

Workplace well-being reviewed from personal characteristic and job demands among lecturers

Rini Eka Sari

Sarjanawiyata Tamansiswa University, Yogyakarta, Indonesia
rini.sari@ustjogja.ac.id

Artikel history

<i>Received</i>	<i>Revised</i>	<i>Accepted</i>	<i>Published</i>
2022-02-10	2022-02-17	2022-02-24	2022-02-28

Keyword :

Job Demands,
Lecturer, Personal
Characteristic,
Workplace Well-
being

Abstract

The high demands and obligations of lecturers require Workplace Well-being in various aspects of work to complete their work. This study examines the relationship between the Workplace Well-being of lecturers in terms of Personal Characteristics and Job Demands. The research method collects subjects using purposive sampling. The study involved 147 lecturers. The scale in this study is the Workplace Well-Being, Personal Characteristic, and Job Demands Scale. The regression analysis results show that the correlation coefficient is 0.436 with a value of $F = 16.946$ and an R square value of 0.191. This shows that the Personal Characteristics and Job Demands variables have an influence of 19.1% on the Workplace Well-being variable, and 80.9% are influenced by other variables not examined in this study. The result of the study helped the University and other educational organizations to create or improve Workplace Well-being by considering the lectures' Personal Characteristics and Job Demands.

How to cite: Sari, R. E. (2022). Workplace well-being reviewed from personal characteristic and job demands among lecturers of Sarjanawiyata Tamansiswa University, Yogyakarta. *Insight: Jurnal Ilmiah Psikologi*, 24(1), 126-138. doi: <https://doi.org/10.26486/psikologi.v24i1.2326>

INTRODUCTION

The increasingly rapid development of the world of education with various innovative programs developed is a strategy to realize the vision of Advanced Indonesian Superior Human Resources as expected by President Joko Widodo to focus on the education sector. The Ministry of Education and Culture, as it is known through "Merdeka Belajar" to "Kampus Merdeka," has an acceleration strategy to improve the quality of human resources (Totoh, 2020).

Improving the quality of education in Indonesia is a challenging task because many aspects must be given special attention and improved. Higher education or university level is one of the institutions that have a role in improving the quality of Indonesian education, in Law Number 12 of 2012 concerning Higher Education; Higher Education has the following functions: (a) developing capabilities and shaping the character and civilization of a dignified nation in the context of the intellectual life of the nation; (b) developing an innovative, responsive, creative, skilled, competitive and cooperative academic community through the implementation of the Tridarma; and (c) developing Science and Technology by taking into account and applying the values of Humanities.

Law Number 14 of 2005 concerning Teachers and Lecturers emphasizes that lecturers are required to have academic qualifications, competencies, and educator certificates, be physically and

mentally healthy, meet other qualifications required by the higher education unit where they work, and can realize national education goals. Lecturers are professional educators and scientists with the main task of transforming, developing, and disseminating science, technology, and art through education, research, and community service. Besides being mandated by Law Number 14 of 2005 concerning Teachers and Lecturers, the qualifications of lecturers are also regulated in Government Regulation 19 of 2005 concerning National Education Standards.

As one of the essential components of higher education, lecturers have a very significant role in universities to carry out their roles. The role of lecturers is expected to be able to catch up with the progress of the development of science, technology, and art from other countries, especially in Asia. Lecturers must have four essential competencies: pedagogic competence, professional competence, personality competence, and social competence. Lecturers have general characteristics as educators with the main distinguishing trait (discriminant trait) as scientists, and a lecturer must have performance, integrity, ethics, and manners, as well as responsibility in carrying out tasks (Totoh, 2020). This statement is supported by the result of research by Adiauwaty (2020) on the job performance of lecturers during the COVID-19 pandemic that they are still able to meet work demands, have low-stress levels, and maintain the quality and quantity of their assignments. However, this is different from the condition that Karseno (in Amang, 2011) found that the performance of private university lecturers was deficient by comparing the ideal conditions. Suhardi and Dharmaputra (in Amang, 2011) found that, in some areas, the performance and quality of the lecturers were still low.

