	0,1927	0,000	Valid
X1.13	0,655	0,1927	0,000	Valid
Workload				
X2.1	0,860	0,1927	0,000	Valid
X2.2	0,895	0,1927	0,000	Valid
X2.3	0,841	0,1927	0,000	Valid
X2.4	0,664	0,1927	0,000	Valid
Employability				
X3.1	0,819	0,1927	0,000	Valid
X3.2	0,927	0,1927	0,000	Valid
X3.3	0,883	0,1927	0,000	Valid
X3.4	0,800	0,1927	0,000	Valid
X3.5	0,863	0,1927	0,000	Valid
X3.6	0,891	0,1927	0,000	Valid
Job Satisfaction				
X4.1	0,812	0,1927	0,000	Valid
X4.2	0,593	0,1927	0,000	Valid
X4.3	0,792	0,1927	0,000	Valid
X4.4	0,897	0,1927	0,000	Valid
X4.5	0,899	0,1927	0,000	Valid
Employee Engagement				
X5.1	0,826	0,1927	0,000	Valid
X5.2	0,803	0,1927	0,000	Valid
X5.3	0,874	0,1927	0,000	Valid
X5.4	0,816	0,1927	0,000	Valid
X5.5	0,816	0,1927	0,000	Valid
X5.6	0,751	0,1927	0,000	Valid
X5.7	0,616	0,1927	0,000	Valid
X5.8	0,653	0,1927	0,000	Valid
X5.9	0,697	0,1927	0,000	Valid
Work Stress				
X6.1	0,673	0,1927	0,000	Valid
X6.2	0,695	0,1927	0,000	Valid
X6.3	0,746	0,1927	0,000	Valid
X6.4	0,584	0,1927	0,000	Valid
X6.5	0,597	0,1927	0,000	Valid
X6.6	0,596	0,1927	0,000	Valid
X6.7	0,534	0,1927	0,000	Valid
X6.8	0,426	0,1927	0,000	Valid

From Table 1 it can be seen that the value of rxy > r-table (0.1927) and sig. < 0.05, so that all questions in the questionnaire on question items on the variables flexible work system, workload, work ability, job satisfaction, employee engagement and work stress

The Effect of Flexible Work System, Workload, Work Ability, Job Satisfaction, Employee Engagement and Work Stress On Employee Performance (Case Study at PT Mecoindo)

are valid. While the validity test of Employee Performance variables can be seen in Table 2 below.

Table 2 Validity Test Results of Employee Performance Variable Items

Indicators	rxy	r-table	Information
Y1.1	0,800	0,1927	Valid
Y1.2	0,856	0,1927	Valid
Y1.3	0,839	0,1927	Valid
Y1.4	0,789	0,1927	Valid
Y1.5	0,873	0,1927	Valid
Y1.6	0,896	0,1927	Valid
Y1.7	0,602	0,1927	Valid
Y1.8	0,837	0,1927	Valid
Y1.9	0,593	0,1927	Valid
Y1.10	0,826	0,1927	Valid
Y1.11	0,803	0,1927	Valid
Y1.12	0,869	0,1927	Valid

From Table 2 it can be seen that the value of rxy > r-table (0.1927) and sig. < 0.05, so all questions in the questionnaire on the question items on the Employee Performance variable are valid.

Instrument Reliability Test Results

The following are the results of variable instrument reliability tests Flexible work system, Work ability, Job satisfaction, Employee Engagement and Employee Performance.

Table 3 Reliability Test Results

Variable	Cronbach Alpha	Critical Value	Information
Flexible Working System	0,892	≥ 0.60	Reliable
Workload	0,831	≥ 0.60	Reliable
Employability	0,930	≥ 0.60	Reliable
Job Satisfaction	0,864	≥ 0.60	Reliable
Employee Engagement	0,904	≥ 0.60	Reliable
Work Stress	0,746	≥ 0.60	Reliable
Employee Performance	0,946	≥ 0.60	Reliable

From Table 3 mentioned above, it can be seen that Cronbach's Alpha coefficient > 0.60, so that all questions in the questionnaire on question items on the variables of flexible work system, workload, work ability, job satisfaction, employee engagement, work stress and employee performance are reliable. So it can be concluded that all variables in this study are rated very high by respondents.

