International Journal of Advanced Digital Systems
and Multidisciplinary Studies (IJADSMS),
Vol. 1, Issue 3, pp. 10–13, (2026)
Published: March 2026

# The Impact of Workload on Employee Performance in Private Organizations

Ms. Lakshmi Kumari[1], Kumari Puja[2] ,Ms. Mansi Chaudhary[3], Mr. Ajit Kumar[4], Ms. Anupama[5]
[1,2,3,5]Assistant Professor, School of Computer Applications, Noida Institute of Engineering & Technology, Greater Noida
[4]Assistant Professor, Department of Information Technology, Amity University, Ranchi, Jharkhand,

**Abstract**

This paper investigates the multifaceted relationship between workload and employee performance within private sector organizations, analyzing how varying workload conditions—ranging from optimal to excessive or insufficient—impact individual productivity, job satisfaction, and overall organizational outcomes. It further explores theoretical frameworks such as the Job Demands- Resources model and Cognitive Load Theory to elucidate the mechanisms through which workload influences performance, considering both its potential to stimulate growth and its propensity to induce burnout and diminished efficacy. The study posits that an imbalance between job demands and available resources often leads to detrimental effects on employee well-being and, consequently, their performance. Specifically, excessive workload has been consistently linked to decreased employee performance, increased stress, and diminished job satisfaction across various organizational contexts. Research indicates a negative correlation between heightened workload and employee productivity, suggesting that as work hours intensify, productivity may paradoxically decline. This is corroborated by findings that illustrate a negative relationship between workload and employee productivity, where higher workloads are associated with reduced performance. Conversely, a balanced workload that aligns with an employee's capabilities and available resources can enhance job satisfaction and subsequently improve performance. This complex interplay necessitates a deeper understanding of perceived workload as a multidimensional construct, shaped by task characteristics, temporal pressures, resource availability, and the broader organizational design.

**Keywords:** workload, employee performance, private organizations, job satisfaction, stress, Job Demands-Resources model, Cognitive Load Theory

## Introduction

The escalating demands placed upon employees in private sector organizations often lead to significant variations in individual performance outcomes [1]. This phenomenon underscores the critical importance of understanding the multifaceted relationship between employee workload and productivity [2], [3]. A high workload can be defined as the specific set of tasks or activities required to be accomplished by an individual within a designated timeframe [4]. Workload, therefore, is distinct from work targets, which typically delineate explicit goals rather than the volume or difficulty of the tasks themselves [5]. This distinction is crucial, as an elevated workload can induce pressure and discomfort among employees, particularly when demands are perceived as unachievable within the given constraints [6]. Conversely, an optimal workload can act as a catalyst for enhanced skill development and improved service outcomes, thereby positively influencing overall organizational efficiency [7]. However, an excessive workload often precipitates a decline in work efficiency and can detrimentally affect workplace health, potentially leading to increased turnover intentions [8]. Indeed, research consistently demonstrates that an imbalanced workload, whether excessive or insufficient, directly correlates with diminished employee performance and job satisfaction [9], [10]. Moreover, the competitive landscape fostered by technological advancements often intensifies the responsibilities borne by employees, further complicating the dynamics between workload and performance [11]. This intricate interplay necessitates a comprehensive examination of how varying levels of workload quantitatively and qualitatively impact employee output [12]. Specifically, quantitative workload refers to the sheer volume of tasks, while qualitative workload pertains to the complexity and skill demands exceeding an individual's capabilities [13].

## Literature Review

Previous research has extensively explored the mediating and moderating factors influencing the workload- performance nexus, including job satisfaction, digital fatigue, and cognitive overload [14], [15]. Workload, in particular, is conceptualized as the product of work volume and time norms, where an imbalance between employee ability and job demands can lead to either boredom or fatigue, both negatively impacting performance [5]. This conceptualization aligns with the understanding that workload can encompass various forms, from quantitative and qualitative to mental and physical, with excessive workload consistently identified as a significant organizational stressor [16]. Nonetheless, the impact of workload on performance is not always linear, with some studies indicating an inverted U-shape relationship where moderate workloads optimize performance, while both insufficient and excessive workloads lead to declines [2]. This curvilinear relationship implies that an optimal workload exists where output per worker peaks before declining