The high demands and obligations that a lecturer must fulfill in carrying out his professional duties as a lecturer, the government also stipulates that lecturers have the right to earn income above the minimum living needs and social welfare guarantees (PP No. 19 of 2005). The welfare of this lecturer does not only include welfare in terms of the salary received but also the welfare felt by the lecturer in the workplace because the welfare felt by a person is closely related to the individual completing his work. The welfare provided is significant and valuable to meet physical and mental needs. Lecturer and his family. Providing welfare will create a calm work spirit, dedication, discipline, and a loyal attitude to the agency so that labor turnover is relatively low (Elisabeth, 2017; Hasibuan, 2011).

Welfare in the workplace is the organization's obligation to assist employees in obtaining what is their right by giving employees the freedom to achieve it so that positive emotions arise in employees. Welfare is commonly referred to as workplace well-being, one of the components of employee well-being (Elisabeth, 2017; Harter et al., 2002).

Workplace well-being is a sense of well-being that employees get from their work, which is related to employees' general feelings (core affect) and the intrinsic and extrinsic values of work (work values) (Maulana, 2018; Page, 2005; Zahro, 2018). The core effect is a state where feelings of comfort and discomfort are mixed with the passion that affects human activities (Russel in Page,

2005). For this reason, the core effect can be interpreted as general individual feelings. Work values, intrinsic and extrinsic, are defined as the degree of value, importance, and things liked by individuals at work (Knoop in Page, 2005). Lecturers need welfare to support the implementation of various job demands on campus. In this case, work demands can cause pressure that affects the welfare of the lecturers. This follows the results of research conducted by the Association of Teachers and Lecturers (ATL), which states that 55% of teaching staff say that work pressure has a detrimental effect on welfare (Hutapea & Budiarto, 2016).

Danna and Griffin (1999) suggest that workplace well-being is essential for companies to pay attention to the welfare of their members at work. There are three reasons why workplace well-being must be considered. First, experience at work or the social environment, both physical and psychological, will affect the daily life of individuals. Second, the large portion of the time employees spend at work makes experiences during work attached to the individual and carried over into everyday life. Third, workplace well-being is an employee's need that the company must meet. Therefore, workplace well-being is a variable of great concern considering that the fulfillment of workplace well-being will improve the quality of the work of the workers themselves (Abun et al., 2020; Aryanti et al., 2020; Maulana, 2018; Zahro, 2018).

Page (2005) explained that workplace well-being is based on the intrinsic and extrinsic values of work. This value comes from the duality theory of motivation which is often studied by organizational psychologists. Intrinsic motivation refers to the drive to work that is influenced by psychological rewards and is associated with the work itself, such as achievement and responsibility. While extrinsic motivation is more influenced by the desire to get things related to external factors from work such as wages and rewards. Page (2005) also explained that workplace well-being is a derivative of subjective well-being, where subjective well-being is a global evaluation of life satisfaction, so the concept of subjective well-being can also be applied in various more specific aspects of life, such as work. Therefore, workplace well-being is the perceived well-being in the workplace.

Workplace well-being is an important element of the success of an organization and contributes to expected outcomes such as improving employee performance (Aryanti et al., 2020; De Simone, 2014; Elisabeth, 2017; Hudin & Budiani, 2021; Kurniadewi, 2016; Slemp et al., 2015). Employees with high well-being are also more productive, so employee well-being is an important element for companies because companies with high levels of well-being in their employees have more profits and productivity in their companies (Aryanti et al., 2020; Elisabeth, 2017; Fridayanti et al., 2019; Harter et al., 2010; Maulana, 2018).

According to Bryson et al. (2014), there are two factors that can affect workplace well-being in employees. First is personal characteristics in the form of positive individual self-evaluations which refer to individuals who feel they are able to control their surrounding environment. Second is job characteristics can be in the form of physical, social or organizational aspects of the job that

may affect job demands. Heuvel et al. (2015), said that employees who are able to control their own work life by creating a healthy environment can take the initiative to optimize their work.

Peoni (2014) explained that personal characteristics are individual differences from other individuals. The most critical resource in an organization is human resources, people who provide their energy, talent, creativity, and effort to the organization so it can continue to exist. Personal characteristics are characteristics or traits possessed by employees that can make them have different abilities from other employees to maintain and improve their performance (Biggio & Cortese, 2013; Shih et al., 2016).

