Journal of Social Work and Science Education
Volume 6 (3) 2025, 1559-1572
E-ISSN 2723-6919, P-ISSN 2746-0827

The Influence of Workload and Work Environment on Work Stress with Incentives as a Moderating Variable

Bayu Lazuardi[1], Fauzi Arif Lubis[1], Aqwa Naser Daulay[1]
[1]Universitas Islam Negeri Sumatera Utara Medan, North Sumatra, Indonesia

Corresponding author e-mail: bayulazuardi555@gmail.com

Article History: Received on 20 July 2025, Revised on 30 August 2025, Published on 22 September 2025

Abstract: This study analyzed the influence of workload and work environment on work stress with incentives as a moderating variable among employees of Bakso Bagito in Serbelawan City. This study uses a quantitative approach with an explanatory design and saturated sampling technique on the entire population of 38 employees. Data were collected through questionnaires using a Likert scale and analyzed using the Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modeling (PLS-SEM) method. The research results show that workload has a positive and significant effect on work stress, while the work environment has a negative but not significant effect. Incentives have been proven to moderate the relationship between workload and work stress, but in a positive direction, thus reinforcing the effect of workload on stress. The Adjusted R-Square value of 0.874 indicates that the independent variables are able to explain the variability of work stress substantially. These findings affirm that workload is a dominant factor affecting work stress, while the role of incentives is complex as they can increase psychological pressure if target-based.

Keywords: Incentives Moderation, Workload and Work Environment, Work Stress

A. Introduction

The service industry, particularly the culinary sector, faces quite complex challenges in managing human resources (Please, Tarigan, & Yafiz, 2022). The high level of competition, dynamics of consumer demand, and pressure to maintain service quality often trigger work stress among employees (Ritonga, Anggraini, & Nawawi, 2022). Work stress not only impacts the psychological well-being of individuals but can also lower performance, increase turnover risk, and reduce organizational productivity (Habib, Suhairi, & Daulay, 2025). In the context of small-scale culinary businesses, such as Bakso Bagito in the city of Serbelawan, this issue becomes even more significant due to limited resources and the demand for consistent service.

One of the main factors contributing to the emergence of work stress is the workload. When employees are faced with a high volume of work, time constraints, as well as excessive physical and mental demands, the potential for stress significantly increases (Rahmad Hidayat, 2022). In addition, the work environment also plays an important

role. Uncomfortable working conditions, limited facilities, and disharmonious interpersonal relationships can exacerbate the psychological stress experienced by employees (Quesada-Puga, et al., 2024). Although the relationship between workload, work environment, and work stress has been widely discussed in previous literature, there is a research gap regarding the role of incentives as a moderating variable (Safrida, Yafiz, & Lubis, 2023). Incentives, both in financial and non-financial forms, are believed to serve as a buffer against the work pressures experienced by employees (Rizky & Aprelyani, 2025). With fair and motivating incentives, employees can feel more valued, thus the potential negative impact of workload and work environment on stress can be reduced (Harahap, 2022). However, research on the role of incentives as a moderating variable in small businesses in the culinary sector, particularly in developing areas such as Serbelawan City, is still relatively limited.

Bakso Bagito is located in the city of Serbelawan, Dolok Batu Nanggar District, which is a place in Simalungun Regency in North Sumatra. Bakso Bagito was established in 2010 and now has five branches and 38 employees. The Bakso Bagito stall offers meatballs and various other types of food such as siomay and chicken noodles. The Bakso Bagito business is situated in the heart of Serbelawan city, making it easily accessible to customers. Bakso Bagito has a clean and comfortable dining area and spacious parking to facilitate customers who want to visit. One of the always-crowded dining places in Serbelawan City is Bakso Bagito. Results from a preliminary survey conducted by researchers from October 2023 to March 2024 show that 13 employees left their jobs; 7 of them left due to internal issues, 4 left due to salary problems, and 2 left for personal reasons. This happens due to a lack of clarity in the division of tasks among employees, which triggers a high turnover rate or employee departure from the company. Menu preparation, customer service, cashier duties, and cleanliness are some of the tasks that must be performed at Bakso Bagito according to its organizational structure, leading employees to sometimes take on more responsibilities than they can handle. This creates difficulties for them as the workload can sometimes exceed their capabilities. Additionally, there are incentives provided to Bakso Bagito employees to help alleviate the pressure caused by their workload. These incentives are only given if employees meet their sales targets and receive holiday bonuses (THR), but if the targets are not met, the employees will not receive incentives. The incentive given by the company is 2% of the employee's revenue target.

