

The Influence of Burnout, Eustress/Distress and Employee Wellbeing on Employee Performance

Zainal Hakim^{a,*}, Anita Maharani^b, & Shine Pintor Siolemba Patiro^a

^aUniversitas Terbuka, Indonesia

^bUniversitas Bina Nusantara, Indonesia

Abstract

This study aims to analyze the effect of burnout, eustress/distress, and employee wellbeing on employee performance. The study used quantitative methods with data collection through surveys of permanent employees who worked before and during the pandemic. The research sample was taken using simple random sampling technique with a minimum number of 50 respondents. Data collection was carried out through an online questionnaire, and data analysis was carried out using descriptive statistics with presentation in tabular form, mean, and standard deviation. The results showed that burnout has a significant negative effect on employee performance, while eustress has a significant positive effect. Employee wellbeing was also shown to have a positive effect on employee performance, indicating that employees who feel emotionally and psychologically wellbeing tend to perform better. The conclusion of this study is that companies should pay attention to employees' burnout and wellbeing conditions to maximize their performance, especially in facing post-pandemic challenges in the New Normal era. These findings can be the basis for company management to develop strategies to improve wellbeing and manage stress in the work environment so that employee performance remains optimal.

Keywords: Burnout, Eustress, Employee Wellbeing, Employee Performance, New Normal Era

Received: 19 April 2025

Revised: 17 May 2025

Accepted: 23 June 2025

1. Introduction

The organization or company must be able to strive for the performance of individual employees as much as possible to be able to achieve the success or achievement of the company's or organization's goals. Basically, individual performance will greatly affect the performance of a team or group, which ultimately also affects the performance of a company or organization. However, what often happens is that it is not easy for companies or organizations to maximize employee performance because there are other conditions so that the employee's performance can be maximized, such as the wellbeing condition. Wellbeing is considered a major basic need within a company or organization, especially in order to maintain the talents and excellence of its employees, both individual employees, and in aspects of the organization as a whole which ultimately relate to the achievement of the goals of the company or organization, since success in achieving the goals of the company or organization and the survival of the company or organization depends on the quality of performance Human Resources (HR) in the company (Dedik, 2019).

In general Employee Wellbeing It is said to be a condition where an individual can feel happiness in life, and the individual's condition is not only related to physical conditions, such as the absence of suffering and the absence of disease, but complex conditions that include mental conditions, physical conditions, health conditions, emotional conditions, and social conditions of the individual. As time goes by, an individual's goal in working is not only to get a salary or wages, but also to be able to achieve happiness or be termed Employee Wellbeing at work. A number of shapes Employee Wellbeing Among other things, such as the feeling of being appreciated that individuals get at work while being able to meet the needs of individuals in affiliates, help in setting life goals, develop social relationships to

* Corresponding author.

E-mail address: zainalhakimofficial@gmail.com

become part of social life or society. In other words, one can achieve Wellbeing that is by working (Majorsy et al., 2021).

Dobrzański et al. (2020) states that Employee Wellbeing and employee performance has a positive and significant influence which is related to how the treatment and reciprocity that employees get for their performance, can influence the way employees carry out their duties and responsibilities, which then have an impact on the employee's performance. The results of this study or study show that the condition of Employee Wellbeing can affect employee performance as stated above.

In addition to the condition Employee Wellbeing that must be considered by the company or organization in order to maximize employee performance, conditions Burnout and the work stress experienced by employees can also affect the performance of these employees, as the results of a study conducted by Adil & Baig (2018) found that Burnout may affect Employee Wellbeing. In addition, Talae et al. (2022) in his study stated that Burnout It is a condition characterized by fatigue for a long period of time and a decrease in the level of motivation and interest in work so that it has an impact on a decrease in work productivity.

