Jurnal Psikologi Tabularasa
Vol.20(1) April 2025, 176-189
p-ISSN: 1693-7007 e-ISSN: 2541-013x
https://jurnal.unmer.ac.id/index.php/jpt/index

The effect of workload on employee burnout: A study of civil servants in East Kalimantan

Dampak beban kerja terhadap kelelahan karyawan: Sebuah studi tentang pegawai negeri sipil di Kalimantan Timur

Nur Khairunnisa, Dian Dwi Nur Rahmah

Mulawarman University, Jalan Kuaro, Samarinda, Indonesia

ARTICLE INFO:

Received: 2025-03-28
Revised: 2025-06-20
Accepted: 2025-08-27

Keywords:
Workload, fatigue, civil servants, government employees.

ABSTRACT

High workloads in government agencies, if not managed properly, can lead to boredom as well as physical and mental fatigue, which in turn may trigger burnout. This study aims to examine the effect of workload on burnout. The research employed a quantitative approach with 50 employees of UPTD X in East Kalimantan Province as subjects, selected through a total sampling technique. Data were analyzed using simple linear regression. The results showed a significant effect of workload on burnout with a p-value = 0.000 (p < 0.05). The contribution of workload to burnout was 69.7%. Based on these findings, UPTD X in East Kalimantan Province is advised to implement a transparent performance management system aligned with the main tasks and roles of each employee and to ensure a fair distribution of assignments across all employees..

Kata Kunci:

Workload, fatigue, civil servants, government agencies.

ABSTRACT

High workloads that affect employees in government agencies if they occur without proper handling cause boredom and physical and mental fatigue, then this condition will trigger burnout. This study aims to reveal the effect of workload on burnout. This research method uses a quantitative approach. The subjects of the study were 50 UPTD Employees X of East Kalimantan Province selected using total sampling techniques. The data analysis technique used was simple linear regression. Analysis of the data obtained using simple regression, the results of the study showed that there was a significant influence between workload on burnout with a p value of 0.000 (p <0.05). With an influence contribution of 69.7%, these results indicate that UPTD X of East Kalimantan Province should implement a transparent performance management system based on the main tasks and roles of each employee and it is hoped that UPTD X of East Kalimantan Province can pay attention to the distribution of tasks given to all employees.

How to cite: Khairunnisa, N., & Rahmah, D. D. N. (2025). The effect of workload on employee burnout: A study of civil servants in East Kalimantan. Jurnal Psikologi Tabularasa, 20(2), 176-189.
doi: http://doi.org/10.26905/jpt.v20.i2.15437

✉ *Corresponding Author:* **Nur Khairunnisa** | E-mail: nurkhairunnisa0423@gmail.com

1. INTRODUCTION

As an educational institution that provides professional health training, the Health Training Center, a government agency, requires its human resources to perform at their best in order to deliver competent training for health workers. Therefore, the agency continuously encourages its employees to work diligently in preparing for the many training programs to be conducted, ensuring the institution's good reputation is maintained (Ahiruddin & Josiah, 2020). However, the large volume of work that must be completed can easily cause employees to feel physically and mentally exhausted, leading to stress, boredom, and decreased motivation due to heavy workloads. This condition often triggers burnout (Hardiani, 2021). According to Hayati and Fitria (2018), burnout is a state in which employees experience a decline in physical and emotional energy, as well as reduced motivation.

According to Herysni and Kuntari (2024), the professionals most affected by burnout due to heavy workloads are those in human services, such as police officers, health workers, teachers, and administrative staff. The role of a State Apparatus Employee, who works for the benefit of the public, carries a high level of responsibility. Factors that contribute to stress include the pressure felt by employees, repetitive (monotonous) tasks each year, increasingly diverse workplace roles that may lead to conflict, as well as workloads and deadlines for task completion. Prolonged and unmanaged stress eventually leads to burnout (Wijaya & Wibawa, 2020). An initial survey conducted in this study, distributed online via Google Form from March 18 to March 25, 2024, received responses from 21 employees. The results showed that 95%, or 20 out of 21 employees, at UPTD X in East Kalimantan Province experienced burnout in their work.

