

CHALLENGE STRESSORS AND HARDINESS MODELING TOWARD WORK ENGAGEMENT

**Sutarno, Universitas Islam Indonesia Yogyakarta, Universitas Slamet Riyadi
Surakarta**

Siswoyo Haryono, Universitas Muhammadiyah Yogyakarta

Wisnu Prajogo, Sekolah Bisnis STIE YKPN Yogyakarta

Zainal Mustafa Elqadri, Universitas Islam Indonesia Yogyakarta

ABSTRACT

This study aims to find out the influence of Challenge stressors toward work engagement and to analyze the moderation role and boosting effect of hardiness to the effect of Challenge stressors toward work engagement of newspaper journalist. The methodology used is quantitative using SEM calculation with AMOS 21.00 program. The sample of the study is consisted of 150 PWI newspaper journalist that spread in Central Java, Solo, and Daerah Istimewa Yogyakarta (DIY). The results showed that Challenge stressors had positive and significant influence toward work engagement of the newspaper journalist. The journalist became more engaged to their work because of the challenging working-atmosphere. Meanwhile, hardiness also showed positive and significant effect as moderation and boosting variable on Challenge stressors toward work engagement. Therefore, it can be concluded that the effect of Challenge stressors toward work engagement becomes stronger to journalist who has high hardiness.

Keywords: Challenge Stressors, Work Engagement, Newspaper Journalist

INTRODUCTION

Work is an important part of somebody's life that contributes to the prosperity (Albrecht, 2013). Engagement within somebody's job has become a popular concept either for the employee or the organization (Arnold B. Bakker, Schaufeli, Leiter & Taris, 2008). Engagement is a condition in which people feel interested, live, and get the sense of energy in everything they do (Arnold B. Bakker et al., 2008; Saks & Gruman, 2014). Every organization or company is trying to increase their employee engagement. Gallup (2017) in his survey, between 2014 until 2015 in 155 countries, showed that only 15% of employees who actively engaged to their job, and the rest of 67% are not engaged and 18% are actively disengaged. In Indonesia, the number of employees who engaged with their job only 15%, 76% are not engaged with the job, and the remaining 9% are actively disengaged. If it is compared to four neighborhood countries that also belongs to ASEAN organization, the number of employee engagement on Indonesia is the lowest. The low number of employees who are engaged in companies in Indonesia is a problem that needs to be solved. This condition reinforces the importance of research on predictors of work engagement in Indonesia.

A survey from Yale University showed that most of the employees with high engagement level have low burnout level. Burnout is mentioned as a rival or negative antithesis from engagement (Maslach, Schaufeli & Leiter, 2001). Engagement has characteristics such as energy, involvement, and effectiveness. While burnout, is the opposite of those three characteristics, namely fatigue, cynicism, and ineffectiveness. A study by González-Romá, Schaufeli, Bakker & Lloret (2006) has proven that the core dimensions of burnout and engagement are inversely related to each other. This

means that if the level of employee burnout is high, then their level of engagement is low. Burnout is the result of prolonged exposure to stress that goes beyond a person's ability to cope effectively (Maslach et al., 2001). One of the most stressful jobs in the world is the profession of the journalist, because this profession has high pressure in completing work or known as "deadline".

Based on the interview with one of the newspaper journalist, who worked for the print media in Surakarta, said that their work is experienced a drastic changes. This phenomenon occurs because of the emergence of online media that can present news quickly and precisely without time constraints. After an event occurs, in a minutes, online media can bring up the news and public can access it right away. Whereas, the newspaper took almost a day to deliver the news because it was waiting for the publication of the next day's edition. Therefore, newspaper journalists should make the print media stand out so that their existence is still can be accepted by the public in the midst of the unstoppable development of online media. One of the efforts made is through a more intense investigation in order to describe the facts in detail. Thus, the news is more 'live' when people read it and it can compete with the online news.

The investigation attempt that must be more intense but still limited to deadline, cause a fatigue and burnout to the employees, this will also lead to the decrease of engagement rate. The phenomenon that happens in the newspaper journalists is a fact that indicates a problem that needs to be investigated. Therefore, this study aims to examine and analyze the effect of Challenge stressorss on the work engagement of newspaper journalists. Also, to test and analyze the role of moderation and the effect of boosting hardiness on the effect of Challenge stressorss on the work engagement of newspaper journalists.

