INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF SOCIAL SCIENCE, EDUCATIONAL, ECONOMICS, AGRICULTURE RESEARCH, AND TECHNOLOGY

THE INFLUENCE OF WORK ABILITY AND WORK STRESS ON EMPLOYEE PERFORMANCE AT DR.GL.TOBING GENERAL HOSPITAL TANJUNG MORAWA

Sri Damayanti[1], Nur Aisyah[2], Sjahril Effendy[3]
[1,2,3] Master of Psychology Study Program, Universitas Medan Area
Correspondence Email: damayanti9062@yahoo.com

Abstract

This research aims to determine the influence of Work Ability and Job Stress on Employee Performance in. The population of this study was 106 samples. This research was taken using total sampling technique, where the entire population was a sample of 106 people. This research uses quantitative methods. The measuring instruments used are the Work Ability scale, Work Stress scale and Employee Performance scale. Data analysis used multiple linear regression tests. The results of this study indicate that (1) there is an effect of work ability and work stress on employee performance, where a significance value of 0.000 is 0.05, the hypothesis is rejected. This means that the Work Ability variable and the Work Stress variable have a significant influence on employee performance. Many employees' performance currently has problems in carrying out services or at work, so there is an influence on work ability on employee performance. From the results of the statistical analysis, it was found that the t coefficient was 2,750 with $p < 0.05$ and the correlation coefficient rx1y was 0.713 with $p < 0.05$, this means that the level of employee ability will be able to influence the level of performance that can be displayed. There is an influence of work stress on employee performance. From the results of statistical analysis it was found that the t coefficient was 1.994 with $p < 0.05$, and the rx2y correlation coefficient was 0.531 with $p < 0.05$, thus it can be concluded that the level of work stress experienced by employees will be able to increase or decrease employee performance. There is an influence of work ability and work stress on employee performance. From the results of statistical analysis it was found that the coefficient F reg = 57.727 with $p < 0.05$, and the correlation coefficient R = 0.727 with $p < 0.05$ and R2 = 0.529. Thus it can be concluded that work ability and work stress jointly affect employee performance, the contribution of both in improving performance is 52.9%. There are 47.1% other factors or variables that can influence employee performance. the contribution of both in improving performance was 52.9%. There are 47.1% other factors or variables that can affect employee performance. the contribution of both in improving performance was 52.9%. There are 47.1% other factors or variables that can influence employee performance.

Keywords: ***Work Ability, Work Stress, Employee Performance.***

1. INTRODUCTION

Human resources are services or work effort that can be provided in the production process (Sonny Sumarsono, 2003). Human resources have a very important role for the running of a company, related to humans who can work to provide services or business work and are able to carry out all activities that have economic activities (Sonny Sumarsono, 2003). The rapid development of the business world and increasingly fierce competition make every organization must face challenges that demand quality human resources. Performance is basically the result of quality work achieved by an employee in completing his duties according to the responsibilities given to him. In this case, employees can learn how much their performance is through means of information such as good comments from work partners, however, performance appraisal refers to a formal and structured system that measures, assesses and influences the characteristics related to work behavior and results including attendance level. Performance in the organization, is the answer to the success or failure of the organizational goals that have been set. Bosses or managers often don't notice unless it's really bad or things are going awry. Too often managers don't know

how bad performance has fallen so that the company/agency faces a serious crisis. Bad organizational impressions result in and ignore the warning signs of poor performance.

According to Mangkunegara (2000) states that the factors that affect performance include: a). Ability factor, psychologically the employee's ability consists of potential ability (IQ) and reality ability (Education). Therefore employees need to be placed in jobs that match their expertise. b). Motivational factors, motivation is formed from the attitude of an employee in dealing with work situations. Employee abilities are formed from excellent knowledge and skills, employees who have excellent abilities in carrying out their duties (Blanchard and Hersey 2013). In other words, an employee who has high ability to carry out work will produce quality work given to the employee. Work ability is a condition that exists in workers who are truly efficient and able to succeed in the specified work field. Furthermore, Hamali (2017) defines stress as individual reactions to new or threatening factors in one's work environment. The work environment often contains novel and stressful situations that are individual in nature, and can result in emotional, perceptual, behavioral, and physiological changes. According to Arif (2018), stress is a psychological and physical reaction to extended internal or environmental conditions.

