

The Effect of Workload, Career Development, and Job Satisfaction on Employee Performance at Ajibarang Regional General Hospital, Banyumas Regency

Jessica Santoso^{1*}, Kosasih¹, Ayu Laili Rahmiyati¹

¹ Universitas Sangga Buana YPKP Bandung, Indonesia

 santosojessica2@gmail.com*

Abstract

This study analyses the effect of workload, career development, and job satisfaction on employee performance at Ajibarang Regional General Hospital, Banyumas Regency. It employs a quantitative, descriptive-verified approach with a cross-sectional design. The sample comprises 92 employees selected through proportionate stratified random sampling from a population of 717. Data were collected using a 46-item Likert questionnaire tested for validity and reliability, transformed with the Method of Successive Interval, and analysed through multiple linear regression. Descriptively, workload is perceived as light, career development and job satisfaction are good, and employee performance is high. Hypothesis testing shows that workload has a negative but insignificant effect, career development has a positive but insignificant effect, whereas job satisfaction has a positive and significant effect and is the largest contributor to employee performance. Simultaneously, the three variables exert a significant effect and explain a substantial portion of the variance in employee performance. Promotion is the weakest dimension within the most influential variable. Hospital management is advised to prioritise restructuring promotion mechanisms, particularly for non-civil-servant BLUD employees, and to reorganise working-time arrangements in units with frequent overtime.

Keywords: Workload, Career Development, Job Satisfaction, Employee Performance, Hospital

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received

May 15, 2026

Revised

July 19, 2026

Accepted

August 30, 2026

Published by

ISSN

Website

This is an open access article under the CC BY SA license

CV. Creative Tugu Pena

2774-4299

<https://attractivejournal.com/index.php/bse/>

<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/>



INTRODUCTION

Hospitals are health service organisations whose performance centres on the quality and safety of care received by patients. Health services are produced and consumed simultaneously, so service failures cannot simply be corrected before they reach users. Sophisticated equipment and complete procedures therefore remain dependent on the employees who implement them. Employee performance consequently becomes a central determinant of hospital effectiveness and public trust (Harter et al., 2002; Katebi et al., 2022).

Employee performance refers to the quantity and quality of results achieved when employees carry out assigned duties. In a hospital, performance is visible in accuracy,

timeliness, teamwork, initiative, efficient resource use, and compliance with standard operating procedures. These dimensions influence both clinical and administrative continuity. High performance also allows the hospital to respond consistently to changing patient needs and accreditation requirements (Judge et al., 2001; Wright & Cropanzano, 2000). Workload is one condition that may shape employee performance. It comprises task volume, task complexity, time pressure, work targets, and the responsibility borne during service delivery. The Job Demands-Resources model explains that excessive demands deplete physical and psychological energy. Nevertheless, demands that remain within employee capacity may function as challenges and need not reduce performance (Bakker & Demerouti, 2017; Bakker et al., 2023; Ji et al., 2024).

The effect of workload is especially relevant in hospitals because service demand changes across units, shifts, and patient conditions. Employees may perceive the general volume of work as manageable while still experiencing pressure from overtime or limited recovery periods. This distinction explains why workload should be analysed through job conditions, use of working time, and work targets. It also supports the possibility of a non-linear relationship between workload and performance (Gilboa et al., 2008; LePine et al., 2005).

Career development is another organisational resource that can strengthen employee capability and confidence. Education, training, work experience, career planning, constructive feedback, and organisational support provide direction for professional growth. Employees tend to interpret these opportunities as evidence that the organisation values their contribution and future. Social exchange theory predicts that such support will be reciprocated through stronger commitment and work effort (Eisenberger et al., 1986; Kurtessis et al., 2017). Job satisfaction reflects employees' positive evaluation of the work itself, pay, promotion opportunities, supervision, and relationships with coworkers. Satisfied employees are more likely to maintain effort, cooperate with colleagues, and complete work according to organisational standards. Meta-analytic evidence consistently demonstrates a positive association between job satisfaction and job performance. In the hospital context, this attitude is important because emotional and relational conditions directly accompany service delivery (Judge et al., 2001; Katebi et al., 2022).

