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ABSTRACT: In work, the working environment directly affects the work attitude and determine employee performance. The pleasant working environment makes a positive employee attitude and gives the impetus to work more diligently and better. Conversely, if the environment situation is not fun they tend to leave the environment. Stress is a negative emotional experience that is experienced by individuals when facing the greater demands of his skill. The negative emotional experiences of individuals can be defined as the perceived negative affective state. Negative affective include: feelings of sadness, disappointment, anxiety, anger and depression. The educational staffs in most of universities in Medan City show that there are still many educational staff who refuse to change the culture within the organization, especially regarding the development of information technology as an opportunity for the educational staff to learn the improvement. Work stress affects the employees. This means that the higher of the work stress level is, the higher the employee performance is.
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INTRODUCTION

Basically, employee performance is the result of a complex process, both from the personal self employee (internal factor) and strategic efforts of the company. Internal factors such as motivation, goals, expectations and others, while examples of external factors are the physical and non-physical environments of the company (Luthans, 2006). Good performance is certainly a hope for all companies and institutions that employ employees, because the performance of these employees in the end is expected to improve the overall performance of the company. Managing by providing facilities and infrastructures which strive to create a work environment and a conducive working climate that can encourage employees to always innovate and be creative, including creating a fair system and flexible structure with clear, humane divisions of tasks, authority and responsibility, taking care of employee and his efforts in achieving his career goals. It is important for companies to make employees feel comfortable with their work and work environment so that they can achieve the best performance. In work, the working environment directly affects the work attitude and determine employee performance. The pleasant working environment makes a positive employee attitude and gives the impetus to work more diligently and better. Conversely, if the environment situation is not fun they tend to leave the environment.

Colquitt, LePine, Wesson (2009) suggest performance is the value of a set of employee behaviors that contribute positively and negatively to organizational objectives. Performance has three dimensions: (1) task behavior, (2) moral behavior, (3) challenging behavior. Task behavior is the behavior of employees who are directly involved in transforming the source of the organization in the virtue, service or production of the organization. Task behavior includes routine tasks and tasks in updating. Moral Behavior is an activity in the form of volunteerism from employees no rewards or no rewards but contribute to improving the overall quality of the workplace. Example: working beyond formal tasks, trying without expecting rewards, loving the organization. Behavior challenging is the behavior of employees by deliberately blocking the achievement of goals. Examples: sabotage, theft, source wastage, corruption, gossip, harassment, cruel treatment (torture).

**METHODOLOGY**

Stress experience in work life and personal life is not a new thing. Work stress may appear starting from the organization, and other places that affect the behavior and performance in the organization (Ivancevich et al., 2007). Work stress is excessive workloads, hard feelings and emotional tension that inhibit the individual performance (Robbins, 2004). Kossen (1998) states that stress as things that disrupt the biological and psychic equilibrium which are not only a condition of life but also the the influences relate to the whole mental, spiritual and social. Meanwhile, according to Riggio (2003), work stress is as a physiological or psychological reaction to an event that is perceived as a threat. The emergence of stress among employees can occur because of the accumulation of various factors as Sheridan and Radmacher (1992) and Gibson et al., (1994) described that work stress is influenced by the condition of the organization, such as setting the direction and the organizational policies, changes in organizational strategy, and financial, the demands of work, responsibility for others, the changes in working time, bad relationship among the working group and role conflict. As the result, the work concentration is disturbed, unsatisfactory performance (Evan and Johnson, 2000) and the individuals cannot meet the demands of the work because of lack of social support (Luthans, 1998). As Luthans (1998) describes that the work stress trigger is derived from the interaction of a person with the work and the uncomfortable work environment. Work stress causes on physiological functions, physical and individual behavioral that causes deviations from normal function (Beehr and Newman, 1988; and Robbins 2004b). While Beehr (1985) mentions that a psychological disorder that most often occurs as a result of work stress is anxiety and depression.

