



The Effect Of Stress And Workload On Employee Performance PT. Midi Utama Indonesia, Tbk (Alfamidi) Malang City

Vena Anggun Pribadi

Affiliation: Department of Management, Institut Teknologi dan Bisnis Asia, Malang, Indonesia

Email Correspondence: venaanggunpribadi@gmail.com

Abstract

Introduction/Main Objectives: This study aims to empirically analyze the effect of work stress and workload on employee performance at PT. Midi Utama Indonesia Tbk (Alfamidi) Malang City in a comprehensive and representative.

Background Problems: In the context of an increasingly competitive retail industry, the phenomenon of increased psychological pressure and excessive workload often becomes a major factor that disrupts the effectiveness of employee performance.

Research Methods: This study used a quantitative approach with saturated sampling technique, involving all 85 employees as respondents, where data were collected through questionnaires and analyzed using SPSS version 26 with multiple linear regression method to test the relationship between variables statistically, including classical assumption tests.

Finding/Results: The results of the study indicate that work stress has a positive but insignificant effect on performance, while workload has a significant positive effect, with both variables simultaneously contributing significantly to employee performance of 44.3% overall.

Conclusion: Controlled stress and workload can encourage increased work productivity. Therefore, companies need to maintain a proper proportion of workloads and create a conducive work environment to support employee performance and well-being. Regular and not excessive work pace management is important to ensure employees can perform their duties effectively, maintain focus, and avoid physical and mental fatigue.

Keywords: Work Stress, Workload, Employee Performance.



Introduction

The current dynamics of the world of work show increasingly competitive competition. Every company needs to manage and improve the performance of its employees in order to be able to adapt and continue to grow. The level of success of an organization is largely determined by the extent to which the performance of its employees can run optimally. In retail companies such as PT. Midi Utama Indonesia Tbk (Alfamidi), employees play an important role because they deal directly with customers and are responsible for the smooth operation of the store. The modern retail sector is known for its fast-paced work rhythm, high sales targets, and complex customer service demands.

With the demand for companies to be competitive, companies are pressuring employees to be more productive. High work pressure, such as setting high sales targets and strict supervision, can cause work stress. These conditions often cause stress and excessive workloads, which can ultimately have a negative impact on the physical and mental balance of employees. Therefore, companies need to create policies that balance performance and employee welfare.

In retail operations such as Alfamidi, negative employee performance is evident in several key aspects. Poor service quality, such as a lack of responsiveness to customers, can reduce customer loyalty and the company's competitiveness. Repeated absenteeism and tardiness disrupt team coordination and increase the workload of other colleagues. In addition, negligence in managing inventory, such as not checking product expiration dates or stock discrepancies, can result in financial losses and customer complaints.

Excessive work stress has a significant impact on employee performance. Work stress is a negative emotional state experienced by individuals when the demands of their job exceed their abilities (Busro, 2017). According to Handoko (2017), work stress is a condition of tension that affects an individual's thinking processes, emotions, and overall state. High work pressure can cause physical and mental fatigue, thereby hindering employees' ability to concentrate, make decisions, and maintain their performance and commitment to work. This condition results in decreased productivity, increased errors in task execution, and reduced work quality. In addition, poorly managed work stress can trigger an increase in absenteeism and a decrease in commitment to the organization, which ultimately has a negative impact on overall performance effectiveness.

Alfamidi employees in Malang City face long working hours, complex responsibilities, and high sales targets, which can cause stress due to an imbalance between workload and resources. This condition has the potential to reduce performance, such as service speed, stock management accuracy, and customer satisfaction.

High workloads have the potential to affect individual performance within an organization. Workload is defined as the totality and level of complexity of various tasks that must be completed by individuals or groups within a specified period of time (Hermawan, 2024). When job demands exceed one's capacity, it often leads to physical and mental fatigue, psychological pressure, and decreased work concentration. This condition makes it difficult for employees to focus, reduces productivity, and increases the potential for errors in performing their responsibilities. As a result, work quality declines and company goals become difficult to achieve optimally.