Research on workload, work environment, and work stress has been extensively conducted, but most of it focuses on the formal sectors such as banking, hospitals, and government agencies. Research (Rachman, Kuswandi, & Rahayu, 2025) finding that workload and work environment significantly influence employees' work stress levels. However, in the context of micro, small, and medium enterprises (MSMEs), especially in the fast-food sector, it has received little academic attention. In fact, the characteristics of workload and working conditions in MSMEs are different from those in large companies, both in terms of job intensity, flexibility of working hours,

and human resource management practices.

In addition, previous research (Haiedar & Kholifah, 2025) placing incentives as an independent or mediating variable that affects performance and job satisfaction. There are still limited studies that explicitly examine the role of incentives as a moderating variable in the relationship between workload and work environment on work stress. However, incentives can be viewed as job resources that have the potential to weaken the negative impact of job demands such as workload and environmental conditions on stress. Furthermore, previous studies (Tamata & Nezhad, 2023) tend to view incentives as a whole without distinguishing their types, whether financial (additional salary, bonuses) or non-financial (awards, work flexibility). There have not been many studies that examine in detail whether specific types of incentives are more effective in reducing work stress. Additionally, the complex interaction among workload, work environment, and incentives is rarely studied simultaneously, whereas in everyday reality, these factors often occur together.

Based on the research gaps, this study offers several novel contributions. First, the research was conducted on a fast food MSME, namely Bakso Bagito in Serbelawan City, thus providing a new perspective in the literature that has predominantly focused on large-scale organizations. Second, this study positions incentives as a moderating variable in the relationship between workload and work environment on work stress, a relatively uncommon approach in previous research. Third, this research distinguishes between financial and non-financial types of incentives, which can provide a more detailed understanding of the most effective forms of incentives in alleviating stress due to workload and environmental conditions. Fourth, this research tests a more complex interaction model, including the possibility of a double interaction between workload, work environment, and incentives on work stress. Thus, the research results are expected to not only enrich the Job Demands–Resources (JD-R) theory but also provide practical recommendations for SMEs in effectively managing human resources. Based on the theoretical framework and previous empirical findings, the proposed research hypothesis is as follows. Workload has a significant positive effect on work stress. The work environment has a significant effect on work stress. Incentives moderate the effect of workload on work stress, such that the higher the incentives, the weaker the positive effect of workload on work stress. Incentives moderate the effect of the work environment on work stress, so that the higher the incentives, the weaker the effect of the work environment on work stress. There is an interaction between workload, work environment, and incentives on work stress.

B. Methods

This study uses an explanatory design with a quantitative cross-sectional approach. The explanatory design was chosen because it can test hypotheses while also explaining causal relationships between variables, specifically workload, work

environment, and work stress with incentives as a moderating variable (Amirullah, 2022). The quantitative approach is considered appropriate because it generates measurable data and allows for statistical hypothesis testing (Sugiyono, 2022). The research population is all employees of Bakso Bagito Kota Serbelawan, totaling 38 people. Because the population size is relatively small (<100), this study uses the saturated sampling technique or census, where all members of the population are made into samples (Creswell, 2020). Thus, the research sample consists of 38 active employees. This technique was chosen to ensure that the data obtained is more comprehensive and reflects the actual conditions of the entire research population. Primary data was obtained through a self-report questionnaire that was developed based on the dimensions and indicators of each research variable. The questionnaire uses a five-point Likert scale, ranging from 1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree, which is widely used to measure respondents' perceptions and attitudes (Miles & Saldaña, 2024). Respondents are asked to fill out the questionnaire based on their personal experiences and perceptions. To maintain the quality of the data, the confidentiality of the respondents is guaranteed, so that answers can be given honestly without pressure.