Previous studies have not produced entirely consistent conclusions regarding the three determinants. Some studies identify significant direct effects of workload and career development, whereas others show that these effects weaken when job satisfaction is included in the same model. The inconsistency indicates that objective work conditions and organisational programmes may influence performance through employee attitudes. Testing the variables simultaneously is therefore necessary to identify the most influential factor in a specific organisational context.

RSUD Ajibarang is owned by the Banyumas Regency Government and serves communities in western Banyumas. The hospital developed from an inpatient unit of Puskesmas I Ajibarang into a class D hospital in 2005, began operating on 27 January 2007, and was upgraded to class C in 2013. Since 2013, it has implemented the Regional Public Service Agency Financial Management Pattern. This status requires professional, accountable, and sustainable human resource management. RSUD Ajibarang employs civil servants, government employees with work agreements, and non-ASN BLUD employees. Each group has different career ladders, competency-development arrangements, and remuneration mechanisms. These differences may shape perceptions of fairness, promotion opportunity, organisational support, and job satisfaction. The heterogeneous employment structure therefore provides an important setting for examining how workload, career development, and satisfaction jointly influence performance.

An initial survey of 30 employees identified a gap between expected and perceived conditions. Average employee performance reached 3.38 or 67.5% of the ideal, while

determinant factors averaged 3.25 or 65.0%. Timely task completion, proportionality of task volume, and clarity of career paths were the weakest indicators. Based on these conditions, the study analyses the partial and simultaneous effects of workload, career development, and job satisfaction on employee performance at RSUD Ajibarang.

Table 1. Initial Survey of Employee Performance and Determinant Factors (n = 30)

No	Aspect and Statement	Mean	Achievement	Gap
1	Performance: work results meet hospital quality standards	3.50	70.0%	30.0%
2	Performance: tasks are completed by the deadline	3.00	60.0%	40.0%
3	Performance: discipline in fulfilling duty hours is good	3.50	70.0%	30.0%
4	Performance: standard operating procedures are followed	3.50	70.0%	30.0%
	Average employee performance	3.38	67.5%	32.5%
5	Determinant: task volume is proportional to capacity and time	3.00	60.0%	40.0%
6	Determinant: the hospital career path is clear	3.00	60.0%	40.0%
7	Determinant: employee feels comfortable in the current job	3.50	70.0%	30.0%
8	Determinant: competency-development opportunities are available	3.50	70.0%	30.0%
	Average determinant factors	3.25	65.0%	35.0%

Source: Research data (2026)

Table 1 shows that the largest performance gap concerns timely task completion, while the weakest determinant indicators concern proportional task volume and career-path clarity. The combined evidence indicates that working-time arrangements and career certainty require managerial attention. The table also confirms that the problem is not limited to one isolated indicator but appears across performance and its possible determinants.

This study aims to describe workload, career development, job satisfaction, and employee performance; analyse the partial effect of each independent variable on performance; and analyse their simultaneous effect on employee performance at RSUD Ajibarang. The conceptual framework places workload as a job demand, career development as a job resource, and job satisfaction as the employee attitude arising from the evaluation of work conditions. Accordingly, the study tests whether workload has a negative effect, career development and job satisfaction have positive effects, and the three variables simultaneously influence employee performance (Bakker & Demerouti, 2017; Kurtessis et al., 2017; Katebi et al., 2022).

METHOD

This study employed a quantitative approach with descriptive and verificative methods. The descriptive method was used to portray workload, career development, job satisfaction, and employee performance. The verificative method tested the partial and simultaneous effects formulated in the hypotheses. A cross-sectional design was used because all variables were measured during one data-collection period without experimental manipulation.

The research was conducted at RSUD Ajibarang, Banyumas Regency. The population consisted of 717 employees who had worked for at least one year. It included medical personnel, nursing and midwifery personnel, other health personnel, and non-health personnel. Respondents represented PNS, PPPK, and non-ASN BLUD employment categories.

Probability sampling was implemented through proportionate stratified random sampling. Employees were first grouped according to employment type, after which the sample was allocated proportionally using $n_i = (N_i/N) \times n$. Slovin's formula with a 10% error tolerance produced a minimum of approximately 88 respondents. After considering Green's regression rule and possible incomplete responses, the final sample was set at 92 employees.

