



The Relationship of Workload with Burnout in Teachers

Rahma Afwina
(Universitas Medan Area)

* Corresponding Author. E-mail: rahmaafwina@staff.uma.ac.id

Receive: 11/01/2023

Accepted: 17/02/2023

Published: 01/03/2023

Abstrak

Penelitian ini merupakan penelitian kuantitatif dengan metode korelasi. Tujuan dari penelitian ini untuk melihat hubungan antara beban kerja dengan *burnout*. Adapun hipotesis dalam penelitian ini terdapat hubungan positif dan signifikan antara beban kerja dengan *burnout*. Populasi dari penelitian ini 60 guru dengan sampel 60 guru. Teknik yang digunakan dalam penentuan sampel adalah teknik *total sampling*. Berdasarkan hasil uji korelasi *product moment* dapat diketahui bahwa nilai signifikansi variabel beban kerja dengan *burnout* sebesar $0.000 < 0.05$. Hal tersebut menjelaskan bahwa terdapat hubungan yang signifikan antara beban kerja dengan *burnout* pada guru. Nilai *Pearson correlation* yang diperoleh antara beban kerja dan *burnout* sebesar 0.483. Hal tersebut menjelaskan bahwa variabel beban kerja dan *burnout* memiliki korelasi yang positif dengan koefisien korelasi yang cukup kuat. Nilai koefisien determinan yang didapat yaitu sebesar 23.4%. Berdasarkan nilai koefisien determinan dapat diketahui bahwa pengaruh beban kerja terhadap *burnout* sebesar 23.4% dan 76.6% sisanya dipengaruhi oleh faktor lain.

Kata Kunci: Beban Kerja, Burnout, Guru

Abstract

This research is a quantitative research with correlation method. The purpose of this research is to see the correlation between workload and burnout. The hypothesis in this study is that there is a positive and significant correlation between workload and burnout. The population of this research is 60 teachers with a sample of 60 teachers. The technique used in determining the sample is the total sampling technique. Based on the results of the product moment correlation test, it can be seen that the significance value of the workload variable with burnout is $0.000 < 0.05$. This explains that there is a significant correlation between workload and teacher burnout. The Pearson correlation value obtained between workload and burnout is 0.483. This explains that the workload and burnout variables have a positive correlation with a fairly strong correlation coefficient. The value of the determinant coefficient obtained is equal to 23.4%. Based on the value of the determinant coefficient, it can be seen that the effect of workload on burnout is 23.4% and the remaining 76.6% is influenced by other factors.

Keywords: Workload, Burnout, Teacher

Introduction

Experts in Indonesia realize that the teaching profession is an honorable and noble profession. Master devoted himself and devoted to educate the nation and improve

the quality of Indonesian human beings as a whole, namely faith, piety and Noble intellect and mastering science and technology. Teachers are required to have a work behavior that is able to provide and

realize the hopes and desires of all parties, especially the general public who have trusted schools and teachers in fostering students. In achieving a good quality of education is strongly influenced by how teachers perform their duties so that the work of teachers becomes an important demand to achieve educational success. Based on the current curriculum, where teachers are given demanding tasks such as facilitating learners, making the learning atmosphere not monotonous, making learning media and so forth. It is not uncommon for teachers to experience burnout.

Maslach and Jackson (in Kristensen et al, 2005) define burnout as a syndrome of emotional exhaustion, lack of appreciation or lack of a positive view of others (depersonalization) and decreased achievement of self (reduced personal achievement) which is characterized by decreased ability to carry out routine tasks as a result of prolonged stress. Baron and Greenberg (2003) say that burnout is a syndrome of emotional, physical, and mental exhaustion, associated with low feelings of self-esteem, caused by suffering intense and prolonged stress. Workers who experience burnout become less energy and interest in work.

According to Muslihudi in (Meiliyandrie, Wardani, & Firmansyah, 2021), burnout is a physical, emotional, mental state that is very down due to pressure on working conditions for a long time. These demands and pressures can be said to be like burnout. Burnout can be one that is often experienced by workers. The feeling of saturation arises because of the amount of work that must be completed, the demand for production that must be met so that the workload becomes heavy and causes fatigue for the workers themselves. Burnout itself often appears the majority of workers who

work in companies, social work such as nurses, teachers, among others. Burnout arises due to several triggering factors, namely starting from a workload that is too heavy, and an unfavorable work environment (Melinia, Yenni & Hamdani, 2022).