Hypothesis

The Influence of Challenge Stressors toward Work Engagement

Challenge stressors tend to be rated as having potential to promote mastery, self-growing, or profitability in the future. Employees tend to see these demands as opportunity to learn, achieve and demonstrate the variety of competencies that are likely to be rewarded (Cavanaugh, Boswell, Roehling & Boudreau, 2000). Van den Broeck, De Cuyper, De Witte & Vansteenkiste (2010) found out that job challenges (Challenge stressorss) had a significant effect and positive direction on vigor (an indication of engagement). Schmitt, Ohly & Kleespies (2015) stated that time pressure, one of the Challenge stressors indicators, had significant and positive effect toward work engagement. Study by Reis, Hoppe, Arndt & Lischetzke (2017) also showed that time pressure had significant and positive direction on vigor and absorption; both vigor and absorption are indicators of engagement. Therefore the first hypothesis can be drawn as follow:

H1: Challenge stressorss have a positive effect on the work engagement of newspaper journalists.

The Effect of Hardiness Moderation on the Influence of Challenge Stressors toward Work Engagement

Tadić, Bakker & Oerlemans (2015) examined the buffer effect of job resources on the effect of hindrance demands on work engagements which they called the buffer hypothesis. While the test of the boosting effect of job resources on the effect of Challenge stressors on work engagement is called as boosting hypothesis. Their results showed that job resources moderate the effect of hindrance demands on work engagement. Particularly, the negative effect of hindrance demands on work engagement is weaker for individuals who have high levels of job resources (buffer effect).

Job resources moderate the effect of challenge demands on work engagement, which means the positive effect of challenge demands on work engagement is stronger for individuals who have a high level of job resources (boosting effect).

Another study conducted by Rai (2018) found that job resources moderated the effect of hindrance demands on work engagement. The negative effect of hindrance demands on work engagement is weaker at high levels of job resources (buffer effect). Job resources moderate the effect of challenge demands on work engagement and the positive effect of challenge demands on work engagement is stronger at high levels of job resources (boosting effect).

In contrast to Tadić et al., (2015); Rai (2018), which use resources in the form of job resources, Searle & Lee (2015) uses personal resources in the form of proactive coping. The results showed that proactive coping did not moderate the effect of hindrance demands on engagement, so that there was no buffer effect of proactive coping on the negative influence of hindrance demands on engagement. Proactive coping moderates the effect of challenge demands on engagement, the positive effect of challenge demands on engagement is stronger at a high level of proactive coping (boosting effect). This study only uses job demands in the form of challenge demands (Challenge stressors), and uses hardiness as a personal resource. Thus, the moderating role of hardiness analyzed is only on the boosting effect. Based on some previous researches above, the second hypothesis can be drawn as follow:

H2: Hardiness moderates the effect of the Challenge stressors on the work engagement of newspaper journalists. The positive effect of Challenge stressors on work engagement is stronger at the high level of hardiness of newspaper journalists.

METHODOLOGY

Research Population and Sample

This study used quantitative approach as the research methodology. Quantitative approach is chosen because this study focuses on the understanding of work engagement and exploration of the relationship between the variables. There are three variables used in this study, including; (1) independent variable, that is, Challenge stressors (marked with X), (2) independent and moderation variable, that is hardiness (marked with Z), and (3) dependent variable, that is, work engagement (marked with Y).

Challenge stressors are a demand in working place that is able to promote the achievement of a job and development of individual. Challenge stressors is measured based on some indicators, such as workload, time pressure, job complexity, and job responsibility (Podsakoff, 2007). Hardiness is an individual structure that consists of three characteristics related to commitment, control, and challenge which functioned as resistance resources in facing stress condition (Moreno-Jiménez, Rodríguez-Muñoz, Hernández & Blanco, 2014). While, work engagement is a condition in doing a job relates to the condition of mind that marked with vigor, dedication, and absorption (Schaufeli, Bakker & Salanova, 2006). The population of this study is including the newspaper journalist of PWI Central Java 259 people, PWI Solo 115 people, and PWI DIY 179 people. Newspaper journalists who become the research population is a journalist that become a settle employee (not freelance) with working period above one year. The research sample is defined using purposive sampling technique. Research sample also defined based on the easiness, the availability to fill in and to resubmit the questionnaire. The number of sample is taken from 27% of the

population of each represented area, including 71 people from PWI Central Java, 31 people from PWI Solo, and 48 people from PWI DIY.

