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Abstract
Herbal products require employees to maintain cleanliness and product quality, while on the other hand, the demand for herbal products has implications for increasing workloads and becoming stressors for employees. Efforts to optimize employee productivity and performance can be carried out by the company by revitalizing employee performance so that they remain productive. The novelty in this study is a combination of work productivity and performance dimensions that produce five indicators, namely work quality, work quantity, task performance, contextual; performance, and adaptive to timeliness. This study aims to identify the factors that affect the productive performance of employees. This study uses a quantitative approach with a questionnaire as primary data, which is analyzed using multiple linear regression analysis with testing using SPSS version 16 for Windows. The research population is the herbal family business employee in Madura. With the cluster sampling technique, 100 employees were obtained from 4 research locations in Bangkalan and Pamekasan. The results showed that eustress can increase the productive performance of employees. Meanwhile, high job burnout reduces the productive performance of employees.
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I. INTRODUCTION
Amid the economic downturn as a result of the 2019 Covid Pandemic, the herbal industry experienced rapid growth, as a result of increased public consumption of herbal health products and the belief in herbs as prevention and treatment efforts (Susilowati & Hikmatulloh, 2021). Data from the Ministry of Industry (2020) shows that the traditional medicine industry group experienced an increase in the fourth quarter of 2019 by 12.73% (Ministry of
Industry, 2020). The increasing market prospects in the herbal industry have implications for increasing company performance.

Cultural culture in Indonesia allows the rapid development of the herbal industry in Indonesia, both small and medium industries. The herbal industry is an inclusive sector because of the ease of developing products (Astriani, Purwantara, & Maryam, 2020) and is supported by the high interest of the public in consuming herbal products (Drajat et al., 2020). The issue of back to nature further strengthens public perceptions and beliefs about the use of natural ingredients (biopharma) (Abdillah, 2020; Amalia & Aprianingsih, 2017). This trend in the use of herbal medicines was also stated by Ismail (2015) who showed that 80% of the population in Africa, Asia, and Latin America used herbal medicines as a complementary treatment.

From the employee's perspective, this industry not only provides job opportunities which means an increase in employee finances but also has an impact on the belief that herbal products will have a health effect on others and themselves. Therefore, herbal industry employees realize that productivity demands do not only work quality and hygiene. Production of traditional or herbal medicines must pay attention to the cleanliness of raw materials, tools, and employees involved in it to avoid contamination of microorganisms in the products produced (Purnomo, Joko, & Yunita, 2016).

Increased production capacity can be perceived by employees as a workload or even a work challenge. Stressors that are viewed positively will be a challenge for employees because they perceive the additional work as an additional reward. However, excessive workload by ignoring working hours will become a negative stressor which in turn can cause job burnout syndrome. Companies need to revitalize employee performance and company performance to remain productive (Banerjee, 2015). Productive employee performance will affect the development and sustainability of the company (Banerjee, 2015; Florence, 2016). Performance is a multi-dimensional concept, which refers to an individual's ability to contribute to activities both technically and contextually (Mgalu, 2017).

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

The research hypothesis built on this research is based on theoretical studies as well as empirical studies. This study is intended to examine the effect of Eustress and Job Burnout on Productive Performance. The novelty of this research is to combine the theory of performance dimensions and work productivity. So the empirical study that is built comes from previous research studies about the relationship between Eustress, Job Burnout, and Productivity, and the relationship between Eustress, Job Burnout, and Performance.]

A. Eustress in the Frame of Human Resources Development

However great the employee's skills in mastering the work, there are stages where employees face work stress, both caused by workloads, conflicts at work, and life situations as well as psychological problems experienced. Work-related stress is a contemporary social problem that is often faced by workers (Husmiati, 2018). Stress will be positive or healthy and improve performance when employees can perceive it positively (Kumar et al., 2015). The most common causes of stress are related to tasks, role demands, interpersonal demands, organizational structure, organizational leadership, and organizational life cycle. (Bhandari, 2019).

Eustress can increase mental alertness, alertness, cognition, and individual performance to create something. This is because when the positive response eustress is evaluated cognitively by the individual (Bienertova-Vasku et al., 2020), then the present stressor is managed properly so that it can increase psychobiological resilience (Aschbacher et al., 2013). The agility of employees in changing demands or workloads into eustress is influenced by financial expectations (Kumar et al., 2015). Agility to respond to stress is related to skills in the body and mind that will affect clarity about future choices, finances, and performance. Low employee performance and productivity is caused by the work environment and work stress (Lastya Sari et al., 2021). However, work stress will be able to improve performance when work stress can be managed into positive stress through a positive mindset (Marten, 2017). Kamaruddin (2021) in his research proves that human brain waves are connected with basic emotions, so they can identify the level of stress received and turn it into a state of eustress or distress.

