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ABSTRACT

This research on health service employees who are in Jakarta wants to observe the work stress experienced and how the risks will arise from organizational commitment and employee performance. The design of this research is to use a survey method with cross-section data collection using a questionnaire. A total of 82 employees of the Private Hospital consisting of Doctors, Nurses and Staff as respondents in this study, were determined by utilizing the simple random sampling method. The data analysis method used is Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) as a design in analyzing data analysis on testing research hypotheses. The results of the study present the results that work stress has a negative and significant impact on organizational commitment, then work stress that has a negative and significant impact on employee performance, then high organizational commitment can actually cause a positive and significant impact on employee performance.
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INTRODUCTION

Health services such as hospitals will certainly always try to provide good and quality health services to be able to compete (Ramli, 2012a). By presenting a quality service, it will bring happiness to patients (Ramli, 2013), so that at the same time will offer profit to the stronghold of the Hospital (Gunawan & Djati, 2011). Hospital is a health assistance service that must always follow the development of science and technology (Imran & Ramli, 2019). Increasing public awareness and demands for improved health services have caused community values to change towards higher quality health services (Ramli & Sjahruddin, 2015). This change is a challenge for the Hospital faced with a changing business environment. The level of competition that is getting tougher among the Hospital businesses requires that there is competitiveness for the Hospital in order to win the competition (Ramli, 2016a; Ramli 2016b). One form of competitiveness that must be created by hospital business is service quality (Ramli, 2017a). Hospitals must strive to improve the quality of their services continuously. Because the higher the level of public understanding of the importance of health to maintain quality of life, the user community will be more critical in receiving service products. Therefore, improving the quality of hospital services needs to be done continuously (Ramli, 2010).

Human Resources is symbolizing a central factor in achieving the direction of an institution or organization (Mariam and Ramli, 2017). The form and purpose of the organization, various visions are designed for the benefit of humans where in the implementation of its mission is managed and managed by humans. This means, that humans are strategic resources in all organizational activities. For this reason, human resources need to be planned, formulated strategies that are relevant to the goals set, and consistent in implementing them continuously so as to improve the performance of the organization where the human resources are located (Mariam, 2016).

To improve the quality of hospital service delivery to its patients, what must be taken care of in addition to facilities and infrastructure is the ability of its human resources. Optimal employee performance will influence the performance of the organization, which in this study is a Private Hospital in DKI Jakarta. The study conducted by Barlian (2016) explained that organizational commitment is one of the variables that influence the performance of employees at the Jember Lung Hospital. Boe (2002)
explains that organizational commitment will create employee trust in the organization because employees get their desired expectations. And if the level of employee confidence has shown a high level of organization, then employees as members of the organization will provide concern for the future and success of the company, and will be able to interpret and understand its role in the organization. So that it will try as optimal as possible to exert its best ability to realize that role.

Organizational commitment is needed in every employee in a company because with the organizational commitment of every employee, employees will be more eager to advance the company (Meyer & Allen, 1997). Organizational commitment reflects the level of trust and acceptance of the workforce towards company goals and has a desire to remain in the company (Mersi & Koeshartono, 2014). Employees who have organizational commitment are more responsible for doing their jobs. And if an employee who has organizational commitment has confidence in the company's goals, then his desire to continue working as long as possible and become an organ part of the organization or company (Ni, Yin, Yee, Sin, Ling, 2011). This opinion confirms findings that explain that organizational commitment is a related part in upholding employee performance achievement (Meyer, Stanley, Herscovitch, & Topolnytsky, 2002). Therefore, this study is interesting for the authors to observe how the effects of job stress and organizational commitment on the performance of employees providing health services to patients at Private Hospitals in the Special Capital Region of Jakarta.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Impact of Job Stress on Organizational Commitment

The concept of Nur (2013) says that stress is experienced by individuals when carrying out their activities, so stress becomes a less joyous and distressing event. However, how a person's response to dealing with stress depends on his personality, the resources available to solve the problem, and the situation that causes the stress to occur (Daft, 2006). As for Ivancevich et al (2007) argued that from an individual's point of view, stress is narrated as the anxiety experienced by someone who is obtained from a stressful experience, a complex programmed to perceive threats that can lead to positive or negative results. This means that stress can have a negative or positive impact on psychological and physiological (Robbins. 2008: 209). Everyone
must experience stress, both outside the organization and inside any organization. In other words, everyone cannot avoid stress, therefore employees and leaders are obliged to manage it well. When an employee and manager are able to manage their stress well, the consequences are functional (positive), otherwise if ignoring the stress that arises, the consequences are negative for individuals and organizations. So, stress not only has a negative impact, but also a positive impact on someone. This is in accordance with the opinion expressed by Hans Selye (Luthan, 2008) suggesting that stress is not just nerve tension, stress can have positive consequences, stress is not something to be avoided, and the absence of stress is death at all.