Primary data were collected using a closed electronic questionnaire with a five-point Likert scale. The instrument contained 46 statements: 12 workload items, 10 career-development items, 10 job-satisfaction items, and 14 employee-performance items. Favourable statements were scored from 5 to 1, while unfavourable statements were reverse-scored. Workload scores were oriented so that a higher composite value represented a heavier perceived workload.

Instrument quality was evaluated before hypothesis testing. Item validity was assessed using Pearson product-moment correlations with an r -table threshold of 0.205 for 92 respondents. Internal consistency was evaluated using Cronbach's alpha, with values above 0.70 regarded as reliable. Because the questionnaire generated ordinal data, scores were transformed to an interval scale through the Method of Successive Interval.

Data analysis consisted of descriptive statistics, classical-assumption testing, and inferential analysis using IBM SPSS Statistics. Descriptive means were interpreted on a five-category continuum, while normality, multicollinearity, heteroscedasticity, and linearity tests assessed regression suitability. Multiple linear regression followed the equation $Y = \alpha + \beta_1 X_1 + \beta_2 X_2 + \beta_3 X_3 + \varepsilon$. Partial effects were evaluated with t -tests, the simultaneous effect with an F -test, and explanatory power with R^2 and partial coefficients of determination.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Respondent Characteristics

Table 2. Respondent Characteristics (n = 92)

Characteristic	Category	Frequency	Percentage
Gender	Male	30	32.6%
Gender	Female	62	67.4%
Age	<30 years	23	25.0%
Age	30-39 years	37	40.2%
Age	40-49 years	24	26.1%
Age	≥50 years	8	8.7%
Education	SMA/equivalent	18	19.6%
Education	D3	33	35.9%
Education	D4/S1	25	27.2%
Education	Profession	12	13.0%
Education	S2/Specialist	4	4.3%
Service	1-5 years	38	41.3%
Service	6-10 years	18	19.6%
Service	11-15 years	9	9.8%
Service	>15 years	27	29.3%
Staff type	Medical	11	12.0%
Staff type	Nursing/midwifery	12	13.0%
Staff type	Other health	32	34.8%
Staff type	Non-health	37	40.2%
Status	PNS	37	40.2%
Status	PPPK	25	27.2%
Status	BLUD non-ASN	30	32.6%

Respondents were predominantly women (67.4%) and aged 30-39 years (40.2%). Employment-status representation was sufficiently distributed across PNS, PPPK, and BLUD non-ASN employees.

Validity and Reliability

Table 3. Instrument Validity

Variable	Items	Lowest r	Highest r	Decision
Workload	12	0.433	0.675	All valid
Career development	10	0.654	0.822	All valid
Job satisfaction	10	0.592	0.799	All valid
Employee performance	14	0.528	0.852	All valid

Source: Research data (2026)

Table 3 indicates that the lowest item-total correlation was 0.433, which remained above the r-table value of 0.205. Career development, job satisfaction, and performance also produced strong correlation ranges. Consequently, all 46 items were retained and every planned dimension remained represented in the analysis.

Table 4. Instrument Reliability

Variable	Items	Cronbach alpha	Interpretation
Workload	12	0.808	High
Career development	10	0.916	Very high
Job satisfaction	10	0.886	Very high
Employee performance	14	0.938	Very high

Table 4 shows that all Cronbach's alpha values exceeded 0.70. Employee performance obtained the highest reliability coefficient (0.938), whereas workload obtained the lowest but still strong coefficient (0.808). The instrument therefore demonstrated adequate internal consistency for further analysis.

Classical Assumption Tests

The Kolmogorov-Smirnov residual test produced a statistic of 0.067 and significance of 0.777, indicating normal residuals.

Table 5. Multicollinearity Test

Variable	Tolerance	VIF	Decision
Workload	0.637	1.569	No multicollinearity
Career development	0.406	2.465	No multicollinearity
Job satisfaction	0.308	3.251	No multicollinearity

Table 6 demonstrates that all tolerance values were above 0.10 and all VIF values were below 10. Job satisfaction produced the highest VIF of 3.251, but this value remained within the accepted limit. The regression estimates were therefore not distorted by problematic multicollinearity.