Furthermore, Peoni (2014) explained that personal characteristics include traits in the form of abilities and skills; family background, social, and experience; age, nationality, gender, and others that reflect specific demographic characteristics; and psychological characteristics consisting of perception, attitude, personality, learning, and motivation. The scope of these traits forms a particular cultural nuance that also marks the essential characteristics of a particular organization.

In line with Peoni, Robbins et al. (1996) state that individuals with individual and organizational characteristics have differences and similarities, so this requires adjustments, especially concerning individual characteristics that individuals bring into the organizational structure, the ability of personal trust, and appreciation of the needs and experiences of others. Individual characteristics are reflected in abilities and skills, age, gender, marital status, years of service, descent, social environment, experience, and individual values. The placement of employees in the field of work by their abilities and skills will lead to high performance and job satisfaction.

Another factor that also affects workplace well-being is job and workplace characteristics (Bryson et al., 2014). Several job characteristics can affect workplace well-being. These characteristics namely job demand, opportunities in job control, opportunities for employees to improve and use their skills, supportive supervision, wages, opportunities for personal contact, the physical environment at work, and better career opportunities (Acas, 2012).

Bakker and Demerouti (2007) stated that many studies showed that job characteristics, including job demands, job control, and job resources, can profoundly impact employee well-being. According to Schaufeli and Bakker (2004), job demands refer to the physical, psychological, social, or organizational aspects of a job that require physical and psychological support (e.g., cognitive or emotional) and are therefore associated with specific physical and psychological costs such as work pressure and emotionally demanding. High job demands tend to trigger low workplace well-being (Love et al., 2007). Job stressors (in this case, job demands) are one thing that may influence well-being, health, and job performance (Diana & Frianto, 2020; Grebner et al., 2005; Lestari & Zamralita, 2018).

According to Bakker and Demerouti (2007), job demands are all physical, psychological, social, and organizational aspects that require ongoing physical and psychological effort and skills,

thus requiring certain physical and psychological sacrifices. Several previous studies have shown that job characteristics, including job demands, job control, and job sources, can significantly impact employee well-being. In addition, job demands such as high work pressure, emotional demands, and role ambiguity can also cause sleep problems, physical and psychological fatigue, and health problems that can affect the welfare and work performance of employees (Arnold B. Bakker & Demerouti, 2007; Diana & Frianto, 2020; Faaroek, 2020; Salsabila, 2019; Wulan & Apriliani, 2017). The relationship between welfare and work performance is supported by other studies, which state that there is a significant negative relationship between job demands and worker welfare (Arwansyah et al., 2012; Dominica & Wijono, 2019).

Based on the explanation and the theory related to how important it is to pay attention to workplace well-being in various aspects of work, where workplace well-being is related to the feelings of well-being felt by individuals when working and completing work assignments and also affects their personal lives indirectly. This statement is supported by the result of research by Adiawaty (2020) on the job performance of lecturers during pandemic covid-19 that they are still able to meet work demands, have low-stress levels, maintain the quality and quantity of their assignments regardless of the lecturers found some obstacles during sessions. However, this is different from the condition that Karseno (in Amang, 2011) found that the performance of private university lecturers was deficient by comparing the ideal conditions. Suhardi and Dharmaputra (in Amang, 2011) found that, in some areas, the performance and quality of the lecturers were still low. Differences in views from previous studies made the current study want to examine the factors that affect the workplace well-being of lecturers. Therefore, the researchers are interested in examining whether the workplace well-being perceived by lecturers was influenced by personal characteristic variables and job demands at the University. The study was also based on the lack of research on lecturers' workplace well-being.

Previous studies in Indonesia related to workplace well-being have been carried out using correlation methods and involving one variable, such as job demands (Arwansyah et al., 2012; Dominica & Wijono, 2019; Elisabeth, 2017; Salsabila, 2019), work engagement (Cholilah, 2019; Sari, 2015), work value (Zahro, 2018), performance (Hudin & Budiani, 2021), mental health (Fridayanti et al., 2019) and turnover intention (Maulana, 2018). Another study tried to explore workplace well-being by involving two variables with workplace well-being, namely Yuniarti and Muchtar (2014) psychological capital variables and perceptions of transformational leadership styles. In addition to the variable aspect, the scope of previous studies was limited to employees in industries or companies (Arwansyah et al., 2012; Dominica & Wijono, 2019; Elisabeth, 2017; Maulana, 2018; Salsabila, 2019; Sari, 2015; Zahro, 2018). Therefore, in this study, the researcher tried to explore workplace well-being more broadly by involving personal characteristics and job demands variables as well as a comprehensive and different scope of the study, namely the educational environment in Indonesia, especially at the university level.