The capacity of an individual to perform various tasks in a job. Ability is also a behavioral dimension of expertise or excellence in someone who has the skills and knowledge to solve a problem. In this case, employees of Dr. General Hospital. GL. Tobing Tanjung Morawa was able to show positive performance before and during the Covid-19 pandemic, so that the hospital did not experience a decrease in patients and continued to maintain good performance during the pandemic with only a few employees resigning and several new employees, employees who did not Making work ability the main thought will be very difficult to support employee performance, various kinds of services provided by hospitals during the pandemic. Dr. Hospital Gerhard Lumban Tobing or abbreviated as RSGL Tobing (and familiar as RSGL Tobing) is a health facility owned by PT Tobacco Deli Medica, a subsidiary of PTP Nusantara II which was founded in 1882 during the Dutch colonial era by the plantation company Senembah Maatschappij under the name Hospital De Tanjong Morawa. Based on Decree Number II.0/kpts/3/1969 which was signed by the President Director of PTPN II at that time, MD Nasution, the name of the Tanjung Morawa PNP II Hospital was designated as dr.Gerhard Lumbal Tobing Hospital PTP II Tanjung Morawa. The merger (restructuring) between PT Perkebunan II and PT Perkebunan IX became PT Perkebunan Nusantara II (Persero) or PTPN II in 1996, so that Dr. GL Tobing Hospital itself became a unit of PT Perkebunan Nusantara II (Persero). At the beginning of 2012, at the policy of PTPN II's Directors, the operational permit for Tobacco Deli Hospital, which was a unit of PTPN II Hospital, was discontinued and joined to dr. GL Tobing Hospital. So that there was a change in the organizational structure and the addition of types of health services at RSGL.

Various processes have been passed to make PTPN II hospitals independent business entities. On June 2 2017, PT Tembakau Deli Medica was formed as a subsidiary of PTP Nusantara II based on the Deed of Establishment of a Limited Liability Company No. 06 which has 3 business units in the hospital sector. (Dr. GL Tobing Hospital, Bangkatan Hospital, and Dr. GL Tobing Hospital) and FKTPs scattered throughout PTPN II plantations Employee work stress is an individual problem, each employee has their own problems and often affects employee performance and stress. Stress at work can be affected by lowering the performance of dr. GL. Tobing continues to try to provide motivation and support to his subordinates, because a superior can influence work abilities and work stress makes employees feel safe, certain efforts are in line with company policies, this motivation aims at company achievements so that employee performance can be well directed. The results of my observations in the field show that there is a decrease in employee performance at Dr. General Hospital. GL. Tobing was caused by a very significant decrease in the number of inpatients from before the Covid-19 pandemic to after the 2023 pandemic.

Table 1.1 Number of Patients per Year

No	Year				
	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
1	2843	1275	1180	174	32

The table above shows that the decline in patients has greatly reduced from 2019 to 2023. This decline has resulted in hospital revenues drastically reducing, resulting in delays in wages each month. From this impact, many employees complained, worried and felt worried and there were some who chose to resign from the company. And in the condition of patients who continue to decline and human resources are decreasing, a lot of work is done that is not in accordance with the abilities of employees and the workload is getting higher so that there are many complaints from employees that have an impact on work that is not completed, work is not optimal, delaying work and less excited at work.

Based on this, the aim of this research is to find out:

1. To determine the effect of work ability on employee performance at Dr. General Hospital. GL. Tobing
2. To determine the effect of work stress on employee performance at Dr. General Hospital. GL. Tobing
3. To determine the effect of work ability and work stress on employee performance at the General Hospital, dr. GL Tobing.

2. IMPLEMENTATION METHOD

This type of research uses a survey approach, the identification of research variables consists of the dependent variable namely Employee Performance (Y) while the independent variables are Work Ability (X1) and Work Stress (X2). operational definitions of research variables, research subjects, data collection methods, validity and reliability of measuring instruments, and data analysis methods. The population is the total number consisting of objects or subjects that have certain characteristics and qualities determined by the researcher to study and then draw conclusions (Sugiyono, 2017). In this study, a sample of 106 employees was taken based on the total sampling technique. The data collection method is obtained through a scale instrument. According to Azwar (2015) a psychological scale is a measuring tool that measures aspects or attributes of psychological samples through behavioral indicators which are translated into question items or statements. The data required in this research was obtained through three types of scale instruments, namely the Employee Performance, Work Ability and Work Stress scales.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Basic Assumption Test Results

Results of Research Data Analysis

This study uses multiple linear regression statistical techniques. Multiple linear regression is a regression in which the dependent variable is connected or explained by more than one independent variable but still shows a linear relationship. Multiple regression analysis is used to predict what the condition of the dependent variable will be if two or more independent variables as predictor factors are manipulated. Before the collected data were analyzed using multiple regression analysis techniques, assumption tests were first performed which included normality tests and linearity tests.