Several studies have demonstrated a clear and significant link between work stress, workload, and employee performance. The study Kurniawan & Rizki (2022) found that work stress and work motivation significantly and positively influence employee performance, while workload has a significant negative impact. Mudrika et al. (2021) reported that work stress, workload, and the work environment both individually and together significantly and positively affect

employee performance at PT Jasa Marga (Persero) Tbk, Balmera Medan Branch. Kadir et al. (2023) demonstrated that the combination of workload and work stress significantly affects employee performance at Panasea Banjarmasin. In addition Septiani et al. (2025) showed that workload, work stress, work discipline, and employee performance exert a significant positive influence on employee performance in Cisarua District, both partially and simultaneously. Meanwhile, Raja et al. (2023) revealed that workload positively and significantly affects employee performance, whereas work stress has a significant negative impact.

Several studies have discussed the relationship between work stress, workload, and employee performance, but most of them focus on the manufacturing and service sectors. Research in the modern retail sector is still limited, while the retail work environment has unique characteristics such as fast pace, long working hours, and shift systems that can contribute to psychological development. Furthermore, previous research findings have been inconsistent, with some studies reporting a significant effect and others reporting no effect. Based on this background, this study aims to analyze the effect of stress and workload on employee performance PT. Midi Utama Indonesia Tbk Malang City.

Research Methods

This research employs an associative quantitative method, which is an approach that is systematically, planned, and clearly structured. Quantitative research is designed to examine the relationships among variables in order to address the research problem, guided by the initial hypothesis and evaluated through statistical analysis techniques (Sahir, 2021). The process includes collecting important information, followed by data analysis through numerical analysis, and presenting the results in an easy-to-understand format such as tables or graphs, to produce conclusions and empirical results. The population in this study was all Alfamidi employees in Malang City, totaling 85 people.

The sampling technique used in this study was saturated sampling. According to Sugiyono (2019) saturated sampling is a method in which all members of the population are selected as the sample. The data were obtained using a Google Form questionnaire developed according to the study variables and subsequently analyzed with SPSS version 26 through validity and reliability testing, classical assumption tests, t-tests, F-tests, and multiple linear regression to ensure the precision and credibility of the findings.

Table 1. Definition of Operational Variables

Variable	Indicators	Question Items
Work stress (Hasibuan, 2019)	Workload	I feel that the work I handle exceeds my capabilities. I often feel exhausted because of too much work.
	Attitude of leaders	I feel pressured when my supervisor reprimands me in front of other employees.
	Working hours	I often work overtime to finish unfinished work. Strict work schedules put pressure on me.
	Conflict	Conflicts between employees make the work environment uncomfortable.
Workload (Koesomowidjojo, 2017)	Working conditions	The work I do requires excessive energy and concentration. The busy work environment makes it difficult for me to work comfortably.

Employee Performance (Mangkunegara, 2017)	Use of working time	I often do not have enough time to complete all the tasks assigned to me.
	Targets to be achieved	I feel pressured to achieve certain sales or productivity targets. Failure to meet targets makes me anxious about my supervisor's assessment.
	Work Quality	I sometimes rush to finish work so that it gets done quickly. I often feel that the quality of my work declines when I am pressed for time.
	Work Quantity	My workload feels overwhelming when my coworkers are absent. I often have to do several tasks at once (serving, organizing, checking stock).
	Task execution	In busy situations, I often overlook minor details of work procedures.
	Responsibilities	I often postpone work because there are other urgent tasks to complete.

Source: Author's Work, 2025.

Result

Validity Test

Table 1. Validity Test Results

Item	R-Count	R-Tabel	Sig.(2-tailed)	A	Conclusion
X1.1	0,667	0,213	0,000	0,05	Valid
X1.2	0,506	0,213	0,000	0,05	Valid
X1.3	0,672	0,213	0,000	0,05	Valid
X1.4	0,558	0,213	0,000	0,05	Valid
X1.5	0,616	0,213	0,000	0,05	Valid
X1.6	0,609	0,213	0,000	0,05	Valid
X2.1	0,696	0,213	0,000	0,05	Valid
X2.2	0,664	0,213	0,000	0,05	Valid
X2.3	0,676	0,213	0,000	0,05	Valid
X2.4	0,645	0,213	0,000	0,05	Valid
X2.5	0,664	0,213	0,000	0,05	Valid
Y.1	0,790	0,213	0,000	0,05	Valid
Y.2	0,702	0,213	0,000	0,05	Valid
Y.3	0,647	0,213	0,000	0,05	Valid
Y.4	0,679	0,213	0,000	0,05	Valid
Y.5	0,733	0,213	0,000	0,05	Valid
Y.6	0,683	0,213	0,000	0,05	Valid

Source: Author's Work, 2025.