Table 6. Glejser Heteroscedasticity Test

Variable	Significance	Decision
Workload	0.092	Homoscedastic
Career development	0.276	Homoscedastic
Job satisfaction	0.201	Homoscedastic

Table 6 presents significance values of 0.092, 0.276, and 0.201 for the three predictors. Each value exceeded 0.05, indicating that the residual variance was stable across predictor levels. Thus, the regression model did not exhibit heteroscedasticity according to the Glejser criterion.

Table 7. Linearity Test

Relationship	Deviation F	Significance	Decision
--------------	-------------	--------------	----------

Workload → Performance	0.163	0.986	Linear
Career development → Performance	1.001	0.430	Linear
Job satisfaction → Performance	0.634	0.703	Linear

Table 7 shows that every deviation-from-linearity significance value exceeded 0.05. The relationships of workload, career development, and job satisfaction with performance can therefore be represented using linear functions. Together with the other assumption tests, this result supports the use of multiple linear regression.

Regression and Hypothesis Testing

Table 8. Multiple Linear Regression

Variable	B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig. (1-tailed)
Constant	1.675	0.642	-	2.609	0.011
Workload	-0.134	0.125	-0.110	-1.074	0.143
Career development	0.021	0.119	0.023	0.180	0.429
Job satisfaction	0.556	0.147	0.555	3.770	0.000

The estimated equation was $Y = 1.675 - 0.134X_1 + 0.021X_2 + 0.556X_3$. Workload had a negative coefficient, career development a small positive coefficient, and job satisfaction the largest positive coefficient.

Table 9. Model Summary

R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error
0.643	0.414	0.394	0.500

Source: Research data (2026)

Table 9 reports an R value of 0.643, showing a moderately strong collective relationship between the predictors and performance. The R^2 value of 0.414 means that workload, career development, and job satisfaction explained 41.4% of performance variance. The remaining 58.6% was associated with factors outside the model.

Table 10. Partial Coefficients of Determination

Variable	Beta	Zero-order	Contribution
Workload	-0.110	-0.446	4.90%
Career development	0.023	0.489	1.13%
Job satisfaction	0.555	0.637	35.36%
Total			41.39%

Table 10 identifies job satisfaction as the dominant contributor, accounting for 35.36% of performance variance. Workload contributed 4.90%, while career development contributed only 1.13% after the other predictors were controlled. The total partial contribution of 41.39% is consistent with the rounded R^2 value.

Table 11. Partial Hypothesis Tests

Hypothesis	Effect	t	t-table	Sig.	Decision
H1	Workload → Performance	-1.074	1.662	0.143	Rejected
H2	Career Development → Performance	0.180	1.662	0.429	Rejected
H3	Job	3.770	1.662	0.000	Accepted

Satisfaction → Performance

Table 11 shows that the absolute t-value for workload and the t-value for career development were below 1.662, with significance values above 0.05. Their proposed significant effects were therefore rejected. Job satisfaction produced $t = 3.770$ and $p < 0.001$, supporting a positive and significant partial effect.

Table 12. Simultaneous F Test

Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Regression	15.508	3	5.169	20.711	0.000
Residual	21.965	88	0.250		
Total	37.473	91			

Table 12 presents $F = 20.711$ with $p < 0.001$. This value exceeded the critical F value and demonstrates that the three predictors jointly improved the prediction of employee performance. The simultaneous hypothesis was therefore accepted even though two partial effects were not significant.

DISCUSSION

The descriptive findings present a generally favourable condition at RSUD Ajibarang. Workload was categorised as light, career development and job satisfaction were good, and employee performance was high. This pattern indicates that the hospital has established a work system that supports employees in completing their main responsibilities. However, favourable aggregate scores should not obscure weak dimensions that may become future performance constraints. The main workload concern was not the overall quantity or complexity of duties but the use of working time. Employees reported a moderately heavy score for this dimension, and overtime was the highest workload item. This finding indicates that particular units or periods may experience an imbalance between available time and service demand. Management should therefore map overtime by unit rather than treating workload as a uniform hospital-wide condition.