Taylor (1999) suggests that stress is a negative emotional experience that is experienced by individuals when facing the greater demands of his skill. The negative emotional experiences of individuals can be defined as the perceived negative affective state. Negative affective include: feelings of sadness, disappointment, anxiety, anger and depression. Wood et al., (1998) stated that stress is not just a demand but link with two other things, the opportunities and constraints faced. Stress is divided into two, they are constructive stress (eustress) and destructive stress (distress). Eustress is a stress that causes a positive result for individuals and organizations where people work, Eutress can be a source of energy for the concerned individuals to be more creative, diligent and work hard to finish the work properly. Destructive stress or distress is high stress levels that causes a negative impact on the physical and mental condition. While Schafer (2000) divides stress into three types, neutress, a netral stress and does not harm the concerned individual, but not too profitable. Distress is harmful stress of the concerned individual. Some symptoms of distress such as the power of concentration decreased, anxiety, lower back pain, depression, anxiety and others. The next type of stress is a positive stress that is a stress which helps the concerned individual such as stress of time deadline that would make such individuals to be able to do the work quickly. Work stress can be defined as the source or stressor of work that causes the individual response in the form of physiological, psychological and behavioral reactions. The work environment is as a potential stressor work. Work stressor is any condition of employment that employees perceived as a demand and can cause work stress (Schafer, 2000). Muchinsky (2003) suggests that work stress is the response of the stimulus n the work and delivers on the negative consequences both physically and psychologically for individuals. These negative consequences caused by physical and psychological responses led to the reduction of the companies’ profits (Higgins, 1982), personal satisfaction, creativity and productivity (Gordon, 1996). The negative consequences occur when the stressor is too much in the quantity and quality (Dale, 2000).
The definition of work stress is also defined by Luthans (1998) as an adaptive response to external situations where it will produce a deviation of physical, psychological and behavior in participation organization. Meanwhile the impacts of organizational level include the increase of burnout or work fatigue, the decrease of work performance, absenteeism and turnover (Aamodt, 2004). Ivancevich et al., (2007) states that work stress will produce the output in the form of the behavioral, cognitive and psychological impacts. Robbins and Judge (2009) define stress is a dynamic condition when people are faced with a choice. Such choice includes the obstacles which is the power to prevent individuals doing a very desirable thing or demand which is the loss of something very desirable or demand which is the loss of something desired very much by the individuals. The obstacles and demands associated with individual needs and desires, and then the results would be perceived as uncertain and important thing. Wood et al., (1998) suggests that stress is a state of tension experienced by the individual when facing charges, coercion or an exceptional opportunity. Work stress is defined as an adaptive response to external situations that cause aberrations in the function of psychological, physical and behavior of all employees (Beehr and Newman, 1988). Jex et al., (1992) suggests that work stress has a relationship with the employees’ negative feelings about their jobs. Work stress is also defined as unpleasant emotions such as tension, frustration, anxiety, anger and depression (Kyriacou and Sutcliffe, 1978). Ivancevich and Koropaske (2006) explain that each individual will interpret the stress with different perceptions. Robbins and Judge (2009) state that employees react more as responses to the perceptions of reality than the realities. Perception will act as a mediator between a potentially condition create the stress and the individual reaction against the state. French et al., In Berry and Houston (1993) develop a theory of person-environment fit in 1970 after some years studying how social factors influence the human decisions as well as the physical and psychological health. Kenny (1999) uses this theory as a method to understand the adjustment or arrangement process between the employees and the work environment. According to this framework, work stress is defined in terms inappropriate between an individual's ability toward work demands. Individual interaction with the environment variables according to this theory is considered as a stressor, instead of personal and environmental factors separately. The form of such work interaction is attitude, work orientation, and experience. Jex (2002) adds that this theory is built based on four basic concepts that is stress trigger or stressor, individual reactions to stress, how people deal with stress and social support for individuals to survive. These four basic concepts are formulated in the category of organizational stress (stress in the organization), strain, coping (how to cope with stress) and social support.

- Stress in the organization (organizational stress) is a work condition that has potential threats such as the complexity of the work, overwork, role ambiguity and inability to perform the task.
- Strain is unhealthy individual response to pressing situations or threatening such as physical reactions (high blood pressure) or behaviorally (drugs usage).
- Coping is a defense in facing stress including physical defense mechanisms and behaviors (fight or flight response).
- Social support is the emotional support that comes from the interpersonal interaction that aims to withstand the stress and tension.

The main proposition of the theory is to explain that the fit between the individual and the environment that determines the stress level of the concerned individual. The fit between individuals and the good environment is arising whenever the skill and ability of the individuals are appropriate with the work needs and the work environment.

