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ABSTRACT

The final measure of success of an HR Department is work performance. The purpose of this study was to determine how much influence work stress has on work performance of employee at PT Surya Menara Pratama, South Jakarta, to find out how much influence discipline has on employee performance at PT Surya Menara Pratama, South Jakarta, and to determine the Effect of Work Stress and Discipline Towards Employee Job Performance at PT Surya Menara Pratama, South Jakarta. The research method used is a quantitative method with descriptive explanation. The population in this study were employees of PT Surya Menara Pratama South Jakarta with a sample of 60 and the sampling technique used was the Simple Random Sampling technique. Furthermore, the analysis method used in this study is multiple linear regression analysis consisting of descriptive analysis of the questionnaire, validity test, reliability test, classic assumption test, coefficient of determination test correlation coefficient test, simple regression test, multiple linear regression test, t test (test partial), f test (simultaneous test). The results of simple linear regression analysis show that work stress has a significant effect on work performance with a tcount of 3.902, a significance value of 0.000, a regression coefficient of 0.436 and a regression equation Y = 24.167 + 0.436X1. The results of simple linear regression analysis show that work discipline has a significant effect on work performance with a tcount of 3.500, a significance value of 0.001, a regression coefficient of 0.400 and a regression equation Y = 25.804 + 0.400X2. The results of multiple linear regression analysis show that work stress and work discipline simultaneously have a significant effect on work performance with a Fcount of 10.923, a significance value of 0.000, a coefficient of determination of 0.252 and a regression equation Y = 17.293 + 0.332X1 + 0.273X2.

Keywords: Work Stress; discipline; job performance

INTRODUCTION

The final measure of success of an HR Department is work performance (Den Hartog & Verburg, 2004; Gelade & Ivery, 2003; Koopmans, 2014; Rambli Bin Haji Hasbi, 2001). Because both the department itself and employees need feedback on their efforts and
contributions according to the evaluation criteria determined by the company or institution. Therefore work performance appraisal is a process whereby organizations evaluate or assess work performance. The company requires employees who have high performance (Bangun, 2012; Douglas, 2010; Notoatmojo, 2010; Yani, 2011). Therefore the company must be able to encourage the increase of its employees' potential and at the same time minimize risks that can reduce employee performance, including work stress.

In every life in this world, humans are not free from all problems. Problems that arise if not resolved properly, will cause frustration and stress. In the world of work, we often miss employees who experience frustration and stress (Dhania, 2010; Irvianti & Verina, 2015; Prihatini, 2008; Tunjungsar, 2011). Job stress in problems experienced by employees tends to arise more easily than overcoming it, because of that work stress will not arise if there is no trigger, work stress can be seen from the sounds that emerge from employees such as the emergence of complaints about work problems (Afriza, Musadieq, & Ruhana, 2014; Dewi & Netra, 2015; Lindawati, 2014; Setiyana, 2013)

Stress is the cause of employee emotions is unstable, and therefore causes employees to not work optimally (Habibi & Jefri, 2018; Han & Ketut Netra, 2014; Othman, 2015; Waspodo, Handayani, & Paramita, 2013). The current condition will increase when it will occur in the company that will come. Job stress is one of the most important of work performance or achievement (Ali, 2011; Mulsita Fitri, 2013; Wartono, 2017; Wibowo, Riana, & Putra, 2015). Therefore, every company needs to create a conducive work environment so that it can reduce the number of employee work stress (Sunarsi, 2018).

Employee discipline will affect the efficiency and effectiveness of work in achieving company goals. Employee performance at PT. Surya Menara Pratama, South Jakarta, has not maximally met the criteria set by the company, only reaching 77%. The lack of alertness of employees in serving customers also has an impact on decreasing employee performance. The observations also show that there are employees who get heavy workloads while the reciprocity received is not as expected. Besides the high pressure from the leadership often makes employees feel mentally depressed, which then makes employees feel stressed with their work. The stress caused the lack of employee discipline, empirical data shows the high level of employees who are absent, sick, permitted and late. This, of course, can disrupt the operational activities in PT. Surya Menara Pratama where there are some employees who want to leave the company, causing the company's performance to be not optimal in achieving its goals.

Starting from the phenomena that arise in PT. PT. Surya Menara Pratama must strive to overcome these problems, especially in terms of reducing stress due to high work causes and finding solutions for the creation of high work discipline, so that employee work performance remains good and the company's existence is maintained.

