Equivalent : Journal Of Economic, Accounting and Management
Vol. 4, No. 2, 2026, Page : 2590 - 2603
Publisher: CV. Doki Course and Training
E-ISSN: 2985-8089 | P-ISSN: 2986-8777

The Effect of Work and Personal Life Integration on Employee Performance with Work Stress as an Intervening Variable at the Binjai City Manpower, Industry, and Trade Office

Dermawaty Br. Sihombing[1], Hernawaty[2], Erwansyah[3]
Universitas Pembangunan Panca Budi, Medan, North Sumatra [1,2,3]
Corresponding email: dermawatyshb@gmail.com[1],
Author email: hernawaty@dosen.pancabudi.ac.id[2], erwansyah@dosen.pancabudi.ac.id[3]

ARTICLE INFO

Article History
Submission : 08/06/2026
Received : 14/06/2026
Revised : 26/06/2026
Accepted : 30/06/2026

Keywords
work and personal life integration, work stress, employee performance, public sector

ABSTRACT

The increasing integration of work and personal life in the modern technology-based work environment has presented both opportunities and challenges for employee performance, especially in public sector organizations. While work-life integration offers flexibility, it also has the potential to increase work stress due to the blurring of role boundaries between work and personal life. This study aims to analyze the influence of work-life integration on the performance of employees with work stress as an intervening variable at the Binjai City Manpower, Industry, and Trade Office. This study uses an associative quantitative research design involving 36 civil servants selected through purposive sampling techniques. Data was collected using a structured questionnaire and analyzed using the Structural Equation Modeling–Partial Least Squares (SEM-PLS) method using the SmartPLS 3.3.3 application. The results show that work-life integration has a positive and significant effect on employee performance, which indicates that effective integration can improve productivity, focus, and work quality. In addition, work-life integration also has a positive effect on work stress, suggesting that increased role integration can trigger psychological distress when role boundaries are unclear. Work stress has also been shown to have a positive but relatively small effect on employee performance, which indicates the presence of eustress that can encourage motivation and work alertness. Furthermore, work stress has been shown to partially mediate the relationship between work-life integration and employee performance. These findings confirm that while work-life integration is important in improving employee performance, its implementation needs to be accompanied by an effective stress management strategy to maintain the sustainability of employee welfare and achieve optimal organizational performance in public sector institutions.

Introduction

The rapid development of digital technology and the transformation of modern work patterns have further blurred the boundaries between work and personal life. Employees are no longer bound by rigid time and space constraints, as technological connectivity allows work to be done outside of regular business hours and office locations. This condition encourages the emergence of the concept *of work-life integration* as a contemporary approach that emphasizes the simultaneous alignment of professional and personal roles, in contrast to the traditional concept *of work-life balance* which emphasizes a firm separation between the two (Idrus 2023). While *work-life integration* offers flexibility and work autonomy, its implementation has the potential to increase job demands and psychological stress, which can ultimately affect employee well-being and performance.

In the study of human resource management, employee performance is the main indicator of organizational effectiveness, especially in the public sector which demands quality of service and accountability to the community. Employee performance reflects the individual's ability to carry out tasks effectively, efficiently, and in accordance with established organizational standards (Hernawaty 2021). Therefore, the identification of factors that affect employee performance, both structural and psychological, is an important concern for public organizations in an effort to improve institutional effectiveness and the quality of public services.

Previous empirical research findings show mixed results regarding the relationship between *work-life integration* and employee performance. A number of studies report that effectively managed *work-life integration* has a positive effect on performance through increased job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and work focus (Allen et al. 2023; Medina-Garrido et al. 2023). Integrated work flexibility and role management allow employees to allocate psychological resources more optimally between the work and personal life domains. Nevertheless, other research suggests that excessive levels of integration can lead to role overload, emotional exhaustion, as well as increased work stress, which negatively impacts performance when role boundaries are not clearly defined (Derks et al. 2022; Riaz et al. 2024). The inconsistency of the results of the study indicates that the influence of *work-life integration* on employee performance may not be direct, but through certain psychological mechanisms.