The purpose of the current study is to provide a comprehensive explanation of the conditions of workplace well-being related to two things, namely personal characteristics and job demands on lecturers. In addition, the current study also aims to assess the role of personal characteristics and job demands in influencing the workplace well-being of the research subject.

Current research has two benefits, namely theoretical and practical. On the theoretical side, the research results add to the breadth of psychologists' knowledge in understanding a workplace well-being phenomenon by involving more than one factor from previous studies, namely personal characteristics and job demands. On the practical side, the results of this study can become one of the essential considerations for managers or policymakers in higher education institutions regarding the importance of workplace well-being for teaching staff, in particular, Universitas Sarjanawiyata Tamansiswa Yogyakarta and other universities, in general.

METHOD

The study uses a quantitative design with multiple regression analysis. The subjects in the study were lecturers who were active and working at the Universitas Sarjanawiyata Tamansiswa Yogyakarta. The total number of lecturers with active status is 277 lecturers. The researcher used a purposive sampling method with criteria for male and female lecturers, permanent and contract status. The number of subjects in the study was 147 lecturers.

Data collection in this study used three research scales, namely the Workplace well-being scale. The researcher refers to the aspects proposed by Page (2005), which consist of intrinsic and extrinsic dimensions as indicators for the preparation of the scale; both Personal Characteristic scales are compiled by developing aspects of Personal Characteristics proposed by Subyantoro (2009) and the third is the Job Demands scale, the researcher modified the Job Demands-Resources Questionnaire instrument from Bakker (2014).

The analysis method of the data in this study used multiple regression analysis with the reason that the researcher wants to know the relationship between variables, as well as the correlation coefficient and the contribution of the independent variables (personal characteristics and job demands) to the dependent variable (workplace well-being). The validity and reliability test of the scale was carried out using Cronbach's Alpha with items with item correlation (r_{xy}) 0.30. The number of each correct item on the research scale, namely the workplace well-being scale, the reliability coefficient value is 0.892, and the correct item is 20. The Personal Characteristics scale is 22 items with a coefficient value of 0.922, and the Job Demands scale is valid. as many as 20 items and a coefficient value of 0.887.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Descriptive data analysis was used to obtain a more in-depth picture of the research subject based on the data obtained. Several statistical indicators that can be used to describe research data are presented in table 1.

Table 1. Statistical description of research data

Variable	Hypothetical Data				SD	Empirical Data			
	Skor		Mean	Mean		Skor		Mean	SD
	Min	Max				Min	Max		
	<i>Workplace well-being</i>	38	190	114		25,3	113	148	130,6
<i>Personal Characteristic</i>	22	110	77	14,7	78	141	91,01	7,72	
<i>Job Demands</i>	23	115	80,5	15,3	62	102	86,96	7,77	

In table 1, a statistical description of the high or low levels of workplace well-being, personal characteristics, and job demands can be explained by looking at the results of categorizing the total score of the subjects on each scale. Then the next step is to classify the subjects into high and low categories. Azwar (2007) explains that categorization aims to put the subject in several groups separately and tiered according to the attributes to be measured.

The results of the data categorization of workplace well-being, personal characteristics, and job demands can be seen in table 2. Based on the categorization formula in the following table:

Table 2. Categorization of score data workplace well-being, personal characteristic and job demands

Categorization	<i>Workplace well-being</i>		<i>Personal Characteristic</i>		<i>Job Demands</i>	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
<i>High</i>	27	18,37	48	32,7	18	12,2
<i>Moderate</i>	120	81,63	99	61,3	126	85,7
<i>Low</i>	0	0	0	0	3	2,1

Based on the categorization of the data in table 2, it can be concluded that the subjects in this study for the categorization of the workplace well-being scores felt by the lecturers were in the high category, as many as 27 subjects, which was about 18.37%, which were in the moderate category, which was 120 subjects or about 81.63 % subjects. In the personal characteristic variable, 48 subjects in the high category and 99 subjects in the moderate category were obtained. For the job demands variable, the average lecturers are in the moderate category, as many as 126 or about 85% of the total subjects.