In Sobirin (2020), it is explained about the negative impact of stress in the context of work life such as burnout, which is generally interpreted as a condition of mental, emotional and physical fatigue due to experiencing excessive stress and for a prolonged period of time. In addition to the various phenomena mentioned above, Gbadgesin & Afolayan (2022) found findings regarding wellbeing that have not been paid much attention among employees who work in companies or industries engaged in the supply chain, even though they must continue to operate in various conditions, even during pandemic conditions, which on the other hand is wellbeing This can affect employee performance as described above.

Based on various phenomena, the results of the study and the results of the preliminary research analysis above, it is interesting to further research the influence of burnout, eustress/distress and employee wellbeing on employee performance in the supply chain industry in the new normal era which is rarely in the spotlight. The demands of the supply chain industry are usually related to how to maintain or improve employee performance under any condition or situation, such as in a pandemic situation where the company must continue to operate. Based on the excavations conducted by the researchers, the studies that have raised PT. ABC as the object of research so far have revolved around employee performance as seen from work discipline, work environment and work motivation (Nurhayati, 2024), work environment and individual characteristics towards performance (Puspita et al., 2020), employee performance analyzed based on training, competence and compensation (Kurnia dewi et al., 2020), employee performance is influenced by organizational culture and organizational commitment (Ismi, 2019) and employee work productivity is influenced by motivation, supervision and work culture (Leihitu et al., 2022). Based on these studies, there is still an opportunity to raise other variables such as burnout and eustress/distress variables according to the results of the Maicu (2017) study above and employee wellbeing according to the results of the Adil & Baig (2018) study above, in an effort to maintain or improve employee performance so that it can have an impact on the performance of the company or organization as described above.

Conversely, stress in the workplace is not inherently negative. Eustress, or positive stress, can act as a motivator that drives employees to perform better, meet challenges, and grow professionally. In contrast, distress, or negative stress, tends to deplete energy and reduce focus, leading to performance decline. The way employees perceive and respond to stress plays a crucial role in determining whether it contributes positively or negatively to their wellbeing and, ultimately, their performance. Employee wellbeing serves as a central element that bridges these psychological states and performance outcomes. Employees who experience high levels of wellbeing are generally more resilient, motivated, and productive (Talae et al., 2022). When wellbeing is compromised whether through burnout or unmanaged distress employee performance is likely to suffer. Thus, understanding how burnout and stress interact with employee wellbeing provides valuable insight into how these factors collectively influence performance (Demerouti et al., 2021).

Burnout and stress are becoming more prevalent, affecting not only individual employees but also organizational productivity and sustainability (Bakker & de Vries, 2021). Despite growing awareness, many organizations still struggle to effectively manage these issues and understand their complex impact on employee performance (Gorgenyi-Hegyey et al., 2021). Therefore, there is an urgent need to investigate how different forms of stress, including both eustress and distress, and burnout influence employee wellbeing and, in turn, affect performance. Addressing this gap is critical for developing comprehensive employee support systems that foster healthier, more resilient, and high-performing workforces. (Aboobaker, 2022) While previous studies have examined the separate effects of burnout or stress on employee wellbeing and performance, this study offers a more integrated approach by simultaneously analyzing the combined impact of burnout, eustress/distress, and employee wellbeing on employee performance. Additionally, the

inclusion of both positive stress (eustress) and negative stress (distress) provides a nuanced understanding of how different stress responses contribute to performance outcomes. This comprehensive perspective advances the current literature by highlighting the interplay between psychological factors and wellbeing in predicting performance, offering fresh insights that can inform more effective organizational interventions. Moreover, this study’s context-specific focus provides new empirical evidence that may differ from findings in other cultural or industrial settings, thus enriching the global discourse on workplace wellbeing and productivity.

This study aims to explore these interrelationships in greater depth by examining the effects of burnout, eustress/distress, and employee wellbeing on employee performance. By identifying which factors significantly impact performance, organizations can develop more targeted strategies to enhance employee wellbeing and optimize workplace outcomes.