One of the psychological mechanisms that is widely studied in these relationships is work stress. Work stress occurs when there is an imbalance between job demands and an individual's ability to deal with internal and external pressures (Hidayati and Harsono, 2022). A number of studies have found that work stress plays an intervening variable in the relationship between *work-life integration* and employee performance (Isa and Indrayati 2023; Udin et al. 2023). Nevertheless, other research shows that work stress does not always negatively impact performance; to some extent, stress can serve as *eustress* that

Equivalent : Journal Of Economic, Accounting and Management
Vol. 4, No. 2, 2026, Page : 2590-2603

increases alertness, responsibility, and work engagement (Le Fevre et al. 2023). These differences in findings show that there is a research gap related to the role of work stress in influencing employee performance in the context of work life integration.

This research gap is even more relevant when viewed from the organizational context. Most of the research on *work-life integration*, work stress, and employee performance was conducted in private sector organizations or banking institutions that have relatively higher work flexibility. On the other hand, empirical studies on public sector organizations, especially local government institutions, are still limited. Public organizations operate within a framework of bureaucracy, strict regulations, and typical public service pressures, which have the potential to shape employees' experiences of *work-life integration* and work stress differently (Erwansyah et al. 2022). Therefore, generalization of findings from the private sector to government institutions requires further empirical testing.

The results of preliminary observations and pre-surveys conducted at the Binjai City Manpower, Industry, and Trade Office show that there are problems related to *work-life integration*. Some employees have difficulty managing work responsibilities and personal and family needs due to high administrative burdens, increasing demands for public services, and limited flexibility in working hours. These conditions are perceived to contribute to increased work stress and fluctuations in employee performance. Pre-survey results showed that some employees experienced work interventions into personal time, felt increased stress due to administrative and service pressures, and reported decreased performance during periods of high stress levels.

These preliminary findings suggest that work stress has an important role in shaping the relationship between *work-life integration* and employee performance in the public sector context. This emphasizes the need for empirical research that systematically examines the relationship between these variables in local government institutions. Without adequate policy support and organizational management, the implementation of *work-life integration* has the potential to increase work stress and negatively impact employee welfare and the effectiveness of public services.

Based on empirical phenomena, inconsistencies in previous research results, and the limitations of studies in the public sector, this study aims to analyze the influence of *work-life integration* on the performance of employees with work stress as an intervening variable at the Binjai City Manpower, Industry, and Trade Office. In particular, this study aims to: (1) analyze the influence of *work-life integration* on employee performance, (2) analyze the influence of *work-life integration* on work stress, (3) analyze the effect of work stress on employee performance, and (4) examine the role of work stress in mediating the relationship between *work-life integration* and employee performance. The results of this research are expected to make a theoretical and practical contribution to the development of human resource management policies in local government institutions, especially in an

effort to improve employee performance in a sustainable manner and maintain work welfare.

Method

This study uses an associative quantitative research design that aims to test the relationship between two or more variables (Ning Wahyuni and Rindrayani 2025). The research model consists of work-life integration as an exogenous variable (X), employee performance as an endogenous variable (Y), and work stress as an intervening variable (Z). This approach was chosen to empirically test the direct and indirect influences between constructs in an integrated structural framework.

This research was carried out at the Binjai City Manpower, Industry, and Trade Office which is located at Jl. Perintis Kemerdekaan No.113, North Binjai District, Binjai City, North Sumatra, Indonesia. The data collection was carried out for four months, from September to December 2025, to provide adequate time in the process of disseminating and returning the questionnaire.

The research population includes all employees at the Binjai City Manpower, Industry, and Trade Office which totals 40 people. Population is defined as a whole subject that has certain characteristics that are relevant to the research problem and become the basis for generalizing research results (Mushofa et al. 2024). The population consists of 34 State Civil Apparatus (ASN) and 6 Government Employees with Work Agreements (PPPK).

Given the relatively small population, this study used a purposive sampling technique, with the sample limited only to employees with the status of State Civil Apparatus. Thus, the number of research respondents was 36 employees. Samples are part of a population that is chosen to represent population characteristics when it is not possible to examine all members of the population (Susanto et al. 2024).