Data Collection

This study used primary data or data that obtained directly from the sources, such as survey or questionnaire. The questionnaire is spread and collected for two months, start from the beginning of June until the end of July, 2020. For about 150 questionnaire is distributed to the participants. However, during the submission, there are only 145 questionnaire that returned back. Therefore the total of the respondent that used in this study is 145 people. The number of respondents is considered feasible since it meets the requirements of research samples.

This study used Likert scale to measurement the question/statement within the questionnaire. The use of Likert scale is based on Sekaran & Bougie (2010) opinion, who said that Likert scale is mostly used to measure attitude and behavior in business research. Referring to various examples that have been written by Sekaran & Bougie (2010), Likert scale has interval scale started from 5 (five) to 8 (eight) scale. In order to avoid central tendency bias, then 6 (six) scale option is used for each question/statement. All questions/statements is designed with positive sentence to give consistency in scoring, therefore 1 (one) score for the lowest assessment and 6 (six) score for the highest assessment. The categorization of each score can be seen below:

Score 1: very low/ very bad/ very disagree

Score 2: low/ bad/ disagree

Score 3: quiet low/ quiet bad/ quite disagree

Score 4: quite high/ quite good/ quite agree

Score 5: high/ good/ agree

Score 6: very high/ very good/ very agree

The instrument can be said to be good or reliable if it meets two criteria, that is, valid and reliable. In this study, the measurement of construct validity and reliability is used. Meanwhile, the processing data that declared to meet the requirements will be carried out using SEM method with AMOS 21.00 software. As a multivariate analysis method, SEM is needed because it is able to accommodate the connection between latent variables. SEM is also used to test the hypotheses of this study. SEM assumptions can be evaluated using normality test, outline test, fit test, modification, hypothesis test and visualization of the boosting effect.

RESULTS

Based on the data obtained from questionnaire, the result of each variable – Challenge stressors, hardiness, and work engagement, can be seen as below;

No	Questions/Statement	Average	Criteria
1	Have to finish a lot of work	4,08	Quite high
2	The workload is too heavy	3,99	Quite high
3	Have many works to be done	3,92	Quite high
4	Must work quickly to finish the work on time.	4,05	Quite high

5	Must work with quick and fast step to finish the work.	4,01	Quite high
6	The work requires a quick and fast pace.	4,12	Quite high
7	The work tasks use a variety of different skills and abilities	4,21	Quite high
8	The work requires using a broad set of skills and abilities.	4,14	Quite high
9	Use a variety of different skills on the job.	3,37	Quite low
10	The work requires taking responsibility for the productivity of own self and others.	4,05	Quite high
11	Responsible on personal/own work and somebody else's work	4,22	Quite high
12	Responsible on somebody else's work	4,02	Quite high
	TOTAL AVERAGE	4,01	Quite high

Source: Processed primary data, 2021

Based on Table 1, it can be seen that the Challenge stressors variable has an average value of 4.01 or is in the quite high category. The statement item that has the highest average value is number 11 (responsible on personal/own work and somebody else's work) that is reaching 4.22 or in the rather high category. This shows that newspaper journalist feel that in addition to being responsible for their personal performance, they are also responsible for the performance of their colleagues. The statement item that has the lowest average value is number 9 (use a variety of different skills on the job) which is 3.37. Although it is the lowest, it is still included in the quite low category. This suggests that newspaper journalist feel compelled to use a variety of different skills on their job.