2. Methods

This study uses a quantitative method (Suvriadi Pangabean, 2021). The research was carried out from March 21, 2024 to April 21, 2024. The object of this study is PT TS, and the subject or unit of analysis of this research is all permanent employees who joined before the pandemic and still exist to date as many as 1,720 people (Source: Annual Report. Sampling technique through simple random sampling (Suvriadi Pangabean, 2021) with the determination of the minimum number of samples in the study based on Memon et al. (2021), that the number of samples is calculated based on the number of variables studied or $n \times 10$. Thus, in this study the variable amounts to 5×10 , which is a minimum of 50 respondents. Data is the result of empirical or experiential measurements and observations that can reveal facts about the characteristics of a particular phenomenon (Kusumastuti, A., Khoiron, A, 2019). The data collection technique in this study is by distributing surveys through questionnaires to all target respondents through an online form. The data analysis in this study uses descriptive analysis with an approach using Partial Least Square (PLS). Partial Least Square (PLS) is a structural equation model of the Structural Equation Model (SEM) based on variants or components.

3. Result and Discussions

This research was carried out with the aim of determining the influence of burnout, eustress/distress, and employee wellbeing on employee performance in the New Normal era. This study uses a simple random sampling method.

The structural model or inner model is aimed at finding out how well the model is designed to explain the correlation between latent variables in the study (Hair et al., 2019). Structural model evaluation can be carried out by testing the Coefficient of Determination (R²), Path coefficient (β), and T-Statistic.

Coefficient of Determination (R²) aims to show how much independent variables can affect dependent variables (Hair et al., 2019). The results obtained are as follows.

Table 1. Coefficient of Determination (R²)

	R Square	R Square Adjusted
Eustress/Distress	0,567	0,559
Employee Wellbeing	0,524	0,504
Performance	0,814	0,802

Table 1 shows the value of R², the dependent variable eustress/distress has an R-square of 0.567 which means that 56.7% of eustress/distress is affected by burnout, and the remaining 43.3% is affected by other variables. Employee wellbeing was influenced by 50.4% by the burnout and eustress/distress variables, while the remaining 49.6% were likely to be influenced by other variables that were not included in the study. Then, employee performance variables were influenced by 80.2% by the variables of burnout, employee wellbeing, and eustress/distress. While the remaining 19.2% were likely to be influenced by other variables that were not included in the study. The value of f square can be seen in the Table 2.

The result of the f-square value shows how much of an influence the relative of an independent variable is on the bound variable in the model. First, the effect of burnout on eustress/distress has an f-square value of 1.311, which shows a very large and significant influence. Second, burnout on employee wellbeing is only 0.072, which can be interpreted as having a small effect. Third, burnout on employee performance was 0.378, indicating a moderate to large influence. Fourth, eustress/distress on employee wellbeing (0.215) and on employee performance (0.117), showed moderate and

small influences, respectively. Finally, employee wellbeing on employee performance has a value of 0.301, which means that the effect is quite strong and significant in improving performance.

Table 2. F Square

Variable Influence	F-Square
Burnout -> Eustress/Distress	1,311
Burnout -> Employee Wellbeing	0,072
Burnout -> Employee Performance	0,378
Eustress/Distress -> Employee Wellbeing	0,215
Eustress/Distress -> Employee Performance	0,117
Employee Wellbeing -> Employee Performance	0,301

Table 3. Predictive Relevance (Q²)

	Q ²
Eustress/Distress	0,378
Employee Wellbeing	0,353
Performance	0,678

Table 3 shows the Predictive Relevance (Q²) value for three variables, focusing on the dependent variable of employee performance that has a Q² value of 0.678. This value shows that the model has good predictive ability for performance variables, which are predicted by the variables burnout, stress/distress and employee wellbeing. Furthermore, the Q² values for the Eustress/Distress (0.378) and Employee Wellbeing (0.353) variables, both > 0, also showed good predictability.

