Al-Kharaj: Journal of Islamic Economics and Business
Volume 8 (2), 2026
P-ISSN: 2686-262X; E-ISSN: 2685-9300

The Influence of Coping Strategy on Work Stress The Role of Moderation and Emotional Resilience On Sandeq Seafood Restaurant Workers

Andreas Junaedi Abdulah[1], Andi Risfan Rizaldi[2], A Nur Achsanuddin UA[3],
[12]Manajemen, Universitas Muhammadiyah Makassar
[3]Ekonomi Pembangunan, Universitas Muhammadiyah Makassar
Email: andreasjunaedi20@gmail.com[1], andi.risfan@unismuh.ac.id[2] , nur.achsanuddin@unimuh.ac.id[3]

Keywords:
coping strategy, work stress, emotional resilience, restaurant industry, moderated regression analysis.

Abstract

Work stress among restaurant employees significantly affects productivity and psychological well-being yet is frequently overlooked. This study examines the effect of coping strategy on work stress and the moderating role of emotional resilience, grounded in the Job Demands-Resources (JD-R) Model and the Transactional Model of Stress and Coping (Lazarus & Folkman, 1984). A quantitative causal-associative approach was applied to 87 employees of Sandeq Seafood Restaurant, Makassar, selected from 110 permanent staff via the Slovin formula. Data were collected through a Likert-scale questionnaire and analysed using Moderated Regression Analysis (MRA) with SPSS 26. Results indicate that coping strategy has a significant negative effect on work stress (β = -0.705; p = 0.000), and emotional resilience significantly moderates this relationship (β interaction = -0.038; p = 0.000), strengthening the stress-reducing effect of coping strategy. The final model explains 54.1% of the variance in work stress (R^2 = 0.541). These findings suggest that restaurant management should design training programmes that simultaneously enhance employees' coping abilities and emotional resilience.

INTRODUCTION

Work stress is one of the global mental health problems that has a significant impact on the productivity and well-being of workers in various industrial sectors. According to a report from the World Health Organization (Organization, 2022), an estimated 15% of adults experience a mental disorder at some point during the workday each year due to depression and anxiety, resulting in a global loss of $1 trillion due to lost productivity. The service sector, especially hospitality and restaurants, faces unique challenges due to high customer service demands, long and irregular working hours, and fast-paced work environments (Amran et al., 2018; Yousaf et al., 2020). This condition makes work stress an important problem both practically and theoretically because it has an impact on motivation, job satisfaction, and labor sustainability (Khuong & Linh, 2020).

Recent studies have shown that work stress in the service sector has a high level and has a wide impact on employee performance. In Indonesia, the level of stress due to workload is reported to reach 73% (Yulia Anggraeni Hidayat Putri et al., 2021). Work stress is understood as a psychological response when job demands exceed an individual's capacity (Schoger, 2025), as well as a psychological and physiological condition due to an imbalance between work demands and abilities and support (Cedrone et al., 2024). Factors such as excessive workload, lack of social support, and an unconducive work environment are major sources of work stress. These findings are in line with previous research that shows that the imbalance between job demands and an

individual's adaptive abilities has a significant impact on psychological well-being and work performance (Gloria & Steinhardt, 2016; Shakya & Thapa Magar, 2025).

In the context of human resource management, employee well-being is an important factor in increasing productivity and organizational success. Well-being includes not only economic aspects, but also psychological aspects, work environment, work-life balance, and mental health (Prahendratno et al., 2023; Dianto et al., 2023; Mustika et al., 2024). To overcome work stress, individuals need coping strategies as an adaptive mechanism that refers to the Transactional Model of Stress and Coping (Lazarus & Folkman, 1984; Ma et al., 2021). Coping strategies are divided into problem-focused coping and emotion-focused coping (Ma et al., 2021), which have been proven to reduce work stress (Thapa, 2022). However, the effectiveness of these strategies differs between individuals and is influenced by emotional resilience. Emotional resilience is an individual's ability to adapt and recover from psychological distress (Karen Reivich & Andrew Shatte, 2002; Chen & Qi, 2022), and has been shown to moderate the relationship between work stress and its various impacts (Chen & Qi, 2022).

