ARTICLE

THE EFFECT OF WORKLOAD AND COPING ON EMPLOYEE STRESS LEVELS THROUGH SOCIAL ENVIRONMENTAL SUPPORT IN THE PADANG BOLAK DISTRICT OFFICE

Khamisah Handari[*], Khairrudin Tampubolon, Ratna Sari Dewi
Universitas Pembinaan Masyarakat Indonesia
Email: kamisahrp@gmail.com[*]

Abstract

This study aims to analyze the influence of workload and coping on employee stress levels, both directly and indirectly through social environmental support at the Padang Bolak District Head's Office. The approach used is quantitative with descriptive and verification methods. The study population consisted of 29 employees with a saturated sampling technique. Data were collected through questionnaires and analyzed using multiple linear regression with the help of SPSS version 25. The results showed that workload and coping significantly influenced employee stress levels. Although workload did not significantly influence social environmental support, coping had a positive influence on that support. Social environmental support plays a role in reducing stress levels and is a partial mediating variable between coping and stress. Simultaneously, the three variables explained 44.9% of the variation in employee stress.

Keywords: Workload, Social Environmental Support, Coping, Employee Stress Levels

A. INTRODUCTION

In the modern era, filled with complex work demands and dynamics, work stress has become a common phenomenon in various organizations, including government agencies. Effective coping can help employees manage stress effectively, while ineffective coping can actually exacerbate stress. However, the success of a coping strategy depends not only on individual abilities but also on the support of the surrounding social environment. Social support, whether from coworkers, superiors, or the organization, can act as a mediator, strengthening or weakening the influence of workload and coping on stress levels. The Padang Bolak District Office, as a government agency, is not immune to this challenge. Emotionally oriented coping mechanisms can have negative impacst and exacerbate ineffective problem-solving processes. This study also examines how social support plays a mediating role. By understanding these dynamics, it is hoped that the research findings can provide strategic recommendations for agency management to create a healthier and more productive work environment.

This study aims to analyze the influence of workload and coping on employee stress levels, considering the role of social support as a mediator. By understanding these dynamics, it is hoped that it can provide appropriate recommendations for the management of the Padang Bolak District Office in creating a healthy and supportive work environment, so that it can reduce employee stress levels and improve overall organizational performance.

B. LITERATURE REVIEW

Workload

According to Sunarso (2010:21), workload is a collection of activities that must be completed by an organizational unit or position holder within a specific timeframe. Employees, as the backbone of a company, should be entitled to the opportunity to complete their work according to their physical and mental capabilities.

Several opinions conclude that workload is a set of activities/tasks assigned to employees, exceeding their workload capacity, and must be completed within a predetermined timeframe. Workload Indicators:

According to Koesomowidjojo (2017:33), workload indicators include:

1. Working Conditions
2. Use of Working Time
3. Targets to be Achieved

Coping

Coping is a persistent cognitive and behavioral change in an effort to overcome specific internal and/or external demands that exhaust or exceed an individual's resources (Lazarus, 1985 in Nasir and Muhith, 2011). According to Lazarus and Folkman (1984 in Intani and Surjaningrum, 2010), coping strategies are cognitive and attitudinal efforts to overcome, reduce, and tolerate internal or external demands. The process is triggered by the interaction between an individual and an event perceived as stressful. The definition of coping strategies can also refer to strategies used to coordinate an individual's resources and the environmental demands that impose them (Dodds, 1993 in Utami and Pratitis, 2013). Coping Indicators

There are several indicators of coping, namely:

Positive (Adaptive) Coping Indicators

a. Ability to control emotions
b. Effective problem-solving
c. Using social support.
d. Maintaining physical health
e. Positive thinking

Negative Coping Indicators (Maladaptive)

a. Avoiding problems
b. Seeking unhealthy escapes
c. Withdrawing from social environments
d. Thinking negatively and
e. Poor changes in sleep and eating patterns

Social Environmental Support

Social support is the assistance, advice, and emotional support provided by an individual or group, in the form of affection, attention, and caring. According to Taylor (in King, 2014), social support is information and feedback from others indicating that a person is loved and cared for, valued, and respected, and is involved in a network of reciprocal communication and obligations.

Social Support Indicators

According to House (1981), social environmental support can be divided into several main indicators, namely:

1. Emotional Support
2. Instrumental Support
3. Informational Support

ARTICLE

Employee Stress Levels

Employee stress levels refer to the extent to which an employee experiences physical, emotional, or mental pressure in the work environment.