Table 4. Multicollinearity

Variable Influence	VIVID
Burnout -> Eustress/Distress	1,000
Burnout -> Employee Wellbeing	2,311
Burnout -> Performance	2,479
Eustress/Distress -> Employee Wellbeing	2,311
Eustress/Distress -> Performance	2,808
Employee Wellbeing -> Performance	2,099

Based on the results of the multicollinearity test on Table 4, all VIF values are known < 5, so it can be concluded that there are no multicollinearity problems in the construct studied. Thus, the data in this study has good quality

Table 5. Hypothesis Test

Variable Influence	Path Coefficients	T-statistics	P-values
Burnout -> Eustress/Distress	-0,753	11,346	0,000
Burnout -> Employee Wellbeing	-0,282	1,763	0,039
Burnout -> Performance	-0,418	3,930	0,000
Eustress/Distress -> Employee Wellbeing	0,487	3,157	0,001
Eustress/Distress -> Performance	0,248	2,258	0,012
Employee Wellbeing -> Performance	0,343	2,572	0,005
Burnout -> Eustress/Distress -> Performance	-0,187	2,214	0,013
Burnout -> Eustress/Distress -> Employee Wellbeing -> Performance	-0,126	1,829	0,034
Eustress/Distress -> Employee Wellbeing -> Performance	0,167	1,893	0,029

Based on Table 5, the results of the hypothesis test mentioned above, show that the effect of burnout on eustress/distress was obtained with a path coefficient of -0.753 with a T-count of 11.346 and a p-value of 0.000. This study uses one tailed hypothesis testing so that the standard T-table used is 1.645. The results showed that T-count 11.346 > 1.645 and

p-value $0.000 < 0.05$, so H1 was accepted. Thus, it can be concluded that burnout has a significant effect on eustress/distress. The effect of burnout on employee wellbeing was obtained with a path coefficient of -0.282 with a T-count of 1.763 and a p-value of 0.039 . The results showed that the T-count was $1.763 > 1.645$ and the p-value was $0.039 < 0.05$, so H2 was accepted. Thus, it can be concluded that burnout has a significant effect on employee wellbeing. Meanwhile, burnout on employee performance was obtained with a path coefficient of -0.418 with a T-count of $3.930 > 1.645$ and a p-value of $0.039 < 0.05$, so that H3 was accepted. The results show that burnout has a significant effect on employee performance.

Next, for the effect of eustress/distress on employee wellbeing, a path coefficient of 0.487 was obtained with a T-count of $3.158 > 1.645$ and a p-value of $0.001 < 0.05$, so that H4 was accepted. The conclusion is that eustress/distress has a significant effect on employee wellbeing. The effect of eustress/distress on employee performance was obtained with a path coefficient of 0.248 with a T-count of $2.258 > 1.645$ and a p-value of $0.012 < 0.05$, so that H5 was accepted. Thus, it can be concluded that eustress/distress has a significant effect on employee performance. Meanwhile, the effect of employee wellbeing on employee performance was obtained with a path coefficient of 0.343 with a T-count of $2.572 > 1.645$ and a p-value of $0.005 < 0.05$, so that H6 was accepted. Thus, it can be concluded that employee wellbeing has a significant effect on employee performance.

Next, for the indirect influence or mediation of burnout on performance through eustress/distress, a path coefficient of -0.187 was obtained with a T-count of $2.214 > 1.645$ and a p-value of $0.013 < 0.05$, so that H7 was accepted. With these results, it can be concluded that eustress/distress can significantly mediate the effect of burnout on employee performance. Furthermore, for the effect of burnout mediation on performance through eustress/distress and employee wellbeing, a path coefficient of -0.126 was obtained with a T-count of $1.829 > 1.645$ and a p-value of $0.034 < 0.05$, so that H8 was accepted. Therefore, it can be concluded that eustress/distress and employee wellbeing can significantly mediate the influence of burnout on employee performance. Finally, for the effect of eustress/distress on employee performance mediated by employee wellbeing, a path coefficient of 0.167 was obtained with a T-count of $1.893 > 1.645$ and a p-value of $0.029 < 0.05$, so that H9 was accepted. This means that employee wellbeing can significantly mediate the influence of eustress/distress on employee performance.