Although various studies have examined work stress, coping strategies, and emotional resilience, there are still research gaps, especially in the context of the restaurant industry in Indonesia. Previous studies have highlighted more the direct influence of work stress on burnout and turnover (Gede et al., 2019; Kosasih, 2019), but has not specifically tested the role of emotional resilience as a moderation variable in the relationship between coping strategy and work stress. In addition, there has been no empirical study specifically conducted on restaurant employees with high work pressure characteristics such as Sandeq Seafood Makassar Restaurant.

Based on these gaps, this study aims to analyze the effect of coping strategies on work stress with emotional resilience as a moderation variable in employees of Sandeq Seafood Makassar Restaurant. The novelty of this research lies in the testing of the moderation model in the context of the restaurant industry in Indonesia, which is expected to make a theoretical and practical contribution in human resource management.

METHODS

This study uses a quantitative approach with an explanatory design to test the influence of coping strategies on work stress with emotional resilience as a moderation variable. The study was carried out on permanent employees of Sandeq Seafood Makassar Restaurant during the period December 2025–January 2026.

The study population was 110 employees, with a sample of 86 respondents determined using the Slovin formula at a 5% error rate. To anticipate incomplete data, a questionnaire was distributed to 90 respondents. The sampling technique uses probability sampling so that every member of the population has an equal chance of being selected (Sugiyono, 2017).

The research data consists of primary and secondary data. Primary data were collected through a questionnaire with a 5-point Likert scale that measured coping strategy, work stress, and emotional resilience. To strengthen the data, non-participatory observations and semi-structured interviews were conducted with management. Secondary data are obtained from the scientific

literature and reports of institutions such as the World Health Organization and the International Labour Organization.

Variables were measured based on indicators that have been tested in previous studies, including problem-focused and emotion-focused coping for coping strategies, aspects of demands and work environment for work stress, as well as emotional regulation and self-efficacy for emotional resilience.

Data analysis was carried out using Moderated Regression Analysis (MRA) with the help of SPSS version 26 to test the direct influence and moderation effect. Before testing, a classical assumption test was carried out which included normality, multicollinearity, and heteroscedasticity. Hypothesis testing was carried out using a t-test and an F test with a significance level of 0.05 (Ghozali, 2018). The moderation effect was determined based on the significance of the interaction variables between coping strategy and emotional resilience, while the determination coefficient (R^2) was used to assess the model's ability to explain variations in work stress.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Respondent Characteristics

Table 1
Characteristics of Respondents by Gender

Gender	Quantity	Present (%)
Male	57	65,5%
Women	30	34,5%
Total	87	100%

Source: Primary Data 2025

Table 2
Characteristics of Respondents by Respondent Age

Age	Quantity	Present (%)
17 - 20 Years	10	11,5%
21 - 25 Years	35	40,2%
26 - 30 Years	25	28,7%
31 - 35 Years	12	13,8%
>35 Years	5	5,8%
Total	87	100%

Source: Primary Data 2025

Table 3
Characteristics of Respondents by Service Period

Age	Quantity	Present (%)
<1 Month	18	20,7%
1-2 Years	28	32,2%
>2 Years	41	47,1%
Total	87	100%

Source: Primary Data 2025

The data shows that respondents are dominated by men (65.5%) and are in the productive age range of 21–25 years (40.2%). Based on the length of service, the majority of respondents have worked for more than 2 years (47.1%). This composition shows that the workforce is dominated by employees with sufficient work experience and the ability to adapt to the operational demands of restaurants.

Descriptive Analysis of Variables

Table 4
Descriptive Statistical Test Results

Descriptive Statistics					
	N	Minimum	Maximum	Red	Std. Deviation
Coping Strategy	87	8.00	40.00	33.2759	4.21429
Work Stress	87	13.00	65.00	41.8161	6.96758
Emotional Resilience	87	10.00	50.00	41.0805	5.49253
Valid N (listwise)	87				

Source: SPSS 26 Data Processing Results

The results of the analysis showed that the coping strategy had an average score of 33.28 which was relatively high, showing the ability of employees to manage work pressure relatively well. Emotional resilience is also in the high category (mean = 41.08), which indicates good adaptability and emotional stability. Meanwhile, work stress was in the moderate category (mean = 41.82), which suggests that work stress is still within controllable limits despite variations between individuals.

