

The Relationship Between Workload and Job Stress on Employee Turnover Intention at CV XYZ

Haerunisa Nanda Putri¹, Kartika Nuradina², Benny Bernadus³

Universitas Indonesia Membangun. Indonesia

Corresponding Author: haerunisaanp@student.inaba.ac.id
kartika.nuradina@inaba.ac.id benny.bernadus@inaba.ac.id

Article Information:

Received: January 01, 2026 Accepted: January 12, 2026, Published: January 15, 2026

Abstract

The high rate of employee turnover has become a major challenge for retail companies, including CV XYZ, as it affects productivity, cost efficiency, and organizational stability. This condition emphasizes the need to examine psychological factors that drive employees' intention to leave their jobs. The present research explores how workload and job stress are associated with turnover intention among employees of CV XYZ. This research employed a quantitative methodology using multiple correlation. The sample comprised 90 respondents selected via stratified random sampling from a total population of 530 employees. The research instruments included the workload scale (NASA-TLX), job stress scale (Parker & DeCotiis, 1983) and turnover intention scale (Mobley, 1977). Data were analyzed using Spearman's Rho correlation and multiple regression techniques. The findings reveal that workload and job stress are positively and significantly associated with turnover intention ($p < 0.001$, $r = 0.603$). These results are consistent with the Job Demands-Resources framework, Cognitive Appraisal Theory, and the Conservation of Resources approach, which suggest that stress and turnover intention result from an imbalance between work demands and available personal resources. Results are expected to provide insights for management in balancing workload, strengthening social support, and improving employees' psychological well-being.

Keywords: Workload, Job Stress, Turnover Intention, Psychological Well-Being, Human Resources

1. Introduction

In a highly competitive business environment, retail companies must adopt adaptive, innovative human resource management (HRM) strategies. Human resources serve as a key factor in organizational success, as they determine the effectiveness of policy implementation and the achievement of strategic corporate goals. To survive and grow, organizations must adapt to market changes and enhance operational efficiency. Employee performance plays a

fundamental role in organizational success, reflecting how effectively an individual carries out assigned tasks, as measured by the quality and quantity of work outcomes ([Wulandari et al. 2025](#)). In line with this, companies must maintain their competitiveness by continuously improving the quality of their products or services, aligning strategies with market needs, and ensuring effective performance across all organizational levels ([Bernadus and Prasetyaningtyas 2023](#)). Efforts to maintain competitiveness require increased employee performance and responsibility, which may lead to psychological pressure if not supported by adequate organizational resources. However, high job demands and strict sales targets often generate psychological strain that can lead to job stress when not accompanied by effective workload management ([Putra and Nuradina 2023](#)).

([Liu et al. 2020](#)) found that employees working at Indomaret convenience stores in Manado City experienced considerable fatigue due to excessive workloads, as they were required to complete their tasks in accordance with predetermined targets. The findings revealed that most employees (50.0%) experienced work fatigue as a result of excessive workload. This suggests that a high workload in the retail sector not only affects physical exhaustion but also induces mental strain due to limited time to complete tasks and the pressure to achieve strict performance targets.

A similar condition was observed at CV XYZ, the retail company that serves as the object of this study. Based on interviews conducted with 15 employees of CV XYZ (2025), it was found that 12 employees (80%) reported experiencing a high workload, such as demanding sales targets, limited working hours, and increased overtime during specific periods, such as the end of the month, major promotions, or national holidays. During these periods, store employees were required to complete additional tasks, such as arranging product displays, conducting stocktakes, and enhancing customer service, while warehouse staff handled increased volumes of inbound and outbound goods. Meanwhile, office staff were responsible for preparing sales and inventory reports within tight deadlines.

In contrast, 3 employees (20%) reported not experiencing a high workload. This was attributed to a relatively balanced distribution of tasks, strong peer support, and effective communication with supervisors. Such conditions enabled employees to complete their work optimally without excessive job pressure. To strengthen these findings, this study also used secondary data on employee overtime hours at CV XYZ in 2025, which served as an objective indicator of workload intensity across divisions. The overtime data of CV XYZ employees for 2025 are presented in Table 1.

Table 1. Overtime Data of CV XYZ, 2025

Division	Average Overtime Hours per Month	Description
Store Staff	15 Hours	Overtime occurs due to staff shortages, high customer volume, stock-taking activities, and store maintenance
Warehouse Staff	72 Hours	Overtime is conducted due to the large volume of incoming goods and the distribution process to various branches or outlets

Office Staff	6 Hours	Overtime is carried out to complete administrative reports, sales data summaries, and end-of-month coordination with the operations department
--------------	---------	--

The data indicate that the warehouse division has the highest average overtime (72 hours per month), indicating a greater workload than other divisions. This condition suggests an imbalance between job demands and employees' available resources. This phenomenon aligns with the Job Demands–Resources (JD–R) Model, which posits that an imbalance between job demands and job resources can lead to job stress and burnout based on ([Schaufeli 2017](#)). An imbalance between high job demands and inadequate resources can increase psychological strain and adversely affect employee well-being at CV XYZ.

Furthermore, interview results revealed signs of job stress among employees at CV XYZ. Several symptoms were identified, including physical and mental fatigue, reduced concentration, increased sick leave, and diminished motivation and work engagement. Moreover, 12 out of 15 employees (80%) reported experiencing sleep difficulties, anxiety, irritability, reduced productivity, and lower job satisfaction. Factors contributing to job stress included excessive workload, lack of support and training from the company, a tense work environment, and insufficient recognition of employee performance.