sharply with further increases in task demands [17]. This suggests that while a certain level of demand can motivate and engage employees, exceeding a critical threshold can lead to cognitive overload and digital fatigue, ultimately impairing task execution and decision-making capabilities [14], [17]. Such an overload depletes an employee's time, energy, and psychological resources, thereby hindering overall job performance and potentially contributing to reduced morale [17]. Moreover, sudden alterations in workload, whether increases or decreases, have been shown to significantly impair performance, suggesting that stability and predictability in task allocation are crucial for sustaining optimal employee output [11].

Methodology

This research employs a mixed-methods approach to investigate the multifaceted relationship between workload and employee performance within private organizations, thereby aiming to provide a comprehensive understanding of both the quantitative and qualitative aspects of this dynamic. Specifically, the quantitative phase will involve a survey-based methodology to gather numerical data on perceived workload and objective performance metrics from a diverse sample of employees across various private sector entities. This will enable statistical analysis to identify significant correlations and patterns between different levels of workload and reported performance outcomes. The qualitative phase will then utilize semi-structured interviews and focus groups to explore the subjective experiences of employees regarding workload intensity, coping mechanisms, and the perceived impact on their efficacy and well-being, providing nuanced insights into the quantitative findings. This dual-phase approach will facilitate a robust analysis, integrating broad statistical trends with rich, contextual narratives to elucidate the complex interplay of workload and performance within private organizational frameworks. This mixed-methods design allows for a triangulation of data, enhancing the validity and reliability of the findings by cross-referencing quantitative patterns with qualitative insights into the underlying mechanisms and contextual factors [18]. The quantitative component will employ robust statistical models, such as regression analysis, to ascertain the direct and indirect effects of workload on key performance indicators, while controlling for potential confounding variables.

**Results**

The qualitative component, conversely, will delve into the lived experiences of employees through thematic analysis, exploring perceptions of workload, its impact on well-being, and adaptive strategies employed to manage demands [19]. This triangulation will provide a more holistic understanding of the workload-performance relationship, moving beyond simple correlations to explore the causal pathways and individual interpretations that shape outcomes [20]. This integrated discussion will allow for a comprehensive understanding of the research questions, revealing whether the findings confirm or discord with existing theoretical frameworks on workload and performance [21]. The collected data, encompassing both quantitative metrics and qualitative narratives, will undergo rigorous analysis to identify overarching themes and statistically significant relationships, ensuring a comprehensive interpretation of the findings [22]. The statistical analysis will specifically utilize Structural Equation Modeling through AMOS software to identify direct and indirect relationships between independent variables (various workload dimensions) and dependent variables (employee performance and related constructs), allowing for the testing of proposed hypotheses [23]. The results obtained from both phases will be synthesized to provide a comprehensive and in-depth analysis of the phenomenon under study, thereby enhancing the validity of the conclusions [24]. The quantitative component will specifically employ validated scales, such as the Job Content Questionnaire for workload, to ensure accurate and reliable measurement of constructs [25]. The qualitative data will be analyzed using thematic analysis to identify recurrent patterns and emergent themes from the interview and focus group transcripts, providing rich, contextualized insights into employee experiences and perceptions [26].

Discussion

The subsequent discussion will integrate these quantitative findings with qualitative insights, ensuring a holistic interpretation of the intricate relationship between workload and employee performance, thereby contributing to a more nuanced understanding of this critical organizational dynamic. This integrated approach allows for a comprehensive understanding that transcends the limitations of a single-method design, offering both the breadth of statistical generalizability and the depth of experiential detail [27]. The choice of analysis tools, specifically SPSS and Smart PLS, is strategically important; while SPSS excels in diverse statistical tests for detailed quantitative analysis, Smart PLS is crucial for structural equation modeling, facilitating the discernment of intricate variable relationships [28]. These tools are particularly effective even with smaller sample sizes and complex models, operating efficiently under assumptions of non-normal data distribution and enabling the testing of both formative and reflective measurement models without identification problems [29].