Work stress can occur when individuals are required to create a competitive advantage through increased knowledge, experience, skills, commitment, and relationships with coworkers and external parties (Stranks, 2005). Employee Stress Level Indicators:

According to Robbins & Judge (2017), work stress can be measured using the following indicators:

1. Physical Indicators
2. Psychological Indicators
3. Behavioral Indicators

C. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The quantitative approach was chosen because this research focuses on testing previously formulated hypotheses, as well as the use of numerical data to measure the relationship between variables statistically (Sugiyono, 2020). This type of causal associative research aims to test whether there is a causal relationship between two or more variables.

D. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

This chapter describes the results of data analysis obtained through the distribution of closed-ended questionnaires to employees at the Padang Bolak District Head's Office. The main focus of this study is to analyze the effect of Workload (X1) and Coping (X2) on Employee Stress Levels (Y), with Social Environmental Support (Z) as an intermediary variable. The data is presented in a structured manner, starting with respondent profiles, descriptions of each variable, instrument validity and reliability tests, classical assumption tests, and hypothesis testing. The analysis process was conducted using SPSS version 25 software to ensure accurate and scientific results.

Respondent Identity

Based on the gender distribution of respondents, the majority of respondents in this study were male, 22 (76%), while the remaining 7 were female, 24% of the total 29 employees at the Padang Bolak District Head's Office.

Age

Based on the age characteristics of respondents, it is clear that the majority of employees are aged 11 (38%) over 45 years. Eight (28%) are aged 25–35 years. Five (17%) are aged <25 and 36–45 years, respectively. These findings indicate that employees at the Padang Bolak Tuan District Head's Office are predominantly of mature age or approaching retirement.

Length of Service

Based on the distribution of employee length of service at the Padang Bolak Tuan District Head's Office, the majority of employees have worked for more than 10 years, representing 13 respondents, or 45% of the total respondents. This indicates that nearly half of the employees have worked for a considerable length of time, reflecting their level of experience and familiarity with the existing work systems and organizational culture.

Furthermore, nine employees, or 31%, have worked between 6 and 10 years. Meanwhile, 7 employees, or 24%, have a tenure of 1–5 years. This has the potential to create a stable work environment that is both open to change and innovation.

Employee Status

Based on employee status distribution data, 22 employees (76%) are Civil Servants (PNS). This indicates that the majority of employees hold permanent employment status,

ARTICLE

which generally offers a clearer career path, job stability, and various rights and obligations regulated by the government. Meanwhile, 7 employees (24%) are honorary employees.

Highest Education

Based on the latest education distribution data, it is known that the majority of employees at the Padang Bolak District Head's Office have a high school education, namely 14 employees, or 48% of the total 29 respondents. This indicates that nearly half of the employees completed their formal education at the upper secondary level. Furthermore, as many as 13 people (45%) are bachelor's degree graduates, which reflects that quite a lot of employees have pursued higher education and have good academic potential in supporting bureaucratic performance. Meanwhile, only 1 person (4%) has a master's degree, and 1 person (3%) is a junior high school graduate. Overall, this data shows that employees at the Padang Bolak District Office are dominated by high school and bachelor's degree graduates. This level of education is one indicator in seeing employee readiness in carrying out administrative tasks and public services, and is important to pay attention to in efforts to improve human resource competency in the future.

Validity Test

In this test, the researcher used a correlation analysis technique comparing r-table and r-calculation, with the data being declared valid if r-calculation > r-table (Sugiyono, 2020). The formula for finding the r-table value is as follows:

$$d(f) = n - 2$$
$$d(f) = 29 - 2$$
$$d(f) = 27$$

Description:

d(f) = degree of preference (r-table) n = number of respondents

From the calculation above, based on the distribution of the r-table values, if d(f) is 27, then the obtained r-table value is 0.367. Based on the distribution table of the r-table (Simple Correlation Coefficient), this value is 0.367. This indicates that the data is considered valid if the calculated r-table is > 0.367. For more details, see the Item-Total Statistics table in the Corrected Item-Total Correlation column. The results of SPSS processing by entering respondent answer data for variables X1, X2, and Y are presented in the following table:

Table 1. Validity Test of Workload Variable (X1)

	Item-Total Statistics			
	Scale Mean if Item Deleted	Scale Variance if Item Deleted	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted
X1.1	39.3448	142.520	.460	.947
X1.2	39.4828	140.544	.584	.944
X1.3	39.4483	145.899	.478	.941
X1.4	39.2069	141.384	.736	.936
X1.5	39.2069	131.241	.886	.947
X1.6	38.6897	139.222	.755	.935
X1.7	38.6207	128.172	.826	.932
X1.8	38.3103	131.079	.860	.931
X1.9	38.5862	131.894	.832	.932
X1.10	38.3793	133.030	.898	.931
X1.11	38.3793	133.887	.765	.934
X1.12	38.5517	129.756	.881	.931