Employees experiencing burnout display certain characteristics. They often tire easily, which affects their emotions and leads to reluctance in facing daily work routines. Common behaviors include frequent complaints and even cynical attitudes toward coworkers, superiors, and the organizational environment. Individuals with burnout tend to show decreased productivity, lack of discipline, and reduced ability to complete tasks (Alvionela & Fauziah, 2016). If burnout is not properly addressed within an organization, it can have negative consequences, as decreased enthusiasm results in suboptimal performance and reduced employee productivity, ultimately harming the organization (Putri & Laily, 2022).

Factors that influence burnout consist of individual factors including gender, age, education level, and marital status, then the second is personality factors consisting of low self-concept, type A behavior, introverted individuals, external locus of control, and flexible individuals, then the third is caused by work factors, and the fourth is caused by organizational factors which include work pressure and support. One of the factors that influence burnout in employees is caused by work pressure which explains that a large workload can cause burnout in employees, therefore this study will include the effect of workload on burnout in employees (Prasetya, 2019).

Therefore, the independent variable of this study is workload, as it has been directly linked to burnout in previous research. Putri and Laily (2022) found that workload influences burnout, explaining that each employee has a limited capacity and can only handle certain tasks according to their expertise. However, when workload includes physical, mental, and time demands—along with tasks requiring high stamina, accuracy, and concentration—the level of burnout increases due to mental and physical exhaustion from carrying out multiple responsibilities simultaneously. This is supported by Atmaja and Suana (2019), who stated that the more work employees are assigned with short completion deadlines, the greater the pressure, which in turn raises the risk of burnout. Similarly, Chandra (2024) highlighted that high workload triggered by growing job demands rapidly drain employees' energy and diminish their enthusiasm for work. If left unaddressed, this condition can lead to burnout, which is harmful both to employees and to the organization.

Previous research relevant to this study was conducted by Febryanti et al. (2023), who examined the effect of work stress on burnout among Generation Y employees at Muhammadiyah University of East Kalimantan. Their research focused on internal psychological factors (stress) within an educational institution. Meanwhile, Muizu et al. (2021) examined the impact of the work environment on burnout among civil servants (ASN) during the COVID-19 pandemic, with results limited to non-standard working conditions (working from home). However, there is still a lack of research specifically exploring the effect of workload on employee burnout in the post-pandemic period, particularly in government UPTD environments. In fact, job demands and workloads post-pandemic actually increased along with the normalization of the bureaucratic system.

Another study similar to the one the researcher will conduct is by Maharani and Budianto (2019) entitled "The Effect of Workload on Job Stress and Inpatient Nurse Performance." The difference between this research and the research that the researcher will conduct lies in the subject, in this research using inpatient nurses as subjects at BLUD RSU Kota Banjar, while the subjects that the researcher will use are employees of UPTD X East Kalimantan Province then another difference lies in the Y variable which uses two variables namely work stress and performance while, the research that the researcher will conduct uses burnout as the Y variable. Then the similarity between this research and the research that the researcher will conduct is located in the X variable which both use the workload variable.

No research has specifically examined the effect of workload on burnout among government employees in the post-pandemic context, where bureaucratic systems have returned to normal and administrative burdens have increased. In addition, no study has provided a detailed, quantitative description of burnout levels caused by workload among civil servants (ASN) at Regional Technical Implementation Units (UPTD). Addressing this gap, the present study offers several novelties: it focuses on civil servants (ASN) at the UPTD of East Kalimantan Province, a subject rarely explored in burnout research. Unlike previous studies that examined job stress, work environment, or burnout in other professional settings, this study specifically analyzes the impact of workload on burnout among government

employees. Using primary data from a survey of 21 employees—of whom 95% reported experiencing burnout—this research highlights practical relevance and underscores the urgency for organizational attention.

This study aims to fill this gap and provide deeper insight into the impact of workload on burnout in the context of government bureaucracy. The hypothesis in this study is X0 there is no effect of workload on burnout in employees of UPTD X, East Kalimantan Province and X1 that there is an effect of workload on burnout in employees of UPTD X, East Kalimantan Province.

2. METHOD

This study employs a quantitative research approach, using calculations and statistical analysis as evidence of data validity (Arikunto, 2014). It also applies both descriptive and inferential statistical designs. The population consists of employees at UPTD X of East Kalimantan Province, totaling 50 employees, comprising 25 ASN and 25 non-ASN staff. The sampling method used is non-probability sampling, a technique that does not provide equal opportunities for every member of the population to be selected as a sample (Siswandi, 2016).