Data collection was carried out using a structured questionnaire. Quantitative data analysis was carried out using the Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) method based on Partial Least Squares (PLS) using SmartPLS software version 3.3.3. This method was chosen because it is suitable for relatively small sample sizes and is able to accommodate research models involving complex mediation relationships.

The evaluation of the measurement model (outer model) is carried out through validity and reliability testing. The validity of the construct is used to ensure that the indicators in the questionnaire are able to accurately measure the construct in question (Sugiarto et al. 2024). Reliability is measured using Cronbach's alpha values and composite reliability, with threshold values above 0.70 indicating an acceptable level of reliability (Cheung 2024).

Furthermore, the evaluation of the structural model (inner model) was carried out to test the relationship between constructs according to the research hypothesis (Hair et al. 2021). The model assessment includes a determination coefficient (R^2) to measure the model's

Equivalent : Journal Of Economic, Accounting and Management
Vol. 4, No. 2, 2026, Page : 2590-2603

explainability, a Stone–Geisser's Q^2 value to test predictive relevance, and a bootstrapping procedure to test the significance of the path of influence. The model is said to have predictive relevance if the value of Q^2 is greater than zero (Fauzi 2022). Hypothesis testing was carried out with criteria of t-statistical value greater than 1.96 at a significance level of 5 percent (Hair et al. 2021). The path coefficient is used to determine the direction and strength of the relationship between variables, while a Normed Fit Index (NFI) value close to 1 indicates a good level of model fit (Hair et al. 2022).

Results and Discussion

Results

Evaluation of Measurement Models (*Outer Model*)

The evaluation of the measurement model was carried out using the Partial Least Squares (PLS) algorithm through SmartPLS software version 3.0 to assess the validity and reliability of the construct. The validity of the convergence was tested by looking at the outer loading value of each reflective indicator. Indicators with an outer loading value above 0.60 are declared to meet the criteria of convergent validity and are acceptable, especially in applied social research (Ghozali and Latan 2015).

Table 1. *Outer Loading*

Indicator	*Outer Loading*	Remarks
Work-life and personal life integration (X)		
IKP.1	0,979	Valid
IKP.2	0,978	Valid
IKP.3	0,989	Valid
IKP.4	0,942	Valid
IKP.5	0,939	Valid
Work stress (Z)		
SK.1	0,863	Valid
SK.2	0,934	Valid
SK.3	0,830	Valid
SK.4	0,800	Valid
SK.5	0,864	Valid
Employee Performance (Y)		
KP.1	0,966	Valid
KP.2	0,975	Valid
KP.3	0,970	Valid
KP.4	0,948	Valid
KP.5	0,839	Valid
KP.6	0,912	Valid
KP.7	0,883	Valid

Source : PLS Smart Output, 2025

As presented in Table 1, all indicators in the variables of work-life integration, work stress, and employee performance show an outer loading value above 0.60, with a

value range between 0.800 to 0.989. These results show that each indicator is capable of adequately representing a latent construct measured. The structural visualization of the measurement model (outer model) is shown in Figure 1.

Furthermore, discriminant validity testing was carried out using cross loading analysis. The results of the discriminatory validity test are presented in Table 2 below.

Table 2. ***Discriminant Validity***

Indicator	Work-life and personal life integration (X)	Employee Performance (Y)	Work Stress (Z)
IKP.1	**0,979**	0,970	0,639
IKP.2	**0,978**	0,966	0,665
IKP.3	**0,989**	0,975	0,666
IKP.4	**0,942**	0,914	0,613
IKP.5	**0,939**	0,916	0,575
KP.1	0,978	**0,966**	0,665
KP.2	0,989	**0,975**	0,666
KP.3	0,979	**0,970**	0,639
KP.4	0,949	**0,948**	0,669
KP.5	0,813	**0,839**	0,659
KP.6	0,837	**0,912**	0,637
KP.7	0,812	**0,883**	0,597
SK.1	0,652	0,659	**0,863**
SK.2	0,762	0,784	**0,934**
SK.3	0,356	0,418	**0,830**
SK.4	0,304	0,361	**0,800**
SK.5	0,515	0,577	**0,864**

Source: PLS Smart Output, 2025

Based on Table 2, it can be seen that each indicator has a higher loading value on the construct it measures compared to other constructs. These results show that the model has met the criteria for discriminant validity, so that each construct in this study is empirically different and can be measured accurately.