ARTICLE

	Scale Mean if Item Deleted	Scale Variance if Item Deleted	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted
X1.13	38.5517	130.685	.846	.932
X1.14	38.5172	131.830	.858	.931
X1.15	38.4483	130.613	.885	.931

Source: Primary Data Processing Output, 2025

Table 2. Validity Test of Coping Variable (X2)

Item-Total Statistics

	Scale Mean if Item Deleted	Scale Variance if Item Deleted	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted
X2.1	57.5862	40.894	.669	.956
X2.2	57.3448	40.734	.793	.953
X2.3	57.4483	40.113	.817	.952
X2.4	57.5517	39.470	.801	.953
X2.5	57.4828	40.901	.832	.952
X2.6	57.2759	42.921	.838	.953
X2.7	57.3448	41.877	.718	.954
X2.8	57.4138	41.680	.827	.952
X2.9	57.4138	41.966	.620	.957
X2.10	57.3103	42.865	.739	.954
X2.11	57.3448	41.805	.729	.954
X2.12	57.3448	42.520	.852	.953
X2.13	57.3448	41.448	.779	.953
X2.14	57.3103	42.007	.761	.954
X2.15	57.2414	42.904	.793	.954

Source: Primary Data Processing Output, 2025

Table 3. Validity Test of Work Environment Support Variable (Z)

Item-Total Statistics

	Scale Mean if Item Deleted	Scale Variance if Item Deleted	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted
Z.1	56.0345	28.463	.637	.835
Z.2	56.1379	29.980	.564	.841
Z.3	56.0690	29.924	.437	.846
Z.4	55.8276	30.433	.532	.843
Z.5	56.0690	29.709	.532	.841
Z.6	56.2414	27.833	.583	.837
Z.7	56.1379	28.552	.541	.840
Z.8	56.1034	28.310	.598	.837
Z.9	55.9310	30.067	.500	.843
Z.10	56.0000	29.643	.644	.838
Z.11	56.0345	29.392	.633	.837
Z.12	55.9655	29.820	.878	.835
Z.13	55.8276	30.933	.429	.847

Z.14	56.4828	29.044	.465	.868
Z.15	56.5862	27.751	.367	.861

Source: Primary Data Processing Output, 2025

Table 4. Validity Test of the Work Stress Level Variable (Y)

Item-Total Statistics

	Scale Mean if Item Deleted	Scale Variance if Item Deleted	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted
Y.1	36.5517	103.328	.875	.951
Y.2	36.5517	103.328	.875	.951
Y.3	36.4138	103.608	.781	.953
Y.4	36.5862	105.751	.695	.955
Y.5	36.8276	103.219	.800	.952
Y.6	36.4483	105.185	.752	.953
Y.7	36.5862	105.180	.847	.952
Y.8	36.9655	105.392	.741	.954
Y.9	36.7931	104.741	.823	.952
Y.10	36.6897	104.793	.861	.952
Y.11	36.3448	102.734	.706	.955
Y.12	36.7241	105.135	.892	.951
Y.13	36.5862	105.466	.711	.954
Y.14	36.1724	111.076	.377	.963
Y.15	36.6552	105.234	.752	.953

Source: Primary Data Processing Output, 2025

Reliability Test

According to Sugiyono (2020), reliability reflects how stable and consistent the measurement results are for a variable. In this study, Cronbach's Alpha was used to determine whether the questionnaire was reliable, with the following criteria:

a. ≥ 0.7 (high reliability)

b. $0.5 - 0.7$ (moderate reliability, acceptable)

c. ≤ 0.5 (low reliability, poor instrument)

Workload Variables

Table 5. Validity Reliability Test (X1)

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.940	15

Source: Primary Data Processing Output, 2025

Coping Variables

Table 6. Reliability Test of Variable (X2)

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.957	15

Source: Primary Data Processing Output, 2025

Social Environmental Support Variables

Table 7. Reliability Test (Z)

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.852	15

Source: Primary Data Processing Output, 2025

Employee Stress Level Variable

Table 8. Reliability Test (Y)

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.956	15

Source: Primary Data Processing Output, 2025

Classical Assumption Test
Normality Test

Table 9 Normality Test

One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test

		Unstandardized Residual
N		29
Normal Parameters[a,b]	Mean	.0000000
	Std. Deviation	7.68634728
Most Extreme Differences	Absolute	.089
	Positive	.089
	Negative	-.075
Test Statistic		.089
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)		.200[c,d]

a. Test distribution is Normal.

b. Calculated from data.

c. Lilliefors Significance Correction.

d. This is a lower bound of the true significance.