3.1. Influence Burnout towards Eustress/Distress

The test results in the first hypothesis show that burnout has a negative and significant effect on eustress/distress. Especially in this study, it is more focused on eustress, which is positive stress. Thus, in this study, burnout is higher and has an impact on weakening positive stress. In other words, burnout causes employees to be more stressed. The findings of this study support the research results of Syafira et al. (2023), which shows that burnout has a significant influence on eustress/distress. High burnout tends to encourage distress, which has an impact on psychological and productivity declines. On the other hand, if burnout can be controlled, employees may still experience eustress that encourages work morale. Therefore, understanding these relationships is important for designing organizational interventions in managing work stress.

3.2. Influence Burnout towards Employee Wellbeing

The test results on the second hypothesis show that burnout has a negative and significant effect on employee wellbeing. This means that the higher the burnout, the lower the employee wellbeing. Work overload, lack of control, lack of rewards, lack of community, lack of fairness, value conflict, make these things burnout create employee wellbeing low. Through the analysis of the outer model, it shows that the value of the loading factor of the most influential indicator is B1, namely work overload. The burnout variable and emphasizing its indicators have been proven to reduce employee wellbeing of employees. The results of the study support the research of Adil & Baig (2018) which states that burnout affects employee wellbeing. Research by Saraun & Ambarwati (2022) also proves that burnout negatively affects employee wellbeing. Similarly, the results of research by Wibowo & Heryjanto (2020) found that burnout has a negative relationship with employee wellbeing

3.3. Influence Burnout on Employee Performance

The results of the third hypothesis test show that burnout has a negative and significant influence on employee performance. This means that the higher the level of burnout experienced by employees, the lower their performance. Burnout can lead to emotional exhaustion, decreased motivation, and reduced productivity. Therefore, it is important for companies or organizations to be able to manage work stress to maintain optimal employee performance. The

findings are in line with previous studies by Syamsu et al. (2019), stated that burnout conditions can affect decreased employee performance, and changes in individual attitudes in the work environment in the company. Research by Maulidah et al. (2022) also shows that burnout has a negative impact on employee performance. This confirms that work fatigue can reduce individual effectiveness, enthusiasm, and work results. These findings reinforce the importance of organizational efforts in preventing and managing burnout in the work environment.

3.4. Influence eustress/distress towards Employee Wellbeing

The results of the fourth hypothesis test show that eustress or positive stress has a positive and significant effect on employee performance. Eustress encourages individuals to be more focused, motivated, and able to complete tasks better. This research focuses on the positive aspect of stress, namely when stress actually triggers performance improvement. When employees experience more eustress, it will have a direct impact on improving employee wellbeing. Therefore, companies or organizations need to create constructive work challenges so that eustress can appear optimally. The findings of this study are in line with the study of Khan & Khurshid (2017), which stated that stress in the workplace affects the well-being of employees, particularly among healthcare staff in the United Arab Emirates. The study emphasizes the importance of stress management so that it does not negatively impact the psychological and emotional state of employees. Furthermore, Auliya & Zulfikri (2023) found that eustress or positive stress actually has a constructive impact on employee wellbeing. Eustress can increase enthusiasm, sense of achievement, and job satisfaction which can contribute to overall employee wellbeing. These two findings reinforce the understanding that the type and management of stress greatly determines its impact on employee well-being.

3.5. Influence eustress/distress on Employee Performance

The results of the fifth hypothesis test show that eustress/distress has a positive and significant influence on employee performance. This means that work pressure, if properly managed as eustress, can encourage improved work performance. Eustress can help employees feel positively challenged, more focused, and motivated to achieve work goals. Although distress is usually negative, in certain controlled contexts, it can also trigger alertness and productivity. Therefore, it is important for organizations to be able to differentiate and be able to manage the type of work stress so that it can be optimally utilized to support employee performance.