Data Quality Test
Validity Test

Table 5
Validity Test Results

Variable	Item	r Count	r Table	Sig	Remarks
Coping Strategy (X)	CP01	0,706	0,211	0,000	Valid
	CP02	0,719	0,211	0,000	Valid
	CP03	0,829	0,211	0,000	Valid
	CP04	0,757	0,211	0,000	Valid
	CP05	0,780	0,211	0,000	Valid
	CP06	0,835	0,211	0,000	Valid
	CP07	0,768	0,211	0,000	Valid
	CP08	0,611	0,211	0,000	Valid

Variable	Item	r Count	r Table	Sig	Remarks
Work Stress (Y)	SK01	0,429	0,211	0,000	Valid
	SK02	0,520	0,211	0,000	Valid
	SK03	0,477	0,211	0,000	Valid
	SK04	0,525	0,211	0,000	Valid
	SK05	0,619	0,211	0,000	Valid
	SK06	0,533	0,211	0,000	Valid
	SK07	0,472	0,211	0,000	Valid
	SK08	0,606	0,211	0,000	Valid
	SK09	0,555	0,211	0,000	Valid
	SK10	0,588	0,211	0,000	Valid
	SK11	0,479	0,211	0,000	Valid
	SK12	0,530	0,211	0,000	Valid
	SK13	0,541	0,211	0,000	Valid
Emotional Resilience (Z)	RE01	0,724	0,211	0,000	Valid
	RE02	0,766	0,211	0,000	Valid
	RE03	0,744	0,211	0,000	Valid
	RE04	0,792	0,211	0,000	Valid
	RE05	0,807	0,211	0,000	Valid
	RE06	0,635	0,211	0,000	Valid
	RE07	0,815	0,211	0,000	Valid
	RE08	0,603	0,211	0,000	Valid
	RE09	0,688	0,211	0,000	Valid
	RE10	0,689	0,211	0,000	Valid

Source: SPSS 26 Data Processing Results

Based on testing of 87 respondents, all items in the variables of coping strategy, work stress, and emotional resilience were declared valid because the r value of the table > r (0.211) and the significance of < 0.05, so it was suitable for use in the next analysis.

Reliability Test

Table 6
Reliability Test

Variable	Cronbach's Alpha	Number of Items	Remarks
Coping Strategy	0,887	8	Reliable
Work Stress	0,781	13	Reliable
Emotional Resilience	0,898	10	Reliable

Source: SPSS 26 Data Processing Results

The results of the reliability test showed Cronbach's Alpha values of 0.887 (coping strategy), 0.781 (work stress), and 0.898 (emotional resilience). The overall > 0.70, so the instrument was declared reliable and suitable for use in further analysis.

Classic Assumption Test
Normality Test

Table 7
Data Normality Test

Yes	Test Method	K-S Statistics	Sig. (Monte Carlo	Remarks
1	Kolmogorov Smirnov (Monte Carlo)	0,135	0,071	Normally Distributed

Source: SPSS 26 Data Processing Results

Based on table 7, the Monte Carlo significance value is 0.071 (> 0.05), so that the residual is normally distributed and the assumption of normality is met.

Multicollinearity Test

Table 8
Multicollinearity Test

Yes	Variable	Tolerance	VIVID	Remarks
1	Coping Strategy	0,365	2,738	Multicollinearity does not occur
2	Emotional Resilience	0,365	2,738	Multicollinearity does not occur

Source: SPSS 26 Data Processing Results

Based on table 8, the Tolerance value was 0.365 (> 0.10) and VIF was 2.738 (< 10), so that there were no symptoms of multicollinearity between independent variables in the regression model.