A normality test was conducted to determine whether the distribution of the data used in this study was normally distributed or not. The researcher tested the normality of the distribution using

the SPSS 22.0 Windows Version program with the Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test. The results of the normality test on the three variables can be seen in the following table:

Table 3. Normality test result

No.	Variable	p	Status
1.	<i>Workplace well-being</i>	0,200	Normal
2.	<i>Personal Characteristic</i>	0,067	Normal
3.	<i>Job Demands</i>	0,200	Normal

In this study, a linearity test was also conducted to determine whether the relationship between the independent variable and the dependent variable was linear or not. According to Hadi (2004), the rule used to determine the linearity of the relationship is that if $p < 0.05$, then the relationship is said to be linear, and if $p > 0.05$, the relationship is considered non-linear. Based on the linearity test of personal characteristics and job demands with workplace well-being, a value of 0.229 ($p > 0.05$). The results show that the relationship between variables is linear.

The multicollinearity test is aimed at whether the regression model found a correlation between independent variables. A good regression test model should not have multicollinearity. Based on the VIF value, it is known that the VIF value is 1.138, which means < 10 . Thus, there is no multicollinearity even though there is a correlation between the independent variables of 0.106. The eigenvalue is 2,992, and it is far above zero.

The results of the hypothesis tested in this study indicate that both personal characteristics and job demands positively affect workplace well-being with a correlation coefficient value of 0.436 and a significance level of 0.000 ($p < 0.01$). It confirmed that lecturers' characteristics and job demands could increase the workplace well-being of lecturers. The result supported by Bryon et al. (2014) is that workplace well-being is influenced by personal characteristics and job characteristics related to job demands. From the Summary model table, the R square value is 0.191. This shows that the personal characteristics and job demands variables influence 19.1% of workplace well-being, and 80.9% are influenced by other variables not examined in this study. Other variables that affect workplace well-being are job characteristics, life and work satisfaction, personality, core self-evaluation, life values, work values, and work goals and achievements (Page, 2005).

Analysis of the second hypothesis showed that personal characteristics are related to workplace well-being with a correlation coefficient value of 0.347 and a significance value of 0.001 ($p < 0.01$). It can be concluded that personal characteristics such as abilities, skills, gender, and age influence the level of workplace well-being that lecturers feel at the University of Sarjanawiyata Tamansiswa Yogyakarta. Furthermore, personal characteristics such as positive self-evaluation help lecturers control their work environment and life so that they can optimize their work (Bryson et al, 2014; van den Heuvel et al., 2015).

The third hypothesis test also showed that the job demands variable affects workplace well-being by 9% with a significance of 0.002 ($p < 0.01$), where the job demands variable has a very

significant correlation with the workplace well-being variable. This means that the level of workplace well-being felt by lecturers at the University of Sarjanawiyata Tamansiswa Yogyakarta is influenced by job demands. The result can be used as an indication that there is a possibility that a low level of workplace well-being may occur due to high demands job demands. It related to Love et al. (2007) that high job demands tend to trigger low workplace well-being. This is also in line with research conducted by Wulan and Putri (2016), which examined the relationship between job demands and workplace well-being in Sekolah Luar Biasa (SLB) teachers. This study showed a significant effect of job demands on workplace well-being in teachers of SLB. The magnitude of the effect given by job demands on workplace well-being is 20.8%, and the remaining 79.2% is influenced by other factors outside of job demands, such as age, gender, and job status.

The categorization score of the data shows that the lecturers at the University of Sarjanawiyata Tamansiswa Yogyakarta are in the moderate category, both for the workplace well-being variable at 81.63%, personal characteristics at 61.3%, and job demands at 85%. The moderate category of all research variables felt by the lecturers is most likely because it has been 1.5 years since Sarjanawiyata Tamansiswa University implemented the Work from Home (WFH) system for lecturers. Research on the impact of the WFH system on lecturer productivity conducted by Simarmata (2020) shows that the variable WFH partially has a significant positive effect on lecturer productivity. Another study that examined the impact of WFH system on lecturers was carried out by Pristiyono et al. (2020). The test results between WFH variables had a direct and significant effect on motivation, and the WFH system also had a direct and significant effect on lecturer performance.