Based on the validity test results, it is known that each statement item in variables X1, X2, and Y has met the requirements as instruments that are suitable for use in research. An instrument is considered valid if the calculated r value is greater than the table r value and the Sig. (2-

tailed) value is less than 0.05. Based on the calculations, the table r value is 0.213 at a significance level of 5%. The analysis shows that all statement items in variables X1, X2, and Y have r-count > r-table and Sig. (2-tailed) $0.000 < 0.05$. Thus, all question items in this research instrument are declared valid, so the instrument is suitable for use in the next stage of analysis.

Reliability Test

Table 2. Reliability Test Results

Item	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted	Provision	Conclusion
X1	.769	> 0.6	Reliable
X2	.715	> 0.6	Reliable
Y	.836	> 0.6	Reliable

Source: Author's Work, 2025.

The reliability test results show that the Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted value for variable X1 reached 0.769, for variable X2 reached 0.715, and for variable Y reached 0.836. Since all of these values are above the threshold of 0.6, it can be said that each statement in each variable has high internal consistency, so this research instrument is declared reliable.

Classical Assumption Test

Table 3. Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test

One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test		
		Unstandardized Residual
N		85
Normal Parameters ^{a,b}	Mean	,0000000
	Std. Deviation	1,98387675
Most Extreme Differences	Absolute	,111
	Positive	,111
	Negative	-,106
Test Statistic		,111
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)		,173 ^c

Source: Author's Work, 2025.

Based on the normality test results, the Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed) value is 0.173. Since this value is > 0.05 ($0.173 > 0.05$), It can be concluded that the data show a normal distribution.

Table 4. Multicollinearity Test

Model	B	Std. Error	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		Collinearity Statistics	
			Beta	t	Sig.	Tolerance	VIF	
1	(Constant)	3,990	2,765		1,443	,153		
	X1	,279	,150	,221	1,869	,065	,484	2,064
	X2	,635	,154	,488	4,121	,000	,484	2,064

Source: Author's Work, 2025.

Based on the results in the table, it shows that the work stress variable (X1) has a Tolerance value of 0.484, while the work load variable (X2) has a similar Tolerance value of 0.484. In addition, both variables have a Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) value of 2.064. Because the Tolerance value for each variable is > 0.10 and the VIF value is < 10 , it can be concluded that there is no indication of multicollinearity between variables.

Table 5. Heteroscedasticity Test

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients			Standardized Coefficients		Collinearity Statistics		
	B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.	Tolerance	VIF	
1	(Constant)	-1.825	1.662					
	X1	,069	,090	,119	,766	,446	,484	2,064
	X2	,073	,093	,122	,790	,432	,484	2,064

Source: Author's Work, 2025.

Based on the table results, the significance value (Sig.) for variable X1 (Work Stress) is 0.446 and for variable X2 (Workload) is 0.432. Both significance values are greater than the significance level of 0.05 (Sig. > 0.05). This show, it can be concluded that there is no heteroscedasticity.

Table 6. Multiple Linear Regression Test

Model	B	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		t	Sig.
		Std. Error	Beta				
1	(Constant)	3,990	2,765			1,443	,153
	X1	,279	,150	,221		1,869	,065
	X2	,635	,154	,488		4,121	,000

Source: Author's Work, 2025.

$$Y = \alpha + \beta_1 X_1 + \beta_2 X_2 + \beta_3 X_3 + e \quad \dots \quad (1)$$

$$Y = 3.990 - 0.279X_1 + 0.635X_2 \quad \dots \quad (2)$$

The regression test results show that variable X1 has a coefficient of 0.279 with a significance level of 0.065, indicating a positive but insignificant effect on Employee Performance (Y). Conversely, variable X2 has a coefficient of 0.635 with a significance level of 0.000, concluding that workload has a positive and significant effect on Employee Performance (Y).