Furthermore, the construct reliability test was carried out using Cronbach's alpha, composite reliability, and average variance extracted (AVE) values. The results of the reliability test are presented in Table 3 below.

Table 3. ***Construct Reliability and Validity***

Equivalent : Journal Of Economic, Accounting and Management
Vol. 4, No. 2, 2026, Page : 2590-2603

Indicators	Cronbach's Alpha	Composite Reliability	Mean Variance Extracted (AVE)
Work-life and personal life integration (X)	0,982	0,986	0,933
Employee Performance (Y)	0,973	0,978	0,863
Work Stress (Z)	0,916	0,934	0,739

Source: *Output Smart PLS*, 2025

Based on Table 3, the entire construct shows Cronbach's alpha and composite reliability values that exceed the minimum limit of 0.70, while the average variance extracted (AVE) value is above the recommended threshold of 0.50. These results confirm that all constructs in this study have met the required reliability and validity criteria.

Evaluation of Structural Models (Inner Model)

The evaluation of the structural model was carried out by reviewing the R-square (R^2) value, the model suitability index, and the path coefficient. Based on Table 4, the R^2 value for the employee performance variable is 0.969, which shows that work-life integration and work stress are simultaneously able to explain 96.7% of employee performance variations. This value reflects a very high level of power explain the model.

Meanwhile, the work stress variable had an R^2 value of 0.429, which indicates that work-life integration contributes a moderate explanation to the variation in work stress.

Table 4.4 R Square Results

Variable	R Square	Adjusted R Square
Employee Performance (Y)	0,969	0,967
Work Stress (Z)	0,429	0,412

Source: *PLS Smart Output*, 2025

Based on Table 4.4, the results of the determination coefficient test (*R Square*) show that the R Square value in the Employee Performance variable (Y) is 0.969, with the Adjusted R Square value of 0.967. This indicates that the Integration of Work and Personal Life (X) and Work Stress (Z) are simultaneously able to affect 96.7% of Employee Performance. This value is included in the very high category, which shows that the structural model built has a very strong explanatory power in explaining employee performance. Thus, only 3.3% of the variation in employee performance was influenced by other factors outside the research model.

The high R Square value in the Employee Performance variable shows that changes in the level of integration of work and personal life as well as work stress conditions have a very large contribution to the increase or decrease in employee performance. This confirms that the balance of personal work roles and work stress management is an important factor in determining employee performance in the organization.

Furthermore, in the Work Stress variable (Z), the R Square value was 0.429 with the Adjusted R Square of 0.412. This value shows that Work-Life and Personal Life Integration (X) is able to affect 41.2% of the variation in Work Stress, while the remaining 58.8% is influenced by other factors that are not included in the research model, such as workload, time pressure, role conflicts, leadership style, and work environment.

The R Square value in the Work Stress variable is moderate, which indicates that the integration of work and personal life has a fairly substantial role in shaping the level of work stress of employees. The better the employee is able to integrate the demands of work with personal life, the potential for work stress experienced tends to be suppressed.

Thus, it can be concluded that this research model has a very high predictive power on the Employee Performance variable and moderate predictive power on the Work Stress variable. These results support the position of Work Stress as a relevant intervening variable in explaining the influence of Work-Life and Personal Life Integration on Employee Performance, although there are still other factors outside the model that also affect employee work stress levels.

Goodness of Fit *Test Results*

Goodness of Fit test is a statistical method used to evaluate how well the model or statistical distribution being tested is in accordance with the observed data. The Goodness of Fit test aims to determine the extent to which the observed data corresponds to the theoretical distribution assumed by the model or hypothesis. The goodness of fit model test can be seen by looking at the NFI value on the program. If the NFI value > SRMR and is closer to 1, then the better the model (good fit). Based on the data processing that has been carried out using the SmartPLS 3.0 program, the Model Fit value is obtained as follows.