**METHOD**

The method used is quantitative associatively, according to (Sugiyono, 2017), the associative method is a research method designed to determine the effect or relationship between two other variables. In this study, the population used was employees at PT. Surya Menara Pratama with a total of 150 people. And to determine the number of samples, the researchers used the Slovin formula. From the calculation of the Slovin formula with an error rate of 5%, the sample obtained was 60 respondents. The data used in this study are primary data and secondary data. According (Sugiyono, 2016), primary data or raw data is data that is processed when the data
collection is done directly to the field. While secondary data is data whose collection process is carried out by gathering documents in the relevant agency or institution, written sources or the internet. The techniques used in research are observation, interview, and distribution of the questionnaire with a Likert scale. Data analysis methods used are validity test, reliability test, classic assumption test (normality test, homogeneity, autocorrelation, multicollinearity, and heteroscedasticity), multiple linear regression, coefficient of determination and hypothesis testing.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study was to determine the effect of work stress on employee work performance, the effect of work discipline on employee work performance, and the effect of work stress and discipline on employee work performance

Validity and Reliability Test

Table 1.
Validity Test Results X₁, X₂ dan Y

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>R calculated X₁ (Work Stress)</th>
<th>R calculated X₂ (Discipline)</th>
<th>R calculated Y (Work Performance)</th>
<th>R table</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>item 1</td>
<td>0.595</td>
<td>0.429</td>
<td>0.442</td>
<td>0.254</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>item 2</td>
<td>0.658</td>
<td>0.421</td>
<td>0.407</td>
<td>0.254</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>item 3</td>
<td>0.563</td>
<td>0.359</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.254</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>item 4</td>
<td>0.432</td>
<td>0.511</td>
<td>0.582</td>
<td>0.254</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>item 5</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.641</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.254</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>item 6</td>
<td>0.505</td>
<td>0.643</td>
<td>0.588</td>
<td>0.254</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>item 7</td>
<td>0.575</td>
<td>0.548</td>
<td>0.773</td>
<td>0.254</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>item 8</td>
<td>0.533</td>
<td>0.513</td>
<td>0.668</td>
<td>0.254</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>item 9</td>
<td>0.381</td>
<td>0.777</td>
<td>0.492</td>
<td>0.254</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>item 10</td>
<td>0.668</td>
<td>0.716</td>
<td>0.692</td>
<td>0.254</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sumber: Data Primer diolah

Table 1 shows that each statement in the work stress questionnaire (X₁), discipline (X₂) and employee performance was stated as valid because it was greater than r table. Because the validity assumptions are fulfilled, the data in this study can be analyzed at a later stage.

Table 2
Reliability Test Results
Based on the table 2, it is known that all variables (work discipline, work stress, and work performance) have a Cronbach alpha value greater than (> ) than 0.60 so it can be concluded that the variable questionnaire in this study is reliable and can be continued in subsequent analyzes (Regression analysis).

**Classic Assumption Test**

Table 3.
Data Normality Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Variabel</th>
<th>Coefficient Alpha</th>
<th>Standard Cronbach Alpha</th>
<th>Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Work Stress (X1)</td>
<td>0.742</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>Reliable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Discipline (X2)</td>
<td>0.752</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>Reliable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Performance (Y)</td>
<td>0.769</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>Reliable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the table above, it is known that all variables (work discipline, work stress, and work performance) have a Cronbach alpha value greater than (> ) than 0.60 so it can be concluded that the variable questionnaire in this study is reliable and can be continued in subsequent analyzes (Regression analysis).

**Auto Correlation Test**

Based on the table above, it is known that the Asymp value. Sig. (2-tailed) work discipline variable of 0.114, Asymp value. Sig. (2-tailed) work stress is 0.648 and Asymp value. Sig. (2-tailed) work performance of 0.370. The three variables in the normality test using the Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test method have an Asymp Sig value greater than the minimum criterion of 0.05 (Ghozali, 2015), so it can be concluded that all variables in this study meet the normality criteria.

Source: Data processed with IBM SPSS version 22
Based on the table above it is known that the DW value of 2.011 is greater than the DU table of 1.651 and smaller than 4 - DU (4-1.651 = 2.349), it can be concluded that there is no correlation between independent variables.

Table 5. Multicollinearity Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Collinearity Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tolerance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Stress Kerja</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disiplin Kerja</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Processed Data SPSS Version 22

Multicollinearity test is done to prove that between independent variables do not have multicollinearity or do not have a correlation relationship between independent variables. Based on data testing results using tolerance values and VIF shows that the tolerance value is smaller than 1.00 and the VIF value is smaller than 10. This can be interpreted that there is no Multicollinearity in this study.

Figure 1. Heteroscedasticity Test
Based on Figure 1, it is known if the data is spread evenly on both positive and negative spaces. Then it can be concluded if the data in this study have met the assumption of heteroscedasticity.

**Coefficient of Determination**

Table 6.