Source: Primary Data Processing Output, 2025

Heteroscedasticity Test

Table 10. Heteroscedasticity Test

Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients B	Std. Error	Standardized Coefficients Beta	t	Sig.
1	(Constant)	-9.647	9.537		-1.012	.321
	Workload	-.254	.125	-.134	-2.217	.067
	Coping	.327	.154	.495	2.122	.064
	Social Environmental Support	-.225	.158	-.297	-1.429	.165

a. Dependent Variable: ABS_RES

Source: Primary Data Processing Output, 2025

Multicollinearity Test

To identify this, this study used tolerance tests and Variance Inflation Factor (VIF). The model is considered free of multicollinearity if the tolerance value is > 0.10 and the VIF value is < 10 (Duli in Melati et al., 2024).

Table 11. Multicollinearity Test

	Coefficients[a]						
	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients			Collinearity Statistics	
	B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.	Tolerance	VIF
Model							
1 (Constant)	82.974	20.375		4.072	.000		
Workload	.357	.135	.445	2.648	.014	.697	1.435
Coping	-.392	.329	-.238	-1.193	.244	.497	2.014
Social Environmental Support	-.560	.337	-.294	-1.660	.109	.626	1.596
a. Dependent Variable: Employee Stress Levels							

Source: Primary Data Processing Output, 2025

Based on table 4.13 above, it is found that each tolerance value of variable X1 is 0.697, variable X2 is 0.497, and variable Z is 0.626, which means that the value is > 0.10. Meanwhile, for the VIF value, it is known that each value of variable X1 is 1.435, variable X2 is 2.014, and variable Z is 1.596, which means that the value is < 10. So it can be concluded that the variables of workload, coping, and social environmental support are considered to independently explain the variability of employee stress level variables, so that there are no symptoms of multicollinearity in this study.

T Test

A variable is said to have a significant influence if the value (p-value) < 0.05 and the calculated t-value > t-table, which is determined based on certain degrees of freedom and significance levels:

$$t_{tabel} = \frac{a}{2} ; (n - k - 1)$$
$$= \frac{0,05}{2} ; (29 - 4 - 1)$$
$$= 0,025 ; 24$$

Description: a: Significance level of error
n: Number of samples
k: Number of variables

In this study, with an α of 0.025 and a df of 24, the t-table value was 2.063. This value will be used as a reference in conducting a partial t-test to evaluate whether each independent variable individually has a significant effect on the dependent variable.

Based on the t-test results for the Workload (X1) variable on Employee Stress Levels (Y), the calculated t-value was 3.407 with a significance value (Sig.) of 0.002. Because the calculated t-value (3.407) is greater than the t-table (2.063) and the significance value is less

ARTICLE

than 0.025, it can be concluded that the Workload variable significantly influences Employee Stress Levels. This means that the higher the workload perceived by employees, the higher their stress levels. These results indicate that workload is an important factor that needs to be considered in stress management efforts in the workplace.

Based on the results of the t-test on the Coping variable and Employee Stress Levels, the calculated t-value was -3.878 with a significance value (Sig.) of 0.001. Because the calculated t-value (3.878) is greater than the t-table (2.063) and the significance value is less than 0.025, it can be concluded that the Coping variable has a significant effect on Employee Stress Levels. The negative sign on the regression coefficient indicates that the effect of coping on stress is negative, meaning that the better an employee's coping skills, the lower their perceived stress levels tend to be. In other words, effective coping strategies can help employees manage work pressure and significantly reduce stress.

Based on the results of the t-test on the Workload variable and Social Environmental Support, the calculated t-value was 0.085 with a significance value (Sig.) of 0.933. Because the calculated t-value (0.085) is less than the t-value (2.063), and the significance value (0.933) is significantly greater than 0.025, it can be concluded that the Workload variable does not significantly influence Social Environmental Support. This means that the level of workload experienced by employees is not directly or significantly related to their perceptions or reality regarding the social environmental support they receive at work.

Based on the results of the t-test on the Coping variable on Social Environmental Support, the calculated t-value was 3.304 with a significance value (Sig.) of 0.003. Because the calculated t-value (3.304) is greater than the t-value (2.063), and the significance value (0.003) is less than 0.025, it can be concluded that the Coping variable significantly influences Social Environmental Support. This means that the better an employee's coping skills, the higher the perceived social environmental support. This indicates that individuals with effective coping skills tend to be able to build better social relationships and receive support from their surroundings.