Descriptive Analysis

Based on the data that has been collected, answers from respondents have been recapitulated and then analyzed to determine respondents' research on variable items of flexible work systems, workload, work ability, job satisfaction, employee engagement, work stress and employee performance. This data analysis goes through two stages, namely descriptive analysis and quantitative analysis. The categories of each interval are as follows:

Tuti Irawati Suparman

Table 4 Scale Interval

Interval	Information
1.00 to 1.79	Very bad
1.80 to 2.59	Bad
2.60 to 3.39	Good enough
3.40 to 4.19	Good
4.20 to 5.00	Excellent

Descriptive Statistics Variables Flexible working system

The following is respondent's assessment of the flexible work system:

Table 5 Respondents' Assessment of Flexible Work System

No.	Variable Items	Mean	Categorically
1.	I can set my own working hours	4,23	Excellent
2.	I can determine where I work	3,61	Good
3.	I can work from home or anywhere else outside the office if I want	3,56	Good
4.	I can determine how I work	4,02	Good
5.	My boss wasn't involved with the way I did the job	3,21	Good enough
6.	My boss judges me based on the quality of my work, not the way I work	3,91	Good
7.	I can easily access teammates	4,23	Excellent
8.	I can easily access my boss	4,24	Excellent
9.	I can easily access colleagues outside the team	3,88	Good
10.	I can access all the necessary information on my computer, *smartphone*, and/or other work devices	4,30	Excellent
11	I have access to all the necessary information anywhere, anytime	4,20	Excellent
12	I have the ability to adapt the scheme of work to my personal needs	4,18	Good
13	I have the possibility to work more or less	4,01	Good
Average		3,98	Good

Based on Table 6 of 102 respondents taken as a sample, it is known that most respondents rated the variable item of flexible work system, Good (Mean 3.98). This shows that respondents can set my own working hours, can determine where respondents work, respondents can work from home or other places outside the office if respondents want, respondents can determine how respondents work, Respondents' superiors are not involved with the way respondents do work, Respondents' superiors judge me based on the quality of my work, not how respondents work, Respondents can easily access teammates, respondents can easily access respondents' superiors, respondents can easily access colleagues outside the team, respondents can access all necessary information on Respondents' computers, smartphones, and/or other work devices, respondents have access to all necessary information anywhere, anytime, respondents have the ability to adapt work schemes to respondents' personal needs and Respondents have the possibility to work more or less.

The Effect of Flexible Work System, Workload, Work Ability, Job Satisfaction, Employee Engagement and Work Stress On Employee Performance (Case Study at PT Mecoindo)

Descriptive Statistics of Workload Variables

Table 6 Respondents' Assessment of Workload

No.	Variable	Mean	Category
1.	I often get tasks outside of the responsibilities I have	3,19	Good enough
2.	I often get assignments given out of the blue with short deadlines	3,59	Good
3.	My workload sometimes requires me to work beyond normal working hours	3,79	Good
4.	I have a hard time balancing the workload I have with my personal life	2,67	Good enough
	Average	3,31	Good enough

Based on Table 6 of 102 respondents taken as a sample, it is known that most respondents rated the workload variable item quite Good (Mean 3.31). This shows that respondents quite often get tasks outside of the responsibilities that respondents have, respondents quite often get tasks that are given suddenly with short deadlines, Respondents' workload sometimes requires respondents to work beyond normal working hours and respondents have enough difficulty to balance the workload I have with respondents' personal lives.

Descriptive Statistics Variables Employability

Table 7 Respondent's Assessment of Employability

No.	Variable	Mean	Category
1.	I am able to communicate with colleagues effectively	4,22	Excellent
2.	I am capable of handling conflicts with others and co-workers	4,06	Good
3.	I am able to make decisions related to the field of duty that I have	4,16	Good
4.	I am able to do my job with minimum supervision	4,11	Good
5.	I am able to do a good job, regularly and on time	4,09	Good
6.	I have the ability to use my knowledge, tools, and experience to solve the job problems I face	4,24	Excellent
Average		4,15	Good

Based on Table 7 of 102 respondents taken as a sample, it is known that most respondents rated the variable item work ability Good (Mean 4.15). This shows that respondents are able to communicate with colleagues effectively, respondents are able to handle conflicts with others and co-workers, respondents are able to determine decisions related to the field of duty that respondents have, respondents are able to do respondents' work with minimum supervision, respondents are able to do work well, regularly and on time and respondents have the ability to use knowledge, equipment, and respondents' experience to solve job problems that respondents face.