Table 5. Model Fit

	Saturated Model	Estimated Model
SRMR	0,102	0,102
d_ULS	1,600	1,600
d_G	2,411	2,411
Chi-Square	660,212	660,212
NFI	0,402	0,402

Source: PLS Smart Output, 2025

Based on table 7, it can be seen that the NFI value is 0.402 > 0.102 so that it can be stated that the model in this study has sufficient *goodness of fit* and is suitable to be used to test the research hypothesis.

Hypothesis Testing Results

After conducting an inner model analysis, the next thing is to evaluate the relationship between latent constructs in order to answer the hypothesis in this study. The hypothesis test in this study was carried out by looking at T-Statistics and P-Values values. The hypothesis is stated to be accepted if the *T-Statistics value is* > 1.96 and the P-Values < 0.05. The following are the results *of Path Coefficients* of direct influence between variables as shown in the following table.

Table 6. *Path Coefficients* (Direct Influence)

Equivalent : Journal Of Economic, Accounting and Management
Vol. 4, No. 2, 2026, Page : 2590-2603

Variable	Original Sample (O)	Sample Mean (M)	Standard Deviation (STDEV)	T Statistics (|O/STDEV|)	P Values	Results
Work-life and personal life integration (X) -> Employee Performance (Y)	0,921	0,921	0,022	42,549	0,000	**Accepted**
Work-life and personal life integration (X) -> Work Stress (Z)	0,655	0,673	0,069	9,445	0,000	**Accepted**
Work Stress (Z) -> Employee Performance (Y)	0,093	0,091	0,024	3,840	0,000	**Accepted**

Source: PLS Smart Output, 2023

Based on Table 4.6, the results of the path *coefficients* analysis show that Integration of Work and Personal Life (X) has a positive and significant effect on Employee Performance (Y). This is evidenced by a T-Statistics value of 42.549 (> 1.96) and a P-Values of 0.000 (< 0.05), as well as a path coefficient (*Original Sample*) of 0.921. This very high coefficient value shows that a good integration between work roles and personal life has a very strong influence on improving employee performance. Thus, the hypothesis that the integration of work and personal life has a positive and significant effect on employee performance is accepted. These findings indicate that employees who are able to balance the demands of work with personal life tend to work more productively, focused, and optimally.

Furthermore, testing the effect of Work and Personal Life Integration (X) on Work Stress (Z) showed positive and significant results, with a path coefficient value of 0.655, T-Statistics of 9.445 (> 1.96), and P-Values of 0.000 (< 0.05). These results show that the level of work-life integration has a significant relationship with the level of work stress experienced by employees. These findings indicate that the dynamics of managing work roles and personal lives can significantly affect the psychological condition of employees, so the hypothesis that there is a significant influence between the two variables is accepted.

Furthermore, the test results showed that Work Stress (Z) had a positive and significant effect on Employee Performance (Y), with a path coefficient value of 0.093, T-Statistics of 3.840 (> 1.96), and P-Values of 0.000 (< 0.05). Although the value of the path coefficient is relatively small, these results indicate that the level of work stress experienced by employees still has a significant contribution to performance. This shows that work stress to a certain extent can be a trigger for increased alertness and work responsibility, but it needs to be managed properly so as not to have a negative impact in the long term.

Overall, the results of the direct influence test show that the Integration of Work and Personal Life (X) has a very dominant role in improving Employee Performance (Y), both directly and through its influence on Work Stress (Z). In addition, Work Stress (Z) has also been proven to have a significant effect on employee performance, so it deserves to be positioned as an intervening variable in this research model. These findings confirm that managing work-life balance and work stress are key factors in efforts to improve employee performance in the context of modern organizations.

To find out more deeply the role of Work Stress (Z) as an intervening variable in the relationship between Work and Personal Life Integration on Employee Performance, the next analysis will be presented in the following table of *specific indirect effects*:

Table 7 Indirect Effects

Variable	Original Sample (O)	Sample Mean (M)	Standard Deviation (STDEV)	T Statistics (|O/STDEV|)	P Values	Results
Work-life and personal life integration (X) -> Work Stress (Z) -> Employee Performance (Y)	0,061	0,062	0,020	3,045	0,004	**Accepted**

Source: PLS Smart Output, 2025

Based on Table 4.7, the results of the *specific indirect effects* test show that Work Stress (Z) plays a role as an intervening variable in the relationship between Work and Personal Life Integration (X) to Employee Performance (Y). This is evidenced by the Original Sample value of 0.061, T-Statistics of 3.045 (> 1.96), and P-Values of 0.004 (< 0.05). These results show that these indirect influences are statistically significant, so the hypothesis that work stress mediates the relationship between work-life and personal integration on employee performance is accepted.