The analysis was conducted using the Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modeling (PLS-SEM) method with the SmartPLS application. PLS-SEM was chosen because it is more suitable for small sample sizes, is prediction-oriented, and can test complex relationships between latent variables. The analysis was carried out in two main stages. First, the evaluation of the measurement model (outer model) was conducted to assess the validity and reliability of the research instrument. Reliability testing is conducted using Cronbach's Alpha and Composite Reliability, while convergent validity is tested through the factor loading value (>0.7) and AVE (>0.5). Discriminant validity is examined through the Fornell-Larcker criterion and the HTMT ratio. Secondly, structural model evaluation (inner model) is performed by testing for multicollinearity (VIF), path coefficients, coefficient of determination (R^2), effect size (f^2), and the significance of relationships between variables. Furthermore, to test the role of incentives as a moderating variable, an interaction term approach was used. This method allows researchers to assess whether incentives strengthen or weaken the impact of workload and work environment on work stress (Chin, Marcolin, & Newsted, 2003). With this approach, the research is expected to provide a comprehensive understanding of the dynamics of factors influencing work stress, as well as affirming incentives as an important mechanism in moderating the relationships among the variables.

C. Results and Discussion

Moderated Regression Analysis

Moderator variables can be categorized, namely 1, by using the moderation regression analysis method. Variable Z cannot be categorized as a moderator variable if in

equation (2) the value of Z is significant, but in equation (3) the interaction X*Z and X is not significant. In that condition, Z is more appropriately treated as an independent, intervening, exogenous, antecedent, or predictor variable. If in equation (2) the coefficient α2Z is not significant and in equation (3) the coefficient α3X*Z is significant, then Z is referred to as a pure moderator (pure moderator variable). If in equation (2) the value of α2Z is not significant and in equation (3) the value of α3X*Z is also not significant, then Z is considered a homologizer moderator. If in equation (2) the value of α2Z is significant and in equation (3) the value of α3X*Z is also significant, then Z is viewed as a quasi-moderator.

Measurement of the Outer Model

Assessment of the measurement model (outer model) with reflective indicators is conducted through testing for convergent validity and discriminant validity on each indicator, as well as testing for construct reliability to ensure the consistency of all indicators.

Table 1. Outer

Latent Variable	Indicator/Relationship	Value
Workload (X1)	BK1	0,841
Workload (X1)	BK2	0,605
Workload (X1)	BK3	0,788
Workload (X1)	BK4	0,611
Work Environment (X2)	LK1	0,748
Work Environment (X2)	LK2	0,879
Work Environment (X2)	LK3	0,627
Work Environment (X2)	LK4	0,774
Work Environment (X2)	LK5	0,828
Work Environment (X2)	LK6	0,726
Incentives (Z)	INS1	0,933
Incentives (Z)	INS2	0,822
Incentives (Z)	INS3	0,936
Work Stress (Y)	SK1	0,803
Work Stress (Y)	SK2	0,638
Work Stress (Y)	SK3	0,804
Path Coefficient	Workload (X1) → Work Stress (Y)	0,87
Path Coefficient	Work Environment (X2) → Work Stress (Y)	-0,363
Path Coefficient	Incentives (Z) → Work Stress (Y)	-0,209
Path Coefficient	Incentives * Workload → Work Stress (Y)	0,418

Based on the factor loading analysis results in Table 1, it can be seen that all indicators in the research construct have values above 0.5. This indicates that the indicators used in this study are valid in measuring the constructs of each variable. For the Workload variable (X1), the factor loading values of the indicators range from 0.605 to 0.841. Indicator BK1 has the highest contribution (0.841), while BK2 has the lowest value

(0.605), but still meets the convergent validity threshold.

In the Work Environment variable (X2), the indicators show values ranging from 0.627 to 0.879. The indicator LK2 is the strongest in reflecting the work environment with a value of 0.879, while LK3 has the lowest value of 0.627. For the Incentives variable (Z), all indicators have very high factor loading values, ranging from 0.822 to 0.936. The INS3 indicator contributes the most with a value of 0.936, indicating that the incentives are measured very well. The Work Stress variable (Y) has factor loading values between 0.638 and 0.804. SK3 is the strongest indicator (0.804), while SK2 is the lowest indicator (0.638) but still valid.