Descriptive Statistics Variables Job satisfaction

Table 7 Respondents' Assessment of Job Satisfaction

No.	Variable	Mean	Category
1.	I feel my work is meaningful and valued by the company	3,93	Good
2.	I was given the freedom to do my job effectively	4,24	Excellent
3.	I have a boss who always gives me support and trust	4,30	Excellent

No.	Variable	Mean	Category
4.	People within my organization support each other to work together as a team.	4,04	Good
5.	I enjoy doing daily activities in my work	3,91	Good
Average		4,08	Good

Based on Table 7 of 102 respondents taken as a sample, it is known that most respondents rated the variable item job satisfaction, Good (Mean 4.08). This shows that respondents feel my work is meaningful and valued by the company, respondents are given the freedom to do respondents' jobs effectively, respondents have superiors who always provide support and trust, People within respondents' organizations support each other to work together as a team and respondents enjoy doing daily activities in respondents' work.

Normality Test

The normality test aims to test whether in the regression model the dependent variable and the independent variable have a normal distribution or not. A good regression model is to have a normal or near-normal data distribution. To test normality, you can analyze by looking at the probability value. The basis for decision making is that if the probability value > 0.05, then the regression model satisfies the assumption of normality.

Table 8 Normality Test Results with Kolmogorov Smirnov Test

Variable	Sig.	*Level of Significant*	Information
Residual1	0.093	0,05	Usual

Based on the results of the normality test with the Kolmogorov Smirnov Test above, it can be seen that the probability value > 0.05, then the regression model meets the normality assumption. Likewise, when viewed from the diagonal axis of the Normal Probability Plot, the diagram diagram shows the data spread around the diagonal line, so the regression model satisfies the assumption of normality.

Multicollinearity Test

A multicollinearity test is a state in which one or more independent variables can be expressed as a linear combination of other independent variables. One of the assumptions of classical linear regression is the absence of no perfect multicollinearity. A regression model is said to be exposed to multicollinearity when there is a perfect or exact linear relationship between some or all independent variables. As a result, it will be difficult to see the influence of individual independent variables on non-free variables. The detection of multicollinearity in this study was carried out by the VIF method.

Test criteria :

If VIF > 5, then Ho is rejected

If VIF < 5, then Ho is accepted

The results of the multicollinearity test with the VIF method are as follows:

Table 9 Multicollinearity Test Results with VIF Method

Variable	VIF	Critical Value	Information
Flexible Working System	1.812	5	Not exposed to multicollinearity
Workload	1.550	5	Not exposed to multicollinearity
Employability	1.776	5	Not exposed to multicollinearity
Job Satisfaction	2.817	5	Not exposed to multicollinearity

The Effect of Flexible Work System, Workload, Work Ability, Job Satisfaction, Employee Engagement and Work Stress On Employee Performance (Case Study at PT Mecoindo)

Employee Engagement	2.986	5	Not exposed to multicollinearity
Work Stress	1.182	5	Not exposed to multicollinearity

Based on the results of the multicollinearity test with the VIF method, the VIF value < 5, meaning that all independent variables do not occur multicollinearity, so as not to refract the interpretation of the regression analysis results.

Heteroscedasticity Test

Homoscedasticity is a situation where the variance (σ2) of the disturbance term is the same for all observations of X. Deviation from this assumption is called heteroscedasticity, that is, if the variance value (σ2) of the non-free variable (Yi) increases as a result of increasing variance of the independent variable (Xi), then the variance of Yi is not the same (Insukindro, Arti, & Aliyudanto, 2016). The detection of heteroscedasticity in this study was carried out by the spearman rank method. You do this by looking at the probability value of > 0.05, so it is not exposed to heteroscedasticity.

The effect of flexible work on employee performance.

The results of the analysis showed that the flexible work system had an effect on employee performance (sig t-count value (0.048) < Level of Significant (0.05)) and with positive regression coefficient. This can be interpreted that if the flexible work system increases, employee performance will increase. in other words, the better a flexible work system at PT Mecindo, the chances of employee performance will increase.

Flexible working hours provided by companies to employees can help workers to manage work schedules, manage working hours and division of work, and flexibility in terms of this workplace including working from home or working outside the office environment. Flexibility in working is preferred among employees compared to regular working hours and placed workplaces (Subramaniam, Overton, & Maniam, 2015). Flexible working arrangements allow employees to make work-related decisions, such as when, where, and for how long they are engaged in company-related tasks (Bal & De Lange, 2015). Furthermore, Sari and Damayanti, 2018 define employee performance as the results of work in quality and quantity carried out by employees in carrying out their duties in accordance with the responsibilities given to them. The results of this study are in line with (Maifanda & Slamet, 2019) showing that flexible work systems have a significant positive effect on employee performance.