Through external model analysis, it shows that the value of the loading factor of the most influential indicator is ED4, which is being undervalued. The eustress/distress variable and emphasizing its indicators have been proven to improve the performance of employees. The results of this study are supported by research conducted by Ayudia & Rochendi (2020), which found that eustress has a positive and significant effect on the performance of employees of PT. Pulse Indomedia Pratama.

3.6. Influence Employee Wellbeing on Employee Performance

The results of the sixth hypothesis test show that employee wellbeing has a positive and significant influence on employee performance. This shows that when employee well-being is maintained, both physically, mentally, and emotionally, employees can tend to work more productively and effectively. Employees who feel prosperous usually have high motivation, commitment to work, and are able to cope with work pressure better. Conversely, if well-being is disrupted, performance can also decline, resulting from stress, fatigue, or job dissatisfaction. Therefore, companies or organizations need to be able to pay attention to and support employee wellbeing as one of the performance improvement strategies.

Job satisfaction, work-related affect, self-acceptance, positive relations with others, environmental mastery, autonomy, personal growth, and life goals (purpose in life), life satisfaction, dispositional effect can make employee wellbeing create good employee performance. Through the analysis of the outer model, it shows that the value of the loading factor of the most influential indicator is EW11. The employee wellbeing variable and emphasizing its indicators are proven to improve the performance of employees. The results of this study are supported by research conducted by Kundi et al. (2020) which says that wellbeing in a company or organization aims to be able to maintain and improve the physical and psychological condition of employees, which is then expected to improve employee work performance.

3.7. Influence Burnout to Employee Performance through Eustress/Distress

The results of testing the indirect or mediated effect of burnout on performance through eustress/distress were concluded. The path coefficient of -0.187 indicates that eustress has a negative mediating effect on the relationship between burnout and employee performance. This means that when eustress levels increase, the negative impact of burnout on performance becomes weaker or smaller. Eustress acts as a protective factor that helps employees stay productive despite work pressure. Thus, the presence of eustress can reduce the adverse consequences of burnout on decreased performance.

3.8. The Effect of Burnout on Employee Performance through Eustress/Distress and Employee Wellbeing

The results of the mediation test showed that burnout had a significant influence on employee performance through the mediating variables eustress/distress and employee wellbeing. A negative mediation coefficient value of -0.126 indicates that this mediation pathway plays a role in reducing the negative impact of burnout on performance. In other words, although burnout can reduce performance, the presence of eustress and a good level of employee well-being are able to suppress these negative effects. Eustress, as a form of positive stress, encourages constructive enthusiasm and challenges at work. Meanwhile, employee wellbeing reflects a healthy physical, mental, and emotional condition, which is a buffer against work pressure. Therefore, strengthening eustress and employee welfare is an important strategy in maintaining optimal performance even in challenging work situations.

3.9. Influence Eustress/Distress to Employee Performance through Employee Wellbeing

The test results showed that eustress/distress had a significant effect on employee performance through employee wellbeing as a mediating variable. A path coefficient of 0.167 which is positive indicates that this mediation has an effect that strengthens the relationship. This means that the higher the level of eustress experienced by employees, the better their well-being, which ultimately has a positive impact on performance. Eustress encourages a positive feeling of being challenged, which can increase job satisfaction and morale. When employee wellbeing is in good condition, employees tend to be more productive, motivated, and resistant to work pressure. Thus, employee wellbeing acts as an important bridge that explains how eustress can indirectly improve employee performance.

4. Conclusions

Burnout does not have a significant effect on employee wellbeing, showing that increased burnout tends to reduce employee well-being. Second, eustress/distress has been shown to have a positive and significant influence on employee performance, which means that even though stress is present, if managed properly, it can encourage performance improvement. Third, employee wellbeing also has a positive and significant influence on employee performance, indicating that good employee well-being contributes directly to improving employee performance.