The sampling technique used in this study was total sampling, where the entire population was taken as the sample (Adha et al., 2019). Thus, the study involved 50 employees of UPTD X, East Kalimantan Province. Two research instruments were used: the burnout scale developed by Maslach and Leiter (2007) and the workload scale developed by Hart and Staveland (1988). The validity of these measurement instruments was tested using data from the 50 employees of UPTD X, East Kalimantan Province.

This study used a Likert scale to collect data to provide four alternative answers for each statement: very appropriate, appropriate, inappropriate, and very inappropriate. The Likert scale has two characteristics: favorable, which refers to positive or supportive statements, and unfavorable, which refers to negative or unsupportive statements.

The validity test conducted in this study used an item validity test. According to the rule, if the calculated r is at least 0.300, the item is considered valid based on the correlation value obtained from the test. Measurement reliability was tested using the Cronbach's Alpha technique developed by Cronbach. If the reliability test shows a Cronbach's Alpha value greater than 0.700, the scale is considered reliable.

There are two types of normality tests: the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test (used if the sample is more than 50 people) and the Shapiro-Wilk test (for smaller samples). In theory, data is considered normal if the significance value is more than 0.05. In this study, the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test was used, and the rule is that if Sig or p-value < 0.05, the data is not normally distributed; conversely, if p > 0.05, the data is normally distributed. The linearity test is used to confirm whether the linear relationship between the two variables as identified in the theory is in accordance with the observation results. The rule used in the linearity test is if the

significance value of linearity is $p < 0.05$ or if the deviation from linearity is $p > 0.05$, the data is considered linear.

Simple regression analysis was used to determine the effect of independent variables on the dependent variable. Additional hypothesis testing in this study was conducted to explore and understand in more detail the relationship between aspects of the independent and dependent variables. This testing was conducted using full-model multivariate regression analysis, partial correlation, and a final model approach. Full-model multivariate analysis is a statistical technique used to determine whether there are significant differences between group means and to identify which independent variables contribute to these differences (Widarjono, 2015).

Partial regression analysis is used to measure the relationship between two variables while controlling for the influence of one or more other variables (Santoso, 2012). The rules applied in this analysis are as follows: if the calculated t-value (t-count) is greater than the t-table value at the 0.05 significance level and the p-value is less than 0.05, the relationship is positive and significant. If both criteria are met but the t-value is negative (indicated by a minus sign), the relationship is negative and significant. Conversely, if the calculated t-value is smaller than the t-table value and the p-value is greater than 0.05, the relationship is not significant.

The final model regression analysis aims to determine the highest level of significance in the influence of each aspect of the independent variable on each aspect of the dependent variable. The rule used in this analysis is if the calculated F value (F count) is greater than the F table value at a significance level of 0.05 and the p value is less than 0.05, then the relationship is considered significant. Conversely, if the calculated F value is smaller than the F table value and the p value is greater than 0.05, then the relationship is not significant (Gunawan, 2013).

3. RESULTS

This study involved 50 respondents to test the measuring instrument. The results showed that of the 20 items tested, 20 were valid on the burnout instrument with a Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficient of 0.931. For the workload variable, of the 24 items tested, 21 were declared valid with a Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficient of 0.912. After the data were collected, descriptive data analysis was conducted to determine the distribution of the research variable categories. The descriptive statistical results are as follows.

Table 1 Empirical Average and Hypothetical Average

Variables	Empirical Average	Empirical Elementary School	Hypothetical Average	Hypothetical SD	Status
Burnout	60.08	10,658	50	10	Tall
Workload	67.60	8,626	60	12	Tall

Table 1 shows the general distribution of research subject data for UPTD X Employees of East Kalimantan Province. Based on the measurement results using the burnout scale, the empirical average was 60.08, which is greater than the hypothetical average of 50.08. with high status. These results indicate that the subjects in this study experienced high levels of fatigue.

Table 2 Fatigue Categorization Score Scale

Trend Interval	Score	Category	F	Percentage
X ≥ 65 + 1.5(16)	≥ 65	Very high	21	42%
55+ 0.5(16) < X < 65+ 1.5(16)	55-65	Tall	12	24%
45- 0.5(16) < X < 54+ 0.5(16)	45-54	At the moment	12	24%
35- 1.5(16) < X < 44- 0.5(16)	35-44	Low	5	10%
X ≤ 35- 1.5(16)	≤ 35	Very Low	0	0%

Based on the categorization in the table above, the burnout scale scores can be seen. It is known that 21 people, or approximately 42%, experienced very high burnout, 12 people, or approximately 24%, experienced high burnout, 12 people, or approximately 24%, experienced moderate burnout, and 5 people, or approximately 10%, experienced low burnout.