No	Questions/Statement	Average	Criteria
1	Getting seriously involved is the best way to achieve your goals.	4,19	Quite high
2	Works as a journalist is valuable to society.	4,14	Quite high
3	Daily work is satisfying.	4,18	Quite high
4	Excitement over progress and completion of activities.	4,12	Quite high
5	Undertake all efforts in order to be able to control the work.	4,09	Quite high
6	Situation control is the only thing that ensures success.	3,90	Quite high
7	Things go well if it is completely prepared.	4,15	Quite high
8	Work seriously and thoroughly will be able to control the results	4,03	Quite high
9	Choose a work that requires new experience, although it must be	4,14	Quite high

	accompanied by greater effort.		
10	Interested to innovation and development process.	4,14	Quite high
11	Interested to task and situation that involved personal challenges.	4,14	Quite high
12	Allows to explore new situations and different work environments.	4,03	Quite high
	TOTAL AVERAGE	4,10	Quite high

Source: Processed primary data, 2021

Based on Table 2, it can be seen that the hardiness variable has an average value of 4.10 or is in the quite high category. The statement item that has the highest average value is statement number 1 (getting seriously involved is the best way to achieve your goals) with average score for 4.19. This shows that newspaper journalist should take their work seriously due to achieve their goals. The statement item that has the lowest average value is number 6 (situation control is the only thing that ensures success) which is 3.90. Although it is the lowest score, it is still included in the quite high category. This shows that newspaper journalist feel the importance of being able to control the situation in achieving success.

No	Questions/Statement	Average	Criteria
1	Feel full of energy at work.	4,46	Quite high
2	Work makes you feel strong and energized.	4,10	Quite high
3	When you wake up in the morning, you immediately feel like going to work.	3,75	Quite high
4	Enthusiastic about work.	4,12	Quite high
5	The work is inspiring.	3,76	Quite high
6	Proud with the work.	4,03	Quite high
7	Feel happy when working intensely.	4,15	Quite high
8	Feel the work.	3,98	Quite high
9	Feel carried away when working.	3,97	Quite high
	TOTAL AVERAGE	4,03	Quite high

Source: Processed primary data, 2021

Based on Table 3, it can be seen that the work engagement variable has an average value of 4.03 or in the quite high category. The statement item that has the highest average value is number 1 (feel full of energy at work) with value of 4.46. This indicates that newspaper journalist feel full of energy at work. The statement item that has the lowest average value is number 3 (when you wake up in the morning, you immediately feel like going to work) which is 3.75. Although it is the lowest, it is still included in the quite high category.

Normality Test

The univariate normality test can be seen from the critical value (c.r) skewness, while the multivariate normality test can be seen from the critical value (c.r) kurtosis. The normal distribution is met if the value of c.r. is in the range of ± 2.58 at a significance level of 0.01 both univariate and multivariate. The calculation results show that the lowest critical (c.r) skewness value is -1.717, while the highest critical (c.r) skewness value is 2.026. The lowest critical (c.r) kurtosis value is -2.140, while the highest critical (c.r) kurtosis value is 0.642. Based on this, there is no c.r value, which is outside the range of ± 2.58 . It can be concluded that the univariate and multivariate data normality is good. Thus the data meets the requirements of normality.

Outliner Test

After deleting some data that are considered outliers, the remaining research data is 140 data. The amount of data is still in the range of data needed in the use of SEM analysis, which is between 100 and 200 (Ferdinand, 2014). Therefore, the next analysis stage can be carried out.

Model Fit Test

Variable	Indicator	P	\square	AVE	Description	Construct Reliability	Description
Challenge stressors	x1	***	0,833	0,66	Valid	0,891	Reliable
	x2	***	0,909		Valid		
	x3	***	0,557		Valid		
	x4		0,943		Valid		
Hardiness	z1	***	0,925	0,82	Valid	0,954	Reliable
	z2	***	0,960		Valid		
	z3		0,919		Valid		
Work engagement	y1		0,873	0,67	Valid	0,863	Reliable
	y2	***	0,795		Valid		
	y3	***	0,800		Valid		

Source: Processed primary data, 2021

The calculation results in Table 4 show that the loading factor value of all indicators is significant and greater than 0.50, so it is declared valid. The AVE value of all variables is greater than 0.5, so the indicators in the developed model are proven to actually measure the targeted latent construct and do not measure the other latent constructs. Based on that, the statement items in the research variables can be used for analysis. While the measure of reliability and internal consistency of the variables that describe a latent construct used in this study is construct reliability.