In addition, the results of the path coefficient indicate that Workload (X1) has a positive and significant effect on Work Stress (Y) with a value of 0.87, meaning that the higher the workload, the higher the employee's work stress. Meanwhile, Work Environment (X2) has a negative effect on work stress with a coefficient of -0.363, indicating that a good work environment can reduce stress levels, although its impact is not very strong. The Incentives (Z) variable also has a negative effect on work stress with a value of -0.209, although its effect is relatively small. Nevertheless, when incentives interact with workload (Incentives*Workload), the path coefficient value recorded is 0.418. This indicates that incentives serve as a moderating variable that can actually strengthen the effect of workload on work stress under certain conditions. Therefore, it can be concluded that all indicators in this study are valid and suitable for use, and the relationships between variables show a significant effect in accordance with the proposed hypothesis.

Discriminant Validity

The testing of discriminant validity in this study uses the Fornell-Larcker Criterion approach. The criteria for this test state that the Fornell-Larcker value is considered satisfied if the square root of the AVE of each research variable is higher than the square root of the AVE correlation with other variables.

Table 2. Discriminant Validity

	Workload (X1)	Incentive (X2)	Work Environment (Z)	Work Stress (Y)
Workload (X1)	0.900			
Work Environment (X2)	0.617	0.912		
Incentive (Z)	0.719	0.898	0.768	
Work Stress (Y)	0.748	0.614	0.661	0.752

Referring to Table 2, the Fornell-Larcker Criterion value for the workload variable (0.900) is recorded to be higher than the values for the incentive variable (0.719), work environment (0.617), and work stress (0.748). The Fornell-Larcker Criterion value for the incentive variable (0.912) is greater than that of the work environment (0.898), and work stress (0.614). Additionally, the Fornell-Larcker value for the work environment

variable (0.768) is higher compared to the work stress value (0.661). Based on these findings, it can be concluded that all variables in this study meet the criteria for discriminant validity.

Construct Reliability

The test of construct reliability is considered fulfilled if the obtained composite reliability value exceeds 0.7.

Table 3. Construct Reliability

	Composite Reliability
Workload (X1)	0.807
Work Environment (X2)	0.895
Work Stress (Y)	0.795
Incentive (Z)	0.926

Based on the results of the construct reliability test presented in Table 3, all research variables have a composite reliability value greater than 0.70. This indicates that each construct in this study is deemed reliable, as it meets the recommended standards for measuring the internal consistency of indicators within a variable. Specifically, the Workload variable (X1) achieved a composite reliability value of 0.807, which means that the indicators on workload are sufficiently consistent in explaining their variable. The Work Environment variable (X2) has the highest reliability value of 0.895, indicating that the work environment is very good at depicting its construct. The Work Stress variable (Y) is also stated to be reliable with a value of 0.795, although it is relatively lower compared to other variables, it still remains above the threshold of 0.70. Meanwhile, the Incentive variable (Z) shows the highest reliability among all variables with a value of 0.926, indicating that the consistency level of incentive indicators is very strong. Thus, it can be concluded that all constructs in this study have met the reliability criteria, making the data used suitable for further analysis.

Measurement of the Inner Model for Hypothesis Testing and MRA

The inner model measurement model evaluated in this study was tested with RSquare and hypothesis testing. The testing of the coefficient of determination (R-Square) serves to evaluate how much the independent variable can explain or influence the dependent variable.

Table 4. R-Square

	R Square	R. Square Adjusted
Job Stress (Y)	0.891	0.874

Based on Table 4, the Adjusted R-Square value for the work stress variable (Y) is 0.874. This indicates that the independent variables, namely workload (X1) and incentives (Z), can explain 87.4% of the variability in work stress, while the remaining 12.6% is

explained by other factors outside the scope of this research model. With a value close to 1, this research model can be categorized as a good (substantial/strong) model, as the tested variables have proven to have a significant contribution in explaining the level of work stress. This means that workload and incentives play a large role in influencing employee work stress, making the results of this study relevant to depict the real conditions in the field. Hypothesis testing is conducted to determine whether the previously formulated hypothesis can be accepted or rejected. The criterion for accepting the hypothesis is if the t-statistic value is greater than 1.96 and the p-value is less than 0.05.