Table 7. Determination Test

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	,665 ^a	,443	,429	1,994

Source: Author's Work, 2025.

The results of the coefficient of determination test show an R^2 value of 0.443, indicating that the independent variable can explain 44.3% of the variation in the dependent variable. The remaining 55.7% is determined by various other factors not covered in this study model.

Table 8. t test

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		
	B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.
1 (Constant)	3,990	2,765		1,443	,153
X1	,279	,150	,221	1,869	,065
X2	,635	,154	,488	4,121	,000

Source: Author's Work, 2025.

Based on the t-test results in the table above, the calculated t-value for variable (X1) is 1.443 and for variable (X2) is 4.121. With a total of 85 respondents and two independent variables, the degrees of freedom (df) = $n - k - 1 = 85 - 2 - 1 = 82$, so the t-table value at a significance level of 0.05 is 1.989.

The comparison results show that:

1. For variable (X1), the calculated t-value (1.869) is less than the t-table value (1.989), so H_0 is accepted and it can be concluded that variable (X1) has no effect on variable Y.
2. For variable (X2), the t-value (4.121) is greater than the t-table value (1.989), so H_0 is rejected and it can be concluded that (X2) has an effect on variable Y.

Therefore, workload significantly influences employee performance, whereas work stress shows no significant impact.

Table 9. F Test

Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	258,766	2	129,383	32,550 ,000 ^b
	Residual	325,940	82	3,975	
	Total	584,706	84		

Source: Author's Work, 2025.

Based on the F-test table, the significance level is 0.000 with a calculated F value of 32.550. Since the significance value is < 0.05 , H_1 is accepted and H_0 is rejected. Therefore, variables X1 and X2 simultaneously have a significant effect on variable Y.

Discussion

The Effect of Work Stress on Employee Performance

The t-test results show a significance value of $0.065 > 0.05$, indicating that work stress does not significantly affect employee performance at Alfamidi in Malang City. This means that even though employees face pressure and work demands, these conditions can still be managed so that they do not reduce performance. These results indicate that Alfamidi employees are still able to adapt and control the stress that arises at work. In addition, support from the team, adjustments to the work rhythm, and work experience can serve as factors that help employees to continue to work optimally even though they face work stress in their daily lives. These research results contrast with those of a study conducted by (Chaeruddin dkk., 2024) entitled "The Influence of Work Environment and Work Stress on Employee Performance at PT. PLN (Persero) ULP Soppeng". The results of that study showed that work stress has a negative and significant effect on employee performance.

The Effect of Workload on Employee Performance at Alfamidi

Based on the t-test results, the workload variable recorded a significance value of $0.000 < 0.05$, indicating that workload significantly influences the performance of Alfamidi employees in Malang City. This suggests that substantial job demands and numerous daily responsibilities such as product arrangement, customer service, and administrative tasks can impact employees' work quality and overall performance outcomes. The results of this study are supported by previous research conducted by Riawan (2025) entitled "The Effect of Workload and Work Stress on Employee Performance at Hotel Vertu & Yello Harmoni Central Jakarta" which revealed that workload has a positive and significant effect on employee performance.

The Simultaneous Effect of Work Stress and Workload on Employee Performance

The F test results show a significance value of 0.000, which is below the threshold of 0.05. This indicates that work stress and workload together have a significant effect on the performance of Alfamidi employees. Therefore, the regression model used in this study is considered valid and reliable.

Conclusion

Based on the results of the study, it can be concluded that workload has a significant effect on the performance of Alfamidi employees in Malang City, while work stress does not show a significant effect. This means that employee performance is more influenced by high task demands than the level of stress experienced, because the stress that occurs can still be managed well by employees. Simultaneously, both variables still contribute to performance, so that workload management is an important aspect that needs to be considered. The implications of these findings emphasize that a proportional division of tasks and proper management of work rhythms are necessary to maintain the effectiveness and quality of employee performance.