Overall Model Fit Test

The overall model fit test was carried out on models without interaction variables and models with interaction variables. Goodness of fit results can be accepted if they meet the 4-5 required goodness of fit criteria, with one of the criteria being chi square probability (Hair, Black, Babin & Anderson, 2019). The result of Goodness of fit index can be seen in table 5 below;

No	GOF Index	Cut off Value	Without interaction variable	Criteria	With interaction variable	Criteria
1.	Chi Square Statistic	$\leq 41,34$	37,179	Fit		
		$\leq 47,40$			46,306	Fit
2.	Probability	$\geq 0,05$	0,115	Fit	0,062	Fit
3.	GFI	$\geq 0,90$	0,952	Fit	0,945	Fit
4.	TLI	$\geq 0,90$	0,986	Fit	0,988	Fit
5.	CFI	$\geq 0,95$	0,992	Fit	0,993	Fit
6.	RMSEA	$\leq 0,08$	0.049	Fit	0,054	Fit

Source: Processed primary data, 2021

The calculation of Amos 21.00, resulted in the value of Chi Square Statistical model with interaction variable of 46.306 < 47.40. This value means that the model with interaction variables is a fit model. The calculation of Amos 21.00, resulted in the probability value of the model without interaction variables of 0.115 > 0.05. While the probability value of the model with the interaction variable is 0.062 > 0.05. Therefore, based on the probability index, the model without and with interaction variables is a fit model.

Hypothesis Test

Hypothesis test is done using the probability value with significance level 0.05. If the probability value (P) ≤ 0.05 then H_0 is rejected (hypothesis is accepted). The result can be seen in table 6 below:

Variable effect			With interaction			Without interaction		
			Coef. Std. Regression	C.R.	P	Coef. Std. Regression	C.R.	P
Challenge Stressor	→	Work Engagement	0,634	7,329	***	0,733	5,883	***
Interaction	→	Work Engagement				0,029	3,654	***
Squared Multiple Correlations			0,662			0,792		

Source: Processed primary data, 2021

Hypothesis 1 in this study states that there is a positive effect of Challenge stressors on the work engagement of newspaper journalists. The results of the AMOS 21.00 calculation on the model without interaction (see Table 6) show that the effect of Challenge stressors on work engagement has a *** sign on the probability value (P) which indicates a significant situation. Likewise with the AMOS 21.00 calculation on the model with the interaction, there is a *** sign on the probability value (P) which indicates a significant condition. Thus, it can be concluded that Challenge stressors have a positive and significant effect on the work engagement of newspaper journalists. This finding is in line with expectations. Regarding the work of newspaper journalists, the higher the Challenge stressors, the higher and the work engagement.

Hypothesis 2 in this study states that hardiness moderates the effect of Challenge stressors on the work engagement of newspaper journalists. The positive effect of Challenge stressors on work engagement is stronger at the high level of newspaper journalist's hardiness. Table 6 shows that the effect of the interaction variable on work engagement has a *** sign on the probability value (P) which indicates a significant condition. This indicates that the effect of Challenge stressors on work engagement is stronger at high hardiness levels. The positive effect of Challenge stressors on work engagement is stronger at the high level of hardiness of newspaper journalists. This finding is in line with expectations. Hardiness has a boosting effect that strengthens the positive influence of Challenge stressors on the work engagement of newspaper journalists.

DISCUSSION

The Influence of Challenge Stressors toward Work Engagement

The results of this study indicate that Challenge stressors have a positive and significant effect on the work engagement of newspaper journalists. This is in accordance with the proposition of the differentiated job demands-resources model which states that Challenge stressors have a positive effect on work engagement. It also supports that job demands are not homogeneous because it can be divided into challenges and hindrances (Cavanaugh et al., 2000; Crawford, LePine & Rich, 2010). In accordance with the opinion of Hargrove, Nelson & Cooper (2013) that definitions and indicators that are able to provide clarity about the category of job demands as Challenge stressors will provide results that are in line with expectations. The definition and indicators of Challenge stressors from Podsakoff (2007) used in this study are able to provide clarity about the effect of Challenge stressors on work engagement.