**Job Stress (with notation = Y1)**

Job stress is the size of the level of psychological and biological balance disorders that causes chaos in the whole spiritual mental and social. Job stress can be identified through the balance or fairness relating to a person's operational metabolism and decreasing the awareness to be able to act rationally. High and low levels of education personnel’s work stress can be measured through these indicators (Kossen, 1998):
The definition of this operational variable can be described in the form of the conceptual model of analysis confirmatory as follows:

**DISCUSSION**

This research is conducted at private university in Medan city, in contrast to previous research which generally research related to employee performance and work stress done with background service company (hospital, school, bank, insurance, etc) and industry, so that research related to the performance of education personnel and job stress has never been done private universities in the city of Medan.

Based on the research results, it is known that the quality of work life statistically has a significant relationship with work stress, as shown by the CR (critical ratio) value of the two variables relationship at -8213 (negative) and p = 0.000 < 0.050. The two variables relationship is supported by a study of Hong et al., (2010); Kasraie et al., (2014); Pisheh (2012), which show a negative relationship between the quality of work life with work stress. The research results of Pisheh (2012) shows that job insecurity, the ability to develop the self efficacy opportunities, the role conflict, compensation, and participation in decision-making correlate with the employees’ work stress. The representative of the leadership task is very detailed so that the educational staff are able to receive the information clearly and workload received is not exaggerated. Participation in meetings and
The development of the quality of the team is expected to increase the participation of educational staff in achieving organizational goals. Based on the research results, it is known that the work stress statistically has a significant relationship with the performance of educational staff, as shown by the CR (critical ratio) value of the two variables relationship at -2.999 (negative) and p = 0.003 < 0.050.

The results of this research are consistent with the research of Higgins (in Umar, 1998) who states that there is a direct relationship between stress and performance, which some researches investigated the relationship of work stress with the performance presented in the stress model-performance (relationship inverted U), that is the rule of Yerkes Podson (Mas’ud, 2002). The inverted U pattern shows the relationship of stress level (low-high) and performance (low-high). If there is no stress, there is no work challenge either, and the performance tends to decrease. In line with the increasing stress, the performance tends to rise, because stress helps employees to direct all available resources to meet the needs of work, it is a healthy stimulus that encourages employees to respond to the challenges of the job. Eventually stress reaches a stable point which roughly corresponds to the ability of employee performance. Further, when the stress becomes too great, the performance will begin to decline because of stress interfere with the implementation of the work. Employees lose the ability to handle it. The most extreme consequence is the performance becomes zero, the employees, become no longer strong enough to work, desperate, out or refuse work to avoid stress.

The happening phenomenon shows that most educational staff in various private universities in Medan City are female (60%) and aged between 35-40 (50%), which often happens the conflict roles as housewives who take care of the family and the role of educational staff who have responsibility for work, so that educational staff often come late and often seen rarely in the workplace during the working hours. In addition, there are still many educational female staff who hold concurrent positions/double roles so that the workload has increased. Some of them become the major factors in the behavioral symptoms of work stress of educational female staff. Increasingly complex jobs faced by a person may pose a workload, but the burden of the work can be done well or not, depending on how the person is convinced and have the feeling enjoying the job. If educational staffs feel that the excessive workload as something that had to be solved and believe that they can then it will not cause any stress and stressful work, and cause the discomfort to the job. Work stress can affect the emotions and love feelings of educational staff to work, so that the performance of educational staff is not optimal. Robbins (2003) states that the level of stress which is able to be controlled can make the employees do a better job, because it enables them to increase alertness, work intensity, and the ability to be creative. But excessive stress level can make the performance of employees decreased. The research results are in line with those of Bashir et al (2010), Mathur et al (2013), Shaheen et al (2013), Long et al (2014), Murtaza et al (2011), Ahmed et al (2013), Fong (2010) as well as Wu (2010) who state that work stress negatively affect the employees’ performance.