According to Kleiber and Ensman (in Melinia, Yenni & Hamdani, 2022) prove that burnout is felt by nurses as much as 43%, teachers as much as 32%, social workers 4%, and other workers 2%. The results showed that the second stage was occupied by teachers. Survey Data prove that about 50% - 70% who feel burnout in nergara Asia majority have a job as a teacher. Teachers who give lessons in elementary school are often found to feel fatigue, emotion or a state of fatigue and a higher emotional decline than teachers who teach in secondary schools. (Fahmi et al., 2019).

Based on Cahyani's research (2019) from 165 honorary teacher respondents, it proves that teachers who have a very high percentage of burnout with a percentage of 6% are as many as 10 people, with a high category there are 58 people (35%), a medium category of 34 people (21%), a low category of 51 teachers (31%), and a very low of 12 people (7%).

Burnout is considered an individual problem and therefore, its solution lies in the personal responsibility, not the organization. Even in the field of Education, burnout is considered a "disease" and because it is entirely an individual problem. The field of Education considers that burnout occurs because teachers do not have adequate coping mechanisms. (Ali et al., 2021). According to Baron and Greenberg (in Rahman, 2007) revealed that there are four dimensions of burnout, namely physical fatigue, emotional fatigue, mental fatigue and low self-esteem. according to Maslach and Leiter (1997), there are three types of

burnout: burnout is lost energy, burnout is lost enthusiasm, and burnout is lost confidence.

The factors that influence burnout are divided into two (Leater and Maslach, 1997), namely the individual and the environment/organization. The influence of individual aspects consists of self-concept, type a behavior, susceptibility to stress, self-efficacy, introverted individuals and self-esteem, while the influence of environmental/organizational aspects includes unclear work (job ambiguity), lack of control (lack of control), physical work condition (physical work condition), organizational change (organizational change), family conflicts that affect work (work-family conflict), lack of social support, and excessive work guidance (work overload).

Workload according to Paramitadewi (2017) is a process of completing work tasks within a certain period of time. According to Munandar (2001), workload is a condition of a job with its job description that must be completed by a certain time limit, workload can be physical workload and mental workload. The problem of excessive workload is one of the factors of work that have an impact on the onset of burnout. The workload of employees includes long working hours and the number of tasks given to individuals/employees causes employees to feel they have a workload that must be borne. This is a stress trigger factor that potentially causes burnout in employees (Maslach & Leither, 1997).

Excessive workload can include working hours, the number of individuals to be served, responsibilities to be assumed, routine and non-routine work and other administrative work that exceeds the capacity and ability of the individual. In addition,

excessive workload can include quantitative aspects in the form of the amount of work and qualitative, namely the level of difficulty of work that must be handled (Pines, 1981). Therefore, the workload on employees will lead to fatigue (physical and non-physical) felt by employees, resulting in bad for the company and workers. In particular workload and time pressure constitute “workplace oversupply” and in this regard, social support can play an important role when job demands are imminent (Alarcon, 2011).

Workload can be grouped into three qualifications, namely under capacity (low workload), standard workload, and over capacity (high workload) (Sitepu, 2013). To measure the workload indicators used in this study from Omar et al. (2015) namely: on time, time of working hours, working while off work, fast at work, activity affected due to workload, waking up late at night because of work, at the end of the working day do not have energy left, have little time pressure, busy and difficult to focus while working.

Previous research conducted by Romadhoni (2015) suggests that there is an impact between workload and burnout. It is explained that the amount of workload that is responsible when it exceeds the limits of the ability and capacity of employees will cause burnout. Atmaja and Suana (2019) say the same thing that in their research shows that the more an employee has a large amount of work with high time pressure, the employee tends to feel depressed so that the incidence of burnout will be higher.

Based on the explanation above, the purpose of this study was to determine the relationship between workload and burnout in teachers, with the hypothesis that there is a positive and significant relationship between workload and burnout in teachers, assuming that the higher the workload, the higher the

perceived burnout of teachers, and vice versa.

Method

The research method used in this study is quantitative method with correlation approach. Quantitative methods are research methods obtained from collecting numerical data and then analyzed using certain statistical calculations to answer hypotheses that have been formulated (Jannah, 2018). Correlation approach is used because researchers want to know the relationship or correlation between workload with burnout

The population in the study was teachers in school X with a total of 60 teachers. While the sampling technique used is total sampling. According to Sugiyono (2017) if the population is less than 100, then the entire population can be sampled, which means that the number of samples in this study is 60 teachers.