Challenge stressors have a positive aspect for newspaper journalists. The characteristics of the challenging work have energized the journalists and made them more engaged with their work. The results of this study are in line with the findings of previous researchers who explained that Challenge stressors have a positive effect on work engagement (Rai, 2018; Reis et al., 2017; Schmitt et al., 2015; Searle & Lee, 2015; Tadić et al., 2015; Van den Broeck et al., 2010). The results of this study add to the evidence that the differentiated job demands-resources model, especially regarding the positive effect of Challenge stressors on work engagement, can be applied to various types of work from various countries. Challenge stressors are built by (1) workload indicators, including the perception of the amount or quantity of work assigned to be completed, (2) time pressure, including the perception of the speed of time used by someone to complete a task, (3) job complexity, and (4) job responsibility. The results show that newspaper journalists are required to have responsibility for their own performance and the performance of others in the company. However, it is actually considered to promote and facilitate development in the work context

thereby increasing energy and high mental resilience at work, willingness to invest effort in work and persistence even in the face of adversity.

The Effect of Hardiness Moderation on the Influence of Challenge Stressors toward Work Engagement

The results of this study indicate that hardiness moderates the effect of Challenge stressors on the work engagement of newspaper journalists. The positive effect of Challenge stressors on work engagement is stronger for newspaper journalists with a high level of hardiness. The combination of high demands and resources increases work motivation and stimulates well-being (Bakker, Van Veldhoven & Xanthopoulou, 2010; Bakker, Hakanen, Demerouti & Xanthopoulou, 2007). Based on the opinion that hardiness is a personal resource, the results of this study are in line with the findings of previous researchers who concluded that resources (in the form of job resources / personal resources) moderate and have a boosting effect on the influence of Challenge stressors on engagement (Rai, 2018; Searle & Lee, 2015; Tadić et al., 2015).

Hardiness is built by the commitment indicator, which reflects the tendency to be optimally involved in any situation of work. Control is reflecting the tendency to feel capable and act in influencing stressful events in one's life. While challenge is the belief that change is something normal in life and anticipating change is interesting and good for self-development. Challenge stressors are built by workload indicators, namely the perception of the amount or quantity of work assigned to be completed, time pressure, namely the perception of the speed of time used by someone to complete a task, job complexity, which is the breadth or variety of skills needed to complete work tasks, and job responsibility, which is the responsibility that employees feel about their own performance and the performance of others in the organization. Work engagement is built by the vigor indicator, which is characterized by a high level of energy and mental resilience at work, a willingness to invest effort in work and persistence even in the face of adversity, dedication, which refers to a strong involvement in work and experiencing a sense of enthusiasm, inspiration, and pride. Absorption is characterized by being fully concentrated and happily doing work, in which time passes quickly and one finds it difficult to get away from work. The highest loading factor for the hardiness variable is the control indicator. The highest loading factor for the Challenge stressors variable is the job responsibility indicator. While the highest loading factor for the work engagement variable in the fit model produced in this study is the vigor indicator. The results showed that the tendency to feel capable and act in influencing stressful events in life is able to reduce the perceived burden of responsibility for their own performance and the performance of others in the organization, thereby increasing energy and high mental resilience, as well as persistent effort, even in the face of adversity.

CONCLUSION

It can be drawn into conclusion that Challenge stressors have positive influence toward work engagement of newspaper journalist in Central Java and DIY province. Meanwhile, hardiness is moderating the effect of Challenge stressors toward work engagement of newspaper journalist in Central Java and DIY province. Therefore, the effect of Challenge stressors is stronger to journalist who has high hardiness. This study has been produced a modification model from differentiated job demands-resources model which integrated with hardiness theory, thus it can contribute in work engagement literature. By adopting differentiated job demands-resources model, the effect of Challenge stressors against work engagement is investigated. The result showed that Challenge

stressors had positive influence toward work engagement. This study also tried to modify the differentiated job demands-resource model by integrating the theory of hardiness to test its moderation effect toward the influence of Challenge stressors to work engagement. The result showed that hardiness can moderate the effect of Challenge stressors toward work engagement. Hardiness is strengthen the positive effect of Challenge stressors toward work engagement.