Table 1
Test Result of Validity and Reliability Work Stress Variable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Pearson Correlation</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work stress</td>
<td>Y1.1</td>
<td>0.881</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Y1)</td>
<td>Y1.2</td>
<td>0.916</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Y1.3</td>
<td>0.814</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Y1.4</td>
<td>0.954</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Y1.5</td>
<td>0.885</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Y1.6</td>
<td>0.818</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.938</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: data processing, 2015
The significance value of the correlation coefficient from all questionnaire items of job stress variables shows the significant level (sig) = 0.05. So the job stress questionnaire is valid and can be used for further research. It is obtained also the values of the Alpha Cronbach from job stress variable that shows greater than the value of 0.6. Thus the respondents’ answers about the job stress variable are reliable, so that the questionnaire of the quality of life variable is reliable and can be used for further research.

Based on the results of this research it is known that factors in balance of the quality of work life among work and life out of work, workload, skills development and the opportunity to progress, work engagement, relationships with colleagues and promotional opportunities affect a person's work stress level. The balance between work and life out of work become the factors that determine the quality of work life at the office, especially in the responsibility not to interfere with other responsibilities conducted by the educational staff. Besides that, the flexible working hours and workload which are not excessive are also the respondents concern so that the inter-role conflict can be avoided.

Werther and Davis (1996) reveal that the quality of work life contains a good supervision, a better work condition, good salaries and incentives, interesting and challenging job, and reward accordingly. A comfortable working environment and humane working conditions are requirements to increase the productivity. This illustrates that the quality of work life is the perception of educational staff to fulfillment of needs through work experience in an organization. The theory of Cascio (2003) reveals that the quality of work life is built on nine components: employee involvement, compensation balance, the safety of the work environment, a sense of security to the job, the safety of the work environment, a sense of pride for the institution, career development, facilities available, solving problems and communication.

Universities have duties to build trust in the context of a reciprocal relationship with their educational staff, and in efforts to establish good corporate governance of the universities cannot escape from the role and support of the educational staff therein. Universities need to make efforts in the form of an effort to show their support for the staff, which finally the educational staff will respond it with positive attitudes, such as the availability to build cooperation, and commitment to the college. The results of the observations show that many recognized universities in Medan City are able to compete at the same time as well as build the competence and transparency to the stakeholders, but do not give the adequate attention in making a bridge with their educational staff in the form of organizational support. Generally, the work relationship pattern of organizations that is more focused on the superordinate-subordinate forms, make the educational staff feel confident that the university really supports to complete their work. In the context of a highly competitive and fast environment, the pattern of the relationship must be changed to the form of exchange relationships that put the colleges and educational staff equally, with their respective obligations and doing well for others. In this kind of relationship pattern, the more optimal the support given to staff is, it will be positive rewards the achievements of educational staff at the college.

Some respondents gave the positive comments on relating to employment matters, such as the suitability of work toward the capabilities and self efficacy, an opportunity to develop, to learn new things, and the matters relating to the work involvement. The assessment of respondents to the communication among colleagues and with the leadership is very sensitive in determining the comfort in work. Thus, the university needs to be aware of all educational staffs’ behavioral symptoms which are associated with work stress such as the reduced enthusiasm for the job, the high rate of absenteeism, the increasing number of delays, and the decreased work productivity. McHugh (1997) in Vakola Nikola (2005) suggests that work stress should be put on the agenda of organizational change management. McHugh states that the people involved in the change management need to recognize the fact that there is increased pressure or work stress due to the organizational changes constantly, and the organizations need to incorporate the stress management program into the change management program.
Test of Confirmatory Factor Analysis for Job Stress Variable (Y₁)

In accordance with the initial plan (proposal) that this research is tested by questionnaires. In the tested questionnaire to the 30 samples out of the questionnaire sample of the research, the questionnaires from job stress variables are valid and reliable so that it can be used for further research. Therefore, at this stage it is conducted the testing of overall validity and reliability to the 145 research samples. The job stress variables (X₃) are measured by using six indicators that consists of ST1 to ST6. The results of these tests are:

Figure 2
CFA Model for Job Stress Variable

Meanwhile the results of goodness of fit model from the measuring instrument of job stress variables fully can be seen from some of the compliance indices values as shown below.