Based on the results of the t-test on the variable of Social Environmental Support on Employee Stress Levels, the calculated t-value was -2.367 with a significance value (Sig.) of 0.025. Because the calculated t (2.367) > t-table (2.063) and the significance value (0.025) = α, it can be concluded that Social Environmental Support has a significant effect on Employee Stress Levels. The negative sign on the regression coefficient indicates that the effect is negative, meaning that the higher the social environmental support received by employees, the lower the level of stress they experience. This confirms that the existence of social support in the work environment plays an important role in helping employees deal with pressure and reducing work stress.

F Test

According to Ghozali (2018:100), the F-test aims to determine the overall significance of the regression, with the null hypothesis (H_0) stating that all regression coefficients are equal to zero (no effect). If the significance value (p-value) is <0.05, then H_0 is rejected, meaning the regression model used together significantly explains the dependent variable. In other words, the independent variables used collectively influence the dependent variable. The formula for determining the F-table value is as follows:

F-table = k - 1; n - k

= 4 - 1; 29 - 4

= 3; 25

Where: n = Number of samples

k = Total number of variables

ARTICLE

Based on the analysis results, the number of independent variables in this study was 4, and the sample size was 29 respondents. Therefore, the degrees of freedom for the numerator (df1) is 3, while for the denominator (df2) is 25. By referring to the F distribution and a probability level of 0.05, the F-table value is 2.99. This number is used as a reference to compare with the calculated F-value, in order to assess whether all independent variables simultaneously have a significant influence on the dependent variable.

Table 12. F Test of Variables X1 and X2 against Y

ANOVA[a]

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	1526.075	2	763.038	10.802	.000[b]
	Residual	1836.683	26	70.642		
	Total	3362.759	28			

a. Dependent Variable: Employee Stress Levels
b. Predictors: (Constant), Coping, Workload

Source: Primary Data Processing Output, 2025

Based on the F-test results displayed in Table 4.19, the F-count value was 10.802 with a significance value of 0.000. Since the F-count (10.802) > F-table (2.99) and the significance value (0.000 < 0.05), it can be concluded that the regression model is simultaneously significant. This means that the Workload and Coping variables together have a significant influence on Employee Stress Levels. Thus, both independent variables are worthy of inclusion in the model because they provide a real contribution in explaining the dependent variable, namely employee stress levels.

Table 13. F Test of Variables X1 and X2 against Z

ANOVA[a]

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	347.550	2	173.775	7.754	.002[b]
	Residual	582.657	26	22.410		
	Total	930.207	28			

a. Dependent Variable: Social Environmental Support
b. Predictors: (Constant), Coping, Workload

Source: Primary Data Processing Output, 2025

Based on the F-test results shown in Table 4.20, the calculated F-value was 7.754 with a significance value of 0.002. Because the calculated F-value (7.754) is greater than the F-table value (2.99) and the significance value (0.002 < 0.05), it can be concluded that the regression model is simultaneously significant. This means that the Workload and Coping variables jointly have a significant influence on the Social Environmental Support variable. Therefore, these two independent variables are worthy of inclusion in the model because they significantly contribute to explaining the dependent variable, namely social environmental support.

ARTICLE

Table 14. F Test of Variables X1 and X2 against Y through Z

ANOVA[a]						
Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	1708.520	3	569.507	8.607	.000[b]
	Residual	1654.238	25	66.170		
	Total	3362.759	28			
a. Dependent Variable: Employee Stress Levels						
b. Predictors: (Constant), Social Environmental Support, Workload, Coping						

Source: Primary Data Processing Output, 2025

Based on the F-test results displayed in Table 4.21, the calculated F-value was 8.607 with a significance value of 0.000. Since the calculated F-value (8.607) > F-table (2.99) and the significance value (0.000 < 0.05), it can be concluded that this regression model is simultaneously significant. This means that the variables Workload, Coping, and Social Environmental Support together have a significant effect on Employee Stress Levels. Thus, the three independent variables are worthy of inclusion in the model because they collectively provide a significant contribution in explaining variations in the dependent variable, namely employee stress levels.

Multiple Linear Regression Analysis

Table 15. Multiple Linear Regression Analysis Test

Coefficients[a]						
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	72.633	20.045		3.623	.001
	Beban Kerja	.280	.131	.348	2.138	.042
	Koping	-.726	.269	-.440	-2.700	.012
a. Dependent Variable: Tingkat Stres Pegawai						

Source: Primary Data Processing Output, 2025

Multiple linear regression analysis was used to determine the influence of Workload (X_1) and Coping (X_2) variables simultaneously and partially on Employee Stress Levels (Y). The results of this test were formulated using the linear equation formula below:

$$Y = \alpha + \beta_1 X_1 + \beta_2 X_2 + e$$

Description:
Y: Purchase Intention
α: Constant (Y value when X=0)
β_1: Regression coefficient of variable X1 X1: Workload
β_2: Regression coefficient of variable X2 X2: Coping
e: Error
Based on the results of data processing displayed in the Coefficients table, the following regression equation is obtained:

ARTICLE

Table 16. Regression Equation

Konstanta	Koefisien X1	Koefisien X2
72.633	.280	-.726

Source: SPSS Data Processing Results, 2025

From the table above, the multiple linear regression equation obtained in this study is as follows:

$$Y = \alpha + \beta_1 X_1 + \beta_2 X_2 + e$$
$$\mathbf{Y = 72.633 + 0.280 - 0.726}$$

The interpretation of this equation is as follows:

- The constant (α) of 72.633 indicates that if the Workload (X_1) and Coping (X_2) values are considered constant or zero, then the Employee Stress Level (Y) is estimated to be 72.633 units.
- The regression coefficient of X_1 (Workload) of 0.280 indicates that every one-unit increase in Workload will cause an increase in Employee Stress Level of 0.280 units, assuming other variables remain constant.
- The regression coefficient of X_2 (Coping) of -0.726 indicates that every one-unit increase in coping ability will cause a decrease in Employee Stress Level of 0.726 units, assuming other variables remain constant.

This strengthens the conclusion that both independent variables (X_1 and X_2) partially have a significant influence on the dependent variable (Y).

E. CONCLUSION

The test results obtained an Adjusted R² value of 0.261, which means that social environmental support is influenced by coping by 26.1%, so that H4 in this study is accepted. Based on the results of the t-test of the Social Environmental Support (Z) variable on Employee Stress Levels (Y), the calculated t-value was -2.367> t-table -2.063 and a significance value of 0.025 <0.05. So it can be concluded that social environmental support has a significant effect on employee stress levels at the Padang Bolak District Head's Office. The test results obtained an Adjusted R² value of 0.141, meaning that social environmental support contributed 14.1% to employee stress levels at the Padang Bolak District Head's Office, so that H5 in this study was accepted. Based on the results of the F test of the Workload (X1) and Coping (X2) variables on Employee Stress Levels (Y), the F-count value was 10.802> F-table 2.99 and a significance of 0.000 <0.05. Therefore, it can be concluded that the workload and coping variables simultaneously have a significant effect on the employee stress level variable at the Padang Bolak District Head's Office. The test results obtained an Adjusted R² value of 0.412, indicating a simultaneous influence contribution in this test of 41.2%, so H6 in this study was accepted. Based on the results of the F test of the Workload (X1) and Coping (X2) variables on Social Environmental Support (Z), the F-count value was 7.754> F-table 2.99 and a significance of 0.002 <0.05. Therefore, it can be concluded that the workload and coping variables simultaneously have a significant effect on the employee social environmental support variable at the Padang Bolak District Head's Office.

The test results obtained an Adjusted R² value of 0.325, indicating a simultaneous influence contribution in this test of 32.5%, so that H7 in this study is accepted. Based on the results of the F test of the variables Workload (X1), Coping (X2) and Social Environmental Support (Z) as intervening variables on Employee Stress Levels (Y), the F-count value was 8.607> F-table 2.99 and a significance value of 0.000 <0.05. So it can be concluded that these

ARTICLE

variables simultaneously have a significant effect on employee stress levels at the Padang Bolak District Office.

REFERENCE

Al Fatih, H., Tania, M., & Pratiwi, E. (2022). Faktor-Faktor Yang Mempengaruhi Tingkat Stres Kerja Perawat IGD Rumah Sakit Di Bandung. Jurnal Keperawatan BSI,10(1),52–60.

Alawiyah, D., & Alwi, C. A. (2022). Pengaruh Dukungan Sosial Terhadap Kesejahteraan Psikologis Pada Mahasiswa Semester Akhir. *Jurnal Mimbar: Media Intelektual Muslim Dan Bimbingan Rohani*, *8*(2), 30-44.

Anwar, R. (2022). Pengaruh Kepemimpinan, Stres Kerja Dan Motivasi Terhadap Kinerja Pegawai Dinas Perhubungan Kabupaten Ogan Komering Ulu. *Majalah Ilmiah Manajemen STIE Aprin Palembang*, *11*(2), 44-52.

Aryantini, T., Sutresna, I., Rahmat, D. Y., & Sopiah, P. (2023). Mekanisme Koping Pada Mahasiswa Prodi Diii Keperawatan Yang Sedang Mengerjakan Tugas Akhir. *Jurnal Kesehatan Tambusai*, *4*(2), 1030-1036.

Azwar, S. (2019). Penyusunan Skala Psikologi. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar. Badan Pusat Statistik. (2024). *Kecamatan Padang Bolak dalam Angka 2024*.

Padang Lawas Utara: BPS Kabupaten Padang Lawas Utara.