Overall, the interview findings suggest that job stress at CV XYZ stems from an imbalance between job demands and both individual capacity and organizational support. If left unaddressed, this condition may decrease job satisfaction, increase emotional exhaustion, and trigger turnover intention among employees. According to internal data from CV XYZ, 323 employees (37.9%) resigned in 2025. This figure indicates a serious issue in employee retention and aligns with the [Hansen \(2022\)](#) report, which reported a national turnover rate of 41%, placing the retail sector among the industries with the highest turnover levels.

An employee's intention to leave an organization, commonly referred to as turnover intention, is influenced by a combination of internal and external determinants. Workplace pressure, ineffective headship, and inadequate compensation are among the main causes ([Yücel 2021](#)). Based on these findings, psychological factors, including work pressure and workload, play a crucial role in shaping employees' intentions to remain with or depart from an organization. This study specifically investigates the role of job stress and workload in influencing turnover intention among employees of CV XYZ.

Workload represents the extent to which task demands match an individual's abilities and available capacity. It is considered a measure of job volume relative to employee capability. When the workload exceeds personal capacity, it can reduce motivation and trigger psychological distress ([Widiyanto and Yunus 2021](#)). The higher the workload, the greater the likelihood of employee fatigue and desire to leave the organization ([Fitriantini et al. 2020](#)).

Job stress is a dynamic condition where individuals face challenges that exceed their coping abilities ([Tampombebu and Wijono 2022](#)). Over time, Emotional exhaustion and decreased job satisfaction are potential outcomes of job stress that may lead to turn over intention. Employee turn over intention is directly determined by job-related stress, as excessive job pressure erodes a sense of security and employee commitment to the organization ([Fauzi et al. 2024](#)).

Most existing studies have examined the manufacturing and banking sectors, whereas research on the retail sector, characterized by high work intensity, remains limited. Moreover, most studies have examined workload and job stress separately rather than within a comprehensive model. Accordingly, this research addresses the identified research gap by simultaneously investigating the roles of workload and job stress in shaping employee turnover intention at CV XYZ. This study contributes by empirically investigating the retail industry, characterized by long working hours, high performance targets, and a dynamic physical environment.

Based on the above explanation, this research analyzes employee turnover intention at CV XYZ, focusing on the roles of workload and job stress.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Workload

Workload represents a key component of human resource management, given its direct linkage to an individual's competence in performing assigned job responsibilities. Workload reflects employees' perceptions regarding the quantity including the degree of difficulty of tasks employees are required to accomplish within a particular timeframe ([Budiasa 2021](#)). High levels of workload are associated with increased physical and psychological fatigue, whereas an excessively light workload may result in boredom and decreased motivation ([Fitriantini et al. 2020](#)). Therefore, maintaining a balance between the quantity and quality of workload is essential to sustain productivity and prevent the emergence of job stress.

In general, two main forms of workload can be identified: quantitative and qualitative. The quantitative dimension refers to the extent of work volume or number of tasks that need to be completed under time constraints. Meanwhile, qualitative job demands relates to the level of job complexity, task difficulty, and the skills required to complete the work ([Vanchapo 2020](#)). These two forms of workload are interrelated and may affect both the physical and mental conditions of employees. Furthermore, Gibson (as cited in [Budiasa, 2021](#)) states that workload is influenced by several factors, including time pressure, work scheduling, role conflict, noise levels, information overload, and the degree of responsibility assigned to employees.

Based on various scholarly perspectives, the tasks and responsibilities assigned to employees, along with time constraints and available resources, collectively represent an individual's workload. A balance between the quantitative and qualitative aspects of work plays a significant role in maintaining employees' physical and psychological well-being. Conversely, an imbalanced or excessive workload tends to increase job stress and may encourage employees' intentions to leave the organization.

2.2 Job Stress

Job stress is a psychological outcome frequently experienced by employees stemming from excessive workload. Job stress refers to individual's reaction to various workplace pressures that emerge when personal characteristics do not align with job demands ([Budiasa 2021](#)). This imbalance may reduce performance, decrease job satisfaction, and increase the likelihood of work-related errors, ultimately lowering productivity. Beyond its impact on productivity, job stress is also closely associated with employees' emotional conditions in performing their work. Job stress represents a state in which individuals experience emotional tension during

work activities. This condition may influence cognitive processes, emotional stability, and behavioral responses in dealing with work situations. Thus, job stress affects not only physiological aspects but also employees' psychological well-being ([Egarini and Prastiwi 2022](#)).

Job stress can be measured through several indicators, including task demands, role demands, interpersonal relationships, organizational structure, and leadership style. Task demands relate to pressure stemming from job characteristics, while role demands arise from unclear responsibilities. In addition, poor interpersonal relationships, ambiguous organizational structures, and authoritarian leadership styles may also contribute to the emergence of job stress in the workplace ([Malik 2021](#)).

In addition to these indicators, [Vanchapo \(2020\)](#) categorizes the sources of job stress into three main factors: organizational factors, individual factors, and environmental factors. Organizational factors include excessive workload and pressure from supervisors, while individual factors are related to personal conditions such as financial problems or family conflicts. Environmental factors involve physical working conditions, such as inadequate lighting or high noise levels. The combination of these factors can exacerbate stress levels and increase employees' intentions to leave the organization.

Based on various expert opinions, A psychological strain known as job stress occurs when work-related demands surpass an individual's coping capacity. This situation may lead to emotional exhaustion, decreased job satisfaction, and an increased tendency for employees to resign from their jobs. Therefore, job stress not only affects individual performance but also serves as a critical factor contributing to the emergence of turnover intention in the workplace.

2.3 Turnover Intention

Turnover intention is a critical issue in human resource management because it reflects employees' voluntary intention to leave their jobs. [Egarini and Prastiwi \(2022\)](#) define turnover intention as an internal drive that emerges when individuals plan to resign from an organization, which may be influenced by inadequate compensation, family issues, or an uncondusive work environment. Zeffane (as cited in [Bawawa et al. 2021](#)) explains that *intention* refers to the desire or willingness to perform a certain action, while *turnover* refers to employees voluntarily leaving an organization. Thus, turnover intention represents an individual's tendency to resign from their job of their own volition.