Table 3. Workload Categorization Score Scale

Trend Interval	Score	Category	F	Percentage
X ≥ 78 + 1.5(15)	≥ 78	Very high	4	8%
66+ 0.5(15) < X < 78+ 1.5(15)	66-78	Tall	30	60%
54- 0.5(15) < X < 65+ 0.5(15)	54-65	At the moment	13	26%
53- 1.5(15) < X < 67- 0.5(15)	53-67	Low	3	6%
X ≤ 52- 1.5(15)	≤ 53	Very Low	0	0%

Based on the categorization in Table 3, the overall workload scale scores can be seen. It is known that 4 research subjects, or approximately 8%, had a very high workload, 30 people, or approximately 60%, had a high workload, 13 people, or approximately 26%, and 3 people, or approximately 6%, had a low workload.

Table 4. Normality Assumption Test Results

Variables	Kolmogorov-Smirnov	P	Information
Burnout	0.100	0.200	Normal
Workload	0.112	0.156	Normal

1) The results of the normality assumption test for the distribution of the burnout variable produced a Z value of 0.100 and p = 0.200 (p>0.05). The results of the rule-based test indicate that the distribution of burnout items is normal.

2) The results of the normality assumption test for the distribution of workload variables produced a Z value of 0.112 and p = 0.156 (p>0.05). The results of the rule-based test indicate that the distribution of workload items is normal.

Table 5. Simple Regression Analysis Results

Variables	F Count	Table F	R2	P
Fatigue - Workload	110, 178	4.05	0.697	0.000

Based on the analysis that has been conducted, a p value of 0.000 (p < 0.05) was found, which means that workload has an effect on burnout. Workload is able to influence burnout of UPTD X employees in East Kalimantan Province by 69.7%.

Table 6. Full Model Multivariate Analysis Test Results

Aspect	F Count	Table F	R2	P
Physical demands (X1), effort (X2), mental demands (X3), time demands (X4), frustration (X5), performance (X6) versus fatigue (Y1)	17,642	4.05	0.697	0.000
Cynicism (Y2)	18,894	4.05	0.725	0.000
Inefficiency (Y3)	4,894	4.05	0.406	0.001

Aspects of the independent variables, namely physical demands (X1), effort (X2), mental demands (X3), time demands (X4), frustration (X5), and performance (X6) have a significant influence on aspects of the dependent variable, namely fatigue (Y1), as evidenced by the R2 value = 0.711 (71.1 percent), F count 17.642 > 4.05 (f count > f table) and p value = 0.000 (p < 0.05).

The independent variable aspect also influences the cynicism aspect (Y2) as indicated by the R2 value = 0.725 (72.5 percent), F count = 18.894 > 4.05 (f count > f table), and p value = 0.000 (p < 0.05). Furthermore, the inefficiency aspect (Y3) has a significant influence as evidenced by the R2 value = 0.406 (40.6 percent), F count 4.894 > 4.05 (f count > f table), and p value = 0.001 (p < 0.05).

Table 7. Partial Regression Analysis Test Results for Fatigue Aspect Analysis Test (Y1)

Aspect	Beta	Number of T	T-table	P
Physical Demands (X1)	0.193	1,076	2.011	0.288
Effort (X2)	0.013	0.104	2.011	0.918
Mental Demand (X3)	0.183	1,210	2.011	0.233
Time Request (X4)	0.153	1,402	2.011	0.168
Frustration (X5)	0.376	2,284	**2.011**	**0.027**
Performance (X6)	0.076	0.678	2.011	0.502

It can be seen that the physical demands aspect (X1) on the fatigue aspect (Y1) produces a beta coefficient value (β) = 0.193, t count 1.076 < t table 2.011 and p value = 0.288 (p > 0.05) which means it does not have a significant influence. The effort aspect (X2) on the fatigue aspect (Y1) produces a beta coefficient value (β) = 0.013, t count 0.104 < t table 2.011 and p value = 0.918 (p > 0.05) which means it does not have a significant influence. The mental demands aspect (X3) on the fatigue aspect (Y1) produces a beta coefficient value (β) = 0.183, t count 1.210 < t table 2.011 and p value = 0.233 (p > 0.05) which means it does not have a significant influence.