Instruments used in this study are workload scale and bournout scale. The burnout scale used was developed from Baron & Greenberg's (2003) aspect with four answer choices, namely always, often, rarely, never. The workload scale used was developed from aspects belonging to Omar et al. (2015) with four answer choices, namely strongly agree, agree, disagree, and strongly agree.

To calculate the data analysis using assumption test and hypothesis test, but before doing assumption test first scale in reliability test, for reliability test using alpha cronbach. Then the assumption test will be conducted normality test using Kolmogorov Smirnov Test and linearity test using anova test with the help of SPSS version 23 for Windows application. To test the hypothesis using Pearson product moment correlation technique with the help of SPSS application version 23 for Windows.

Results and Discussion

Descriptive Test

Based on the results of research conducted on 84 students obtained descriptive statistical test results as follows:

Table 1. Descriptive Test

Descriptive Statistics				
N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
60	31	76	58.65	13.111
60	42	104	81.43	12.201
60				

Gender	Total
Men	28
Girls	32

Based on the above descriptive statistical test results can be seen that the variable workload has the lowest value of 31 and the highest value of 76 with an average of 58.65. The burnout variable has the lowest value of 42 and the highest value of 104 with an average of 81.43. For the standard deviation of the workload variable is 13,111, while the burnout variable is 12,201.

Reliability Test

Based on the results of the study, it was found that the burnout scale and workload scale were tested on 30 teachers. The trials were conducted to determine the validity and reliability at each scale. Validity test conducted by comparing the R count and R table so it was found that on the workload scale there are 22 valid items and on the burnout scale there are 28 valid items. For reliability test using cronbach's alpha with the following results:

Table 2. Reliability Test Results

Instrument	Alpha Cronbach
Working Load	0.908
Burnout	0.919

Assumption Test Results

Normality Test

Normality test is a test performed to determine whether the data used by a researcher is normally distributed or not normally distributed. Data can be said to be normally distributed if it has a significance value > 0.05 , while data that is not normally distributed is data that has a significance value < 0.05 .

Table 3. Normality Test Results

One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test			
		Beban Kerja	Burnout
		60	60
Parameters ^{a,b}	Mean	58.65	81.43
	Std. Deviation	13.111	12.201
Significance	Absolute	.153	.157
	Positive	.093	.157
	Negative	-.153	-.132
Asymptotic		.153	.157
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.071 ^c	.097 ^c

Based on the results of the normality test above can be seen the value of the significance of the workload variable $0.071 > 0.050$ and burnout variable of $0.097 > 0.05$, it can be concluded that the data from the research results are normally distributed.

Linearity Test

Linearity test is a test performed to determine whether the variables X and Y have a linear relationship or not. Data is said to be linear if it has a significance value > 0.05 , while non-linear data is data that has a significance value < 0.05 .

Table 4. Linearity Test Results

ANOVA Table						
		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Burnout * Beban Kerja	Between Groups	(Combined) 4097.883	23	178.169	1.369	.195
		Linearity 2053.106	1	2053.106	15.777	.000
		Deviation from Linearity 2044.777	22	92.944	12.714	.096
Within Groups		4684.850	36	130.135		
Total		8782.733	59			

Based on the results of the linearity test above, it can be seen that the significance value of deviation from linearity of workload variable and Burnout variable is $0.096 > 0.05$, it can be concluded that burnout variable and workload are linear.

Hypothesis Test Results

Hypothesis testing is performed to determine whether the hypothesis of this study is acceptable or not. The hypothesis of this study is whether there is a relationship between workload and burnout in teachers. The correlation technique used is Pearson Product moment correlation technique with the help of SPSS 23.0 for windows. The significance level used in this study is 0.05. The hypothesis will be accepted if $p < 0.05$ and the hypothesis will be rejected if $p > 0.05$. To determine the correlation coefficient between the two variables can be guided by the provisions below:

Table 4. Interpretation Interval Correlation Coefficient Guidelines

Interval	Interpretasi
0.00-0.19	Very Low
0.20-0.39	Low
0.40-0.59	Strong Enough
0.60-0.79	Strong
0.80-1.00	Very Strong

Here is the result of a hypothetical test:

Correlations			
		Working Load	Burnout
Kerja	Pearson Correlation		
		1	.483**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
t	N	60	60
	Pearson Correlation	.483**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
N		60	60

Based on the results of the product moment correlation test above, it can be seen that the significance value of workload and burnout variables is $0.000 < 0.05$. This explains that there is a significant relationship between workload and burnout in teachers.