References

- Adil, M. S., & Baig, M. (2018). Impact of job demands-resources model on burnout and employee's well-being: Evidence from the pharmaceutical organisations of Karachi. *IIMB Management Review*, 30(2), 119–133. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.iimb.2018.01.004>
- Auliya, N. N. F., & Zulfikri, A. (2023). Developing Android-Based Transformational Geometry E-Module Using Adobe Animate CC. *Jurnal Pendidikan Matematika (Kudus)*, 6(1), 81. <https://doi.org/10.21043/jpmk.v6i1.19944>
- Ayudia, R., & Rochendi, T. (2020). Hubungan Iklim Organisasi, Eustress dengan Kinerja Karyawan di Pt. Pulsa Indomedia Pratama. *Kompleksitas: Jurnal Ilmiah Manajemen, Organisasi Dan Bisnis*, 9(1), 58–72. <http://ejurnal.swadharma.ac.id/index.php/kompleksitas/article/view/25>
- Dedik, T. I. (2019). Pengembangan Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia Berbasis Kompetensi Guna Meningkatkan Kinerja Pegawai. *Jurnal Perkeretaapian Indonesia*, III(2), 93 – 101.
- Dobrzański, B., Rybczyński, R., Dobrzańska, A., & Wójcik, W. (2020). Some physical and nutritional quality parameters of storage apple. *International Agrophysics*, 15(1), 13–18.