Several factors influence turnover intention, including the work environment, job stress, workload, and employees' level of job satisfaction ([Kristin et al. 2022](#)). These factors encourage individuals to seek more favorable working conditions. Turnover intention can be identified through behaviors such as increased absenteeism, job burnout, work errors, protests against supervisors, and efforts to seek alternative employment ([Waskito and Putri 2021](#)).

There are three main indicators of turnover intention: behaviors such as seeking alternative employment, contemplating resignation, and expressing intentions to leave. These indicators reflect the psychological stages individuals experience before making the decision to leave an organization ([Kartono 2017](#)).

Conceptually, workload and job stress are closely related to turnover intention. Excessive

workload triggers fatigue, while prolonged job stress reduces employees' organizational commitment. The combination of these factors may significantly increase employees' intentions to resign from their jobs ([Fauzi et al. 2024](#); [Waskito and Putri 2021](#)).

3. Resecarch Method

3.1 Research Framework

This research utilizes a quantitative methodology and applies multiple correlation analysis. According to ([Sugiyono 2020](#)), This study applies a quantitative approach rooted in positivism, where data are collected from a defined population or sample to empirically test formulated hypotheses. According to ([Sugiyono 2020](#)), Multiple correlation analysis serves to measure the magnitude of relationships between several independent variables (X) and one dependent variable (Y) at the same time.

This study collected data using standardized questionnaires and employed multiple correlation methods to examine the degree and direction of interrelationships among variables. This approach was chosen to provide an empirical foundation for CV XYZ's management to reduce employee turnover rates.

3.2 Participant Selection and Sampling Method

This research involved a population of 530 employees working at CV XYZ. A stratified random sampling method was employed by dividing the population into strata and randomly selecting participants from each stratum before pooling them into a single sample. According to ([Azora 2021](#)) This technique provides equal selection opportunities for all members of the population and supports the generalizability of the research results. This technique was applied so that each group within the population, such as divisions or job positions, was proportionally represented in the study.

Table 2. Number of Employees

Division	Number of Employees
Warehouse Staff	80
Office Staff	52
Store Staff	398
Total	530

In this study, the required sample size was determined by applying the sample size calculation was based on the Slovin formula with an error tolerance of 10%. The formula used for this calculation is shown below:

$$N = N / (1 + N(e)^2)$$

which:

- n = number of respondents
- N = total population
- e = allowable error (10% or 0.10)

The sample distribution for each stratum was calculated using the following formula:

$$n_i = (N_i / N) \times n$$

which:

- n_i = sample size for the i-th stratum
- N_i = population size for the i-th stratum
- N = total population
- n = total sample size

The sample distribution calculation is presented in the table below:

Table 3. Sample Distribution

Division	Number of Employees (N_i)	Calculation ($N_i / N \times n$)	Number of Sampel (n_i)
Warehouse Staff	80	$(80 / 530) \times 84$	13
Office Staff	52	$(52 / 530) \times 84$	8
Store Staff	398	$(398 / 530) \times 84$	63
Total	530		84

Using the stratified random sampling method with a 10% margin of error, a total of 84 respondents were obtained, proportionally representing the population of 530 employees at CV XYZ. This proportional allocation ensures that the research findings remain representative, as each division had an equal opportunity to be selected as respondents in accordance with the proportion of employees in each division.

3.3 Research Instruments and Analytical Procedures

Three measurement scales were employed in this study: the job stress scale, the workload scale, and the turnover intention scale.

The instrument used to measure job stress was derived from a model proposed by [\(Parker and Decotiis 1983\)](#). In the journal *Organizational Determinants of Job Stress*, published in *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*. This model conceptualizes job stress as comprising two main dimensions: time stress and anxiety.

The workload measurement in this study was derived utilizing the NASA – TLX instrument, which was originally designed by [\(Hart 1988\)](#) in *Human Mental Workload*, published by Elsevier. Subjective workload is measured using 6 (six) core dimensions: temporal demand, frustration level, mental demand, effort, performance, and physical demand.

The turnover intention measure was adapted from [\(Mobley 1977\)](#) model, which explains the process underlying employees' intentions to leave their jobs. This model describes the cognitive and behavioral stages leading to turnover decisions. In general, the dimensions measured include evaluation of the current job, job satisfaction, thoughts of quitting, consideration of the costs and benefits of leaving, intention to search for alternative employment, searching for and evaluating job alternatives, comparison between the current job and available alternatives, and ultimately the formation of intention and actual turnover behavior.

Before distribution, the instrument was evaluated for validity and reliability to ensure it was

appropriate for the study. A pilot test involving 30 respondents with characteristics similar to those of the research sample was carried out. To assess validity, the Total Correlation technique was applied by examining the relationship between each item score and the total scale score. An item was considered valid if the calculated r value exceeded the critical value of 0.361.