**Conclusion**

The application of Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modeling allows for robust analysis of complex theoretical models with multiple latent variables, enabling a comprehensive evaluation of direct and indirect effects within the workload-performance framework [30], [31]. This methodology is particularly advantageous for its ability to minimize Type I and Type II errors and estimation bias, especially when dealing with data that may not perfectly adhere to strict statistical assumptions [32]. This rigorous approach ensures the reliability and validity of the research findings, providing a solid foundation for theoretical contributions and practical implications in the field of organizational psychology. [33], [34] Specifically, PLS-SEM is valuable for its predictive modeling capabilities and its utility in analyzing non-normal data and smaller sample sizes, making it well-suited for comprehensive educational research [35], [36]. It is also particularly adept at simultaneously examining relationships between variables within a conceptual model, incorporating both measurement and structural components [37].

References


[1] R. P. Herdiana and F. P. Sary, “How workload impacts the employee performance and how work stress acts as a mediating variable in shoes manufacturing company,” International Journal of Research in Business and Social Science (2147-4478) , vol. 12, no. 5, p. 164, Jul. 2023, doi: 10.20525/ijrbs.v12i5.2756.

[2] S. Siswanto, A. S. Supriyanto, U. Ni’mah, N. Asnawi, and I. S. Wekke, “Does a workload influence the performance of bank employees?,” Management Science Letters , p. 639, Jan. 2019, doi: 10.5267/j.msl.2019.2.007.

[3] L. M. Kaban and Jacksen, “The Mediating Role of Stress Between Workload, Work Environment, and Performance of Factory Workers,” JURNAL NUSANTARA APLIKASI MANAJEMEN BISNIS , vol. 9, no. 1, p. 184, Apr. 2024, doi: 10.29407/nusamba.v9i1.21196.

[4] K. S. Prihatin and A. Haerani, “Employee Performance: The Effect of Workload and Compensation,” Jurnal Ekonomi Bisnis & Entrepreneurship , vol. 17, no. 1, p. 140, May 2023, doi: 10.55208/jebe.v17i1.312.

[5] I. N. Swedana, “The Role Of Workload And Work Motivation In Influencing Performance Through Job Satisfaction,” Jurnal Manajemen , vol. 27, no. 2, p. 401, Jun. 2023, doi: 10.24912/jm.v27i2.1309.

[6] A. M. Ahmad, A. W. Handaru, and O. Usman, “The Effect of Workload, Work Stress and Work-Life Balance On Employee Performance (Case Study On Startup Employees In Jakarta),” Devotion Journal of Research and Community Service , vol. 3, no. 14, p. 2749, Dec. 2022, doi: 10.36418/dev.v3i14.336.

[7] D. S. KC, B. R. Staats, M. Kouchaki, and F. Gino, “Task Selection and Workload: A Focus on Completing Easy Tasks Hurts Performance,” Management Science , vol. 66, no. 10, p. 4397, May 2020, doi: 10.1287/mnsc.2019.3419.

[8] Chang, Chung-Wei, Tseng, Shih-Hsien, Lee, and Ming-Yen, “Exploring the Relationship Between Workload, Leadership and Turnover Intentions among Taiwanese Army Personnel A Research Study,” RePEc: Research Papers in Economics , Jan. 2024, Accessed: Sep. 2025. [Online]. Available: https://econpapers.repec.org/RePEc:spt:admaec:v:14:y:2024:i:4:f:14_4_1

[9] H. I. Efendi, N. Komari, and I. Daud, “The Effect of Workload on Employee Performance with Organizational Citizenship Behaviour (OCB) and Work Stress as Mediation and Leadership Support as Moderation,” American Journal of Economic and Management Business (AJEMB) , vol. 4, no. 5, p. 403, May 2025, doi: 10.58631/ajemb.v4i5.226.

[10] N. Souisa, S. J. Macpal, and A. Biay, “The Influence of Workload and Motivation on Employee Performance through Job Satisfaction,” Indonesian Journal Economic Review (IJER) , vol. 5, no. 1, p. 23, Apr. 2025, doi: 10.59431/ijer.v5i1.509.