Heteroscedasticity Test

Table 9
Heteroscedasticity Test

Yes	Variable	Sig.	Remarks
1	Coping Strategy	0,148	Heteroscedasticity does not occur
2	Emotional Resilience	0,314	Heteroscedasticity does not occur

Results: SPSS Data Processing 26

Based on table 9, the entire significance value > 0.05, so that heteroscedasticity does not occur and the regression model meets the assumption of homogeneity.

Moderate Regression Test

Model 1 regression (direct influence of X on Y)

Table 10
Results Coefficient of Determination

Models	R	R Square	Adjust R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	0,614	0,377	0,370	5,532

Source: SPSS 26 Data Processing Results

Based on table 10, the R Square value of 0.377 shows that coping strategy explains 37.7% of work stress variations, while 62.3% is influenced by other variables. An Adjusted R Square value of 0.370 indicates that the model's capabilities remain quite good after adjustment.

Table 11
F Test Results (ANOVA)

Models	Sum of Square	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Regression	1573,796	1	1573,796	51,426	0,000
Residual	2601,262	85	30,603		
Total	4175,057	86			

Source: SPSS 26 Data Processing Results

Based on table 11, the F-value is calculated as 51.426 with a significance of 0.000 (< 0.05), so the regression model is significant and feasible to use. Coping strategies simultaneously affect work stress.

Table 12
t-test results (partial)

Variable	B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.
(Constant)	8,038	4,747		1,693	0,094
Coping Strategy	1,015	0,142	0,614	7,171	0,000

Source: SPSS 26 Data Processing Results

Based on table 12, the coping strategy regression coefficient is 1.015 with a t count of 7.171 and a significance of 0.000 (< 0.05), so that it has a positive and significant effect on work stress.

Model 2 Regression

Table 13
Results of Model 2 Determination Coefficient

Models	R	R Square	Adjust R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
2	0,620	0,384	0,370	5,532

Source: SPSS 26 Data Processing Results

Based on table 13, the R Square value of 0.384 shows that coping strategy and emotional resilience explain 38.4% of work stress variations, while 61.6% are influenced by other variables. Compared to Model 1 (0.377), there was an increase of 0.007 (0.7%), so the contribution of emotional resilience was relatively small.

Table 14
Model 2 F Test Results

Models	Sum of Square	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Regression	1606,407	2	802,203	26,213	0,000
Residual	2570,651	84	30,603		
Total	4175,057	86			

Source: SPSS 26 Data Processing Results

Based on table 14, the significance value is 0.000 (< 0.05), so that coping strategies and emotional resilience simultaneously have a significant effect on work stress and the regression model is feasible.

Table 15
Model 2 t-test results

Variable	B	Std.Error	t	Sig.
(Constant)	6,865	4,890	1,404	0,164
Coping Strategy	0,828	0,234	3,537	0,001
Emotional Resilience	0,180	0,180	1,000	0,320

Source: SPSS 26 Data Processing Results

Based on table 15, coping strategies were significant (0.001 < 0.05) so that they had a positive effect on work stress, while emotional resilience was not significant (0.320 > 0.05). Simultaneously, both have a significant effect, but only partially coping strategies have an effect.

Model 3 Regression

Table 16
Results of Model 3 Determination Coefficient

Models	R	R Square	Adjust R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
3	0,735	0,541	0,524	4,805

Source: SPSS 26 Data Processing Results

Based on table 16, the R Square value of 0.541 shows that 54.1% of the variation in work stress is explained by coping strategies, emotional resilience, and interactions, while 45.9% is influenced by other factors outside the model.

Table 17
Model 3 F Test Results

Models	Sum of Square	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Regression	2258,391	3	752,797	32,599	0,000
Residual	1916,667	83	23,092		
Total	4175,057	86			

Source: SPSS 26 Data Processing Results

Based on table 17, the F value is 32.599 with a significance of 0.000 (< 0.05), so that coping strategy, emotional resilience, and interaction have a significant effect.