- Gbadgesin, A., & Afolayan, I. (2022). Impact of Covid-19 Pandemic on Supply Chain Workers Wellbeing in Nigeria. *Research Square*, 1–11. <https://www.researchsquare.com/article/rs-1893783/latest.pdf>
- Hair, J. F., Ringle, C. M., Gudergan, S. P., Fischer, A., Nitzl, C., & Menictas, C. (2019). Partial least squares structural equation modeling-based discrete choice modeling: an illustration in modeling retailer choice. *Business Research*, 12(1), 115–142. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40685-018-0072-4>
- Ismi, N. (2019). *Pengaruh Budaya organisasi Dan Komitmen Organisasi Terhadap Kinerja Karyawan Pada PT. Tigaraksa Satria*. <http://repository.umsu.ac.id/handle/123456789/6085>
- Khan, N., & Khurshid, S. (2017). Workplace Stress and Employee Wellbeing: Case of Health Care Staff in UAE. *European Scientific Journal, ESJ*, 13(5), 217. <https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2017.v13n5p217>
- Kundi, Y. M., Aboramadan, M., Elhamalawi, E. M. I., & Shahid, S. (2020). Employee psychological well-being and job performance: exploring mediating and moderating mechanisms. *International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, 29(3), 736–754. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJOA-05-2020-2204>
- Kurnia dewi, E., Styowati, T., & Rozzaid, Y. (2020). Analisis pelatihan, kompetensi, dan kompensasi terhadap kinerja karyawan pada pt. tigaraksa satria tbk jember. *Jurnal Fakultas Ekonomi Universitas Muhammadiyah Jember*, 2, 166.
- Kusumastuti, A., Khoiron, A, M. (2019). Penelitian Kualitatif: Metode Penelitian Kualitatif. In *Semarang: Lembaga Pendidikan Sukarno Pressindo* (Vol. 5, Issue January). <http://lib.unnes.ac.id/id/eprint/40372>
- Leihitu, K. F., Kalangi, J. A. F., & Rogahang, J. J. (2022). Pengaruh Motivasi, Pengawasan dan Budaya Kerja Terhadap Produktivitas Kerja Karyawan PT. Tigaraksa Satria, Tbk Manado. *Productivity*, 3(1), 61–66. <https://ejournal.unsrat.ac.id/index.php/productivity/article/view/37991>
- Maicu, M. C., & C. M. (2017). Stress And Its Effects on the Employees in a Fast Moving Consumer Goods (FMCG) Organisation. *Thesis, University Of The Western Cape*. <http://hdl.handle.net/11394/6318>
- Majorsy, U., Suryani, A. I., Mayangsari, E. T., Aglif, M., & Qomariah, N. (2021). Faktor-Faktor Yang Mempengaruhi Well-Being. *Jurnal Bisnis Dan Ekonomi (JBE)*, 05(2), 202–209.
- Maulidah, Q. B., Wibowo, N. M., & Widiastuti, Y. (2022). Pengaruh Burnout Terhadap Kinerja Karyawan Dimediasi Semangat Kerja Karyawan Pada Staf BPBD Kota Surabaya. *Jurnal EMA*, 7(2), 109. <https://doi.org/10.47335/ema.v7i2.282>
- Memon, M. A., Salleh, R., Mirza, M. Z., Cheah, J. H., Ting, H., Ahmad, M. S., & Tariq, A. (2021). Satisfaction matters: the relationships between HRM practices, work engagement and turnover intention. *International Journal of Manpower*, 42(1), 21–50. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJM-04-2018-0127>
- Nurhayati, N. (2024). Pengaruh Disiplin Kerja, Lingkungan Kerja dan Motivasi Kerja terhadap Kinerja Karyawan. *Blantika: Multidisciplinary Journal*, 2(5), 533–543. <https://doi.org/10.57096/blantika.v2i5.142>
- Puspita, A., Firdaus, M. A., & Rinda, R. T. (2020). Pengaruh Karakteristik Individu Dan Lingkungan Kerja Terhadap Kinerja Karyawan. *Manager : Jurnal Ilmu Manajemen*, 3(1), 1. <https://doi.org/10.32832/manager.v3i1.3821>
- Saraun, G. G. S., & Ambarwati, K. D. (2022). Hubungan Antara Psychological Well-Being Dengan Burnout Pada Pekerja Pt Pertamina Geothermal Energy Area Lahendong. *Jurnal EMPATI*, 11(5), 359–367. <https://doi.org/10.14710/empati.0.36745>
- Sobirin, A. (2020). Perilaku Organisasi. In *Tangerang Selatan: Universitas Terbuka*.
- Suvriadi Pangabea. (2021). Konsep dan Strategi pembelajaran. In *Medan: Yayasan Kita Menulis* (Issue August).
- Syafira, M., Khotimah, S., & Nugrahayu, E. Y. (2023). Hubungan Stres dengan Burnout pada Mahasiswa Program Studi Kedokteran Fakultas Kedokteran Universitas Mulawarman. *Jurnal Kedokteran Mulawarman*, 10(1), 14–15.
- Syamsu, N. N., Soelton, M., Nanda, A., Putra, R. L., & Pebriani, P. (2019). Bagaimanakah Konflik Peran Dan Beban Kerja Mempengaruhi Kinerja Karyawan Dengan Burnout Sebagai Variabel Intervening. *Jurnal Ilmiah Manajemen Dan Bisnis*, 5(1), 1. <https://doi.org/10.22441/jimb.v5i1.5621>
- Talae, N., Varahram, M., Jamaati, H., Salimi, A., Attarchi, M., Kazempour dizaji, M., Sadr, M., Hassani, S.,

Farzanegan, B., Monjazebi, F., & Seyedmehdi, S. M. (2022). Stress and burnout in health care workers during COVID-19 pandemic: validation of a questionnaire. *Journal of Public Health (Germany)*, 30(3), 531–536. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10389-020-01313-z>

Wibowo, B., & Heryjanto, A. (2020). Pengaruh Kredibilitas Influencer, Nominal Harga, Dan Media Sosial Terhadap Minat Pembelian Dengan Mediasi Citra Merek Di Tokopedia. *Journal of Business and Applied Management*, 13(1), 83–101.