Table 5. Results of the Direct and Indirect Effect Test

	Original Sample (0)	Sample Mean (M)	Standard Deviation (STDEV)	T Statistics (JO/STDEV)	P Values	Information
Workload (X1) -> Stress Work (Y)	0.946	0.901	0.143	5.449	0.000	Proven
Work Environment (X2) -> Job Stress (Y)	-0.307	0.490	0.224	-1.595	0.111	Not Proven
Workload Incentive -> Work Stress (Y)	0.211	-0.212	0.114	2.783	0.006	Proven

Based on Table 5, the following conclusions can be drawn. The test results show that the p-value for the impact of workload on work stress is 0.000 < 0.05, with a t-statistic value of 5.449 > 1.96 and a positive path coefficient of 0.946. This finding indicates that workload has a positive and significant effect on work stress, so the first hypothesis is proven. The test results show that the p-value for the impact of the work environment on work stress is 0.036 < 0.05, with a t-statistic of 1.595 < 1.96 and a positive path coefficient of 0.307. This indicates that the work environment factor does not have a significant impact on work stress, so the second hypothesis is considered unproven. The test results show that the p-value for the effect of workload on work stress with incentive moderation is 0.006 < 0.05, with a t-statistic of 2.783 > 1.96 and a positive path coefficient of 0.211. These results confirm that incentives influence the relationship between workload and work stress, thus the third hypothesis is stated to be proven.

The Influence of Workload on Work Stress

The results of this study indicate that workload has a positive and significant effect on work stress with a path coefficient value of 0.946, a p-value of 0.000 < 0.05, and a t-statistic of 5.449 > 1.96. These findings suggest that the higher the workload borne by employees, the greater the level of work stress experienced. Excessive workload tends to increase psychological pressure, reduce concentration, and cause fatigue both physically and mentally. These results are consistent with the findings of various previous studies. For example, a study conducted by (Yuninda & Nababan, 2025) states that an unbalanced workload with individual capacity can trigger work stress

as it creates feelings of pressure in completing tasks. Similarly, research by (Sadiq, 2022) emphasizing that high workload impacts the increase in emotional exhaustion, which ultimately exacerbates stress conditions. This is in line with the Job Demand-Resources Model (JD-R) concept, which explains that high job demands, including workload, can be a major predictor of work-related stress if not balanced with adequate resources. In addition, the results of the analysis in this study also show that incentives play a role as a moderating variable in the relationship between workload and work stress. The interaction coefficient of workload with incentives (Workload*Incentive) recorded a positive value of 0.211 with a p-value of 0.006 < 0.05. This means that under certain conditions, the presence of incentives actually strengthens the relationship between workload and work stress. This phenomenon can be explained that although incentives are intended to provide motivation, in practice, target-based incentives often drive employees to work harder, thereby increasing their workload and potentially increasing stress.

Interestingly, the test results on the work environment variable (X2) show that although theoretically a conducive work environment can reduce stress (negative coefficient -0.307), its effect in this study is not significant (p-value 0.111 > 0.05). This indicates that the workload factor has a stronger dominance in explaining the variability of work stress compared to the work environment. In other words, even though the work environment is comfortable, a high workload will still significantly trigger stress. When related to the results of the R-Square analysis, it is found that the variables of workload and incentives can explain work stress by up to 87.4%, indicating a very significant contribution. This emphasizes that managing workload is a key factor in controlling employee work stress. Overall, this discussion reinforces the argument that workload is a primary determinant of work stress, consistent with existing literature and theoretical models. However, the role of incentives as a moderator indicates the complexity of the relationships among variables, where incentives do not always function as a buffer, but can contribute to increased stress if not managed properly. Therefore, organizations need to balance the provision of incentives with rational workload management, so that the goal of increasing motivation does not end up leading to high levels of employee stress.

The Influence of Work Environment on Work Stress

The results of this study indicate that the work environment (X2) has a negative path coefficient of -0.307 towards work stress. Theoretically, this relationship suggests that the better the work environment, the lower the level of work stress tends to be. However, the hypothesis test results show that the effect is not significant (p-value 0.111 > 0.05, t-statistic 1.595 < 1.96), thus the hypothesis stating that there is a significant effect of the work environment on work stress is declared unproven. This finding is interesting, as the majority of literature emphasizes that the work environment is one of the important determinants in the development of work stress. Research by (Dodanwala, Santoso, & Yukongdi, 2023) finding that inadequate

physical work environment conditions, such as poor lighting, noise, and insufficient ventilation, can trigger increased stress among employees. Similarly, a study by (Anakpo, Nqwayibana, & Mishi, 2023) emphasizes that non-physical aspects of the work environment, such as relationships with colleagues, the leadership style of supervisors, and social support, play a significant role in reducing stress levels.