Table 4. Validity Test Results

Indicator	r count	r table	Description
How mentally demanding is your job, including activities such as thinking, remembering, searching for information, and making decisions while carrying out your daily tasks?	0,764	0,361	Valid
How physically demanding is your job, such as requiring prolonged standing, walking, lifting, or carrying items during work?	0,715	0,361	Valid
How intense is the time pressure you experience due to work pace, workload, or performance targets that must be completed within a limited time?	0,775	0,361	Valid
How much effort do you have to exert, both physically and mentally, to achieve good work results and meet performance targets?	0,813	0,361	Valid
How high is the level of stress, frustration, or pressure you experience while working compared to feelings of calmness and comfort?	0,762	0,361	Valid
I feel that this job makes it difficult for me to spend time with my family due to long and demanding working hours.	0,637	0,361	Valid
My job often interferes with my personal time, leaving me with little opportunity to engage in activities outside of work.	0,685	0,361	Valid
I feel that my workload is too heavy and the time available to complete it is very limited.	0,882	0,361	Valid
I often feel rushed to complete my tasks in accordance with deadlines or performance targets.	0,770	0,361	Valid
I rarely have leisure time because my work frequently consumes my personal time.	0,718	0,361	Valid
I feel that this job takes up a significant amount of my time and makes me feel more burdened than I should be.	0,461	0,361	Valid
High sales targets often cause me to work under pressure.	0,533	0,361	Valid
I feel anxious or nervous due to the demands of my job.	0,649	0,361	Valid

At times, when thinking about my work, I experience chest tightness and dizziness.	0,717	0,361	Valid
I feel guilty when taking breaks or leave because my work may pile up.	0,762	0,361	Valid
There are times when I feel that this job truly exhausts me emotionally.	0,607	0,361	Valid
Many coworkers at my level experience exhaustion due to work demands.	0,531	0,361	Valid
I often consider leaving my position at this company.	0,903	0,361	Valid
I feel that the working conditions at this workplace make me consider seeking another position.	0,90	0,361	Valid
Due to heavy workload and high pressure, I have thought about quitting my job.	0,835	0,361	Valid
My relationships with coworkers or supervisors make me want to look for a new work environment.	0,935	0,361	Valid
I feel physically or mentally exhausted to the point that I develop a desire to leave this job.	0,838	0,361	Valid
I intend to look for a new job in the near future.	0,934	0,361	Valid
I often browse job vacancies on social media or career websites.	0,606	0,361	Valid
I compare my salary and benefits with those offered by other companies.	0,725	0,361	Valid
I feel that other companies could offer better job opportunities than my current workplace.	0,642	0,361	Valid
I have a desire to look for a job that better matches my abilities and expectations.	0,843	0,361	Valid
If I could, I would like to leave my current job.	0,904	0,361	Valid
I have already considered the right time to submit my resignation.	0,846	0,361	Valid
I feel that I will actually leave this company in the near future.	0,870	0,361	Valid
I have started preparing myself (CV, job applications, or interviews) to change jobs.	0,706	0,361	Valid
I do not see a future career for myself in this company.	0,820	0,361	Valid

In addition, instrument reliability was analyzed using Cronbach's Alpha to assess internal consistency. A scale was considered reliable if its alpha coefficient exceeded 0.60, indicating

that the instrument consistently measured the intended construct. The findings demonstrate that the instruments used in this study fulfilled both reliability and validity criteria. The table below displays the results of the validity testing:

Table 5. Reliability

Reliability Statistics	
Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.956	32

In light of the validity testing results, Those items across the three researchs variable showed r values higher than the r table value of 0.361. Therefore, all three variables were declared valid, as each item was able to accurately measure the intended construct or aspect. The reliability analysis revealed that the Cronbach's Alpha coefficients for all variables surpassed the required minimum standard, indicating that the instruments were reliable and demonstrated very good internal consistency. Overall, the results confirm that all questionnaire items were valid and reliable and could be used for data collection in this case situation.

The study applied a quantitative method for data analysis. Analysis process involved: (1) descriptive statistical techniques to illustrate the characteristics of the data; and (2) classical assumption tests, including tests of normality, to verify the suitability of the regression framework; and (3) multiple correlation analyses to examine the direction and strength of relationships among variables, both partially and simultaneously.

4. Result and Discussions

4.1 Analisis Statistik Deskriptif

A descriptive statistical approach was used to characterize each study variable. This analysis involved examining the minimum and maximum values, mean scores, and standard deviations of the variables studied. These data were used to inform the researcher's understanding of the distribution and trends before proceeding to further analysis. The outcomes of the descriptive statistical analysis are summarized in the following table.

Table 6. Descriptive Statistics

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Task Load	90	5.00	20.00	14.8111	3.25988
Job Stress	90	12.00	48.00	33.6444	7.62360
Turnover Intention	90	15.00	60.00	44.1333	10.83917
Valid N (listwise)	90				

The distribution of data obtained within the current study is described as follows considering the findings of the descriptive statistical analysis:

1. Task Load (X1): The minimum value is 5, the max. value is 20, the mean= 14.8111, accompanied by a standard deviation of 3.25988.
2. Job Stress (X2): The minimum value is 12, the max. value is 48, the mean= 33.6444,

accompanied by a standard deviation of 7.62360.

3. Turnover Intention (Y): The minimum value is 15, the maximum value is 60, the mean= 44.1333, accompanied by a standard deviation of 10.83917.

After obtaining the descriptive statistics, the next step was to classify the scores for each variable for each respondent. This classification process was carried out using the mean and standard deviation to determine score categories. The interval formula used to classify the scores is presented in Table 7.

Table 7. Formula for Calculating Interval Ranges

	Category
$X < \text{Mean} - 1.SD$	Low
$\text{Mean} - 1.SD \leq X < \text{Mean} + 1.SD$	Moderate
$\text{Mean} + 1.SD \geq X$	High

The classification aimed to provide a more detailed understanding of how each score was positioned within the data distribution. Given that the data follow a normal distribution, the Mean and standard deviation were used to distinguish among score levels. Consequently, the variables were classified into low, moderate, and high categories, with the complete instrument analysis results presented in the tables that follow.