Eustress or positive stress is pleasant and a satisfying experience, which can motivate individuals (Bienertova-Vasku et al., 2020). Eustress is called a positive response (Aschbacher et al., 2013; Fleige, 2017; Husmiati, 2018). Eustress is defined as the individual's way of controlling stress levels to achieve goals and targets (Brulé & Morgan, 2018). Bhandari (2019) considers eustress to be the result of competent and healthy management as a result of mature and cooperative leadership so that every employee can work together, feel valued, and get support, to improve the performance and welfare of employees. Ramkumar et al. (2015) found that the agility of employees
to change job demands or stressors into eustress is influenced by financial expectations. Hargrove et al. (2015) conceptualizes eustress as positive stress that is good and gives healthy, positive, and constructive results to stressful events because the response given is related to expectations. Agility to respond to stress is related to skills in perceiving stress with the mind by directing the mind to clarity about the future, finances, and performance (Kumar et al., 2015).

From the opinion of Hargrove et al. (2015) and Brulé & Morgan (2018), it can be concluded that the notion of eustress is positive stress that is controlled to achieve the financial targets and expectations of the work he does. Hargrove (2015) found a eustress model in the human resources development frame that shows a clear relationship between eustress and performance. There are three models of HRD eustress, including:

1. Transactional Model Of Stress (TM). Employees react positively to stressors or job demands with positive emotions in the form of hope and goodwill, constructive and enthusiastic.
2. Preventive Stress Model (TPSM). Employees respond to stress that occurs in the organization holistically which includes cognitive, affective, and physiological reactions that will provide positive strength for the organization.
3. Challenge Hindrance Framework (CHF). Stressors associated with challenges will produce positive directions whereas obstacles lead to negative outcomes. So to develop employees, stress is directed at challenges at work that are necessary for the achievement of job tasks, employee personal development, and task achievement. There are four types of challenges, namely work speed, workload, work complexity, and job responsibilities.

Empirical studies on the effect of Eustress on Productive Performance are based on the theory of the effect of eustress on Performance and the effect of eustress on Productivity. The following empirical studies show that eustress improves performance (Hargrove et al., 2015; Natsir et al., 2021; Prasetyo, 2020; Srimulyani et al., 2020). Eustress is also able to increase productivity, this is proven by research (Brulé & Morgan, 2018; Kumar et al., 2015). From theoretical and empirical studies about the relationship between eustress and productive performance, it is obtained that hypothesis 1 in this study that eustress has a significant effect on employee productive performance.

B. Job Burnout

The term job burnout was first introduced by Freudenberger (1974) to describe conditions of extreme stress and fatigue in employees (Pangemanan et al., 2017). Shepherd et al., (2011) later termed it a "syndrome or emotional exhaustion and cynicism that occurs frequently among individuals who do people work of some kind". Fatigue is the aspect that is most often reported and analyzed than other aspects. When individuals feel that the work being done is very heavy or excessive, this can cause fatigue and will run out of energy (Jaya and Rahmat, 2005). Employees who experience burnout are generally employees who experience chronic fatigue and are cynical about their work so they show decreased performance (Bakker & Costa, 2014).

Job burnout can also be caused by excessive work stress and has an impact on the stamina and psychological condition of employees (Hakim & Windijarto, 2016; Ramdan & Fadly, 2016), which will then have an impact on decreasing employee performance and productivity (Hartanti et al., 2018; Sadry, 2017). Employees who experience job burnout will show psychosomatic problems, insomnia, emotional problems (depression, anxiety), lack of confidence, isolation, and may even show aggressive behaviour (Bakker & Costa, 2014; Kartono & Hilmiana, 2018; Ramdan & Fadly, 2016). Another impact of job burnout is that employees become lazy to work absenteeism, prolonged fatigue, difficulty concentrating, and decreased work performance (Sadry, 2017). In general, the causes of job burnout are situational factors, namely job demands, ambiguity, and role conflict in work, and workload, while individual factors that cause job burnout are related to socioeconomic status, personality, cognitive abilities of employees (Bakker & Costa, 2014). As a result of prolonged job burnout, job dissatisfaction will appear, and decreased employee performance and productivity (Sadry, 2017).