Following the research conducted by Chu (2006), his findings have been presented on how the impact of work stress experienced by nurses in Taiwan which validly explains that the effect of work stress on organizational commitment will show the effect on employees’ behavior towards the organization. Research conducted by Iresa, Utami and Prasetya (2015) on employees of PT.Telekomunikasi Indonesia Malang Region exposes the results that work stress has a negative and significant impact on organizational commitment. Based on these empirical instructions, the following hypotheses are proposed:

**H1:** *Job stress has a negative and significant impact on organizational commitment.*

**Impact of Job Stress on Employee Performance**

The findings of the investigation regarding the consequences of work stress experienced by employees at Khairun University showed a negative and significant effect on employee performance (Nur, 2013). Research conducted by Fontannaz and Oosthuizen (2007) and Yang and Hwang (2014) have tried to test the impact of work stress on employee performance whose findings turned out to show that organizational performance is an element that collectively will be born from the achievement of each employee’s performance. According to Robbins, (2003) if we can find out the causal relationship between the achievement of employee performance with organizational performance, it will be able to assist managers in directing the limited organizational resources in the right direction, which is the cause of improved employee performance, so that Organizations with workforce will be more satisfied and more efficient.
Job stress according to Basri (2012) can be explained as a negative feeling and arises because of an individual’s inability to face the weight of a workload that has an inappropriate capacity or encounters pressure at work. Another description that explains about work stress is also explained by Rivai (2004) that a condition with tension that results in an unfavorable effect on the physical and psychological, so that it can affect all emotions, how the thought process, and also the conditions of an employee. Handoko (2018) also stated that work stress is a condition of tension that affects emotions, processes, thinking and conditions of a person, thus work stress can be said to be a condition that disturbs the state of employees which affects the emotions, cognitive processes of the employees themselves. Job stress can also be said to be a condition of discomfort experienced by an employee caused by work or work environment so that it has an impact on the survival of his life.

Previous research has provided data and the fact that work stress has a negative and significant impact on employee performance. This result is demonstrated by findings from Iresa, Utami and Prasetya (2015), but it contradicts the findings of Princess and Ramli (2017). Based on these empirical instructions, the following hypotheses are proposed:

**H₂: Job stress has a negative and significant impact on employee performance.**

**Impact of Organizational Commitment to Employee Performance**

In organizations that are able to encourage their employees to commit and commit effectively to an organization, the individual will devote all his efforts to achieve work performance as an employee (Ahmad, et al., 2016). The findings of Yousef (2016), explain that organizational commitment is an antecedent whose function is to ensure job performance. Colquitt, LePine, and Wasson (2009) have also presented their findings which show the conclusion that organizational commitment has a fairly close connection to employee performance.

Research conducted by Barlian (2016) and Ramli (2017b) indicates that organizational commitment has a significant and positive impact on employee performance. Likewise, Jamal (2011) has the concept that organizational commitment also has a significant impact on employee performance. Iresa, Utami and Prasetya (2015) of PT.Telekomunikasi Indonesia Malang Region exposes the results that organizational commitment has a positive and significant effect on employee
performance. Based on these empirical instructions, the following hypotheses are proposed:

H3: Organizational commitment has a positive and significant impact on employee performance.

RESEARCH METHODS

In this research design, the quantitative method used to determine the impact of work stress on organizational commitment and employee performance in health services, namely Private Hospitals in DKI Jakarta Province. The data analysis method used in the hypothesis test is Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) using the Partial Least Square (PLS) tool.

The population in the research conducted and located in DKI Jakarta Province is employees in Private Hospitals whose exact number is rather difficult to ascertain, so the sampling method uses the theory recommended by Hair et al., (2010), which is a minimum sample size of five times the number of indicators. Because there are 15 indicators in this study, the number of samples is a minimum of 75. With 82 respondents, the minimum sample size was met.