Table 8. Frequency Distribution of Task Load Levels

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Low	9	10.0	10.0	10.0
	Moderate	27	30.0	30.0	40.0
	High	54	60.0	60.0	100.0
	Total	90	100.0	100.0	

Based on the table, the analysis of 90 respondents showed that Task Load scores were divided into three categories: low, moderate, and high. These categories were determined using classification guidelines based on the previously calculated mean and standard deviation. The results indicated that 9 respondents (10%) were classified in the low category, suggesting a relatively low level of task load. Furthermore, 27 respondents (30%) were classified as moderate, indicating a moderate level of task load. Meanwhile, 54 respondents (60%) were classified in the high category, indicating that most respondents experienced relatively high task demands.

Table 9. Frequency Distribution of Job Stress Levels

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Low	10	11.1	11.1	11.1
	Moderate	42	46.7	46.7	57.8
	High	38	42.2	42.2	100.0
	Total	90	100.0	100.0	

Shown in the table, the findings from the study of 90 respondents indicate that indicated that

most employees experienced job stress at a moderate level. This was shown by 42 respondents (46.7%) classified in the moderate category, followed by 38 respondents (42.2%) in the high category, and only 10 respondents (11.1%) in the low category. These findings indicate that nearly half of the employees experienced moderate job stress, meaning that they faced work pressure but were still able to manage it relatively well. However, the proportion of employees experiencing high job stress (42.2%) was also substantial, indicating a potential risk to their psychological well-being and work productivity.

Table 10. Frequency Distribution of Turnover Intention Levels

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Rendah	11	12.2	12.2	12.2
	Sedang	35	38.9	38.9	51.1
	Tinggi	44	48.9	48.9	100.0
	Total	90	100.0	100.0	

As shown in the table, the findings from the study of 90 respondents indicate that demonstrated that a large proportion of employees experienced a high degree of turnover intention. That was indicated by 44 respondents (48.9%) classified in the high category, followed by 35 respondents (38.9%) in the moderate category, and only 11 respondents (12.2%) in the low category. These findings suggest that most respondents had a strong intention to leave the organization. Meanwhile, respondents with a moderate level of turnover intention (38.9%) indicate that a considerable proportion of employees were still contemplating leaving their jobs but had not yet made a definite decision. Respondents with low turnover intention (12.2%) represent individuals who felt relatively satisfied and emotionally attached to the organization.

4.2 Testing of Classical Assumptions

4.2.1 Test of Data Normality

To determine, the normality of a variable's data distribution, a normality test is performed. To assess data normality in studies, the Kolmogorov–Smirnov (K–S) Test is often utilized. This test compares the distribution of the research data with a theoretical or conventional normal distribution.

Before performing the test, data are typically transformed into Z-scores, resulting in raw data adjusted to a normalized distribution with a mean value of zero and a standard deviation of one. This adjustment permits the data to be compared with a normalized normal distribution. The interpretation of Kolmogorov–Smirnov test results are evaluated according to the significance value (p-value).:

- If $p > 0.05$, the residuals are considered normally distributed.
- If $p \leq 0.05$, the distribution of the residuals is not normal.

Table 11. One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test

	Unstandardized Residual
N	90

Normal Parameters ^{a,b}	Mean		.0000000
	Std. Deviation		8.64913837
	Absolute		.128
Most Extreme Differences	Positive		.128
	Negative		-.111
Test Statistic			.128
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)			.001 ^c
Monte Carlo Sig. (2-tailed)	Sig.		.093 ^d
		Lower	
	99% Confidence	Bound	.085
	Interval	Upper	
		Bound	.100

As indicated by the results of the One-Sample Kolmogorov–Smirnov test, the sample size of the respondent characteristics was 90. The residuals had a mean of 0.000000 with a standard deviation of 8.6491. The Kolmogorov–Smirnov Z was 0.128, with a two-tailed significance value of 0.001, indicating that, conventionally, the residuals were not normally distributed ($p < .05$). However, the Monte Carlo two-tailed significance value was 0.093, at a 99% confidence interval extending from 0.085 ~ 0.100. This value exceeded the 0.05 threshold, suggesting that the deviation of the residual distribution from normality was not substantial and remained within acceptable statistical limits.

Given that this study used a relatively large sample size ($N = 90$), the Kolmogorov–Smirnov normality test is sensitive to minor deviations. Therefore, the Monte Carlo significance value, which is more stable for larger sample sizes, was used to guide decision-making; the residuals are therefore regarded as approximately normally distributed and acceptable for further analysis.

4.3 Correlation Examination

To examine the relationships among task load, Spearman’s Rho correlation analysis was utilized, job stress, and turnover intention. Given that the normality test revealed non-normal data distribution, Spearman’s test was considered appropriate, making it a non-parametric method. This method ranks the data to estimate relationships among variables, yielding valid and reliable results even when the normality assumption is violated.

Table 12. Correlations Among Task Load, Job Stress, and Turnover Intention (Spearman’s rho)

		Task Load	Job Stress	Turnover Intention
Task Load	Correlation Coefficient	1.000	0.730***	.582***
	Sig. (2-tailed)		<,001	<,001
	N	90	90	90
Job Stress	Correlation Coefficient	.730***	1.000	.613***
	Sig. (2-tailed)	<,001		<,001
	N	90	90	90
Turnover Intention	Correlation Coefficient	.582***	.613***	1.000

Sig. (2-tailed)	<.001	<.001	
N	90	90	90

Based on the Spearman's Rho analysis, the significance value was .001, which is less than .05 ($p < .05$). This indicates a significant relations among turnover intention, job stress, and task load. The analysis indicated that task load and job stress are strongly and positively correlated ($r_s = .730$, $p < .001$), suggesting that higher perceived task load is associated within upper levels of job stress.