Workload had a negative but statistically insignificant partial effect on performance. The negative coefficient is consistent with the health-impairment process in the JD-R model, in which excessive demands consume energy and concentration (Bakker & Demerouti, 2017). Its insignificance is understandable because the average workload had not reached a heavy category. Job demands may only reduce performance after intensity, duration, or insufficient recovery passes a particular threshold (Bakker et al., 2023; Ji et al., 2024).

The zero-order relationship between workload and performance was stronger than its regression coefficient in the full model. This reduction suggests that part of the workload relationship overlaps with job satisfaction and career-related perceptions. Employees can tolerate demanding tasks when they consider the environment fair, supportive, and professionally meaningful. Thus, workload management should be accompanied by improvements in work attitudes and organisational resources rather than focusing only on reducing the number of tasks.

Career development was perceived as good, particularly in education and training. This result shows that the hospital has provided opportunities for employees to strengthen the competencies required for their daily work. Nevertheless, promotion clarity and fairness received weaker assessments than training opportunities. Employees therefore appear to distinguish between opportunities to learn and opportunities to

translate learning into career advancement. Career development had a positive but insignificant direct effect on performance. Its separate correlation with performance was moderate, but the coefficient became very small when job satisfaction entered the model. The pattern is consistent with social exchange theory because career opportunities may initially strengthen perceived organisational support and satisfaction before being expressed as improved performance (Kurtessis et al., 2017; Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002). Future analysis should explicitly test job satisfaction as a mediator of this relationship.

Job satisfaction was the only predictor with a positive and significant partial effect. It also contributed 35.36%, far exceeding the contributions of workload and career development. This result agrees with meta-analytic evidence showing that satisfied employees tend to produce better task and contextual performance (Judge et al., 2001; Katebi et al., 2022). In the RSUD Ajibarang context, employees' evaluations of their work experience therefore appear more influential than workload alone.

Promotion was the weakest dimension within job satisfaction, while coworkers constituted the strongest dimension. The hospital consequently possesses valuable social capital in the form of supportive relationships and strong cooperation. At the same time, unclear promotion opportunities may reduce employees' sense of future progress, particularly among non-ASN BLUD personnel. A transparent promotion system would allow the hospital to address the weakest satisfaction dimension without losing the collaborative climate that already supports performance.

Workload, career development, and job satisfaction simultaneously had a significant effect and explained 41.4% of performance variance. This finding confirms that employee performance results from the interaction of demands, resources, and attitudes rather than a single isolated factor. The simultaneous significance alongside two insignificant partial effects also indicates shared explanatory variance among the predictors. The model is therefore more useful for integrated human-resource policy than for separate interventions implemented without coordination.

The unexplained variance of 58.6% indicates that leadership, compensation, organisational culture, motivation, staffing adequacy, and other factors remain important. Practical improvement should prioritise promotion transparency, structured performance feedback, overtime mapping, and forums that encourage employee initiative. These actions target the weakest dimensions while preserving high cooperation and coworker support. Further research should use longitudinal or structural-equation models and compare results across employment-status groups.

CONCLUSION

Workload was light (2.441), career development was good (3.734), job satisfaction was good (3.673), and employee performance was high (4.039). Workload had a negative but insignificant effect and contributed 4.90%; career development had a positive but insignificant effect and contributed 1.13%; and job satisfaction had a positive significant effect and contributed 35.36%. Together, the three variables significantly explained 41.4% of performance variance.

Theoretically, the results support a threshold-sensitive interpretation of job demands and suggest that career development may work through job satisfaction. Practically, RSUD Ajibarang should: (1) develop and communicate transparent promotion requirements, assessment procedures, schedules, and appeal channels, particularly for non-ASN BLUD employees; (2) map overtime and review shift schedules; (3) hold at least two structured supervisor-subordinate feedback meetings annually; (4) create unit-level quality-improvement forums to strengthen initiative; and (5) preserve the strong coworker and cooperation climate. Future studies should test mediation using path

analysis or SEM, incorporate supervisor-rated performance, add predictors outside the model, use longitudinal designs, and compare employment-status groups.