Basic Assumption Test Results

1. Normality Test

The distribution normality test was analyzed using the research data normality test using the Kolmogorov-Smirnov technique. From the results of the normality assumption test on the data distribution of the dependent variable employee performance, the independent variables parental social support and learning motivation, it is known that the data distribution is normally distributed. The following is the explanation;

Test the Normality Assumption of Employee Performance

From the results of the normality assumption test on the distribution of employee performance data, it is known that the data distribution is normally distributed. It is known from the Kolmogorov-Smirnov normality test coefficient of 0.081 with p = 0.084 or p > 0.05. Complete normality test results can be seen in the following el table:

Table of normality test results for the distribution of employee performance data

Tests of Normality

	Kolmogorov-Smirnova			Shapiro-Wilk		
	Statistics	df	Sig.	Statistics	df	Sig.
EMPLOYEE PERFORMANCE	,081	106	084	,973	106	.029

a. Lilliefors Significance Correction

Test of Assumption of Normality of Work Ability

From the results of the normality assumption test for the distribution of workability data, it is known that the data distribution is normally distributed. This is known from the Kolmogorov-Smirnov normality test coefficient of 0.079 with p = 0.096 or p > 0.05, the results of the normality test calculation can be seen in the following table:

Table of normality test results for work ability data distribution

Tests of Normality

	Kolmogorov-Smirnova			Shapiro-Wilk		
	Statistics	Df	Sig.	Statistics	df	Sig.
WORK ABILITY	079	106	,096	,971	106	.020

a. Lilliefors Significance Correction

Test of the Normality Assumption of Job Stress

From the results of the normality assumption test for the distribution of work stress data, it is known that the data distribution is normally distributed. This is known from the Kolmogorov-Smirnov normality test coefficient of 0.083 with p = 0.070 or p > 0.05, the results of the normality test calculation can be seen in the following table:

Table 4.3. The results of the normality test for the distribution of work stress data

Tests of Normality

	Kolmogorov-Smirnova			Shapiro-Wilk		
	Statistics	Df	Sig.	Statistics	df	Sig.
WORK STRESS	083	106	.070	,968	106	012

a. Lilliefors Significance Correction

Furthermore, a summary of the results of the normality test of the three variables in this study can be seen in the following table.

Table of Summary of Normality Test Results

Variable	Kolmogorov-Smirnov	P (Significance)	Information
Employee performance	0.081	0.084	Normal
Work ability	0.079	0.096	Normal
Work Stress	0.083	0.070	Normal

2. Linearity Test

The linearity test is intended to determine the degree of linearity of the independent variable and the dependent variable. That is, does work ability and work stress affect the performance of employees at dr. gl. Tobing Tanjung Morawa. From the results of the linearity test between the work ability variable and employee performance, it is known that there is a linear correlation between the work ability variable and employee performance. This is shown by the linearity coefficient F = 128.037 with p < 0.05, the complete calculation results can be seen in the following table:

Table of results of the linearity test of the work ability variable with employee performance

ANOVA Table

			Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
EMPLOYEE PERFORMANCE * WORK ABILITY	Between Groups	(Combined)	863,932	16	53,996	10.119	.000
		Linearity	683,211	1	683,211	128037	.000
		Deviation from Linearity	180,720	15	12,048	2,258	010
	Within Groups		474,908	89	5,336		
	Total		1338,840	105			

From the results of the linearity test between the work stress variable and employee performance, it is known that there is a linear correlation between the work stress variable and employee performance. This is shown by the linearity coefficient F = 103.170 with p < 0.05, the complete calculation results can be seen in the following table:

Table of linearity test results for work stress and employee performance variables

ANOVA Table

			Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
EMPLOYEE PERFORMANCE * JOB STRESS	Between Groups	(Combined)	787,655	19	41,456	6,468	.000
		Linearity	661,230	1	661,230	103,170	.000
		Deviation from Linearity	126,425	18	7,024	1,096	,370
	Within Groups		551,185	86	6,409		
	Total		1338,840	105			

Summary Table of Linearity Test Results

CORRELATIONAL	F	P	INFORMATION
X1 – Y	128037	0.000	**LINEAR**
X2 – Y	103,170	0.000	**LINEAR**

Information :

X1 = Work Ability
X2 = Work Stress
Y = Employee Performance
F = Linearity Coefficient
p = Significance of Linearity

Hypothesis Test Results

In detail, the hypothesis test can be seen in the following explanation:

First Hypothesis: Influence of Work Ability on Employee Performance

From the results of statistical analysis it was found that there is an influence of work ability on employee performance. This is indicated by the t coefficient of 2,750 with p < 0.05, and the rx1y correlation coefficient of 0.714 with p < 0.05. It can be concluded that work ability affects employee performance, and the higher the work ability, the higher the employee performance.