A positive path coefficient value indicates that Work-Life and Personal Life Integration not only affects Employee Performance directly, but also indirectly through Work Stress. This means that the level of success of employees in integrating work roles and personal lives can affect the work stress conditions experienced, which ultimately has an impact on improving or decreasing employee performance.

These findings reinforce the results of previous direct influence testing, where Work-Life and Personal Life Integration was shown to have a significant effect on Work Stress, and Work Stress also had a significant effect on Employee Performance. Thus, Work Stress functions as a partial mediator, because the influence of Work and Personal Life Integration on Employee Performance occurs both directly and through the mediation of work stress.

Overall, the results of this indirect influence analysis confirm that work stress management is an important mechanism in bridging the relationship between the integration of work and personal life with employee performance. In the organizational context, this shows that efforts to improve employee performance not only need to be focused on creating work-life balance, but must also be accompanied by an effective work stress management strategy so that the positive impact on performance can be optimized.

Discussion

The results of the hypothesis test showed that the Integration of Work and Personal Life (X) had a positive and significant effect on Employee Performance (Y) with a path coefficient value of 0.921, T-Statistics of 42.549, and P-Values of 0.000. This very high coefficient value indicates that employees' ability to manage and integrate work demands with personal life has a very dominant role in improving performance. Employees who are able to maintain a balance between work responsibilities and personal lives tend to have better work focus, lower levels of fatigue, and more optimal productivity. These findings are in line with the research of Allen et al. (2023) and Putri & Handayani (2024) which states that effective *work-life integration* contributes

Equivalent : Journal Of Economic, Accounting and Management
Vol. 4, No. 2, 2026, Page : 2590-2603

significantly to improving employee performance, especially in modern and flexible work environments.

Furthermore, the results of the analysis also showed that Work and Personal Life Integration (X) had a positive and significant effect on Work Stress (Z) with a path coefficient value of 0.655, T-Statistics of 9.445, and P-Values of 0.000. These findings indicate that the dynamics of integration between work roles and personal lives have a real relationship with the level of work stress experienced by employees. In this context, integration that demands a high degree of interconnectedness between work and personal life—for example through hybrid work systems and the use of digital technology—can increase exposure to work pressures if it is not balanced with clear role boundaries. These results are in line with the research of Derks et al. (2022) and Riaz et al. (2024) who concluded that the intensity of work–personal life integration can increase work stress when role demands overlap.

The results of the next test showed that Work Stress (Z) had a positive and significant effect on Employee Performance (Y) with a path coefficient value of 0.093, T-Statistics of 3.840, and P-Values of 0.000. Although the magnitude of the coefficient is relatively small, the effect is still statistically significant. These findings indicate that work stress to some degree can function as *eustress*, that is, positive stress that encourages alertness, responsibility, and motivation to get work done better. These findings support the Yerkes–Dodson Law theory and the results of research by Le Fevre et al. (2023) which states that moderate work stress can improve performance, as long as it does not exceed a threshold that is detrimental to the psychological condition of employees.

In the analysis of indirect effects, the results of *the specific indirect effects* test showed that Work Stress (Z) was proven to mediate the relationship between Work and Personal Life Integration (X) on Employee Performance (Y). This is evidenced by the path coefficient value of 0.061, T-Statistics of 3.045, and P-Values of 0.004. These findings show that the influence of work-life and personal life integration on employee performance does not only occur directly, but also through work stress mechanisms. Thus, work stress acts as a partial mediator, since the direct and indirect pathways are equally significant.

These results reinforce the previous finding that the integration of work and personal life has a double implication, namely being able to improve performance directly, but at the same time affecting work stress levels which ultimately also have an impact on performance. These findings are in line with research by Kossek et al. (2023) and Sonnentag & Fritz (2024) which states that work-life integration affects performance through employee psychological conditions, including stress and work fatigue.