Pearson correlation value obtained between workload and burnout is 0.483. This explains that the workload and burnout variables have a positive correlation with a strong correlation coefficient. A positive correlation explains that the higher the workload on teachers, the higher the perceived burnout. Conversely, the lower the workload on the teacher, the lower the burnout felt by the teacher.

The value of the determinant coefficient obtained is 23.4%. This value is obtained by the formula $KD = r^2 \times 100\%$ (Qomusuddin, 2019). Based on the value of the determinant coefficient, it can be seen that the effect of workload on burnout is 23.4% and the remaining 76.6% is influenced by other factors.

Discussion

Fajriani and Septiari (2015) in their publication said that there are two factors that are considered to influence the emergence of burnout, namely: (1) external factors are working conditions, which include unfavorable psychological work environment, lack of opportunities for promotion, insufficient rewards, lack of social support from superiors, job demands, monotonous work, and (2) internal factors include age, gender, self-esteem, education level, length of Service and personality characteristics. So the workload studied in this study is an external factor derived from working conditions that can cause burnout in employees.

According to Bolino and Turnley (2005) states that workload occurs because

an employee has too much work to be done under the pressure of a very tight time schedule and not in accordance with the ability. When too much work to be done causes physical and mental fatigue, even burnout and stress due to workload, coupled with the feeling that the skills possessed do not meet the demands of the task, this will trigger burnout. Like Virick and Casper (2007) statement that workload causes high physical and psychological fatigue. Research conducted by Prijayanti (2015) on the influence of workload and social support on burnout shows that there is a significant influence of workload on burnout.

Based on the results of research from Juhnisa and Fitria (2020), there is a direct and significant and positive influence between workload and burnout on PT employees. PLN (persero) the parent Unit of Riau and Riau Islands. This means that when the organization is able to provide justice, that normal time in working with good standard, and a feeling of comfort in working, it will be able to reduce feelings of fatigue and fatigue in the work and employees can focus more on working for the organization. Excessive workload will cause fatigue both physical and mental and emotional reactions such as headaches, indigestion and irritability. While the workload is too little where the work that occurs due to the reduction of motion will cause boredom and a sense of monotony. Boredom in daily routine work due to tasks or work that is too little resulting in a lack of attention to work so that it is potentially harmful to workers.

This is in accordance with the theory put forward by Hasibuan (2009) that fatigue is one indicator of the amount of workload that must be borne by an employee. Many cases occur in Indonesia that the management is not able to take into account

the ability that an employee is able to carry out his job. The leadership does not realize that heavy workload negatively affects personnel performance. The negative impacts of the workload include not achieving the work target or the vision and mission of the organization that has been set, the low quality of personnel work, the increasing level of personnel fatigue which will subsequently have an impact on the level of absenteeism or even the increasing number of disciplinary violations.

The workload received can cause feelings of pressure so that employees are not able to work properly and optimally due to lack of manpower. This can cause burnout syndrome attitudes in employees and can indirectly harm the company (Atmaja & Suana, 2019). Burnout syndrome in this study was seen from physical exhaustion (physical fatigue), depersonalization (cynical attitude about his own career and performance), and personal achievement (low self-esteem).

Conclusion

Based on the results of the product moment correlation test above, it can be seen that the significance value of workload and burnout variables is $0.000 < 0.05$. This explains that there is a significant relationship between workload and burnout in teachers.

Pearson correlation value obtained between workload and burnout is 0.483. This explains that the workload and burnout variables have a positive correlation with a strong correlation coefficient.

The value of the determinant coefficient obtained is 23.4%. Based on the value of the determinant coefficient, it can be seen that the effect of workload on burnout is 23.4% and the remaining 76.6% is influenced by other factors.