The time demand aspect (X4) on the fatigue aspect (Y1) produces a value of 0.153, t count 1.402 < t table 2.011 and p value = 0.168 (p > 0.05) which means it does not have a significant influence. The frustration aspect (X5) on the fatigue aspect (Y1) produces a beta coefficient value (β) = 0.376, t count 2.284 > t table 2.011 and p value = 0.027 (p < 0.05) which means it has a positive and significant influence. The performance aspect (X6) on the fatigue aspect (Y1) produces a beta coefficient value (β) = 0.076, t count 0.678 < t table 2.011 and p value = 0.05 (p > 0.502) which means it does not have a significant influence. Based on the regression analysis test, the results obtained show that the frustration aspect (X5) on the fatigue aspect (Y1) has a significant influence, which is presented in the results of the final model regression analysis in the following table:

Table 8. Final Model Regression Analysis Test Results for Fatigue

Source of Variation	F Count	Table F	R2	P
Regression X (X5, X3)	49,116	4.05	0.676 0.000	

The frustration aspect (X5) and the mental demand aspect (X3) have the highest significant influence compared to other independent variable aspects on fatigue (Y1) in UPTD X Employees of East Kalimantan Province. This is evidenced by the value of R2 = 0.676 (67.6 percent), F count = 49.116 > 4.05 (F count > F table), p = 0.000 (p < 0.05). The results of the partial analysis with the cynicism aspect (Y2) are presented in the table below:

Table 9. Partial Regression Analysis Test Results for Cynicism Aspect Analysis Test (Y2)

Aspect	Beta	Number of T	T-table	P
Physical Demands (X1)	**0.365**	**2,081**	**2.011 0.043**	
Effort (X2)	-0.012	-0.099	2.011 0.922	
Mental Demand (X3)	0.028	0.189	2.011 0.851	
Time Request (X4)	0.041	0.382	2.011 0.705	
Frustration (X5)	0.473	2,941	**2,011 0.005**	
Performance (X6)	0.028	0.289	2.011 0.774	

The physical demands aspect (X1) on the cynicism aspect (Y2) produces a beta coefficient value (β) = 0.365, t count 2.081 > t table 2.011, and p value = 0.043 (p < 0.05), which means

it has a positive and significant influence. The effort aspect (X2) on the cynicism aspect (Y2) produces a beta coefficient value (β) = -0.012, t count -0.099 < t table 2.011, and p value = 0.922 (p > 0.05), which means it does not have a significant influence. The mental demands aspect (X3) on the cynicism aspect (Y2) produces a beta coefficient value (β) = 0.028, t count 0.189 < t table 2.011 and p value = 0.851 (p > 0.05) which means it does not have a significant influence.

The time demands aspect (X4) on the cynicism aspect (Y2) produces a value of 0.041, t count 0.382 < t table 2.011, and p value = 0.705 (p > 0.05), which means it does not have a significant influence. The frustration aspect (X5) on the cynicism aspect (Y2) produces a beta coefficient value (β) = 0.473, t count 2.941 > t table 2.011, and p value = 0.005 (p < 0.05), which means it has a positive and significant influence. The performance aspect (X6) on the cynicism aspect (Y2) produces a beta coefficient value (β) = 0.028, t count 0.289 < t table 2.011, and p value = 0.774 (p > 0.05) which means there is no significant influence. Based on the partial analysis test, the results show that the physical demands aspect (X1) and the frustration aspect (X5) on the cynicism aspect (Y2) have a significant influence, which is presented in the final model regression analysis in the table below.