Overall, the results of this study confirm that the Integration of Work and Personal Life is a key factor in improving Employee Performance, both directly and through its role in influencing Work Stress. Work stress in this study serves as a psychological mechanism that bridges these relationships. Therefore, in the context of modern organizations and hybrid work systems, employee performance improvement needs to be balanced with policies that support healthy work-life integration and effective work stress management strategies, so that the positive impact on performance can be optimized in a sustainable manner.

Conclusion

Based on the results of the analysis of the structural model (inner model) using the SEM-PLS approach and the discussions that have been carried out, several conclusions can be drawn as follows:

1. The integration of work and personal life has a positive and significant effect on Employee Performance.
   The results of the analysis show that the integration of work and personal life has a very strong influence on improving employee performance, as evidenced by the path coefficient value of 0.921, T-Statistics > 1.96, and P-Values < 0.05. These findings confirm that employees who are able to manage a balance between work demands and personal lives tend to have more optimal productivity, work focus, and performance quality.
2. The integration of work and personal life has a positive and significant effect on Work Stress.
   Hypothesis testing showed that the integration of work and personal life significantly affected employees' work stress levels with a path coefficient of 0.655. This indicates that the dynamics of integrating work and personal life roles, especially in the context of modern and technology-based work, can increase psychological pressure if not balanced with clear role boundaries.
3. Work Stress has a positive and significant effect on Employee Performance.The results show that work stress has a positive and significant influence on employee performance with a path coefficient of 0.093. Although the effect is relatively small, these findings indicate that moderate levels of work stress can function as eustress that encourages alertness, responsibility, and work motivation, thus positively impacting employee performance.
4. Work Stress acts as an intervening variable (partial mediator) in the relationship between Work-Life Integration and Personal Life on Employee Performance.The results of the indirect influence test showed that work stress significantly mediated the relationship between the integration of work and personal life on employee performance, with an indirect path coefficient value of 0.061 and P-Values < 0.05. These findings confirm that the improvement in employee performance is not only directly influenced by the integration of work and personal life, but also through psychological mechanisms in the form of work stress, so that work stress functions as a partial mediator in this research model.

References

Afandi. (2018). *Human Resource Management: Concept Theory and Indicators*. Zanafa Publishing.

Allen, T. D., French, K. A., Dumani, S., & Shockley, K. M. (2023). A cross-national meta-analytic examination of work–life integration and employee performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 108*(4), 612–630. https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0001023

Askarov, R. (2024). *What Is Work-Life Integration?* Monitask Business Glossary.

Brun, A., Lucas, G., & Becerik-Gerber, B. (2025). *Under pressure: contextualizing workplace stress towards user-centered interventions*. arXiv

Chauhan, P., & Rai, S. (2024). *Conceptualizing work-life integration: A review and research agenda*. Asia Pacific Management Review, 29(4), 415–426.

Equivalent : Journal Of Economic, Accounting and Management
Vol. 4, No. 2, 2026, Page : 2590-2603

Cheung, G. W. (2024). Methods for assessing reliability. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management, 41*(1), 123–145. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10490-023-09871-y

Derks, D., van Duin, D., Tims, M., & Bakker, A. B. (2022). Smartphone use and work–life integration: The role of stress and recovery. *Human Relations, 75*(2), 341–365. https://doi.org/10.1177/00187267211045572

Dwitanti, N., et al. (2025). The Effect of Workload and Job Stress on Employee Performance with Work-Life Balance as an Intervening Variable: Case of BNI. International Journal of Business, Law, and Education, link

Erwansyah, Rintan, Br. S., & Purba, T. O. H. (2022). Digitalization Marketing to Increase Sales for Women MSME Actors in Medan City, North Sumatra. *METHABDI Journal of Community Service*, *2*(2), 137–144. https://doi.org/10.46880/methabdi.Vol2No2.pp137-144

Fauzi, M. A. (2022). Evaluate the structural model using the PLS-SEM approach: R-square, Q-square, and effect size. *Scientific Journal of Management*, 12(2), 55–67. https://doi.org/10.21009/jim.122.05

Ghozali, I. (2021). *Partial Least Squares: Concepts, Methods, and Applications using the SmartPLS 3.0 Program*. Semarang: Publishing Agency of Diponegoro University.