The discrepancy between the results of this study and the literature can be explained through several possibilities. First, although the work environment indicators in this study (WK1–WK6) have relatively high factor loading values (0.627–0.879), the analysis results show that their contribution to reducing stress is weaker compared to workload. This means that for the respondents of this study, the main factor affecting work stress is more determined by excessive job demands rather than by work environment conditions. Second, the presence of a moderating incentive factor may also influence this relationship. The incentives given may cause employees to focus more on achieving targets rather than on the comfort of the work environment, making perceptions of the work environment less significant in influencing stress.

In addition, when viewed from the Adjusted R-Square value of 0.874, most of the variability in work stress is explained by workload and incentives. Thus, the contribution of the work environment in this model is relatively small. This reinforces the conclusion that in the context of the organization studied, the work environment factor is not strong enough to reduce stress if it is not accompanied by proportional workload management. However, this does not mean that the work environment can be ignored. A study by (Bruyneel, et al., 2023) emphasizing that a good work environment can be a protective factor (buffer) against stress when employees face high work pressure. Therefore, the results of this research need to be understood in a specific context: even though the influence of the work environment on stress is not statistically significant, its existence remains important as a supportive element for employee well-being, but the dominance of workload factors is more prominent in this case. Thus, it can be concluded that the work environment has the potential to reduce work stress, but in this study its effect is not significant due to the stronger role of workload and incentives. Therefore, employee stress management strategies should emphasize workload management while still considering the quality of the work environment to function as a supporting factor for employees' psychological balance.

The Role of Incentives in Moderating the Effect of Workload on Job Stress

The research results indicate that workload (X1) has a positive and significant effect on work stress with a path coefficient of 0.946 (p-value 0.000 < 0.05; t-statistic 5.449 > 1.96). This means that the higher the workload received by employees, the higher the level of work stress they experience. This condition is in line with the job demand-resources theory (Karepesina, Zakaria, & Labo, 2024), which explains that excessive work demands can drain both the physical and psychological energy of employees,

thereby increasing the risk of stress. However, interestingly, when the incentive (Z) was tested as a moderating variable, the analysis results showed a coefficient value of 0.211 with a p-value of 0.006 < 0.05 and a t-statistic of 2.783 > 1.96. These findings indicate that incentives play a significant role in moderating the relationship between workload and work stress. However, the emerging relationship is actually positive, meaning that the presence of incentives strengthens the impact of workload on work stress. In other words, the provision of incentives does not function as a buffer that reduces stress, but rather as a driving force that causes employees to continue accepting high workloads in order to receive material or non-material rewards.

This finding is in line with the study conducted by (Bio & Sambung, 2022), which found that incentives can create 'motivational pressure' where employees are pushed to work harder, but at a certain point actually increase fatigue and work stress. A similar finding was also shown by research (Prihantoro & Sutianingsih, 2025) in the manufacturing industry sector, where high incentives drive short-term productivity, but in the long term relate to increased emotional exhaustion. On the other hand, other literature finds different results. For example, research by (Amrillah, Wahyuni, Rachmawati, & Suyoto, 2025) It shows that incentives can function as a coping resource that helps employees reduce stress due to heavy work demands. This occurs when incentives are perceived as a form of fair recognition and are provided consistently. The differences in results indicate that the effectiveness of incentives as a moderator greatly depends on the organizational context, the mechanisms of distribution, and employees' perceptions of the incentive system itself.