Furthermore, a statistically significant and moderately strong positive association existed between task load and turnover intention ($r_s = .582$, $p < .001$), indicating that increased task load is associated with a higher intention to leave the job. Additionally, job stress also demonstrated a strong and significant positive correlation with turnover intention ($r_s = .613$, $p < .001$), meaning that higher job stress is associated with a greater likelihood of employees intending to leave the organization.

Overall, these findings indicate that task load and job stress are positively and significantly associated with turnover intention, suggesting that increases in workload and stress can increase employees' intention to leave the company.

4.4 Multiple Correlation Analysis

To assess multiple correlation, the study referred to the Sig. F Change value presented in the Model Summary output. The obtained value of .001, which is lower than the significance level of .05 ($p < .05$), indicates that task load (X_1) and job stress (X_2) together have a significant simultaneous effect on turnover intention (Y).

Table 13. Model Summary of Multiple Correlation Analysis

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	R Square Change	F Change	Sig. F Change
1	.603	.363	.349	874.799	.363	21.818	>.001

a. Predictors: (Constant), Job Stress, Task Load

The multiple correlation coefficient (R) was .603, indicating a strong relationship between task load and job stress together with turnover intention. This suggests that increases in task load and job stress are collectively associated with higher turnover intention among respondents.

These results are further supported by the ANOVA test, which yielded an F value of 24.818 with a significance level of .000. This indicates that the regression model as a whole is significant and that task load and job stress effectively explain variations in turnover intention.

Table 14. ANOVA Results

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	3798.524	2	1899.262	24.818	.000 ^b
	Residual	6657.876	87	76.527		

Total	10456.400	89
-------	-----------	----

a. *Dependent Variable: Turnover Intention*

b. *Predictors: (Constant), Job Stress, Task Load*

Descriptive analysis showed that the highest mean task load was observed among warehouse employees (15.00), followed by store employees (14.94), and office employees (14.33). Although there were differences in mean values across divisions, the One-Way ANOVA indicated $F = 0.291$ with $p > .05$, suggesting that the differences were not statistically significant. Thus, the work division does not influence employees' perceived task load.

Table 15. One-Way ANOVA of Task Load

DIVISI	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Office	14,33	3,979	21
Store	14,94	3,117	54
Warehouse	15,00	2,777	15
Total	14,81	3,260	90

Similarly, the highest mean job stress was observed among warehouse employees (34.93), followed by store employees (33.94), and office employees (31.95). Despite these differences in mean values, the ANOVA test showed $F = 0.769$ with $p > .05$, indicating that the differences were not significant. This suggests that work division does not affect the level of job stress, and that employees across all divisions experience relatively similar levels of stress, reflecting a balanced workload system within the company.

Table 16. One-Way ANOVA of Job Stress

DIVISI	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Office	31,95	6,975	21
Store	33,94	8,252	54
Warehouse	34,93	5,982	15
Total	33,64	7,624	90

The highest mean turnover intention was observed among office employees (46.43), followed by store employees (43.59), and the lowest among warehouse employees (42.87). However, the ANOVA test indicated $F = 0.635$ with $p > .05$, suggesting that there were no significant differences among divisions. Therefore, work division does not appear to influence employees' turnover intention, as policies and working conditions across divisions are relatively similar.

Table 17. One-Way ANOVA of Turnover Intention

DIVISI	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Office	46,43	10,298	21
Store	43,59	11,360	54
Warehouse	42,87	9,804	15
Total	44,13	10,839	90

The One-Way ANOVA results further showed no significant differences in turnover intention, job stress, and task load among employees from the three divisions (store, office, and warehouse). The F values were 0.635 for turnover intention, 0.769 for job stress, and 0.291 for

perceived task load, with p-values greater than 0.05. These findings indicate that work division does not significantly affect variation in turnover intention, job stress, or perceived task load. In other words, employees across the three divisions have relatively similar perceptions and work experiences.

Table 18. One-Way ANOVA Results by Work Division

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F
TURNOVER INTENTION	Between Groups	150,487	2	75,243	,635
	Within Groups	10305,913	87	118,459	
	Total	10456,400	89		
JOB_STRESS	Between Groups	89,903	2	44,952	,769
	Within Groups	5082,719	87	58,422	
	Total	5172,622	89		
TASK_LOAD	Between Groups	6,289	2	3,144	0,291
	Within Groups	939,500	87	10,799	
	Total	945,789	89		

4.5. Discussion

This study found a significant positive link between workload, job stress, and employees' intention to leave CV XYZ. Evidence indicates that as workloads intensify, employees experience higher stress levels, which in turn increase their likelihood of turnover. From a psychological standpoint, these findings highlight the influence of internal aspects such as pressure to perform, limited time, and achievement expectations on employees' mental health and retention decisions. The strong correlation between workload and stress ($r = 0.730$, $p < 0.001$) indicates that excessive job demands directly increase psychological strain. These results are consistent with the Job Demands–Resources (JD–R) framework proposed by [Schaufeli and Bakker \(2017\)](#), which posits that stress arises when job demands exceed employees' personal or organizational resources.

In the context of CV XYZ, the high workload is driven by several factors, including continuously increasing sales targets without adequate workforce expansion, prolonged overtime hours, performance-based work systems, and insufficient social support from supervisors and coworkers. In addition, limited technology and the continued reliance on manual work systems further increase employees' workloads in completing daily tasks. These conditions create an imbalance between individual capacity and organizational demands, leading to emotional exhaustion and a decline in psychological well-being.

While the ANOVA findings indicated that the divisions did not differ significantly in workload and job stress, this does not rule out individual differences in perceptions of similar work pressures. Individual perceptions of the work environment are strongly influenced by personal characteristics, needs, values, and emotional states ([Nuradina et al. 2023](#)). Therefore, subjective differences in perception may explain why some employees adapt to high work pressure, whereas others exhibit a greater tendency toward stress and turnover intentions. This perspective reinforces the argument that psychological factors and personal characteristics play

a crucial role in shaping work experiences and perceptions of the organizational climate.