The effect of workload on employee performance

The results of the analysis showed that the load affected employee performance (sig t-count value (0.013) < Level of Significant (0.05)) with negative regression coefficient. This can be interpreted that if the workload decreases, employee performance will increase. in other words, the lower the workload of PT Mecindo employees, the chances of employee performance will increase.

Significant results illustrate that the magnitude of the load has an impact on performance. Employee performance will be maximized if the workload is fulfilled in balance with the capacity owned by individuals. Workload is one of the elements that need to be considered in running company operations. (Budiasa, 2021) Too high or too low workload correlates with low performance. An increase or decrease in workload leads to a decrease in performance, but an increase in the workload curve is more sensitive adversely affecting employee performance, so it can be said that the higher the workload, the lower the performance. For this reason, it is necessary to provide an appropriate workload in order to produce efficient employee performance. The results of this study

are in line with (Nainggolan & Heryenzus, 2018) showing that workload has a significant negative effect on employee performance.

The effect of work ability on employee performance.

The results of the analysis showed that work ability had an effect on employee performance (sig t-count value (0.0000) < Level of Significant (0.05)) and with positive regression coefficient. This can be interpreted that if work ability increases, employee performance will increase. In other words, the higher the work ability of employees, the performance of employees will increase

In line with Farlen's theory 2011 which states that good work ability can support the smooth work of employees. The ability of employees can be seen from the potential that supports oneself to get optimal performance. Work ability is basically very influential on the quality or weight of work achieved by an employee. This is understandable because in work ability there are various potential skills, skills, and other supporting potentials that are reflected in physical and psychological conditions. So that work ability can determine the performance of employees in an organization. The results of this study are in line with research conducted by (Jailan, 2016) and (Arini, Rachma, & Primanto, 2022) which showed that work ability variables have a positive and significant effect on employee performance.

The effect of job satisfaction on employee performance.

The results of the analysis show that job satisfaction affects employee performance (sig t-count value (0.048) < Level of Significant (0.05)) and with positive regression coefficient, Ha is accepted or Ho is rejected, so it can be concluded that the job satisfaction variable has a positive and significant effect on employee performance. This can be interpreted that if job satisfaction increases then employee performance will also increase, in other words the better job satisfaction in learning, the higher the employee performance

(Mangkunegara & Octorend, 2015) states that a person's job satisfaction has an impact on the organization, including the level of employee performance, employee health level, employee attendance rate, the level of effectiveness of job completion, error rates, idea development and innovation, to a sense of pride in the organization or company which is manifested in commitment and loyalty to the organization or company. Furthermore, (Priansa, 2016) stated that high job satisfaction will encourage employees to be precise in completing tasks and is very important to improve individual performance. The results of this study are in line with Alawi 2018, Adiwinata 2014, Agus 2016, and Saryanto 2016 which show that job satisfaction variables have a positive effect on employee performance.

The Effect of Employee Engagement on Employee Performance

The results of the analysis show that employee involvement affects employee performance (sig t-count value (0.00) < Level of Significant (0.05)) and with psotive regression coefficient, Ha is accepted or Ho is rejected, so it can be concluded that employee involvement variables affect employee performance. This shows that employee involvement can affect employee performance,

The results of this study are in line with (Marciano, 2010) which states that employees who have attachment will be motivated to give their best effort. Conversely, the result of low employee engagement not only has an impact on performance but also increases the desire to move, decreases customer service satisfaction and increases absenteeism (Cataldo, Slaughter, Jahan, Pongquan, & Hwang, 2011). The results of this study are not in line with previous research by (Mohammad Ebrahim et al., 2014), which

The Effect of Flexible Work System, Workload, Work Ability, Job Satisfaction, Employee Engagement and Work Stress On Employee Performance (Case Study at PT Mecoindo)

shows that employee engagement has a positive and significant effect on employee performance.

The effect of work stress on employee performance

The results of the analysis showed that the load affected employee performance (sig t-count value (0.026) < Level of Significant (0.05)) with negative regression coefficient. This can be interpreted that if work stress decreases, employee performance will increase. in other words, the lower the level of work stress of PT Mecindo employees, the chances of employee performance will increase.