Table 10. Final Model Regression Analysis Test Results for Cynicism Aspect (Y2)

Source of Variation	F Count	Table F	R2	P
Regression X (X5, X1)	61,187	4.05	0.723 0.000	

Based on the table, only the frustration aspect (X5) and the physical demands aspect (X1) have the highest significant influence compared to other variable aspects on the cynicism aspect (Y2) in UPTD X employees of East Kalimantan Province. This is proven by the value of R2 = 0.723 (72.3 percent), F count = 61.187 > 4.05 (F count > F table), p = 0.000 (p < 0.05). The results of the partial analysis with the inefficiency aspect (Y3) are presented in the table below:

Table 11. Partial Regression Analysis Test Results for Inefficiency Aspect Analysis Test (Y3)

Aspect	Beta	Number of T	T-table	P
Physical Demands (X1)	0.273	1,059	2,011 1,296	
Effort (X2)	-0.129	-0.745	2.011 0.460	
Mental Demand (X3)	-0.267	-1,231	2.011 0.225	
Time Request (X4)	0.082	0.522	2.011 0.604	
Frustration (X5)	0.651	2,754	**2.011 0.009**	
Performance (X6)	-0.059	-0.418	2.011 0.678	

The physical demand aspect (X1) on the inefficiency aspect (Y3) produces a beta coefficient value (β) = 0.273, t count 1.059 > t table 2.011, and p value = 1.296 (p > 0.05), which means

it does not have a significant influence. The business aspect (X2) on the inefficiency aspect (Y3) produces a beta coefficient value (β) = -0.129, t count -0.745 < t table 2.011, and p value = 0.460 (p > 0.05), which means it does not have a significant influence. The mental demand aspect (X3) on the inefficiency aspect (Y3) produces a beta coefficient value (β) = -0.267, t count -1.231 < t table 2.011 and p value = 0.225 (p > 0.05) which means it does not have a significant influence.

The time demand aspect (X4) on the inefficiency aspect (Y3) produces a value of 0.082, t count 0.522 < t table 2.011, and p value = 0.604 (p > 0.05), which means it does not have a significant influence. The frustration aspect (X5) on the inefficiency aspect (Y3) produces a beta coefficient value (β) = 0.651, t count 2.754 > t table 2.011, and p value = 0.009 (p < 0.05), which means it has a positive and significant influence. The performance aspect (X6) on the inefficiency aspect (Y3) produces a beta coefficient value (β) = -0.059, t count -0.418 < t table 2.011, and p value = 0.678 (p > 0.05) which means it does not have a significant influence. Based on the partial analysis test, the results show that the frustration aspect (X5) on the inefficiency aspect (Y3) has a significant influence, which is presented in the final model regression analysis in the table below:

Table 12. Final Model Regression Analysis Test Results for Inefficiency Aspect (Y3)

Source of Variation	F Count	Table F	R2	P
Regression X (X5)	27,863	4.05	0.367	0.000

Only the frustration aspect (X5) has the highest significant influence compared to other independent variable aspects on the inefficiency aspect (Y3) on UPTD X Employees of East Kalimantan Province. This is proven by the value of R2 = 0.367 (36.7 percent), F count = 27.863 > 4.05 (F count > F table), p = 0.000 (p < 0.05).

4. DISCUSSION

This study aims to examine the effect of workload on work fatigue (burnout) among UPTD X employees in East Kalimantan Province. The results of the data analysis show that workload has a significant effect on work fatigue. Specifically, the findings indicate that the higher the workload, the greater the level of burnout experienced by employees at UPTD X. The coefficient of determination (R^2) of 69.7% demonstrates that variations in work fatigue can be explained by workload.

The findings of this study are in line with the factors that influence burnout explained by Prasetya (2019) which shows the existence of individual factors consisting of gender, age, education level, marital status, then there are personality factors that include low self-concept, type A behavior, introverted individuals, locus of control, flexible individuals, then there are job factors, and finally there are organizational factors that discuss work pressure where

this indirectly includes excessive workload on employees which can make employees feel stressed in doing their work for a long time so that it will give rise to feelings of burnout. These burnout factors are in accordance with the findings of this study which reveal the influence of workload on burnout.

This is also supported by research conducted by Fatmawati and Doni (2018) which also revealed that if employees have experienced a high level of burnout, then unconsciously they will ignore their needs and desires as individuals, because all they do is focus on completing their work so that if they are not optimal in fulfilling the task, they will feel guilty and stressed which will cause feelings of burnout.

Employees experiencing high levels of burnout tend to show behavioral changes, such as withdrawing from their work, which leads to a decline in their ability to perform tasks (Wardani & Amalia, 2021). Luthans (2012) further explains that burnout causes employees to feel dissatisfied with their work, resulting in decreased creativity and innovation, which in turn lowers productivity and prevents optimal achievement of organizational goals.