Table 2
Suitability Index of Measuring Instrument Model of Job Stress Variable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Cut off Value</th>
<th>Model Result</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chi-Square</td>
<td>16.918</td>
<td>7.869</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMIN/DF</td>
<td>≤ 2</td>
<td>0.874</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probability</td>
<td>≥ 0.05</td>
<td>0.547</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GFI</td>
<td>≥ 0.9</td>
<td>0.982</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TLI</td>
<td>≥ 0.9</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFI</td>
<td>≥ 0.9</td>
<td>1.005</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMSEA</td>
<td>≤ 0.08</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Data Processing Result (2015)

The results of the model fit instrument test for the measurement of the job stress variable (Y₁) can be concluded that all the required values in modeling have met the requirements of ideal goodness of fit indexes. So the conclusion is that the measuring instrument of the job stress is unidimensional. Meanwhile the significance level of loading standard coefficient for each indicator in the job stress variable (Y₁) can be seen in below.
Table 3
Standard Loading Indicator of Job Stress Variable (Y₁)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>λ</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Construct Reliability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ST1</td>
<td>0.783</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>0.875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST2</td>
<td>0.803</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST3</td>
<td>0.513</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST4</td>
<td>0.862</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST5</td>
<td>0.823</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST6</td>
<td>0.583</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Data Processing Result (2015)

It is obtained information that each measuring indicator of work stress variable (Y₁) has a standard loading value which produces a significance level of ≤ 0.05, then it can be said that the indicator is valid as a measuring of the work stress variable (Y₁). As well as the construct reliability value > 0.6. So the conclusion that the measuring instrument of the job stress is reliable.

Respondents’ answers toward the work stress
Job stress is the size of the level of psychological and biological balance disorders that causes chaos in the whole mental, spiritual and social. Work stress can be identified through the balance or fairness relating to personal’s bodily operating metabolism and the awareness decreasing to be able to act rationally. The figure of the respondents; perceptions about work stress variables can be seen from the results of descriptive analysis. More descriptive analysis results are presented in appendix and summarized below:

Table 4
Respondents’ Answers toward the Work Attitude Based on the Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>SCORE</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y₁</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y₂</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y₃</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y₄</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y₅</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y₆</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4,8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: data processing Result (2015)

1,2..... 6 = scoring scale, from very low (1) to very high (6)
f = frequency = the number of respondents
It can be noted that the respondents generally give a rather low perception on all indicators from the work stress variable ($Y_1$), because the total average value is 3.21. Most respondents select a score of 3 (three) or rather low for anger sensitivity indicator ($Y_{1.1}$) with a frequency of 54 respondents, or 37.2%, and the total of average value for the indicator ($Y_{1.1}$) is 3.10. Most respondents select a score of 3 (three) or rather low for heartthrob intensity indicator in action ($Y_{1.2}$) with a frequency of 58 respondents, or 40.0%, and the total of the average value for the indicator ($Y_{1.2}$) is 3.06. Most respondents select score of 4 (four) or rather high for confusion level indicators ($Y_{1.3}$) with a frequency of 69 respondents, or 47.6% and the total of the average value for the indicator ($Y_{1.3}$) adalah 3.66. Most respondents select a score of 3 (three) or rather low for the work focus nervousness level indicator ($Y_{1.5}$) with a frequency of 59 respondents, or 40.7% and the total of the average value for the indicator ($Y_{1.5}$) is 3.23. Most respondents select a score of 3 (three) or rather low for the likeness indicator ($Y_{1.6}$) with a frequency of 61 respondents, or 42.1%, and the total of the average value for the indicator ($Y_{1.6}$) is 3.12. Normality test results with Normal Q-Q plot shows that the distribution of data points has distribution which are located around the diagonal line. This means that the work attitude variable used in this study has a normally distributed random data.
Normality test results with Normal Q-Q plot shows that the distribution of data points has distribution which are located around the diagonal line. This means that the work stress variable used in this study has a normally distributed random data.

CONCLUSION

Based on the theoretical study analysis and empirical study as well as the synthesis of two studies that have been proven in qualitative and quantitative way, it can be concluded that the quality of work life is proved has a negative effect on work stress. This means that the better the level of the quality of work life is, the lower the employee stress level is. Work attitude does not affect the performance of the employees. This is because the educational
staffs in most of universities in Medan City show that there are still many educational staff who refuse to change the culture within the organization, especially regarding the development of information technology as an opportunity for the educational staff to learn the improvement. Work stress affects the employees. This means that the higher of the work stress level is, the higher the employee performance is.
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