REFERENCES

- Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2017). Job demands-resources theory: Taking stock and looking forward. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 22(3), 273-285. <https://doi.org/10.1037/ocp0000056>
- Bakker, A. B., Demerouti, E., & Sanz-Vergel, A. (2023). Job demands-resources theory: Ten years later. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 10, 25-53. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-120920-053933>
- Ji, T., de Jonge, J., Peeters, M. C. W., & Taris, T. W. (2024). Matching job demands and job resources as linear and non-linear predictors of employee vigor and sustainable performance. *Human Performance*, 37(3), 81-99. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08959285.2024.2329298>
- Judge, T. A., Thoresen, C. J., Bono, J. E., & Patton, G. K. (2001). The job satisfaction-job performance relationship: A qualitative and quantitative review. *Psychological Bulletin*, 127(3), 376-407. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.127.3.376>
- Katebi, A., HajiZadeh, M. H., Bordbar, A., & Salehi, A. M. (2022). The relationship between job satisfaction and job performance: A meta-analysis. *Global Journal of Flexible Systems Management*, 23(1), 21-42. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40171-021-00280-y>
- Kurtessis, J. N., Eisenberger, R., Ford, M. T., Buffardi, L. C., Stewart, K. A., & Adis, C. S. (2017). Perceived organizational support: A meta-analytic evaluation of organizational support theory. *Journal of Management*, 43(6), 1854-1884. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206315575554>
- Mazzetti, G., Robledo, E., Vignoli, M., Topa, G., Guglielmi, D., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2023). Work engagement: A meta-analysis using the job demands-resources model. *Psychological Reports*, 126(3), 1069-1107. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00332941211051988>
- Muhaimin, A., Nazaruddin, B., Indar, I., Palutturi, S., Palopadang, V., Masni, M., & Mumang, A. A. (2024). Determinants of nursing performance in Sandi Karsa Hospital, Makassar City, Indonesia. *Asia Pacific Journal of Health Management*, 19(3). <https://doi.org/10.24083/apjhm.v19i3.3579>
- Al-Hanawi, M. K., et al. (2025). The relationship between professional autonomy and job performance among Iranian ICU nurses: The mediating effect of job satisfaction and organizational commitment. *BMC Nursing*, 24, 20. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12912-024-02551-2>
- Otsen, B., et al. (2025). Moderating role of shared vision on employee job satisfaction, perceived stress and job performance relationship among healthcare professionals in Ghana. *Journal of Health Organization and Management*. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JHOM-12-2024-0506>
- Ripiani, L., Nurwulandari, A., Hasanudin, H., & Sugiono, E. (2025). The effect of motivation and career development on nurses performance through nurses job satisfaction at Pertamina Balikpapan Hospital. *International Journal of Economics, Management and Social Sciences*, 3(1). <https://doi.org/10.61132/ijems.v3i1.1144>
- Sulistyorini, K., Istiatin, I., & Sudarwati, S. (2025). Employee performance reviewed from incentive given, competence, career development and employee satisfaction. *Jurnal Ners*, 9(2), 1721-1730. <https://doi.org/10.31004/jn.v9i2.40007>
- Alarcon, G. M. (2011). A meta-analysis of burnout with job demands, resources, and attitudes. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 79(2), 549-562. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2011.03.007>