The results of this study are in line with the officials of Riyan et al., 2021 who said one of the things that can affect employee performance is work stress. When individuals face stress due to various work conditions and fail to cope with stress then it results in burnout (Pandey & Pal, 2020). When employees feel depressed or burdened when completing their work, their performance will be disrupted (Rahayu & Hidayat, 2021). Most employees who work in the city and live outside the city face a lot of stress from home to work, having compound stress due to traffic. Stressed employees have unstable emotions, unclear thinking processes, and disrupted health and have an impact on decreased performance (Triyono & Prayitno, 2017). The results of this study are in line with (Lukito & Alriani, 2019) showed that work stress has a significant negative effect on employee performance

The Effect of Flexible Work System, Workload, Work Ability, Job Satisfaction, Employee Engagement and Work Stress on Employee Performance

The results of the F test analysis show that flexible work systems, workload, work ability, job satisfaction, employee engagement and work stress simultaneously have a positive and significant effect on employee performance (F-count sig value (0.000) < Level of Significant (0.05)). This can be interpreted, if the flexible work system, workload, work ability, job satisfaction, employee involvement and work stress, then employee performance has increased in other words employee performance will increase with the factors of flexible work system system, workload, work ability, job satisfaction, employee involvement and work stress. Based on the results of the study shows that the effect of flexible work systems, workload, work ability, job satisfaction, employee engagement and work stress has a positive impact on employee performance.

Conclusion

Based on the results of data analysis, findings and discussion of research that have been described in Chapter IV, it can be concluded:

The results of the analysis showed a t-count probability value (0.048) < Level of Significant (0.05)) and with a positive regression coefficient. So it can be concluded that the flexible work system has a positive and significant effect on employee performance.

The results of the analysis showed a t-count probability value (0.016) < Level of Significant (0.05)) and with a negative regression coefficient. So it can be concluded that workload has a negative and significant effect on employee performance.

The results of the analysis showed a t-count probability value (0.000) < Level of Significant (0.05)) and with a positive regression coefficient. So it can be concluded that work ability has a positive and significant effect on employee performance.

The results of the analysis showed a t-count probability value (0.048) < Level of Significant (0.05)) and with a positive regression coefficient. So it can be concluded that job satisfaction has a positive and significant effect on employee performance.

Tuti Irawati Suparman

The results of the analysis showed a t-count probability value (0.000) < Level of Significant (0.05)) and with a positive regression coefficient. So it can be concluded that employee involvement has a positive and significant effect on employee performance.

The results of the analysis showed a t-count probability value (0.026) < Level of Significant (0.05)) and with a negative regression coefficient. So it can be concluded that work stress has a negative and significant effect on employee performance.

The Effect of Flexible Work System, Workload, Work Ability, Job Satisfaction, Employee Engagement and Work Stress On Employee Performance (Case Study at PT Mecoindo)

Bibliography

Aaker, David. (2014). *Aaker on branding: 20 principles that drive success*. Morgan James Publishing.

Allvin, Michael, Mellner, Christin, Movitz, Fredrik, & Aronsson, Gunnar. (2013). The diffusion of flexibility: Estimating the incidence of low-regulated working conditions. *Old site of Nordic Journal of Working Life Studies*, *3*(3), 99–116.

Andrulli, Rémi, & Gerards, Ruud. (2023). How new ways of working during COVID-19 affect employee well-being via technostress, need for recovery, and work engagement. *Computers in Human Behavior*, *139*, 107560.

Arifin, Zainul, Desrani, Ayu, Ritonga, Apri Wardana, & Ibrahim, Faishol Mahmoud Adam. (2023). An Innovation in planning management for learning Arabic at Islamic boarding schools. *Nidhomul Haq: Jurnal Manajemen Pendidikan Islam*, *8*(1), 77–89.

Arini, Arini, Rachma, N., & Primanto, Alfian Budi. (2022). Pengaruh Komunikasi Dan Stres Kerja Terhadap Kinerja Karyawan (Studi Kasus Pada CV. Pakta Karya). *E-JRM: Elektronik Jurnal Riset Manajemen*, *11*(09).

Bal, P. Matthijs, & De Lange, Annet H. (2015). From flexibility human resource management to employee engagement and perceived job performance across the lifespan: A multisample study. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, *88*(1), 126–154.

Boy, Guy André. (2021). *Design for flexibility: a human systems integration approach*. Springer.