Job burnout is a condition that causes employees to lose physical and psychological energy due to unsupportive work situations, and mismatches between needs and expectations (Rizka, 2013). Job burnout is defined as the main tension dimension of chronic fatigue experienced by individuals as a result of cynicism about the value of their work and doubts about their ability to perform in workers (Atmaja & Suana, 2018; Bakker & Costa, 2014; Christianty & Widhaningtanti, 2017). Kartono (2018) describes job burnout as an experience or situation where employees feel physical, emotional, and mental fatigue in the long term as a result of the demands and stress
experienced by employees. Thus it can be interpreted that job burnout is a combination of chronic fatigue and negative attitudes of employees toward their work which causes a decrease in health and productivity (Bakker & Costa, 2014).

Ramdan & Fadly (2016) identified three components of Job Burnout which were then used as indicators in this study, including:
1. Emotional exhaustion, i.e. emotional exhaustion describes a feeling of tiredness, drained energy, and a prolonged feeling of emptiness
2. Depersonalization is related to employee attitudes at work that tend to be cynical and withdrawn toward others
3. Personal Accomplishment is a feeling of helplessness, feeling less competent in the work he does

Several studies have shown that job burnout can reduce Hakim’s work productivity (2016); Ramdan & Fadly (2016); Sadry (2017). Job burnout can also reduce employee performance as evidenced in research by Bakker & Costa (2014); Anggriana et al. (2014); Al Badri (2017); Hartanti et al. (2018). Based on theoretical and empirical studies regarding the relationship between job burnout and productive performance, hypothesis 2 can be put forward that job burnout has a significant effect on employee productive performance.

C. Productive Performance Model

Productivity is a person’s ability to achieve work targets effectively both in terms of quantity, quality, and time efficiency between inputs made by employees to produce certain outputs (Fadillah et al., 2013). Productivity is also defined as the level of production produced by workers for a year (Amin, 2014). Sumarno et al., (2013) define work productivity as a comparison of the work achieved with the role of employees in units of time. Work productivity is also defined as the ability of employees to produce goods or services by using resources and production factors to improve the quality and quantity of work (Hakim & Windijarto, 2016).

The definition of Productive Performance is based on the theory of performance and productivity. Performance and productivity are an amalgamation of the notion of performance proposed by Koopmans et al., (2011) and Tabiu et al. (2016), and the notion of productivity put forward by Fadillah et al., (2013). Performance is defined as the output and work achievement of employees recognized by the company (Suciu et al., 2013). Employee performance is also defined as the value or work of employees whose contribution can increase organizational effectiveness (Koopmans et al., 2011; Tabiu et al., 2016). Performance is defined as the output or work produced from certain activity functions over a certain period (Mardiana, et.al, 2017), according to the authority and responsibility of each employee to achieve company goals (Rachmadinata & Ayuningtias, 2017; Ramadhan et al., 2020).

Productive performance is a combination of the notion of productivity proposed by Fadillah et al., (2013) and the notion of performance proposed by Koopmans et al., (2011) and Tabiu et al. (2016). Productive performance in this study is defined as the work of employees to achieve work targets effectively and efficiently. The basic theoretical model of Productive performance combines the study of work productivity theory proposed by Nishu (2021) and the Performance Dimension theory proposed by Tabiu, et.al. The description of the synthesis which is a combination of theoretical studies of work productivity and performance is shown in Figure 1 below the Theory Synthesis of the Productive Performance Model.

![Fig. 1. Theory Synthesis of the Productive Performance Model](Source: Data Processed, 2022)
Figure 1 shows that employee work productivity can be measured from work quality, work quantity, and timeliness (Nishu & Lalrinzuala, 2021). While the theory of performance dimensions suggests that to improve employee performance, task performance, contextual performance, and adaptive performance are needed (Tabiu et al., 2016). So the Productive performance model is built by five indicators, including work quality, work quantity, task performance, contextual performance, and adaptive to timeliness. The third hypothesis is built based on theoretical and empirical studies, namely eustress and job burnout simultaneously have a significant effect on employee productive performance.

III. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

A. Research Design

This research design uses quantitative research whose research design is made to find out the background of the research, references both empirical and theoretical studies that are used to then be proposed as research problems, and data analysis is carried out to answer research problems. The object of this research is the Herbal Family Business in Madura, the research population is the Madurese Herbal Industry employee. Considering that this research is aimed at the type of family business in the herbal industry, the appropriate sampling technique used is cluster sampling. The primary research data were obtained through questionnaires which were then analyzed using the Statistical Program for Social Science (SPSS) version 16 for Windows, while secondary data were in the form of field studies, interviews, and studies originating from scientific publications both from books and journals. Figure 2 shows that the Eustress variable is constructed by three indicators referring to the theory proposed by Hargrove (2015), including the Transactional Model Of Stress; Preventive Stress Model Challenge Hindrance Framework. The Job Burnout variable indicator uses three components of job burnout as proposed by Ramdan & Fadly (2016), namely Emotional Fatigue; Depersonalization; Personal Accomplishment.