The results also revealed a positive relationship between workload and turnover intention ($r = 0.582$, $p < 0.001$). According to the Cognitive Appraisal Theory proposed by [Lazarus and Folkman 1984](#)), **individuals** evaluate job demands based on their perceived abilities and available resources. When these demands are perceived as exceeding individual capacity, maladaptive stress arises and encourages avoidance behaviors, including the intention to leave the organization. The present finding corroborates the research of [Fitriantini et al. \(2020\)](#) and [Widiyanto and Yunus \(2021\)](#), indicating that when workloads become overwhelming, employees experience decreased motivation and satisfaction, which encourages them to look for more balanced job conditions.

The analysis further revealed a significant association between job stress and employees' intention to leave the organization ($r = 0.613$, $p < 0.001$). These results are consistent with [\(Hobfoll 1989\)](#) Conservation of Resources (COR) Theory emphasizes that people actively seek to defend and sustain their psychological resources. When these resources are depleted by prolonged job stress, individuals tend to distance themselves from the source of stress, including by leaving their job. According to findings from [\(Fauzi et al. 2024\)](#) and Kristin et al. (2022), sustained exposure to job stress tends to lower employees' satisfaction and commitment toward the organization, thereby heightening their likelihood of leaving the company.

The multiple correlation test further indicated that, when considered together, workload and job stress significantly explain variation in turnover intention ($R = 0.603$; $p = 0.001$). However, the One-way ANOVA results indicated no significant differences among divisions in workload, job stress, or turnover intention. This suggests that perceptions of high workload are evenly distributed across the organization, including office, store, and warehouse divisions. Therefore, the workload issue at CV XYZ appears to be systemic rather than confined to a specific department. In organizational psychology terms, the phenomenon represents an imbalance in the organizational structure, where job demands exceed the available resources. Expanding resources, including supportive relationships, professional development, and greater autonomy, helps buffer employees from the harmful consequences of excessive workload [\(Bakker and Demerouti 2017\)](#). Accordingly, CV XYZ is encouraged to redistribute workloads across divisions, provide stress management training, strengthen communication systems and social support in the workplace, and implement fair performance recognition and reward systems. These strategies are expected to reduce job stress levels, suppress turnover intention, and enhance employees' psychological well-being and organizational commitment.

5. Conclusion

This study demonstrates a significant positive association between workload, job stress, and employees' intention to leave CV XYZ. As perceived job demands increase, employees experience higher levels of stress, which subsequently heightens their likelihood of leaving the company. The One Way ANOVA results showed no significant differences among divisions, indicating that employees across all units have relatively similar perceptions of high workload. This condition suggests that work pressure at CV XYZ is pervasive and systemic, largely driven by high job demands, stringent sales targets, and limited supporting resources.

These findings are consistent with the Job Demands–Resources Theory [\(Bakker and Demerouti](#)

2017; [Schaufeli 2017](#)), Cognitive Appraisal Theory ([Lazarus and Folkman 1984](#)), and Conservation of Resources Theory ([Hobfoll 1989](#)), which collectively explain that job stress and turnover intention tend to arise when job demands exceed individual capacity and available resources. In addition, both employee performance and retention are shaped not only by individual characteristics but also by the level of organizational commitment and the presence of a supportive workplace culture ([Pras 2018](#)). Therefore, organizations need to strengthen job resources through workload redistribution, coping skill development, enhanced social support, and the implementation of effective reward and communication systems. Balancing job demands and organizational resources is expected to reduce job stress, lower turnover intention, and sustainably improve employee satisfaction and psychological well-being.

References

- Azora, P. 2021. "Analisis Quick Count Dengan Menggunakan Metode Stratified Random Sampling Studi Kasus Pemilu Gubernur Kalimantan Barat 2018." *Buletin Ilmiah Mat. Stat. Dan Terapannya (Bimaster)* 10(1):43–50. doi:<https://doi.org/10.26418/bbimst.v10i1.44666>.
- Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. 2017. "Job Demands-Resources Theory: Taking Stock and Looking Forward." *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology* 22(3):273–85. doi:10.1037/ocp0000056.
- Bawawa, A. A., Lengkong, V. P. K., & Taroreh, R. N. 2021. "Pengaruh Kepuasan Kerja, Komitmen Organisasional Dan Stres Kerja Terhadap Turnover Intention Pada PT. SIG Asia Kota Bitung." 9(2):785–95. doi:<https://doi.org/10.35794/emba.v9i2.33750>.
- Bernadus, B., & Prasetyaningtyas, S. 2023. *Memimpin Melalui Perubahan Dan Disrupsi: Strategi Dan Keterampilan Untuk Bertahan Di Dunia Yang Berubah Dengan Cepat*. Yogyakarta: Deepublish Digital.
- Budiasa, I. K. 2021. *Beban Kerja Dan Kinerja Sumber Daya Manusia*. Banyumas: CV. Pena Persada.
- Egarini, N. N., & Prastiwi, N. L. P. E. Y. (2022). "Pengaruh Beban Kerja, Stres Kerja, Dan Kepuasan Kerja Terhadap Turnover Intention Pada Karyawan Spbu 54.811.05 Desa Lokapaksa Kecamatan Seririt." *KONTAN: Jurnal Ekonomi, Manajemen Dan Bisnis* 1(3). doi:10.59818/kontan.v1i3.236.
- Fauzi, A., Jauhari, F. A., & Suhada. 2024. "Dampak Job Insecurity Dan Job Stress Terhadap Turnover Intention: Peran Mediasi Kepuasan Kerja Di Bank Muamalat Yogyakarta." *Jurnal Ilmiah Ekonomi Islam* 10(3):3119–27. doi:10.29040/jiei.v10i3.15078.
- Fitriantini, R., Agusdin, & Nurmayanti, S. 2020. "Pengaruh Beban Kerja, Kepuasan Kerja Dan Stres Kerja Terhadap Turnover Intention Tenaga Kesehatan Berstatus Kontrak Di RSUD Kota Mataram." 8(1). doi:10.29303/distribusi.v8i1.100.
- Hansen, J. 2022. "Employee Turnover Rates by Industry: Trends and Solutions." <https://www.awardco.com/blog/employee-turnover-rates>.