In this study, the results show that incentives are more appropriately positioned as quasi moderators because the incentive variable has a direct influence on work stress (-0.209) while also significantly affecting the interaction between workload and work stress (0.211). Thus, incentives do not only stand as independent variables but also strengthen the relationships among other variables. This reinforces the notion that the incentive provision strategy in the studied organization tends to act as a driving factor for increasing employee work intensity, which ultimately increases stress rather than reducing it. Thus, it can be concluded that incentives have a complex role in moderating the relationship between workload and work stress. Instead of always being a protective factor, incentives in certain conditions actually strengthen the psychological pressure due to workload. Therefore, management needs to reevaluate incentive provision strategies to function as a healthy motivational resource, for example by balancing material and non-material rewards, ensuring fairness in distribution, and integrating them with realistic workload management policies.

D. Conclusions

This research concludes that workload has a positive and significant effect on work stress, while the work environment was not proven to have a significant effect. Incentives were found to play a role as a quasi-moderator because, in addition to

having a direct effect on work stress, they also strengthen the relationship between workload and work stress. This indicates that incentives, if not managed properly, can lead employees to accept higher workloads, which in turn increases stress. The implications of these findings emphasize the importance of management in designing balanced incentives, which should not only be material but also include non-material rewards and work-life balance policies so that incentives truly become a healthy motivation. The limitations of the research lie in the use of cross-sectional data, less comprehensive work environment indicators, and a quantitative approach that has not explored psychological factors and organizational culture. Therefore, future research is recommended to use a longitudinal design, expand work environment indicators, combine qualitative approaches, and examine non-material incentive forms as an effort to enrich the understanding of work stress dynamics.

E. Acknowledgement

Thanks to all friends and respondents in this study.

References

Amirullah. (2022). *Methods & Techniques of Preparing Research Proposals.* Media Nusa Creative: T. M. Publishing (ed.); Pertama.

Amrillah, H., Wahyuni, S., Rachmawati, E., & Suyoto. (2025). The Influence of Workload, Stress Work and Compensation on Employee Performance with Motivation Work As Intervening Variables. *Islamic Economics Journal (IEJ), 11*(1), 1-17. https://doi.org/10.21111/iej.v11i1.14905

Anakpo, G., Nqwayibana, Z., & Mishi, S. (2023). The Impact of Work-from-Home on Employee Performance and Productivity: A Systematic Review. *Sustainability, 15*(5), 4529. https://doi.org/10.3390/su15054529

Bio, E., & Sambung, R. (2022). Impact of workload and incentives on employee turnover intention: work stress as mediation. *Jurnal Inovasi Ekonomi, 7*(2), 141-156. https://doi.org/10.22219/jiko.v7i02.22051

Bruyneel, A., Bouckaert, N., Noordhout, C. M., Detollenaere, J., Kohn, L., Pirson, M., Heede, K. V. (2023). Association of burnout and intention-to-leave the profession with work environment: A nationwide cross-sectional study among Belgian intensive care nurses after two years of pandemic. *International Journal of Nursing Studies, 137*(1), 104385. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijnurstu.2022.104385

Chin, W., Marcolin, B. L., & Newsted, P. R. (2003). A partial least squares latent variable modeling approach for measuring interaction effects: Results from a Monte Carlo simulation study and an electronic-mail emotion/adoption study. *Information Systems Research, 14*(2), 189–217. https://doi.org/10.1287/isre.14.2.189.16018

Creswell, J. (2020). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approach (4th edition).* Thousand Oaks: CA: Publikasi Sage.

Dodanwala, T. C., Santoso, D. S., & Yukongdi, V. (2023). Examining work role stressors, job satisfaction, job stress, and turnover intention of Sri Lanka's construction industry. *International Journal of Construction Management, 23*(15), 2583-2592. https://doi.org/10.1080/15623599.2022.2080931

Habib, M. F., Suhairi, & Daulay, A. N. (2025). The influence of work stress and job insecurity on turnover intention with job satisfaction as an intervening variable. *Jurnal EDUCATIO: Jurnal Pendidikan Indonesia, 11*(1), 21-31. https://doi.org/10.29210/1202525492

Haiedar, M. H., & Kholifah, S. (2025). The Impact of Occupational Safety, Workload, and Compensation on Employee Job Satisfaction in the Mining Industry: A Case Study of PT BCKA. *JMI: Journal of Management and Informatics , 4*(1), 587-598. https://doi.org/10.51903/jmi.v4i1.53

Harahap, M. I. (2022). The Influence of the Work Environment on the Performance of the Development Planning Division at the Regional Development Planning Agency of North Sumatra. *EKOMA: Jurnal Ekonomi, Manajemen, Akuntansi, 1*(2), 44–50. https://doi.org/10.56799/ekoma.v1i2.245

Karepesina, N. A., Zakaria, & Labo, I. A. (2024). Workload, Personality and Incentives on Employee Performance. *Advances: Jurnal Ekonomi & Bisnis, 2*(6), 362–377. https://doi.org/10.60079/ajeb.v2i6.325

Miles, H., & Saldaña. (2024). *Qualitative Data Analysis: A Methods Sourcebook.* New York: SAGE Publications.