Employees, by nature, must always be prepared to face various demands, including deadlines, role expectations, workplace conflicts, and especially workload, which is the most significant and unavoidable demand. These persistent challenges increase the likelihood of work fatigue (burnout) among employees (Sagala & Ardi, 2017). Research by Parashakti and Ekhsan (2022) also shows that workloads contributing to employee burnout reduce employees' ability to perform optimally.

Workload arises from the interaction between various job demands and the skills employees possess, which are shaped by their perception of the tasks that must be completed. This situation worsens when compounded by limited human resources (Sofiana et al., 2020). A heavy workload, combined with insufficient staffing, leads to both physical and psychological fatigue, making employees more prone to burnout (Nataria et al., 2018). Consistent with this, Sundari and Meria (2022) found that high workloads can drain employees' physical and emotional energy, diminish their enthusiasm for work, and create feelings of incapability in completing tasks. This supports the theory that workload significantly influences the onset of burnout.

This study also examines the relationship between workload and burnout variables through partial analysis. The findings show that frustration has a partial relationship with fatigue. Employees facing workloads that exceed their capacity tend to feel uncomfortable with their jobs and may believe they are unable to complete tasks effectively, which can trigger feelings of hopelessness. Boredom caused by continuously increasing workloads further worsens this condition. Such pressure creates a cycle of intense physical and emotional exhaustion, ultimately draining employees of their sense of accomplishment (Hart & Staveland, 1988).

In terms of physical demands, the analysis reveals a relationship between cynicism and physical activity. The varying physical demands of work can cause boredom and fatigue.

When physical exhaustion is compounded by emotional stress, employees often develop cynical attitudes toward their jobs, such as reduced attention to tasks and colleagues, as well as more frequent complaints. This combination of physical and emotional strain creates a negative cycle that undermines the quality of workplace relationships (Hart & Staveland, 1988).

The frustration aspect is also linked to cynicism. The discomfort and stress employees experience, such as frustration in completing tasks, manifest as indifference toward their work, serving as a form of self-protection from worsening emotional exhaustion. This often results in negative behaviors, including decreased enthusiasm and a tendency to complain frequently (Hart & Staveland, 1988).

Frustration is also related to inefficiency. Excessive pressure from increasing work intensity and tasks that exceed employees' responsibilities or abilities can create feelings of despair, as employees perceive their work as unmanageable. This condition undermines self-confidence, leading employees to feel that their efforts are disproportionate to the results achieved. Over time, they become trapped in a deep sense of failure, as their goals seem increasingly out of reach (Hart & Staveland, 1988).

Based on the explanation above, it can be concluded that workload affects burnout among UPTD X employees in East Kalimantan Province. The findings also show that burnout levels among these employees tend to be high, in line with their heavy workloads. This study has limitations, particularly because the scale used for the workload variable (X) was less representative in capturing the phenomenon among the subjects. This limitation should be considered for future research, which is recommended to adopt more relevant theories—especially regarding workload—that can be better aligned with the phenomena and conditions faced by UPTD X employees, particularly those working in the field of health training.

5. CONCLUSION

Based on the research conducted, it was found that workload has a significant influence on burnout among UPTD X employees in East Kalimantan Province. The high level of burnout identified is closely related to frustration and inefficiency, as revealed in the partial analysis. This finding shows that the heavier the workload perceived by employees, the greater the tendency to experience emotional exhaustion, reduced sense of personal accomplishment, and feelings of ineffectiveness in completing tasks—all of which contribute to burnout.

If UPTD X in East Kalimantan Province does not implement a systematic job analysis based on each employee's performance targets (SKP), it may lead to a lack of alignment between job descriptions and actual work activities. Such misalignment has the potential to create task ambiguity and increase the likelihood of employees being assigned duties outside their formal roles, functions, and responsibilities. These conditions not only decrease work effectiveness and efficiency but also pose risks to accountability and the overall institutional performance.

REFERENCES

Adha, S., Wandi., & Susanto, Y., (2019). The Influence of Job Satisfaction on Employee Performance at the Department of Industry, Trade and Energy and Mineral Resources of Pandeglang Regency. Journal of Vocational Economics, 2(1), 61-72.

Ahiruddin & Josiah, T. (2020). The relationship between the work environment and the performance of employees at the Lampung Province Health Training Center (Bapelkes). Saburai Independent Management Journal, 4(1), 11-19.