- Bakker, A. 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>
- Bakker, A. B., Demerouti, E., & Sanz-Vergel, A. I. (2014). Burnout and work engagement: The JD-R approach. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 1, 389-411. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-031413-091235>
- Breevaart, K., Bakker, A. B., Demerouti, E., & Derks, D. (2014). Who takes the lead? A multi-source diary study on leadership, work engagement, and job performance. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 37(3), 309-325. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.2041>
- Chiaburu, D. S., & Harrison, D. A. (2008). Do peers make the place? Conceptual synthesis and meta-analysis of coworker effects. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 93(5), 1082-1103. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.93.5.1082>
- Christian, M. S., Garza, A. S., & Slaughter, J. E. (2011). Work engagement: A quantitative review and test of its relations with task and contextual performance. *Personnel Psychology*, 64(1), 89-136. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.2010.01203.x>
- Colquitt, J. A. (2001). On the dimensionality of organizational justice: A construct validation of a measure. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(3), 386-400. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.86.3.386>
- Crawford, E. R., LePine, J. A., & Rich, B. L. (2010). Linking job demands and resources to employee engagement and burnout. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 95(5), 834-848. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0019364>
- De Vos, A., De Hauw, S., & Van der Heijden, B. I. J. M. (2011). Competency development and career success. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 79(2), 438-447. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2011.05.003>
- Demerouti, E., Bakker, A. B., Nachreiner, F., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2001). The job demands-resources model of burnout. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(3), 499-512. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.86.3.499>
- Eisenberger, R., Huntington, R., Hutchison, S., & Sowa, D. (1986). Perceived organizational support. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71(3), 500-507. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.71.3.500>
- Gilboa, S., Shirom, A., Fried, Y., & Cooper, C. (2008). A meta-analysis of work demand stressors and job performance. *Personnel Psychology*, 61(2), 227-271. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.2008.00113.x>
- Grant, A. M. (2008). The significance of task significance: Job performance effects, relational mechanisms, and boundary conditions. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 93(1), 108-124. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.93.1.108>
- Hackman, J. R., & Oldham, G. R. (1976). Motivation through the design of work. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 16(2), 250-279. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0030-5073\(76\)90016-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/0030-5073(76)90016-7)
- Harter, J. K., Schmidt, F. L., & Hayes, T. L. (2002). Business-unit-level relationship between employee satisfaction, engagement, and business outcomes. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(2), 268-279. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.87.2.268>
- Humphrey, S. E., Nahrgang, J. D., & Morgeson, F. P. (2007). Integrating motivational, social, and contextual work design features. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92(5), 1332-1356. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.92.5.1332>
- Iaffaldano, M. T., & Muchinsky, P. M. (1985). Job satisfaction and job performance: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 97(2), 251-273. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.97.2.251>
- Janssen, O. (2001). Fairness perceptions as a moderator in the curvilinear relationships between job demands and job performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 44(5), 1039-1050. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3069447>

- LePine, J. A., Podsakoff, N. P., & LePine, M. A. (2005). A meta-analytic test of the challenge stressor-hindrance stressor framework. *Academy of Management Journal*, 48(5), 764-775. <https://doi.org/10.5465/AMJ.2005.18803921>
- Lesener, T., Gusy, B., & Wolter, C. (2019). The job demands-resources model: A meta-analytic review of longitudinal studies. *Work & Stress*, 33(1), 76-103. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02678373.2018.1529065>
- Ng, T. W. H., Eby, L. T., Sorensen, K. L., & Feldman, D. C. (2005). Predictors of objective and subjective career success. *Personnel Psychology*, 58(2), 367-408. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.2005.00515.x>
- Organ, D. W., & Ryan, K. (1995). A meta-analytic review of attitudinal and dispositional predictors of organizational citizenship behavior. *Personnel Psychology*, 48(4), 775-802. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.1995.tb01781.x>
- Parker, S. K., Morgeson, F. P., & Johns, G. (2017). One hundred years of work design research. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 102(3), 403-420. <https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000106>
- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Lee, J. Y., & Podsakoff, N. P. (2003). Common method biases in behavioral research. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88(5), 879-903. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.88.5.879>
- Rhoades, L., & Eisenberger, R. (2002). Perceived organizational support: A review of the literature. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(4), 698-714. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.87.4.698>
- Spector, P. E. (1985). Measurement of human service staff satisfaction. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 13(6), 693-713. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00929796>
- Sturges, J., Guest, D., Conway, N., & Davey, K. M. (2002). A longitudinal study of the relationship between career management and organizational commitment. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 23(6), 731-748. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.164>
- Tims, M., Bakker, A. B., & Derks, D. (2013). The impact of job crafting on job demands, job resources, and well-being. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 18(2), 230-240. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0032141>
- Wright, T. A., & Cropanzano, R. (2000). Psychological well-being and job satisfaction as predictors of job performance. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 5(1), 84-94. <https://doi.org/10.1037/1076-8998.5.1.84>