Data collection by distributing questionnaires. After the questionnaire is distributed to respondents, then the data quality test is carried out. The results of the validity test of the work stress variables are in table 1 below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1: Stress Variable Validity Test Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instrument number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Data processing results (SPSS)

Table 1 above explains that the variable work stress instrument is entirely valid. Because the value of r is greater than the r table 0.23 (Sugiyono, 2013). Thus the results of this validity test show that all instruments are correct.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2: Variable Validity of Organizational Commitment Test Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instrument number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Data processing results (SPSS)
From table 2 we can know that all instruments in the organizational commitment variable are valid, this is because $r_{\text{count}} > r_{\text{table}}$ compared with $r_{\text{table}} 0.23$ (Sugiyono, 2013). This shows that all instruments are appropriate instruments for measuring organizational commitment variables. Furthermore, to find out the validity of the variable turnover intention is in table 3 below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instrument number</th>
<th>$R_{\text{count}}$</th>
<th>Instrument number</th>
<th>$R_{\text{count}}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Data processing results (SPSS)

Based on table 3, all instruments in the turnover intention variable are valid, this is because the $r_{\text{table}}$ is 0.23 smaller than the value of $r_{\text{count}}$ (Sugiyono, 2013). The results of this validity test show that all instruments are the right instruments to measure the turnover intention variable. Next is the reliability test, the reliability test results of the three variables are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variabel</th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha</th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items</th>
<th>N of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stress Kerja</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Komitmen organisasi</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinerja karyawan</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Data processing results (SPSS)

The three variables mentioned above are reliable, because the Cronbach’s alpha value is above 0.7 (Sugiyono, 2013).

**RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

Testing of the proposed hypothesis is carried out using Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) with the help of PLS software. Hypothesis test decision making is by looking at the results of $t$-value, where if the value is positive it means that the variable has a positive impact, while to see the significance is by referring to the $t$-statistic values between variables, if the value of $t$ obtained is greater than $t$-table of 1.96, meaning
that the impact is significant (Hair, et al. 2010). The results of this study, can be seen in the table below:

**Table 4: Hypothesis Test Results**

| Variables                   | T Statistics (|O/STERR|) |
|-----------------------------|---------------|
| Job stress -> Organizational Commitment | 2.2261        |
| Job stress -> Employee performance | 2.1714        |
| Organizational Commitment -> Employee performance | 2.4359        |

Source: PLS Data Processing Results, 2018

In table 4 shows the results of the impact of one variable on another variable shows a positive value, including:

1. Impact of job stress on organizational commitment is negative and significant because the estimated value is -0.147 with a t-value of 2.2261, which means negative and significant because it is greater than the t-table of 1.96.

2. The impact of work stress on employee performance is negative and significant because the estimated value is -0.221 with a t-value of 2.1714 which means negative and significant because it is greater than the t-table of 1.96.

3. Impact of employee performance on organizational commitment is positive and significant because the estimated value is 0.512 with a t-value of 2.4359, which means positive and significant because it is smaller than the t-table of 1.96.

**CONCLUSION**

The conclusions of this study are formulated based on the results of hypothesis testing, namely:

1. Job stress has a negative and significant impact on organizational commitment.

   This result shows that employee commitment to the organization or company will be found, if the company can pay attention to the work stress of its employees. With this negative and significant influence shows that high work stress will cause organizational commitment to be low, but conversely if work stress can be reduced, it will make employees to increase their commitment to the organization, so that they will work seriously and earnestly to improve its performance.

2. Job stress has a negative and significant impact on employee performance.
From the results of data processing shows a negative and significant effect of work stress on employee performance. So the company must assign work stress to these employees as the main component that must be cared for by the leadership, because it is proven to have a negative and significant effect on employee performance and organizational commitment. Because high work stress will reduce employee commitment and employee performance directly.

3. Organizational commitment has a positive and significant impact on employee performance.

Only one of the results of this study shows positive and significant results, so the organization or company must make it a top priority, because the results of this research impact shows that if the company pays attention to the organizational commitment of its employees, then companies will be able to obtain employee performance improvement in accordance with the ideals of the organization or company.
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