Coefficient of Determination

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
<th>Durbin-Watson</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.526</td>
<td>0.277</td>
<td>0.252</td>
<td>3.253</td>
<td>2.002</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), Work Stress, Discipline

b. Dependent Variable: Work Performance

Source: Processed Data SPSS Version 22

Based on the table above, the value of the contribution of the variable work stress and work discipline to work performance is 0.252. This means that job stress and work discipline have the
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ability to explain work performance variables by 25.2% while the remaining 74.8% is explained by other variables outside this study.

**Regression Analysis**

Multiple regression analysis is used to find out how much influence the independent variable (Independent), namely: work stress (X1), and work discipline (X2) on the dependent variable (Dependent) of employee performance (Y).

Tabel 7.
Regression of Work Stress (X1) and Discipline (X2) on Performance (Y)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17.293</td>
<td>5.359</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Stres Kerja</td>
<td>.332</td>
<td>.117</td>
<td>.347</td>
<td>2.846</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disiplin Kerja</td>
<td>.273</td>
<td>.117</td>
<td>.265</td>
<td>2.335</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Processed Data SPSS Version 22

Based on the results of these calculations it can be obtained as follows:

\[ Y = 17.293 + 0.332X1 + 0.273X2 \]

A constant value of 17.293 means that if the variables of work stress (X1) and discipline (X2) are in a constant state, then the performance of employees (Y) is equal to 17.293. A regression value of 0.332 X1 means that if the motivation variable (X1) increases by 1 unit and the discipline variable (X2) remains, then the employee's performance (Y) will increase by 0.332 units. A regression value of 0.273 X2 means that if the discipline variable (X2) increases by 1 unit, and the motivation variable (X1) remains, then the employee's performance (Y) will increase by 0.273 units.

**Correlation Coefficient**

The results of testing the correlation coefficient of this study can be seen in the following SPSS 22 output:

Tabel 8.
Correlation Coeffisien
Based on table 8, it can be stated that the correlation value between work stress and work performance is 0.456 in the "medium" category. While the correlation value of the work discipline variable with the work performance of 0.418 falls into the "medium" category. In other words, there is a moderate/strong relationship between work stress variables and work discipline with work performance.

**Hypothesis Test Results**

Hypothesis testing is done in two stages, namely partial testing, and simultaneous testing. Based on the results of data processing, it can be put forward a simple linear regression equation as follows: from the results of data processing known regression equations, t arithmetic, and significance as follows:

Regression Equation \( Y = 24.167 + 0.436X_1 \)

\[ T \text{ count} = 3.902 \]

Significant Value \( = 0.000 \)

Based on the above findings, it can be stated that testing this hypothesis is that work stress has a tcount greater than t table \( (3.902 > 2.002) \), so it can be concluded that \( H_0 \) is rejected and \( H_a \) is accepted. Thus, work stress is proven to have a significant effect on work performance.

The results of data processing above are known to the regression equation, t-count and significance as follows:

Regression Equation \( Y = 25.804 + 0.400X_2 \)

\[ T \text{ count} = 3.500 \]

Significant Value \( = 0.001 \)

Based on the above findings, it can be stated that testing this hypothesis is that work discipline has a tcount greater than t table \( (3.500 > 2.002) \), so it can be concluded that \( H_0 \) is rejected and \( H_a \) is accepted. Thus, m that work discipline is proven to have a significant effect on work performance.
This test is performed using the F distribution by comparing the calculated F value and the F table value. If the calculated F value > Ftable, then H0 which states that the variation in the change in the value of the independent variable (work stress and discipline) cannot explain the change in the value of the dependent variable (employee work persuasion) is rejected and vice versa.

Table 9.
F test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>231.135</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>115.568</td>
<td>10.923</td>
<td>.000a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>603.049</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>10.580</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>834.183</td>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), Disiplin Kerja, Stres Kerja
b. Dependent Variable: Prestasi Kerja

Source: Processed Data SPSS Version 22

Based on table 9, the calculated F_count is 10.293 with a significance level of 0.000 <0.05. While the F_table value is 3.10 (from the calculation dk1 = 2 = 0.05 and dk = 60-2-1 = 57 obtained F table 3.16). This means that the value of F_count 10.293 > F_table 3.10 with a significance of 0.000 <0.05 thus H0 is rejected and Ha is accepted, which means work stress (X1) and work coordination (X2) of simultaneous or joint cooperation and significant on performance employees at PT. Surya Menara Pratama South Jakarta.

CONCLUSION

The results showed the contribution of work stress and work discipline to work performance by 25.2% and the remaining 74.8% explained by other variables outside this study. It is hoped that further researchers will use other variables such as compensation, leadership, competence, etc. so that the results become more comprehensive.
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