Reseacher hoped that the result of the study could be beneficial for the management of the Universitas Sarjanawiyata Tamansiswa Yogyakarta in making policies that stimulate or create a feeling of workplace well-being for lecturers because the feelings of workplace well-being felt by lecturers are significantly related to personal characteristic variables and job demands. The management could pay attention to these two variables in making policy rules so that efforts to improve the performance and quality of lecturers are maximized, and lecturers can make a better contribution to the university.

CONCLUSION

Based on the results of the current study, workplace well-being is influenced by the personal characteristics and job demands of lecturers at the University of Sarjanawiyata Tamansiswa Yogyakarta. The result follows the proposed hypothesis that personal characteristics and job demands affect the workplace well-being of lecturers at the University of Sarjanawiyata Tamansiswa Yogyakarta. It also showed that workplace well-being is influenced by other variables not examined in this study.

This study found that, either together or separately, the personal characteristic variable influenced the level of workplace well-being perceived by lecturers at the University of Sarjanawiyata Tamansiswa Yogyakarta. It has also become one of the essential considerations for managers or policymakers in higher education institutions regarding the importance of workplace well-being for lecturers. Further research can develop other factors that affect workplace well-being perceived by lecturers, such as job resources, job characteristics, and workplace. In addition, the future study could also choose respondents from other occupations.

REFERENCES

- Abun, D., Magallanes, T., Foronda, G. S. L., & Encarnacion, M. J. (2020). Employees' workplace well-being and work engagement of divine word colleges' employees in Ilocos region, Philippines. *International Journal of Research in Business and Social Science (2147- 4478)*, 9(2), 70–84. <https://doi.org/10.20525/ijrbs.v9i2.623>
- Acas. (2012). *Health, work and wellbeing*. Advisory Conciliation and Arbitration Service.
- Adiawaty, S. (2020). Pandemi Covid-19 dan kinerja dosen (study kasus kinerja dosen pada PT XYZ). *ESENSI: Jurnal Manajemen Bisnis*, 23(2), 185–191. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.55886/esensi.v23i2.204>
- Amang, B. (2011). Analisis kinerja dosen pada program studi terakreditasi perguruan tinggi swasta di Sulawesi Selatan. *Media Riset Bisnis & Manajemen*, 11(2), 140–173.
- Arwansyah, W. I., Salendu, A., & Radikun, T. B. S. (2012). Hubungan antara job demands dengan workplace well-being pada pekerja shift. *Jurnal Psikologi Pitutur*, 1(1), 32–44.
- Aryanti, R. D., Sari, E. Y. D., & Widiana, H. S. (2020). A literature review of workplace well-being. *Proceedings of the International Conference on Community Development (ICCD 2020)*. <https://doi.org/10.2991/assehr.k.201017.134>
- Azwar, S. (2007). *Sikap manusia teori dan pengukurannya*. Pustaka pelajar.
- Bakker, A. B. (2014). *Job demands-resources questionnaire*. Erasmus University.
- Bakker, Arnold B., & Demerouti, E. (2007). The job demands- resources model: State of the art. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 22(3), 309–328. <https://doi.org/10.1108/02683940710733115>
- Biggio, G., & Cortese, C. (2013). Well-being in the workplace through interaction between individual characteristics and organizational context. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies on Health and Well-Being*, 8(1), 19823. <https://doi.org/10.3402/qhw.v8i0.19823>
- Bryson, A., Forth, J., & Stokes, L. (2014). *Does worker wellbeing affect workplace performance*. Department of Business Innovation and Skills.
- Cholilah, I. R. (2019). Workplace well-being berkontribusi dalam meningkatkan engagement karyawan (studi literatur). *Jurnal Al-Tatwir*, 6(1), 77–88. <https://doi.org/10.35719/altatwir.v6i1.6>