This study has limitations in the number of variables used, which only focus on work stress and workload, so it does not describe other factors that may also affect employee performance. Although the study was conducted at several Alfamidi outlets, the results still require broader

testing to obtain a more comprehensive picture in different contexts. Therefore, further research is recommended to add other variables such as work motivation, compensation, organizational support, or work environment, as well as to expand the scope of the research area so that the results obtained are more comprehensive and representative.

References

Busro, M. (2017). *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia*. Yogyakarta: Expert.

Chaeruddin, C., Abbas, S. A., & Kasmirandi, K. (2024). Pengaruh lingkungan kerja dan stres kerja terhadap kinerja karyawan pada PT. PLN (Persero) Ulp Soppeng. *Jurnal Minfo Polgan*, 13(1), 1228–1235. <Https://Doi.Org/10.33395/Jmp.V13i1.14005>

Handoko, H. (2017). *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia* (Edisi Revisi). Jakarta: Bumi Aksara.

Hasibuan, M. S. P. (2019). *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia* (Edisi Revisi). Jakarta: Bumi Aksara.

Hermawan, E. (2024). *Buku Monograf Beban Kerja*. Purbalingga: Uureka Media Aksara.

Kadir, A., Melania, M., Jayen, F., & Syaukillah, A. (2023). Pengaruh Beban Kerja Dan Stres Kerja Terhadap Kinerja Karyawan Pada PT. Panasea Banjarmasin. *Jurnal Aplikasi Pelayaran Dan Kepelabuhanan*, 13(2), 127–139. <Https://Doi.Org/10.30649/Japk.V13i2.96>

Koesomowidjojo, S. R. M. (2017). *Analisis Beban Kerja*. Jakarta: Raih Asa Sukses.

Kurniawan, I. S., & Rizki, F. A. (2022). Pengaruh Stres Kerja, Beban Kerja Dan Motivasi Kerja Terhadap Kinerja Karyawan PT Perkebunan Mitra Ogan. *Jurnal Sosial Dan Sains*, 2(1), 104–110. <Https://Doi.Org/10.59188/Jurnalsosains.V2i1.316>

Mangkunegara, A. A. A. P. (2017). *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia Perusahaan*. Bandung: Remaja Rosdakarya.

Mudrika, A. H., Simanjuntak2, D. C. Y., & Tarigan, A. S. (2021). Pengaruh Stres Kerja, Beban Kerja, Lingkungan Kerja Terhadap Kinerja Karyawan PT. Jasa Marga (Persero) Tbk Cabang Belmera. *Juima : Jurnal Ilmu Manajemen*, 11(1). <Https://Doi.Org/10.36733/Juima.V11i1.2061>

Raja, B. P. R. P., Salean, D. Y., Nursiani, N. P., & Fanggidae, R. E. (2023). Pengaruh Beban Kerja Dan Stres Kerja Terhadap Kinerja Karyawan Pada PT. Pos Indonesia Kantor Pos Kupang. *Glory Jurnal Ekonomi Dan Ilmu Sosial*, 4(4), 833–844. <Https://Doi.Org/10.35508/Glory.V4i4.113937>

Riawan, D. (2025). The Effect Of Workload And Work Stress On Employee Performance At Hotel Vertu & Yello Harmoni Central Jakarta. *Jurnal ASIK: Jurnal Administrasi, Bisnis, Ilmu Manajemen & Kependidikan*, 3(2), 78–43. <Https://Doi.Org/10.59639/Asik.V3i2.107>

Sahir, S. H. (2021). *Metodologi Penelitian*. KBM Indonesia. <Https://Repositori.Uma.Ac.Id/Jspui/Bitstream/123456789/16455/1/E-Book%20Metodologi%20Penelitian%20Syafrida.Pdf>

Septiani, I. N., Ismartaya, I., & Pramestidewi, C. A. (2025). Pengaruh Beban Kerja Dan Stres Kerja Terhadap Kinerja Karyawan Dengan Disiplin Kerja Sebagai Variabel Intervening Pada Kantor Kecamatan Cisarua. *J-CEKI : Jurnal Cendekia Ilmiah*, 4(3), 1634–1653. <Https://Doi.Org/10.56799/Jceki.V4i3.8085>

Sugiyono, S. (2019). *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif, Kualitatif, Dan R&D*. Bandung: Alfabeta.