Bahua, W., & Mendo, A. Y. (2022). Pengaruh kepuasan kerja dan tingkat stres kerja terhadap prestasi kerja pegawai di dinas sosial provinsi Gorontalo. *Jambura: Jurnal Ilmiah Manajemen Dan Bisnis*, *4*(3), 264-273.

Dhamayantie, S. (2018). Peran Dukungan Sosial pada Interaksi Positif Pekerjaan- Keluarga dan Kepuasan Hidup. Jurnal Ekonomi dan Keuangan, 18, (2), 181-200.

Efficacy dengan Tingkat Stress pada Perawat di Rumah Sakit Umum Pusat Sanglah. Jurnal Psikologi Udayana. ISSN: 2354 5607.Tarigan,. M. 2018

Fasya, Z. A., Yuwono, P., & Septiwi, C. (2019). Gambaran Tingkat Stres dan Mekanisme Koping Mahasiswa dalam Mengerjakan Skripsi di STIKES Muhammadiyah Gombong Tahun. Proceeding of The 10th University Research Colloquium 2019: Bidang MIPA Dan Kesehatan, 622–629.

Hardono, Indra, Herni Widiyah Nasrul, and Yenni Hartati. "Pengaruh penempatan dan beban kerja terhadap motivasi kerja dan dampaknya pada prestasi kerja pegawai." *Jurnal Dimensi* 8.1 (2019): 28-43.

HARI, W. (2024). Strategi Coping Dalam Mengatasi Kelelahan Emosional Pada Ibu Yang Memiliki Anak Autis Di Lembaga Pengembangan Sumber Daya Manusia (Lpsdm) Graha Jiwa Indonesia Pringsewu Provinsi Lampung (Doctoral dissertation, UIN Raden Intan Lampung).

Hutapea, N. K. (2024). Pengaruh Stres Kerja Dan Motivasi Kerja Terhadap Kinerja Pegawai Pt. Kereta Api Indonesia (Persero) Upt Balai Yasa Pulu Brayan Kota Medan (Doctoral dissertation, Fakultas Ekonomi, Universitas Islam Sumatera Utara).

Intani, F. S., & Surjaningrum, E. R. (2010). Coping strategy pada mahasiswa salah jurusan. *INSAN: Media Psikologi*, 12(02), 119–126. Fakultas Psikologi Universitas Airlangga.

Jundillah, Zhafarina, Yuniar Wardani, and Heni Trisnowati. "Pengaruh Beban Kerja dan Lingkungan Kerja Terhadap Stres Kerja pada Perawat: Studi Literatur." *Jurnal Promotif Preventif* 7.4 (2024): 750-762.

Khoiriyah, Nikmatul. Perbedaan strategi koping stres pada mahasiswa berorganisasi dan tidak berorganisasi di Universitas nahdlatul Ulama Indonesia (UNUSIA) Jakarta. Diss. UNUSIA, 2021.

Lestari, A., & Fachrian, A. (2022). Hubungan Antara Beban Kerja Dengan Stres Kerja Pada Pegawai Di Balai Pemasyarakatan Kelas I Medan. Jouska: Jurnal Ilmiah Psikologi, 1(2), 81-89.

Lubis, N.H. (2008). *Sejarah dan Budaya Padang Lawas*. Medan: USU Press.

Maharani, R., & Budianto, A. (2019). Pengaruh beban kerja terhadap stres kerja dan kinerja perawat rawat inap dalam. Journal of Management Review, 3(2), 327-332.

Melati, A. S., Yanuar, D., & Susilawati, N. (2024). Dampak E-WOM dan Kepercayaan Merek terhadap Minat Beli Somethinc pada Gen Z. Jurnal Komunikasi Global. https://doi.org/10.24815/jkg.v13i2.38179

Minarda, S. (2024). Hubungan Religiusitas Dengan Stres Pada Ibu Yang Memiliki Peran Ganda (Doctoral dissertation, UIN SUSKA RIAU).

Nazila & Yuliana. (2019). Pengaruh Beban Kerja dan Stres Kerja Terhadap Kinerja Pegawai Badan Pengawasan Keuangan dan Pembangunan Perwakilan Provinsi Aceh. Prosiding SEMDI-UNAYA, 03(01), 273–282

Pane, A. C. (2020). Studi Identifikasi Faktor Faktor Yang Memengaruhi Stres Kerja Karyawan PT. Pusaka Megah Bumi Nusantara di Pangkalan Kerinci Riau (Doctoral dissertation, Universitas Medan Area).

Pemerintah Kabupaten Padang Lawas Utara. (2023). *Profil Wilayah Kecamatan Padang Bolak*. Diakses dari https://padanglawasutarakab.go.id/.