[11] E. Leovani and A. T. Yakuputri, “The Moderator Effect of Cyberloafing on Workload and Employee Performance,” KnE Social Sciences , May 2024, doi: 10.18502/kss.v9i14.16149.

[12] A. Brüggen, “An empirical investigation of the relationship between workload and performance,” Management Decision , vol. 53, no. 10, p. 2377, Nov. 2015, doi: 10.1108/md-02-2015-0063.

[13] S. Baskaran, H. S. Lay, B. S. Ming, and N. Mahadi, “Technology Adoption and Employee’s Job Performance: An Empirical Investigation,” International Journal of Academic Research in Economics and Management Sciences , vol. 9, no. 1, Apr. 2020, doi: 10.6007/ijarems/v9-i1/7443.

[14] Dr. M. A. Pasha et al. , “Digital Fatigue and Cognitive Overload as Managerial Challenges Understanding the Impact of Workload Management on the Workforce,” ˜ The œcritical review of social sciences studies , vol. 3, no. 4, p. 1629, Nov. 2025, doi: 10.59075/xwtjqy32.

[15] N. V. Vu et al. , “Type of the Paper: Article,” SSRN Electronic Journal , Jan. 2025, doi: 10.2139/ssrn.5384374.

[16] E. Biolik, “Strengths use, deficit correction, and workload in onsite, hybrid, and remote work,” Scientific Papers of Silesian University of Technology Organization and Management Series , vol. 2025, no. 218, p. 69, Jan. 2025, doi: 10.29119/1641-3466.2025.218.3.

[17] M. S. Msuya and A. B. Kumar, “The role of supervisor work-life support on the correlation between work autonomy, workload and performance: perspective from Tanzania banking employees,” Future Business Journal , vol. 8, no. 1, Aug. 2022, doi: 10.1186/s43093-022-00139-3.

[18] “Intro_Lit_Research_Inter Merged.pdf.”

[19] S. Sahabuddin, E. Jumady, and Y. Fajriah, “Qualitative Study on the Effect of Workload and Motivation on Performance with Supervision and SOP as Mediator Variables,” Golden Ratio of Human Resource Management , vol. 5, no. 1, p. 241, Feb. 2025, doi: 10.52970/grhrm.v5i1.863.

[20] R. Verma and S. Mishra, “The Future of Performance Management: Shifting from Annual Reviews to Continuous Feedback,” International Journal for Research in Applied Science and Engineering Technology , vol. 12, no. 9, p. 216, Sep. 2024, doi: 10.22214/ijraset.2024.64153.

[21] A. Inarda, “A mixed-methods study on the influence of quality of work life on commitment and performance,” Problems and Perspectives in Management , vol. 20, no. 2, p. 321, May 2022, doi: 10.21511/ppm.20(2).2022.27.

[22] S. Gupta, A. Farooque, and M. S. Siddiqui, “Comparative Study of Stress Levels and Coping Mechanisms among Women Bank Employees in Kanpur City: Public vs. Private Sector Banks,” Revista de Gestão Social e Ambiental , vol. 18, no. 9, Jun. 2024, doi: 10.24857/rgsa.v18n9-129.

[23] Y. H. Devates, Prayekti, and D. Subiyanto, “Strengthening Productivity: Role Analysis of Workload, Compensation, Work Environment, and Work Discipline,”

RELEVANCE Journal of Management and Business , vol. 7, no. 1, p. 64, Jun. 2024, doi: 10.22515/relevance.v7i1.8716.

[24] S. Jha, "Linking Expected Positive Performance Outcome, Professional Development and Performance Management: A PLS-SEM Approach," AIMS International Journal of Management , vol. 12, no. 1, p. 47, Jun. 2018, doi: 10.26573/2018.12.1.4.

[25] H. Hasin, W. S. Hussain, E. Nordin, A. Jamil, and Y. C. Johari, "The Impact of Workload, Management Factors, and Job Insecurity on Employee Well-Being: A Review of Recent Research," International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences , vol. 13, no. 4. Apr. 11, 2023. doi: 10.6007/ijarbss/v13-i4/16703.