The dependent variable is the novelty of this research which is obtained by combining the Performance and Productivity variables. The purpose of the study was to determine the effect of Eustress (X1) on Productive Performance (Y1) and determine the effect of Job Burnout (X2) on Productive Performance (Y1). Questionnaire questions are prepared by considering the indicators used for each variable. Figure 2 shows that the Eustress variable is constructed by three indicators referring to the theory proposed by Hargrove (2015), including the Transactional Model Of Stress; Preventive Stress Model Challenge Hindrance Framework. The Job Burnout variable indicator uses three components of job burnout as proposed by Ramdan & Fadly (2016), namely Emotional Fatigue; Depersonalization; Personal Accomplishment. The Productive Performance variable is a research novelty that combines the theory of Productivity with indicators that refer to indicators of work productivity from Nishu (2021) and Performance whose indicators refer to the theory of performance dimensions from Tabiu et al. (2016), which were synthesized into five indicators including Work Quality, Work Quantity, Task Performance, Contextual; Performance, and Adaptive to Timeliness. In each indicator, 2 statements are made, so 16 questionnaire statements are obtained, which consist of 6 statement items about the eustress variable, 6 statements about job burnout variables, and 10 statements on the productive performance variable. The following is a picture of 2 conceptual frameworks and the number of indicators used.

![Figure 2 Research Conceptual Framework](source: Data Processed, 2022)
B. Characteristics of Respondents

The descriptive analysis used in this study is intended to obtain demographic data regarding the characteristics of respondents consisting of working period and age.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>years of service</td>
<td>&lt;2 years</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2-5 years</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;6 years</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>58 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>&lt;20 years</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20-39 years</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>51 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;40 years</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: SPSS output

The description of respondents in this study was described based on the characteristics of the respondents to provide an overview of the demographics and their relationship to the results of the study. Table 1 on the Characteristics of respondents shows that the most years of service are 6 to 10 years, with a total of 68 employees. This shows that most of the employees have experience and tend to master the work. A large number of employees with work experience above 5 years also shows that employees are not easy to change places of work. This is also supported by the age of the respondents, most of whom (51%) are 20-39 years old and 34% are 34 years old.

Questionnaires that have been filled out by research respondents are tabulated, to then be tested for validity and reliability tests. Testing the validity of the item is done by correlating the item score with the total score (Pearson product-moment). Table validity test can be done by comparing the r count (Pearson correlation value) with the r table (obtained from table r). According to Sugiyono (28) if the r count is positive and r count > r table then the statement is declared valid. The results of the validity test showed that all questionnaire statement items (16 statements) were declared valid. Furthermore, the reliability test was carried out using the SPSS program. An instrument or questionnaire is said to be reliable if the Cronbach alpha coefficient is above 0.6. A reliability value of 0.7 is acceptable and above 0.8 is good, while a Cronbach alpha value of less than 0.6 is not good (Purnomo, 2016). The following is Table 2 about the results of the research data reliability test.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
<th>N Item</th>
<th>Reliability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eustress</td>
<td>0.874</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Reliable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Burnout</td>
<td>0.708</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Reliable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Productive Performance</td>
<td>0.937</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Reliable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 shows the results of the reliability test which shows that the value of the Cronbach alpha coefficient is above 0.7, which means the reliability value is high. The next stage is the basic assumption test, normality, and homogeneity test using SPSS version 23 for Windows. At this stage, the data obtained that the data is normally distributed. The Heteroscedasticity test shows that the scatterplot of points spreads randomly, either at the top of the zero or at the bottom of the number 0 from the vertical or Y axis, it can indicate that there is no heteroscedasticity. While the results of the multicollinearity test state that the path analysis used in this study is free from multicollinearity.

IV. RESULT/FINDING

To test whether there is an effect of Eustress on Productive Performance and whether there is an effect of Job Burnout on Productive Performance, the researchers used multiple linear regression analysis. The multiple regression test in this study used the help of the SPSS application program. From the results of regression analysis, obtained data about how much influence the independent variable has on the dependent variable by looking at the independent variables of this study were Eustress (X1) and Job Burnout (X2), while the dependent variable of this study was Productive Performance (Y1). The following are the results of the regression analysis shown in
Table 3 regarding the output model summary. While table 4 Anova is the result of the F test which is used to see the simultaneous effect of the Eustress and Job Burnout variables on Productive Performance.