Pucangan, M. A. A. P., & Indrawati, K. R. (2019). Peran work-life balance dan dukungan sosial terhadap stres kerja pada perempuan Bali yang bekerja di hotel bintang 4 di Kabupaten Badung. Jurnal Psikologi Udayana Edisi Khusus Kesehatan Mental dan Budaya I, 178-186.

Purnama, Ni Luh Agustini, et al. "Pengaruh mekanisme coping terhadap stres remaja." Jurnal Riset Kesehatan Poltekkes Depkes Bandung 16.1 (2024): 10-20.

Putra, Abimanyu Aditya, and Nur Laily. "Pengaruh beban kerja, lingkungan kerja dan motivasi terhadap kinerja pegawai pada pt para bathara surya." *Jurnal Ilmu dan Riset Manajemen (JIRM)* 8.9 (2019)..

Qodris, Raihandy, et al. "Hubungan kepercayaan diri dengan mekanisme koping dalam menghadapi skripsi mahasiswa Kedokteran Universitas Malahayati angkatan 2019." *Prepotif: Jurnal Kesehatan Masyarakat* 7.1 (2023): 1079- 1091.

Robbins, S. P., & Judge, T. A. (2021). Organizational Behavior. 18th Edition. Pearson Education.

Ruseng, S. S. (2021). Analisis Pengaruh Beban Kerja dan Stres Terhadap Produktivitas Karyawan PT. Eastern Pearl Flour Mills. Jurnal Kesehatan Masyarakat.

Santoso, M. R., & Widodo, S. (2022). Pengaruh beban kerja dan lingkungan kerja terhadap kinerja karyawan Dinas Perhubungan Provinsi DKI Jakarta. *Jurnal Ilmiah M-Progress*, 12(1), 84–94. Universitas Dirgantara Marsekal Suryadarma.

Sejahtera, Debby Nirma Sari. Burnout Berbasis Beban Kerja Yang Dimoderasi Variabel Emphatical Leadership dan Religious Coping di Masa Pandemi *Covid-19 (Studi Pada Tenaga Kesehatan Puskesmas Bawang, Batang)*. MS thesis. Universitas Islam Sultan Agung (Indonesia), 2022.

Sekar Ayu Kirana, N. (2024). Pengaruh Beban Kerja, Dukungan Supervisor, dan Stress Kerja terhadap Kinerja Karyawan pada Generasi Z di Kota Tangerang. Bachelor Thesis, Universitas Multimedia Nusantara

Setiani, R., & Novitasari, D. (2023). Pengaruh Beban Kerja, Lingkungan Kerja, Dan Dukungan Sosial Terhadap Stres Kerja Karyawan Di Puskesmas Kasihan 1 Bantul. Jurnal Riset Akuntansi Dan Bisnis Indonesia, 3(1), 270- 289.

ARTICLE

Setiawan, A. I., & Darminto, E. (2013). Pengaruh dukungan sosial terhadap stres kerja pada karyawan. *Jurnal Mahasiswa Psikologi*, 1(1). Universitas Negeri Surabaya.

Simanjuntak, T. (2006). *Jalur Sutra di Sumatera: Bukti Arkeologis dan Perdagangan Masa Lampau*. Jakarta: Pusat Arkeologi Nasional.

Siregar, M. T. (2011). *Islam dan Sufisme di Tanah Batak*. Yogyakarta: LKIS. Siringoringo, F. L. (2023). *Perbedaan Stres Kerja Ditinjau Dari Tipe Kepribadian Ekstrovert Dan Introvert Karyawan PT. Sumber Daya Insani* (Doctoral dissertation, Universitas Medan Area).

Sugiyono. (2020). Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif, Kualitatif, dan R&D. Bandung: Alfabeta.

Sukmawati, D. (2016). Pengaruh prestasi belajar, dukungan sosial keluarga dan teman sebaya terhadap literasi keuangan siswa. *Jurnal Ekonomi Pendidikan dan Kewirausahaan*, 4(1), 30–41. Universitas Negeri Surabaya.

Undang-Undang Republik Indonesia Nomor 37 Tahun 2007 tentang Pembentukan Kabupaten Padang Lawas Utara di Provinsi Sumatera Utara.

Yusuf, A. M. (2018). Psikologi Industri dan Organisasi. Jakarta: Kencana Prenada Media Group.

Zulmaidarleni, Z., Sarianti, R., & Fitria, Y. (2019). Pengaruh Beban Kerja dan Lingkungan Kerja Fisik Terhadap Stres Kerja pada Pegawai Kantor Kecamatan Padang Timur. Jurnal Ecogen, 2(1), 61–68.