Reference

- Alarcon, G. M. (2011). A meta-analysis of burnout with job demands, resources, and attitudes. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*.
- Ali, M., Zulkifli, A., & Nurqamar, I. F. (2021). *Manajemen burnout konsep dan implementasi* (b. S. M.c.a (ed.); i). UPT Unhas Press.
- Atmaja, I. G. I., & Suana. I. W. (2019). Dampak Beban kerja terhadap Burnout dengan Role Stress sebagai Variabel Mediasi pada Karyawan Rumours Restaurant. *E-Jurnal Manajemen Unud*, 8(2), 7775–7804.
- Baron & Greenberg. (2003). *Behavior in organization understanding and managing the human side of work 5th edition*. USA: Prentice Hall.
- Bolino, M. C & William, H. T. (2005). The Personal Costs of citizenship behaviour: The Relationship between Individual Initiative and Workload, Job Stress, and Work Family Conflict. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90 (4), 740-748
- Cahyani, D. R. (2019). Kejenuhan kerja (Burnout) pada Guru Honorer di Kota Makassar (Vol. 8, Issue 5). Universitas Negeri Makassar.
- Fahmi, A. Z., Muthia, W. S., Alfarizi, F., Garlianka, M., Wangsadikrama, & Widiastara, N. (2019). Diversity and Burnout in Elementary School Teachers in Yogyakarta. *Psikologika: Jurnal Pemikiran Dan Penelitian Psikologi*, 24(2), 105–114. <https://doi.org/10.20885/psikologi.vol24.iss2.art1>
- Fajriani, A & Septiari, D. (2015). Pengaruh Beban Pekerjaan terhadap Kinerja Karyawan: Efek Mediasi Burnout.

- Jurnal Akuntansi, Ekonomi dan Manajemen Bisnis*, 3 (1), 74-79.
- Hasibuan, M. (2009). Manajemen sumber daya manusia. Edisi revisi, PT. bumi Aksara, Jakarta.
- Jannah, M. (2018). *Metodologi Penelitian Kuantitatif Untuk Psikologi*. Unesa University Press.
- Kristensen, T. S., Borritz, M., Villadsen, E., & Christensen, K. B. (2005). The Copenhagen Burnout Inventory: A new tool for the assessment of burnout. *Work & Stress*, 19(3), 192-207.
- Maslach, C., Leiter, M.P. (1997). *The truth about burnout. How organization cause personal stress and what to do about it*. San Fransisco: Jossey-Bass Publisher
- Meilina, S., Yenni, M., & Hamdani. (2022). Faktor Yang Berhubungan Dengan Kejenuhan Kerja (Burnout) Pada Guru Honorer Sekolah Dasar Negeri Di Kecamatan Muara Sabak Timur Tahun 2022. *Jurnal Kesmas Jambi (JKMJ)*. Vol 6 (2). 1-6
- Meiliyandrie, L., Wardani, I., & Firmansyah, R. (2021). Work-Life Balance Para Pekerja Buruh (M. Nasrudin (ed.); I). NEM-Anggota IKAPI.
- Munandar, A.S. (2001). *Psikologi Industri dan Organisasi*. Jakarta UI Press
- Omar, M. K. (2015). Workload, Role Conflict and Work-Life Balance among Employees of an Enforcement Agency in Malaysia. *International Journal of Business*, 8(2), 52-57.
- Paramitadewi, K. F. (2017). Pengaruh Beban Kerja Dan Kompensasi Terhadap Kinerja Pegawai Sekretariat Pemerintah Daerah Kabupaten Tabanan. *E-Jurnal Manajemen Unud*, 6(6), 3370- 3397.
- Pines A, Aronson E, Kafry D. (1981). *Burnout: From Tedium to Personal Growth*. New York: Free Press.
- Prijayanti, I. (2015). Pengaruh Beban Kerja dan Dukungan Sosial Terhadap Burnout pada Karyawan PT X. Universitas Islam Negeri Syarif Hidayatullah.
- Rahman, U. (2007). Mengenal burnout pada guru. *Lentera Pendidikan: Jurnal Ilmu Tarbiyah dan Keguruan*, 10(2), 216-227.
- Romadhoni, et al (2015). Dampak Beban Kerja, Lingkungan Kerja, dan Dukungan Sosial Terhadap Burnout Pustakawan di Kota Mataram. *Jurnal Ilmu Perpustakaan, Informasi, Dan Kearsipan*.
- Sitepu, A. T. (2013). Beban Kerja Dan Motivasi Pengaruhnya Terhadap Kinerja Karyawan Pada PT. Bank Tabungan Negara Tbk Cabang Manado. *Jurnal Riset Ekonomi, Manajemen, Bisnis Dan Akuntansi*, 1(4), 1123-1133.
- Sugiyono. (2017). *Metode Penelitian Pendidikan Pendekatan Kuantitatif, Kualitatif, dan R&D*. Bandung: Alfabeta.
- Virick, M., J. L & W. Casper. (2007). Doing More with Less: An Analysis of Work Life Balance among Layoff Survivors. *Journal of Career Development International*. 12 (5).