Brynjolfsson, Erik, Horton, John J., Ozimek, Adam, Rock, Daniel, Sharma, Garima, & TuYe, Hong Yi. (2020). *COVID-19 and remote work: An early look at US data*. National Bureau of Economic Research.

Budiasa, I. Komang. (2021). Beban Kerja dan Kinerja Sumber Daya Manusia. *Jawa Tengah: CV. Pena Persada*.

Cataldo, Janine K., Slaughter, Robert, Jahan, Thierry M., Pongquan, Voranan L., & Hwang, Won Ju. (2011). Measuring stigma in people with lung cancer: psychometric testing of the cataldo lung cancer stigma scale. *Oncology nursing forum*, *38*(1), E46. NIH Public Access.

Chandra, Vallury. (2012). Work–life balance: Eastern and western perspectives. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, *23*(5), 1040–1056.

Cooper, Donald R., & Schindler, Pamela. (2014). *Business research methods*. Mcgraw-hill.

Dewiyani, Asti Aldila, Rahmi, Palupi Permata, & Herlina, Listi. (2020). Pengaruh Employee Engagement, Beban Kerja Dan Kepuasan Kerja Terhadap Kinerja Pada Cv Anugrah Sukses Mandiri. *MAHATANI: Jurnal Agribisnis (Agribusiness and Agricultural Economics Journal)*, *3*(2), 269–280.

Gerards, Ruud, van Wetten, Sanne, & van Sambeek, Cecile. (2021). New ways of working and intrapreneurial behaviour: the mediating role of transformational leadership and social interaction. *Review of Managerial Science*, *15*(7), 2075–2110.

Ghozali, Imam. (2016). *Desain penelitian kuantitatif dan kualitatif: untuk akuntansi, bisnis, dan ilmu sosial lainnya*.

Hasibuan, Malayu S. P., & Hasibuan, H. Malayu S. P. (2016). *Manajemen sumber daya manusia*. Bumi aksara.

Hill, E. Jeffrey, Erickson, Jenet Jacob, Holmes, Erin K., & Ferris, Maria. (2010). Workplace flexibility, work hours, and work-life conflict: finding an extra day or

two. *Journal of Family Psychology*, *24*(3), 349.

Insukindro, Insukindro, Arti, ADJI, & Aliyudanto, Aryo. (2016). Analysis of the Unanticipated Factors in Portfolio Inflows to Indonesia: A SVAR Approach: 2001-2012. *Journal of Economics Library*, *3*(2), 327–341.

Irawati, Rusda, & Carollina, Dini Arimbi. (2017). Analisis pengaruh beban kerja terhadap kinerja karyawan operator pada PT Giken Precision Indonesia. *Inovbiz: Jurnal Inovasi Bisnis*, *5*(1), 51–58.

Jailan, Abdulkarim. (2016). Pengaruh Kemampuan Kerja, Motivasi Kerja dan Fasilitas Kerja terhadap Kinerja Pegawai Kantor Pertanahan Kota Palangka Raya. *JSM (Jurnal Sains Manajemen) Program Magister Sains Manajemen UNPAR, ISSN*, 1411–2302.

Lukito, Leonardo Hendy, & Alriani, Ida Martini. (2019). Pengaruh beban kerja, lingkungan kerja, stres kerja terhadap kinerja karyawan pada PT. Sinarmas Distribusi Nusantara Semarang. *Jurnal Ekonomi Manajemen Akuntansi*, *25*(45).

Mahfudz, Muhammad. (2017). PENGARUH KEPUASAN KERJA DAN BEBAN KERJA TERHADAP KINERJA KARYAWAN DAN STRES KERJA SEBAGAI VARIABEL MEDIASI PADA KARYAWAN DIVISI SALES CONSUMER PT BANK NEGARA INDONESIA (PERSERO) Tbk. *Jurnal Eksekutif*, *14*(1).

Maifanda, Nonik, & Slamet, Ramadhan. (2019). The Effect of Salary, Flexible Working Hours And Work Stress On Employee Performance In Companies In Batam City. *Journal Of Applied Managerial Accounting*, *3*(1).

Mangkunegara, Anwar Prabu, & Octorend, Tinton Rumbungan. (2015). Effect of work discipline, work motivation and job satisfaction on employee organizational commitment in the company (Case study in PT. Dada Indonesia). *Marketing*, *293*, 31–36.

Marciano, Alain. (2010). *Calabresi, 'Law and Economics' and the Coase Theorem*.