SUGGESTION

The new model produced by this research allows it to be developed for various forms of relevant personal resources in explaining work engagement. Therefore, future research can use relevant personal resources other than hardiness.

REFERENCES

- Albrecht, S.L. (2013). Work engagement and the positive power of meaningful work. In advances in positive organizational psychology, 237–260. Emerald Group Publishing.
- Bakker, A., Van Veldhoven, M.J.P.M., & Xanthopoulou, D. (2010). Beyond the demand-control model: Thriving on high job demands and resources. *Journal of Personnel Psychology*, 9(1), 3–16.
- Bakker, A.B., Hakanen, J.J., Demerouti, E., & Xanthopoulou, D. (2007). Job resources boost work engagement, particularly when job demands are high. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 99(2), 274–284.
- Bakker, A.B., Schaufeli, W.B., Leiter, M.P., & Taris, T.W. (2008). Work engagement: An emerging concept in occupational health psychology. *Work & Stress*, 22(3), 187–200.
- Cavanaugh, M.A., Boswell, W.R., Roehling, M.V., & Boudreau, J.W. (2000). An empirical examination of self-reported work stress among U.S. managers. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85(1), 65–74.
- Crawford, E.R., LePine, J.A., & Rich, B.L. (2010). Linking job demands and resources to employee engagement and burnout: A theoretical extension and meta-analytic test. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 95(5), 834–848.
- Ferdinand, A. (2014). *Structural Equation Modeling in Management Research*. application of complex models in research for thesis, thesis and dissertation. Semarang: Diponegoro University Press.
- Gallup, G. (2017). *State of the global workplace*. New York: Gallup Press.
- González-Romá, V., Schaufeli, W.B., Bakker, A.B., & Lloret, S. (2006). Burnout and work engagement: Independent factors or opposite poles? *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 68(1), 165–174.
- Hair, J.F., Black, W., Babin, B., & Anderson, R. (2019). *Multivariate Data Analysis*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Hargrove, M.B., Nelson, D.L., & Cooper, C.L. (2013). Generating eustress by challenging employees. *Organizational Dynamics*, 42(1), 61–69.
- Maslach, C., Schaufeli, W.B., & Leiter, M.P. (2001). Job Burnout. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 52(1), 397–422.
- Moreno-Jiménez, B., Rodríguez-Muñoz, A., Hernández, E.G., & Blanco, L.M. (2014). Development and validation of the Occupational Hardiness Questionnaire. *Psicothema*, 26(2), 207–214.
- Podsakoff, N.P. (2007). *Challenge and hindrance stressors in the workplace: Tests of linear, curvilinear, and moderated relationships with employee strains, satisfaction, and performance*. University of Florida.
- Rai, A. (2018). Differential relationship of challenge and hindrance demands with employee engagement. *International Journal of Sociology and Social Policy*, 38(9/10), 887–906.
- Reis, D., Hoppe, A., Arndt, C., & Lischetzke, T. (2017). Time pressure with state vigour and state absorption: Are they non-linearly related? *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 26(1), 94–106.
- Saks, A.M., & Gruman, J.A. (2014). What do we really know about employee engagement? *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 25(2), 155–182.
- Schaufeli, W.B., Bakker, A.B., & Salanova, M. (2006). The measurement of work engagement with a short questionnaire. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 66(4), 701–716.
- Schmitt, A., Ohly, S., & Kleespies, N. (2015). Time pressure promotes work engagement. *Journal of Personnel Psychology*, 14(1), 28–36.
- Searle, B.J., & Lee, L. (2015). Proactive coping as a personal resource in the expanded job demands–resources model. *International Journal of Stress Management*, 22(1), 46–69.

- Sekaran, U., & Bougie, R. (2010). *Research methods for business: A skill-building approach (5th edition)*. Haddington: John Wiley & Sons.
- Tadić, M., Bakker, A.B., & Oerlemans, W.G.M. (2015). Challenge versus hindrance job demands and well-being: A diary study on the moderating role of job resources. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 88(4), 702–725.
- Van den Broeck, A., De Cuyper, N., De Witte, H., & Vansteenkiste, M. (2010). Not all job demands are equal: Differentiating job hindrances and job challenges in the Job Demands–Resources model. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 19(6), 735–759.