- Danna, K., & Griffin, R. W. (1999). Health and well-being in the workplace: A review and synthesis of the literature. *Journal of Management*, 25(3), 357–384. <https://doi.org/10.1177/014920639902500305>
- De Simone, S. (2014). Conceptualizing wellbeing in the workplace. *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, 5(12), 118–122.
- Diana, A. M., & Frianto, A. (2020). Hubungan antara job demand terhadap kinerja karyawan melalui burnout. *BIMA : Journal of Business and Innovation Management*, 3(1), 17–33. <https://doi.org/10.33752/bima.v3i1.303>
- Dominica, S. V., & Wijono, S. (2019). Hubungan antara job demands dengan workplace well-being pada karyawan Generasi Z di Jakarta. *Psikologia (Jurnal Psikologi)*, 4(2), 1–9. <https://doi.org/doi:10.210070/psikologia.v4i2.1640>
- Elisabeth, E. (2017). *Hubungan antara job demands dengan workplace well-being pada karyawan kantor cabang perusahaan "X"*. Skripsi. Bandung: Universitas Katolik Parahyangan.
- Faarook, S. A. (2020). Pengaruh job demands terhadap turnover intention melalui burnout pada karyawan work from home. *Forum Ilmiah*, 1(3), 354–396.
- Fridayanti, F., Kardinah, N., & Nurul Fitri, T. J. (2019). Peran workplace well-being terhadap mental health: Studi pada karyawan disabilitas. *Psymphatic : Jurnal Ilmiah Psikologi*, 6(2), 191–200. <https://doi.org/10.15575/psy.v6i2.5754>
- Grebner, S., Semmer, N. K., & Elfering, A. (2005). Working conditions and three types of well-being: A longitudinal study with self-report and rating data. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 10(1), 31–43. <https://doi.org/10.1037/1076-8998.10.1.31>
- Harter, J. K., Schmidt, F. L., Asplund, J. W., Killham, E. A., & Agrawal, S. (2010). Causal impact of employee work perceptions on the bottom line of organizations. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 5(4), 378–389. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691610374589>
- Harter, J. K., Schmidt, F. L., & Hayes, T. L. (2002). Business-unit-level relationship between employee satisfaction, employee engagement, and business outcomes: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(2), 268–279. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.87.2.268>
- Hasibuan, M. S. P. (2011). *Manajemen sumber daya manusia*. CV. Haji Masagung.
- Hudin, A. M., & Budiani, M. S. (2021). Hubungan antara workplace well-being dengan kinerja karyawan pada PT. X di Sidoarjo. *Character: Jurnal Penelitian Psikologi*, 8(4), 1–11.
- Hutapea, B., & Budiarto, Y. (2016). Aplikasi psikologi positif untuk meningkatkan wellbeing guru-guru bruderan Purwokerto. *Jurnal Pemberdayaan Masyarakat*, 3(1), 25–38. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/327211880_Aplikasi_Psikologi_Positif_Untuk_Meningkatkan_Wellbeing_Guru-guru_Brunderan_Purwokerto
- Kurniadewi, E. (2016). Psychological capital dan workplace well-being sebagai prediktor bagi employee engagement. *Jurnal Psikologi Integratif*, 4(2), 95–112. <https://ejournal.uin-suka.ac.id/isoshum/PI/article/view/1253>
- Lestari, W., & Zamralita, Z. (2018). Gambaran tuntutan pekerjaan (job demands) dan dukungan pekerjaan (job resources) pada pegawai institusi X DKI Jakarta. *Jurnal Muara Ilmu Sosial, Humaniora, Dan Seni*, 1(2), 134. <https://doi.org/10.24912/jmishumsen.v1i2.983>