- Hart, S. G. 1988. "Development of NASA-TLX (Task Load Index): Results of Empirical and Theoretical Research." *Human Mental Workload* 139–78.
- Hobfoll, S. E. 1989. *Conservation of Resources: A New Attempt at Conceptualizing Stress*. American Psychologist.
- Kartono. 2017. *Personality, Employee Engagement, Emotional Intelligence, Job Burnout : Pendekatan Dalam Melihat Turnover Intention*. Yogyakarta: Deepublish Digital.
- Kristin, D., Marlina, E., & Lawita, N. F. 2022. "Pengaruh Lingkungan Kerja, Stres Kerja, Beban Kerja Dan Kepuasan Kerja Terhadap Turnover Intention Karyawan." *Economics, Accounting and Business Journal* 2(1):52–63. <https://jom.umri.ac.id/index.php/ecountbis/article/view/164/39>.
- Lazarus, R. S., & Folkman, S. 1984. *Stress, Appraisal, and Coping*. New York: Springer Publishing.
- Liu, R. M., Kawatu, P. A., & Sanggelorang, Y. 2020. *Hubungan Antara Shift Kerja Dan Beban Kerja Dengan Kelelahan Kerja Pada Pekerja Minimarket Indomaret Di Kota Manado*. Vol. 9. <https://jom.umri.ac.id/index.php/ecountbis/article/view/164/39>.
- Malik, M. M. 2021. "Pengaruh Kepuasan Kerja, Beban Kerja Dan Stres Kerja Terhadap Turnover Intention Karyawan Millennial Di Kecamatan Cileungsi Selama Masa Pandemi COVID-19." *Business Management, Economic, and Accounting National Seminar* 287–97. <http://repository.upnvj.ac.id/id/eprint/12601>.
- Mobley, W. H. 1977. *Intermediate Linkages in the Relationship Between Job Satisfaction and Employee Turnover*. Vol. 62.
- Nuradina, K., Ekanesia, P., Athallah, S. F., & Mukin, R. 2023. *The Importance of Personal Characteristic in Shaping Positive Perceptions of Organizational Climate in Universities*. Vol. 01. doi:<https://doi.org/10.58812/wsis.v1i09.204>.
- Parker, D. E., & DeCotiis, T. A. 1983. *Organizational Determinants of Job Stress*. Vol. 32. Moss.
- Pras, R. 2018. *Pengaruh Komitmen Organisasi Terhadap Kinerja Karyawan Dengan Budaya Organisasi Sebagai Moderating Variable Pada Instruktur Awak Kabin Lion Air*. <http://repository.widyatama.ac.id/xmlui/handle/123456789/10788>.
- Putra, D. A., & Nuradina, K. 2023. "Strategi Coping Dan Upaya Resiliensi Karyawan Di Masa Pandemi COVID-19." *INABA Journal of Psychology* 01(01):33–40. doi:<https://doi.org/10.56956/ijop.v1i01.189>.
- Schaufeli, W. B. 2017. "Applying the Job Demands-Resources Model: A 'How to' Guide to Measuring and Tackling Work Engagement and Burnout." *Organizational Dynamics* 46(2):120–32. doi:10.1016/j.orgdyn.2017.04.008.
- Sugiyono. 2020. *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif, Kualitatif Dan R&D*. Bandung: CV. ALFABETA.

- T ampombebu, A. T. V., & Wijono, S. 2022. “Resiliensi Dan Stres Kerja Pada Karyawan Yang Bekerja Di Masa Pandemi Covid-19.” *Bulletin of Counseling and Psychotherapy* 4(2). doi:10.51214/bocp.v4i2.195.
- Vanchapo, A. R. 2020. *Beban kerja dan stress kerja*. Pasuruan, Jawa Timur: CV. Penerbit Qiara Media.
- Waskito, M., & Putri, A. R. 2021. “Pengaruh Kompensasi Dan Kepuasan Kerja Terhadap Turnover Intention Pada Karyawan Office PT. Cipta Nugraha Contrindo.” 4(2):261–72. doi:https://doi.org/10.34005/kinerja.v4i02.1799.
- Widiyanto, G., & Yunus, K. 2021. “Pengaruh Beban Kerja Dan Stres Kerja Terhadap Turnover Intention Karyawan Pada CV. Wan Qian.” *Prosiding: Ekonomi Dan Bisnis* 1(1). https://jurnal.buddhidharma.ac.id/index.php/pros/article/view/731/432.
- Wulandari, R., Recky, Siddiq, A. M., & Akbar, R. F. (2025). Pengaruh gaya kepemimpinan, motivasi kerja, dan disiplin kerja terhadap kinerja karyawan di minimarket Indomaret Bandung. *Jurnal Economica*, 13(1), 95–104. <https://doi.org/10.46750/economica.v13i1.36>
- Yücel, İ. 2021. “Transformational Leadership and Turnover Intentions: The Mediating Role of Employee Performance during the COVID-19 Pandemic.” *Administrative Sciences* 11(3). doi:10.3390/admsci11030081.

Copyrights

Copyright for this article is retained by the author(s), with first publication rights granted to the journal.

This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>)