Mohammad Ebrahim, Baki, Sayyed Mohsen, Miresmaili, Majid, Pourentezari, Esmail, Amraii, Vahid, Yousefi, Morteza, Anvari, Mohammad, Fazilati, & Esmat, Mangoli. (2014). *Effects of silver nano-particles on sperm parameters, number of Leydig cells and sex hormones in rats*.

Nainggolan, Nora Pitri, & Heryenzus, Heryenzus. (2018). Analisis Faktor-Faktor Yang Mempengaruhi Minat Beli Konsumen Dalam Membeli Rumah Di Kota Batam. *Jurnal ilmiah manajemen dan bisnis*, *19*(1), 41–54.

Neessen, Petra C. M., Caniëls, Marjolein C. J., Vos, Bart, & De Jong, Jeroen P. (2019). The intrapreneurial employee: toward an integrated model of intrapreneurship and research agenda. *International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal*, *15*, 545–571.

Pandey, Neena, & Pal, Abhipsa. (2020). Impact of digital surge during Covid-19 pandemic: A viewpoint on research and practice. *International journal of information management*, *55*, 102171.

Peters, N., Oppenheimer, C., & Kyle, P. (2014). Autonomous thermal camera system for monitoring the active lava lake at Erebus volcano, Antarctica. *Geoscientific Instrumentation, Methods and Data Systems*, *3*(1), 13–20.

Priansa, Donni Juni. (2016). Pengaruh e-wom dan persepsi nilai terhadap keputusan konsumen untuk berbelanja online di Lazada. *Jurnal Ecodemica: Jurnal Ekonomi Manajemen dan Bisnis*, *4*(1), 117–124.

Rahayu, Meika Kurnia Puji, & Hidayat, Bayu Nur. (2021). The Job Stress as a Mediation Between Role Conflict and Employee Performance. *4th International Conference*

The Effect of Flexible Work System, Workload, Work Ability, Job Satisfaction, Employee Engagement and Work Stress On Employee Performance (Case Study at PT Mecoindo)

on Sustainable Innovation 2020-Accounting and Management (ICoSIAMS 2020), 121–127. Atlantis Press.

Rigtering, J. P. Coen, & Weitzel, Utz. (2013). Work context and employee behaviour as antecedents for intrapreneurship. *International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal*, *9*, 337–360.

Sekaran, Uma, & Bougie, Roger. (2017). *Metode Penelitian untuk Bisnis: Pendekatan Pengembangan Keahlian Edisi 6 Buku 2*.

Stam, C. J. van, & Van Straaten, E. C. W. (2012). The organization of physiological brain networks. *Clinical neurophysiology*, *123*(6), 1067–1087.

Subramaniam, A. Geetha, Overton, B. John, & Maniam, C. Bala. (2015). Flexible working arrangements, work life balance and women in Malaysia. *International Journal of Social Science and Humanity*, *5*(1), 34.

Sugiyono. (2021). *Metode Penelitian Kualitatif. 4th ed*. Bandung: CV Alfabeta.

Sugiyono, Prof. Dr. (2018). *Metode penelitian kuantitatif* (Cet. 1). Bandung: Alfabeta.

Suwarto, Arief Subyantoro. (2020). Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia Strategi. *Andi (Anggota IKAPI)*.

Theorell, Töres, Oxenstierna, Gabriel, Westerlund, Hugo, Ferrie, Jane, Hagberg, Jan, & Alfredsson, Lars. (2003). Downsizing of staff is associated with lowered medically certified sick leave in female employees. *Occupational and Environmental Medicine*, *60*(9), e9–e9.

Ting, Daniel Shu Wei, Carin, Lawrence, Dzau, Victor, & Wong, Tien Y. (2020). Digital technology and COVID-19. *Nature medicine*, *26*(4), 459–461.

Triyono, Agus Joko, & Prayitno, Agus. (2017). Pengaruh konflik peran dan ambiguitas peran terhadap stres kerja dan kinerja pegawai Dinas Penerangan Jalan dan Pengelolaan Reklame Kota Semarang. *Jurnal Penelitian Ekonomi dan Bisnis*, *2*(2), 92–100.

Wijaya, Cindy Natalia, Mustika, Martina Dwi, Bulut, Sefa, & Bukhori, Baidi. (2023). The power of e-recruitment and employer branding on Indonesian millennials' intention to apply for a job. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *13*, 1062525.