- Love, P. E. D., Irani, Z., Standing, C., & Themistocleous, M. (2007). Influence of job demands, job control and social support on information systems professionals' psychological well-being. *International Journal of Manpower*, 28(6), 513-528. <https://doi.org/10.1108/01437720710820026>
- Maulana, F. (2018). *Pengaruh workplace well-being terhadap intensi turnover pada karyawan. Skripsi*. Malang: Universitas Muhammadiyah Malang. <http://eprints.umm.ac.id/39591/1/Skripsi.pdf>
- Page, K. (2005). *Subjective wellbeing in the workplac*. Deakin University.
- Peoni, H. (2014). Pengaruh karakteristik individu dan lingkungan kerja terhadap kinerja karyawan. *Jurnal Administrasi Bisnis (JAB)*, 3(1), 1-15. <https://doi.org/doi:https://doi.org/10.35797/jab.3.001.2014.5715.%25p>
- Pristiyono, P., Ikhlah, M., Rafika, M., & Hasibuan, D. K. (2020). Implementasi work from home terhadap motivasi dan kinerja dosen di Indonesia. *Jurnal Akuntansi, Ekonomi, dan Manajemen Bisnis*, 8(2), 263-269. <https://doi.org/10.30871/jaemb.v8i2.2692>
- Robbins, S. P., Triyana, I., & Hadyana, P. (1996). *Perilaku organisasi: Konsep, kontroversi, aplikasi*. Prenhallindo.
- Salsabila, C. A. (2019). *Peran job demands terhadap workplace well-being pada karyawan di minimarket X Palembang. Skripsi*. Palembang: Universitas Sriwijaya. https://repository.unsri.ac.id/2035/25/RAMA_73201_04041381520051_0028109005_01_front_ref.pdf
- Sari, D. W. (2015). *Hubungan antara workplace well-being dengan employee engagement pada staff tata usaha Universitas Kristen Satya Wacana Salatiga. Skripsi*. Salatiga: Universitas Kristen Satya Wacana. https://repository.uksw.edu/bitstream/123456789/9129/2/T1_802010039_Full text.pdf
- Schaufeli, W. B., & Bakker, A. B. (2004). Job demands, job resources, and their relationship with burnout and engagement: A multi-sample study. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 25(3), 293-315. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.248>
- Shih, E.-C., Hou, W.-L., Lin, P.-L., Hsiao, S.-M., Sun, C.-A., Chou, Y.-C., & Yang, T. (2016). Personal characteristics, workplace stressors, and occupational burnout among psychiatric nurses in Southern Taiwan: A cross-sectional study. *Nursing and Health*, 4(2), 15-23. <https://doi.org/10.13189/nh.2016.040201>
- Simarmata, R. M. (2020). Pengaruh work from home terhadap produktivitas dosen Politeknik Negeri Ambon. *Jurnal Ekonomi, Sosial & Humaniora*, 2(1), 73-82.
- Slemp, G. R., Kern, M. L., & Vella-Brodrick, D. A. (2015). Workplace well-being: The role of job crafting and autonomy support. *Psychology of Well-Being*, 5(1), 7. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13612-015-0034-y>
- Subyantoro, A. (2009). Karakteristik individu, karakteristik pekerjaan, karakteristik organisasi dan kepuasan yang dimediasi oleh motivasi kerja. *Jurnal Aplikasi Manajemen*, 11(1), 11-19.
- Totoh, A. (2020). *Kualitas dan kesejahteraan dosen*. Kumparan.Com. <https://kumparan.com/asep-totoh/kualitas-dan-kesejahteraan-dosen-1toKGNhcyL7>

- Heuvel, V. D. M., Demerouti, E., & Peeters, M. C. W. (2015). The job crafting intervention: Effects on job resources, self-efficacy, and affective well-being. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 88(3), 511–532. <https://doi.org/10.1111/joop.12128>
- Wulan, D. K., & Apriliani, A. C. (2017). Job demands dan burnout pada guru sekolah luar biasa (SLB) Negeri. *Jurnal Penelitian Dan Pengukuran Psikologi*, 6(1), 17–25. <https://doi.org/doihttp://doi.org/10.21009/JPPP>.
- Wulan, D. K., & Putri, M. (2016). Job demands dan workplace well-being pada guru sekolah luar biasa negeri. *JPPP - Jurnal Penelitian Dan Pengukuran Psikologi*, 5(1), 28–38. <https://doi.org/10.21009/JPPP.051.05>
- Yuniarti, A., & Muchtar, D. Y. (2014). Pengaruh modal psikologis dan persepsi gaya kepemimpinan transformasional terhadap workplace well-being. *TAZKIYA Journal of Psychology*, 2(2), 283–299. <https://doi.org/doi: 10.15408/tazkiya.v2i2.10776>
- Zahro, S. F. (2018). *Hubungan antara work value dan workplace well-being pada karyawan PT Gressboard Mojokerto. Skripsi*. Surabaya: Universitas Islam Negeri Sunan Ampel Surabaya. http://digilib.uinsby.ac.id/22170/1/Siti Fatimatuz Zahro_ B97213112.pdf %0A%0A