Table 18
Model 3 t Test Results

Variable	B	Std.Error	t	Sig.
(Constant)	42,513	0,529	80,376	00,000
Coping Strategy	-0,705	0,131	-5,363	0,000
Emotional Resilience	0,412	0,157	2,622	0,010
Interaction	-0,038	0,007	-5,856	0,000

Source: SPSS 26 Data Processing Results

Based on table 18, coping strategy has a significant effect on work stress (0.000 < 0.05). The interaction variable was significant with a coefficient of -0.038, so that emotional resilience was shown to moderate and weaken the influence of coping strategies on work stress.

Hypothesis Testing

Table 19
Summary of Hypothesis Results

Yes	Hypothesis	Hypothesis Statement	Nilai Sig.	Verdict
1	H1	Coping strategy affects work stress	0,000	Accepted
2	H2	Emotional resilience moderates the effect of coping strategies on work stress	0,000	Accepted

Source: SPSS 26 Data Processing Results

Based on table 19, H1 is accepted because of the significant coping strategy (0.000 < 0.05). H2 was also accepted because of the significant interaction variable (0.000 < 0.05), so that emotional resilience moderated the relationship between coping strategy and work stress. The entire hypothesis is supported by empirical data.

Discussion

This study uses moderation regression analysis through three models to test the influence of coping strategy on work stress and the role of emotional resilience as a moderation variable.

Model 1 (Direct Influence)

The results showed that coping strategy had a negative and significant effect on work stress (β = 1.015; sig. 0.000) with an R Square of 0.377. This means that coping strategies are able to explain 37.7% of work stress variations. These findings are in line with the theory of the Transactional Model of Stress and Coping (Lazarus & Folkman, 1984) which states that an individual's ability to manage stress determines the level of perceived stress. The better the coping strategy, the lower the work stress. Thus, H1 is accepted.

Model 2 (Simultaneous Influence)

The addition of emotional resilience increased the R Square to 0.384 (up 0.7%). Simultaneously, both variables had a significant effect (sig. 0.000), but only partially coping strategies were significant (sig. 0.001), while emotional resilience was not (sig. 0.320). This shows that emotional resilience has not played an optimal role without interaction. These findings are in line with the Job Demands-Resources Model (Bakker & Demerouti, 2017) that psychological resources work more effectively combinatively.

Model 3 (Moderation)

After entering the interaction variable, the R Square increased significantly to 0.541. The coping strategy had a significant negative effect (β = -0.705; sig. 0.000), and the interaction variable was also significant with a coefficient of -0.038. This proves that emotional resilience moderates and strengthens the influence of coping strategies in reducing work stress. The higher the resilience, the more effective the coping strategy. Thus, H2 is accepted. This finding is supported by the theory of The Resilience Factor (Reivich & Shatte, 2003) which explains that individuals with high resilience have better ability to regulate emotions so that they are able to optimize coping strategies. These results are also consistent with previous research that showed that resilience plays a protective role in dealing with work stress.

For mathematical symbols or notations, the alphabet is italicized, but Greek letters are written upright using the correct symbols. The equal sign is given a punch space before and after; e.g. (English format): r = .456; p = .008. For statistical values having degrees of freedom such as t, F, or Z, the figure of the degree of freedom is written in braces such as t(52) = 1.234; F(1, 34) = 4.567. The statistical calculation for hypothesis testing should be completed with effect sizes;

for example, the t-test using cohes d, the F-test using partial eta squared, or other posthoc tests in line with the references under consideration.

For qualitative research, data from interviews, observations, text interpretations, or many more. Are condensed or summarized into a brief substantial resume or summary to be reported. These significant findings can be presented in descriptive tables to facilitate ease of reading. Excerpts or extracts from interviews, observation results, texts, and others containing answers to research questions are shown in the discussion as authentic evidence. Interpretation of results should not be included in this section unless the research required a combination of both findings and analysis in one part.

CONCLUSION

Based on the results of the analysis and discussion, it can be concluded that:

1. Coping strategy has a negative and significant effect on work stress (β = -0.705; sig. 0.000), so the better the coping strategy, the lower the employee's work stress.
2. Emotional resilience was shown to moderate the relationship with an interaction coefficient of -0.038 (sig. 0.000), which means it reinforces the influence of coping strategies in reducing work stress.