Hair, J. F., Hult, G. T. M., Ringle, C. M., Sarstedt, M., Danks, N. P., & Ray, S. (2021). *Partial least squares structural equation modeling (PLS-SEM) using R: A workbook.*Handoko, T. H. (2013). *Management* (2nd ed.). BPFE.

Hair, J. F., Hult, G. T. M., Ringle, C. M., & Sarstedt, M. (2022). *A primer on partial least squares structural equation modeling (PLS-SEM)* (3rd ed.). Sage Publications.

Hernawaty. (2021). Leadership Style, Motivation and Work Environment Affect Employee Performance. *Smart Scientific Journal*, *1*(1). http://stmb-multismart.ac.id/ejournal

Hidayati, L. N., & Harsono, M. (2022). *Literature Review on Stress in Organizations*. Journal of Management Science, 18(1), 20–30. https://doi.org/10.21831/jim.v18i1.39339 UNY Journal

Idrus. (2023). The Impact of Work-Life Integration on Employee Welfare and Work Productivity. COSTING Journal of Economic, Business and Accounting, link

Isa, N., & Indrayati, A. (2023). The mediating role of work-life balance on work-family conflict and employee performance. South African Journal of Human Resource Management, link

Kossek, E. E., Thompson, R. J., & Lautsch, B. A. (2023). Balanced work–life integration: Organizational strategies and employee outcomes. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior, 10*, 101–128. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-120920-043509

Le Fevre, M., Matheny, J., & Kolt, G. S. (2023). Eustress, distress, and performance: Revisiting the stress–performance relationship. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *44*(3), 356–370. https://doi.org/10.1002/job.2674

Medina-Garrido, J. A., et al. (2023). Work-life integration and well-being: Evidence from Spanish banking sector. arXiv preprint, link

Mangkunegara. A.A. P. (2020). *Human Resource Management Agency. Edition XIV.* PT. Teenager Rosdakarya.

Mushofa, M., Hermina, D., & Huda, N. (2024). *Understanding Populations and Samples: A Key Pillar in Quantitative Research.* Journal of Syntax Admiration, 5(12), 5937–5948. https://doi.org/10.46799/jsa.v5i12.1992

Ning Wahyuni, & Rindrayani, S. R. (2025). Associative research methodology. *Jupiter: Journal of Management, Accounting, and Economics, 14*(9), 41–50. https://doi.org/10.8734/musytari.v14i9.10767

Putri, A. N., & Handayani, R. (2024). Work–life integration and employee performance in hybrid work settings. *Journal of Management and Organization, 15*(1), 45–59.

Riaz, S., Xu, Y., & Hussain, S. (2024). Work–life integration, role blurring, and job stress. *International Journal of Human Resource Management, 35*(6), 1034–1052. https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2023.2251148

Robbin & Judge. (2015). Organizational Behavior 16th Edition. Salemba Four.

Sonnentag, S., & Fritz, C. (2024). Recovery from job stress and its impact on performance. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 33*(1), 12–18. https://doi.org/10.1177/09637214231203456

Susanto, P. C., Arini, D., & et al. (2024). *Quantitative research concepts: Population, sample, and Data Analysis (A literature review).* Journal of Multidisciplinary Science, **3**(1), 9–20

Sugiarto, A., Kamakaula, Y., Susanty, L., & Periansya. (2024). *Research Methodology. Theory & Practice*. Saba Jaya Press.

Sukmawati, R., & Hermana, C. (2024). *The Effect of Work Stress and Work Stress on Employee Performance*. *Journal of Management and Business Research*, 4(1), 51–56.DOI: 10.29313/jrmb.v4i1.4019

Sapphire. (2024, September 4). *Development of Integration of work and personal life to Improve the Performance of the Organization in Serving the Public*. Research and Development Agency and Training of the Ministry of Religion.

Udin, et al. (2023). Work-life balance, job satisfaction, and affective commitment: Evidence from plywood company employees. International Journal of Sustainable Development and Planning, link