Please, K., Tarigan, A. A., & Yafiz, M. (2022). Iwan Triyuwono's Thought About The Concept Of Sharia Enterprise Theory In The Development Of Sharia Accounting Theory In Indonesia. *Al-Masharif: Jurnal Ilmu Ekonomi dan Keislaman, 10*(1), 2579-8650. https://doi.org/10.24952/masharif.v10i1.5870

Prihantoro, A., & Sutianingsih. (2025). Workload, Incentives, and Job Satisfaction: Their Influence on Employee Retention. *Annals of Human Resource Management Research (AHRMR), 5*(2), 479-493. https://doi.org/10.35912/ahrmr.v5i2.2930

Quesada-Puga, C., Izquierdo-Espin, F. J., Membrive-Jiménez, M. J., Aguayo-Estremera, R., Fuente, G. A.-D., J. L.-B., & g, J. L.-U. (2024). Job satisfaction and burnout syndrome among intensive-care unit nurses: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Intensive and Critical Care Nursing, 82*(1), 103660. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.iccn.2024.103660

Rachman, A., Kuswandi, & Rahayu, S. (2025). The Influence of Financial Compensation, Work Facilities, and Workload on Employee Job Satisfaction.

Jurnal Ilmiah Manajemen Kesatuan, 13(1), 433–444. https://doi.org/10.37641/jimkes.v13i1.3088

Rahmad Hidayat, T. I. (2022). Strategies to Increase Income for the Welfare of Merchant Families. *Inovatif: Jurnal Ekonomi, Manajemen, Akuntansi, Bisnis Digital dan Kewirausahaan, 1*(4), 305-315. https://doi.org/10.55983/inov.v1i4.197

Ritonga, S. R., Anggraini, T., & Nawawi, Z. M. (2022). Analysis of Factors Influencing Students' Interest in Entrepreneurship in Islamic Business Through Motivation. *Jurnal Ilmiah Ekonomi Islam, 8*(2), 2269–2280. https://doi.org/10.29040/jiei.v8i2.5874

Rizky, R. I., & Aprelyani, S. (2025). Analysis of the Influence of Work Conflict and Work Stress on Employee Performance (Literature Review of Human Resource Management). *Jurnal Kewirausahan Dan Multi Talenta, 3*(2), 58-63. https://doi.org/10.38035/jkmt.v3i2.363

Sadiq, M. (2022). Policing in pandemic: Is perception of workload causing work–family conflict, job dissatisfaction and job stress? *Journal of Public Affairs, 22*(2), 2486. https://doi.org/10.1002/pa.2486

Safrida, Yafiz, M., & Lubis, F. A. (2023). The Influence of Compensation and Work Environment on Employee Loyalty at PT. BSI KC Medan S Parman with Job Satisfaction as an Intervening Variable. *Jurnal Ilmiah Ekonomi Islam, 9*(2), 2683–2696. https://doi.org/10.29040/jiei.v9i2.9684

Sugiyono. (2022). *Quantitative, Qualitative, and R&D Research Methods*. Bandung: CV. Alfabeta.

Tamata, A. T., & Nezhad, M. M. (2023). A systematic review study on the factors affecting shortage of nursing workforce in the hospitals. *Nursing Open, 10*(3), 1247-1257. https://doi.org/10.1002/nop2.1434

Yuninda, E., & Nababan, M. (2025). Influence of Workload and Work Stress on Motivation and Performance of Outpatient Nurses in Region C. *Jurnal Ilmiah Manajemen Kesatuan, 13*(2), 1031–1038. https://doi.org/10.37641/jimkes.v13i2.3243