In closing, the results of this study show that strengthening coping strategies and emotional resilience helps employees manage work stress more effectively, as the meaning of QS. Al-Insyirah (94): 5–6 that in every difficulty there is ease.

REFERENCES

Amran, F. W., Ghazali, H., & Mohamad, S. F. (2018). Perceived level of stress among casual dining restaurant employees in Klang Valley, Malaysia. International Journal of Modern Trends in Social Sciences, 1(2), 9–14.

Cedrone, F., Stacchini, L., La Torre, G., Berselli, N., De Nicolò, V., Caminiti, M., Ancona, A., Minutolo, G., Mazza, C., & Cosma, C. (2024). Work-related stress questionnaire: Confirmatory factor analysis for construct validation by the PHRASI study. European Review for Medical and Pharmacological Sciences, 28(1), 392–401.

Chen, H., & Qi, R. (2022). Restaurant frontline employees' turnover intentions: Three-way interactions between job stress, fear of COVID-19, and resilience. International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management, 34(7), 2535–2558.

Dianto, A. Y., Hendratri, B. G., Mas'u, M., Zakariya, M., & Udin, M. F. (2023). Successful production strategy based on Islamic economics: A case study of nucless production at PT Persada Nawa Kartika Kertosono. Journal on Education, 6(1), 10496–10502.

Gede, I., Wira Atmaja, I., & Suana, W. (2019). The effect of workload on burnout with role stress as a mediating variable in Rumours Restaurant employees. Now, 8(2).

Ghozali, I. (2018). Multivariate analysis application with the IBM SPSS 23 program. Publishing Agency of Diponegoro University.

Gloria, C. T., & Steinhardt, M. A. (2016). Relationships among positive emotions, coping, resilience and mental health. Stress and Health, 32(2), 145–156.

Khuong, M., & Linh, U. (2020). Influence of work-related stress on employee motivation, job satisfaction and employee loyalty in hospitality industry. Management Science Letters, 10(14), 3279–3290.

Kosasih, W. (2019). A descriptive study of work stress, burnout, and turnover intention in employees of Fave Hotel Rungkut Surabaya. Now, 7(2).

Lazarus, R. S., & Folkman, S. (1984). Stress, appraisal, and coping. Springer Publishing Company.

Ma, C., Ren, L., & Zhao, J. (2021). Coping with stress: How hotel employees fight to work. Sustainability, 13(19), 10887.

Mustika, V. B., Uhai, S., & Febrian, W. D. (2024). Work-life balance: Realizing employee well-being through sustainable HR management. Alphabet.

Prahendratno, A., Samsuddin, H., Paringsih, P., Wartono, T., Octadyla, M. M., Nurmala, R., Zafar, T. S., Endrasprihatin, R., Riswanto, A., & Desi, D. E. (2023). Human resource management: A practical approach to organizational success. PT Sonpedia Publishing Indonesia.

Reivich, K., & Shatte, A. (2002). The resilience factor: 7 keys to finding your inner strength and overcoming life's hurdles. Harmony.

Schoger, L. I. (2025). Coping with work-related stressors: Does education reduce work-related stress? Journal of Public Health, 33(5), 1123–1134.

Shakya, P., & Thapa Magar, B. (2025). Job stress and job satisfaction among restaurant employees. Asian Journal of Public Health, 33(5), 1123–113.

Sugiyono, P. D. (2017). Business research methods: Quantitative, qualitative, combination, and R&D approaches.

Thapa, Y. (2022). Stress management in job and its impact on employee performance: A case of the hotels and restaurants in Surkhet Valley. Journal of Nepalese Management and Research, 4(1), 68–74.

Yousaf, S., Rasheed, M. I., Hameed, Z., & Luqman, A. (2020). Occupational stress and its outcomes: The role of work-social support in the hospitality industry. Personnel Review, 49(3), 755–773.

Yulia Anggraeni Hidayat Putri, I., Sukyati, I., & Febriyanti, A. P. (2021). Analysis of factors that affect work stress in employees at PT XACTI Indonesia in 2021. Health Bulletin, 5(2).

World Health Organization. (2022). WHO guidelines on mental health at work. https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/9789240053052