Second Hypothesis: The Effect of Job Stress on Employee Performance

From the results of statistical analysis it was found that there is an influence of work stress on employee performance. This is indicated by the t coefficient of 1.994 with p <0.05, with a correlation coefficient rx2y of 0.703 with p <0.05. It can be concluded that work stress affects performance, the higher the work stress felt by employees, the higher their performance will actually be. The results of the complete calculation of the data analysis can be seen in Tables 7 and 8.

Table of results of the calculation of the data analysis of the magnitude of the influence of the independent variables

Coefficientsa

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients			Correlations		
		B	Std. Error	Betas	Q	Sig.	Zero-order	partial	Part
1	(Constant)	6,539	2,751		2,377	.019			
	WORK STRESS	.305	.153	.313	1994	,049	,703	.193	.135
	WORK ABILITY	,444	.162	.432	2,750	007	.714	.262	,186

a. Dependent Variable: EMPLOYEE PERFORMANCE

Table of results of correlation calculations between research variables

Correlations

		EMPLOYEE PERFORMANCE	WORK STRESS	WORK ABILITY
Pearson Correlation	EMPLOYEE PERFORMANCE	1,000	,703	.714
	WORK STRESS	,703	1,000	,902
	WORK ABILITY	.714	,902	1,000

Sig. (1-tailed)	EMPLOYEE PERFORMANCE	.	.000	.000
	WORK STRESS	.000	.	.000
	WORK ABILITY	.000	.000	.
N	EMPLOYEE PERFORMANCE	106	106	106
	WORK STRESS	106	106	106
	WORK ABILITY	106	106	106

Third Hypothesis: Influence of Work Ability and Job Stress on Performance

From the results of statistical analysis, it was found that there is an influence of work ability and work stress on performance. This is indicated by the coefficient F reg = 57.727 with p < 0.05, and the correlation coefficient R = 0.727 with p < 0.05 and R2 = 0.529. Thus it can be concluded that work ability and work stress jointly affect employee performance, and their contribution to performance is 52.9%.

Summary models

Summary models

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics				
					R Square Change	FChange	df1	df2	Sig. F Change
1	.727a	,529	,519	2.47562	,529	57,727	2	103	.000

a. Predictors: (Constant), ABILITIES, JOB STRESS

ANOVAa

Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	707,586	2	353,793	57,727	.000b
	Residual	631,254	103	6,129		
	Total	1338,840	105			

a. Dependent Variable: EMPLOYEE PERFORMANCE

b. Predictors: (Constant), WORK ABILITY, JOB STRESS

Analysis of Hypothetical Mean and Empirical Mean.

The following table presents the calculation of the hypothetical mean and the empirical mean of each variable involved in this study.

Calculation table for hypothetical and empirical means of research variables

Variable	ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	**Average value Empirical Hypothesis**	Information
WORK ABILITY	3.47	33 39.24	Tall
WORK STRESS	3.66	33 38.73	Tall
PERFORMANCE	3.57	30 35.80	Good

Discussion

Hypothesis 1: There is an Effect of Work Ability on Employee Performance

Based on the results of the study, the hypothesis that there is an effect of work ability on employee performance is accepted. This is shown by the t coefficient of 2,750 with p < 0.05, and the rx1y correlation coefficient of 0.713 with p < 0.05, thus it can be concluded that there is a significant influence of work ability on employee performance. From these results it can be concluded that the greater the work ability of employees will further improve their performance.

Hypothesis 2: There is an Effect of Job Stress on Employee Performance

The results of this study found that there was an effect of work stress on employee performance, as indicated by the t coefficient of 1.994 with p <0.05, and the correlation coefficient rx2y of 0.703 with p <0.05. This finding illustrates that work stress affects employee performance. From the results of this data analysis it can be concluded that the higher the work stresswill further improve its performance

Hypothesis 3: There is an effect of work ability and work stress on performance

The results of this study found that there is an influence of work ability and work stress on employee performance, as indicated by the Freg coefficient of 57,727 with p < 0.05; in other words, work ability and stress affect employee performance together. Apart from that, it is also known that the correlation between work ability and work stress on performance is R = 0.727 with p < 0.05 and R2 = 0.529, this means that work ability and work stress contribute to employee performance by 52.9%. There are other factors of 47.1% that can affect employee performance besides work ability and work stress.