### Table 3. Model Summary.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error in the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.552</td>
<td>.329</td>
<td>.290</td>
<td>5.49524</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), JobBurnout, Eustress  
Source: SPSS output

### Table 4. ANOVA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>408.131</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>209.055</td>
<td>9.635</td>
<td>.003*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>705.325</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>21.148</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1123.427</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), JobBurnout, Eustress  
b. Dependent Variable: Product. Perform  
Source: SPSS output

Table 3 of the model summary shows the value of R = 0.552, which means that the relationship between the independent variables and the dependent variable is strong, namely 55.2%. Based on the results of the F test in Table 4 ANOVA, Fount is 9.635 and shows a significance value of 0.003. These results indicate that Eustress and Job Burnout together have a significant effect on Productive Performance. Furthermore, the t-test (partial) is to see the effect of the independent variables partially on the dependent variable resulting in the calculation of the calculated t value and the level of significance.

### Table 5. Coefficients*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>22.905</td>
<td>4.794</td>
<td>5.821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JobBurnout</td>
<td>-.128</td>
<td>.062</td>
<td>-3.591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eustress</td>
<td>.342</td>
<td>.088</td>
<td>3.912</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Product. Perform  
Source: SPSS output

Coefficients are the results of the T-test which is used to see the partial effect of the X1 and X2 variables on the Y variable, following the results of the T-test:

1. Based on the T-test in Table 5, shows that partial eustress has a significant effect on productive performance, with a positive relationship direction
2. T-test results show that partial job burnout has a significant effect on productive performance, with a negative relationship direction.

V. DISCUSSION

This study proves that eustress has a significant effect on the direction of a positive relationship to productive performance. The higher the eustress, the higher the employee's productive performance. Stressors that are managed properly will form a positive mindset which is called eustress. This proves that a positive response to stressors can make employees work effectively and efficiently in achieving work targets (productive performance). The eustress model is the transactional model of stress; the preventive stress model and challenge hindrance framework, have proven productive performance. This finding is in line with research by Hargrove et al., (2015); Nasir et al. (2021); Prasetyo (2020), and Srimulyani et al. (2020) which shows that eustress can improve employee performance. These findings also prove that eustress is also able to increase employee productivity, and this is in line with the research by Brulé & Morgan (2018) and Kumar et al. (2015).

This study also proves that job burnout affects productive performance with a negative relationship direction. This proves that high job burnout will be able to reduce the productive performance of employees. Employees
who experience emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and personal accomplishment will feel a decrease in work quality, work quantity, task performance, contextual; performance, and adaptation to timeliness. In employees, fatigue both physically and psychologically can reduce the acquisition of work results so employees find it difficult to achieve work targets because the work they do becomes less efficient. This finding is in line with Hakim (2016)’s research; Ramdan & Fadly’s (2016); Sandry’s (2017) proof that job burnout can reduce work productivity. This research is also in line with research by Bakker & Costa (2014); Anggriana et al. (2014); Al Badri (2017); Hartanti et al. (2018). Ramdan & Fadly (2016) found that job burnout reduced performance.

VI. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

The results showed that eustress and job burnout affect productive performance. Eustress has a positive influence on productive performance, on the other hand, job burnout can reduce employee productive performance. This research is expected to provide an illustration that management needs to consider the importance of understanding productive performance. Increased production capacity that demands effective and efficient performance will be achieved when the stressor given in the form of workload to employees becomes a positive stressor or eustress. Employees will perceive stress as eustress when job demands are balanced by positive emotions constructed by work spirit, affective strength, and self-development challenges. Optimizing productive performance will be achieved when management considers the symptoms that allow for job burnout to occur in employees. Efforts to minimize job burnout can be done if the company considers working hours and workload arrangements, provides motivation and training if employees feel less competent in their work, and seeks activities that support involvement and togetherness among employees.

The limitation of this research is that the job satisfaction variable is not included as an intervening. Job satisfaction can contribute to mediating between Eustress and Productive Performance because job satisfaction has control of positive encouragement for employees to achieve work and performance targets (Pavithra & Sivakumar, 2019). Job Satisfaction will also be able to mediate burnout jobs to productive performance because prolonged psychological syndrome on the burnout job response experienced by employees can be reduced fatigue if employees feel satisfaction at work. Job satisfaction will bring up good interpersonal relationships among employees, thus overcoming the chronic levels caused by Burnout Employees (Patonangi & Gustomo, 2018). Future research is expected to include job satisfaction as a mediating variable on eustress, and job burnout on productive performance, to test the effectiveness of job performance in increasing eustress, and the effectiveness of job performance to reduce the effect of job burnout on productive performance.
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