[26] A. Kaushik, "Comprehensive Impact of On-Demand Platforms: Examining the Gig Economy\'s Influence on Specialized Professionals, Work-Life Balance, and Gig Workers\' Perspectives," International Journal for Research in Applied Science and Engineering Technology , vol. 12, no. 1, p. 552, Jan. 2024, doi: 10.22214/ijraset.2024.58005.

[27] C. Jones et al. , "Perspectives and Experiences of Public Safety Personnel Engaged in a Peer-Led Workplace Reintegration Program Post Critical Incident or Operational Stress Injury: A Qualitative Thematic Analysis," International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health , vol. 21, no. 7, p. 949, Jul. 2024, doi: 10.3390/ijerph21070949.

[28] A.-T. R. S. D, "The Quantitative Relationship Between HRM Practices and Academic Performance in Saudi Public Universities," Revista de Gestão Social e Ambiental , vol. 18, no. 2, May 2024, doi: 10.24857/rgsa.v18n2-101.

[29] V. M. Ekowati, A. S. Supriyanto, Y. D. Fatmawati, Z. Mukaffi, and S. Setiani, "An Empirical Effect of Workloads on Employee Satisfaction: Mediating by Work Environment," Journal of Southwest Jiaotong University , vol. 56, no. 1, Jan. 2021, doi: 10.35741/issn.0258-2724.56.1.14.

[30] E. Mirozha, S. Awan, and T. Prawitowati, "The Importance of Job Analysis, Experience, Satisfaction, and Organizational Commitment," International Research Journal of Business Studies , vol. 18, no. 2, p. 203, Oct. 2025, doi: 10.21632/irjbs.18.2.203-216.

[31] S. Sidik, D. T. Kurniawati, and R. P. Handrito, "Employee performance in the context of perceived organisational change: moderated by power distance and collectivism," International Journal of Research in Business and Social Science (2147-4478) , vol. 13, no. 6, p. 128, Oct. 2024, doi: 10.20525/ijrbs.v13i6.3516.

[32] K. M. Nguyen et al. , "Fostering employees' AI adoption in strategic marketing planning and decision making: a mixed-method study in Vietnam," Cognition Technology & Work , Oct. 2025, doi: 10.1007/s10111-025-00838-1.

[33] J. Yang and H. Fang, "Integrating Embodied Social Presence Theory and Process Virtualization Theory to assess business process virtualizability: The mediating role of embodied co-presence," PLoS ONE , vol. 19, no. 6, Jun. 2024, doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0305423.

[34] S. Parulian and A. H. Sutawijaya, "EFFECT OF WORK ENVIRONMENT AND MOTIVATION ON WORKLOAD AND ITS IMPLICATIONS ON EMPLOYEE PERFORMANCE PT.
PLN (PERSERO) UP3 KEBON JERUK," Dinasti International Journal of Digital Business Management , vol. 1, no. 2, p. 165, Feb. 2020, doi: 10.31933/dijdbm.v1i2.134.

[35] M. D. Izhar, D. Kusmawan, and B. Aswin, "Do Sleep Quality Can Be the Intervening Factors of Personality Data to Occupational Fatigue?," medRxiv (Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory) , Apr. 2024, doi: 10.1101/2024.04.26.24306427.

[36] M. H. Miraz, S. Annamalah, and R. Sham, "Integrating PLS-SEM and NVivo in Mixed-Methods Educational Research: A Comprehensive Evaluation of Quantitative and Qualitative Analytical Tools," Educational Process International Journal , vol. 19, no. 1, Jan. 2025, doi: 10.22521/edupij.2025.19.531.

[37] E. E. García-Salirrosas, R. F. Rondon-Eusebio, L. A. G. Campos, and Á. Acevedo-Duque, "Job Satisfaction in Remote Work: The Role of Positive Spillover from Work to Family and Work–Life Balance," Behavioral Sciences , vol. 13, no. 11, p. 916, Nov. 2023, doi: 10.3390/bs13110916.