Research Limitations

This research has been carried out using standard scientific procedures. then receive guidance from experts who are considered competent. However, in its implementation, researchers realized that this research was not free from limitations. The following are some research limitations that the researcher will describe:

1. The variables studied in this research as independent variables are only two variables, of course there are many other variables that can be studied that are related to employee performance so that by examining several variables that have not been studied in this research, practitioners in the field of industrial and organizational psychology can further strengthen their understanding. or HR development.
2. This research was only conducted in one agency, of course it cannot guarantee employee performance on a regional scale, because each agency certainly has a different culture or work climate and instant infrastructure. Therefore, it is necessary to carry out more in-depth research with a wider range.
3. The researcher's experience, which is still relatively minimal, certainly does not escape various mistakes both in terms of data collection, data analysis, discussion and drawing conclusions for this research.

4. CONCLUSION

Based on the research findings, analysis and hypothesis testing, several conclusions can be drawn as follows:

1. There is influence work ability with employee performance. From the results of the statistical analysis, it was found that the t coefficient was 2,750 with p < 0.05 and the correlation coefficient rx1y was 0.713 with p < 0.05, this means that the level of employee ability will be able to influence the level of performance that can be displayed.
2. There is an influence of work stress on employee performance. From the results of statistical analysis it was found that the t coefficient was 1,994 with p < 0.05, and the correlation coefficient rx2y was 0.531 with p < 0.05, thus it can be concluded that the high or low work stress that employees have will be able to increase or decrease employee performance.
3. There is an influence of work ability and work stress on employee performance. From the results of statistical analysis it was found that the coefficient F reg = 57.727 with p < 0.05, and the correlation coefficient R = 0.727 with p < 0.05 and R2 = 0.529. Thus it can be concluded that work ability and work stress jointly affect employee performance, the contribution of both in improving performance is 52.9%. There are 47.1% other factors or variables that can influence employee performance.

REFERENCES

Aamodt, M. G., (2013). Industrial Organizational Psychology: An Applied
Approach. Belmont, CA: Thomson Learning, Inc.

Anoraga. 2014. Work Psychology. Jakarta: Rineka Cipta

Arikunto, S. 2013. Research Procedures, a Practical Approach, Revised Edition VI. Jakarta: Rineka Cipta.

As'ad, M. 2013. Industrial Psychology. 4th edition. Yogyakarta: Liberty.

Azwar, Saifuddin. 2012. Research Methods. Yogyakarta: Learning Library

Wake, W. (2012). Human Resource Management. Jakarta: Erlangga

Gibson, James, L; John. M. Ivancevich and JH Donelly. 2013. Organization and Management, Behavior, Structure, Process. Translation. Djoerban Wahid. Jakarta: Erlangga.

Hasibuan, Malayu SP. 2014. Human Resources Management. Print Fourteenth. Jakarta: Bumi Literacy

Nur Aisyah. 2019. Lecturer Performance. First Printing. Banten : CV.AA.Rizky

Hughes, RL, RC Ginnett., GJ Curphy. 2012. Leadership: Enriching Lessons from Experience. Seventh Edition. Jakarta: Salemba Humanika.

Kaswan. 2017. Industrial & Organizational Psychology. Bandung: Alphabeta

Kreitner, R. and Kinicki, A. 2014. Organizational Behavior – Organizational Behavior. Edition 9, Book 1. Jakarta : Salemba Empat.

Luthans, F. 2011. Organizational Behavior: An Evidence-Based Approach (12th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill/Irwin.

Daryanto, Bambang Suryanto. 2022. Employee Performance Appraisal Management. Revised Edition. Yogyakarta: Gava Media

Manulang, M. 2014. Basics of Management. Jakarta: Ghalia Indonesia.

Marliani, Rosleny. (2015). Industrial and Organizational Psychology. Bandung: CV. Faithful Library.

Mathis, R.L. and Jackson. 2011. Human Resource Management. Jakarta: Salemba Empat.

Nawawi, Hadari. 2011. Human Resource Management: For Competitive Business. Yogyakarta: Gadjah Mada University Press.

Nawawi, Hadari. 2012. Leadership Makes Organizations Effective. Yogyakarta: Gadjah Mada University Press.