Alam, R. (2022). Burnout: Theory, Organizational Behavior, Psychology, Applications, and Research. Kampus Publisher

Avionela, F., & Fauziah, N. (2016). The Relationship Between Emotional Intelligence and Burnout in Certified Teachers at State Senior High Schools in Bojonegoro District. Empathy Journal, 5(4), 687-693.https://doi.org/10.14710/empati.2016.15440

Arikunto, S. (2014). Research Procedures: A Practical Approach. PT Rineka Cipta

Assa, AF (2022). The impact of workload and work environment on burnout syndrome in employees of PT. Sinergi Integra Services. MEA Scientific Journal, 6(3), 436-451. https://doi.org/10.31955/mea.v6i3.2454

Christianty, TOV, & Widhianingtanti, LC (2016). Burnout as viewed from the perspective of employee engagement. Psikodimensia, 15(2), 351-373.https://doi.org/10.24167/psiko.v15i2.996

Ekhsan, M., & Hidayati, W. (2022). The Role of Burnout as a Mediator in the Effect of Job Stress on Employee Performance. National Seminar on Research and Community Service, 520-526.https://journal.irpi.or.id/index.php/sentimas/article/view/408

Hardiani, WAA (2021). The Effect of Work-Family Conflict and Workload on Burnout and Its Impact on Cyberloafing. Journal of Management Vision, 7(1), 14-30. https://doi.org/10.56910/jvm.v7i1.149

Hariyoko, Y., Jehaut. YD, & Susiantoro, A. (2021). Effectiveness of Public Health Services by Community Health Centers in Manggarai Regency. Journal of Good Governance, 17(2), 17178.https://doi.org/10.32834/gg.v17i2.346

Hartanti, ID, Supriyanto, S., & Ulfatin, N. (2018). Burnout Management in Improving the Performance of School Administrative Staff. Journal of Educational Administration and Management, 1(3), 1-11.http://dx.doi.org/10.17977/um027v1i32018p347

Hayati, I., & Fitria, S. (2018). The effect of burnout on employee performance at BMT El-Munawar Medan. Journal of Religion and Islamic Education, 10(1), 50-65.https://doi.org/10.30596

Hart, SG, & Staveland, LE (1988). Development of the NASA-TLX Task Load Index: Empirical and Theoretical Research Results. Elsevier Science Publisher

Luthans, F. (2012). Organizational Behavior. Andi

Maharani, R., & Budianto, A. (2019). The effect of workload on job stress and performance of inpatient nurses. Journal of Management, 3(2), 327-332. Accessed https://jurnal.unigal.ac.id/managementreview/article/view/2614

Masduki, MP (2021). The Relationship Between Worker Demographic Characteristics, Mental Workload, and Leadership Style on Burnout in Administrative Staff of the Faculty of Public Health, Diponegoro University. Journal of Public Health, 9(6), 784-792.https://doi.org/10.14710/jkm.v9i6.31435

Maslach, C., & Leiter, M. (2007). Encyclopedia of stress, second edition. Elsevier Inc.

Nataria. O., Dedi, S., & Sabarofek, MS (2018). The Effect of Job Stress and Workload on the Performance of Employees at the Manokwari Department of Industry, Trade, Cooperatives, and Micro, Small, and Medium Enterprises. Horizon Business Management Journal. 1(1), 67-83.https://doi.org/10.30862/cm-bj.v1i1.5

Parashakti, RD, & Ekhsan, M. (2022). The Role of Burnout as a Mediator in the Effect of Job Stress on Employee Performance. Journal of Economics & Islamic Economics, 5(1), 365-373.https://doi.org/10.36778/jesya.v5i1.609

Prasetya, KBT (2019). Burnout Based on Occupational Profession and Demographic Factors in Female Workers. Journal of Management, 2(2), 153-163.https://repository.unja.ac.id/63145/9.pdf

Puspita, A., & Kusumaputri, ES (2021). The Role of Grit on Burnout with Gender Differences as a Moderator in Civil Servants. Journal of Integrative Psychology. 9(2), 175-193.https://doi.org/10.14421/jpsi.v9i2.2255

Putri, JDUK & Laily, N. (2022). The influence of workload and work environment on employee performance through burnout as an intervening variable in a study of the Surabaya City Social Services Department. Journal of Management Science and Research, 11(4), 1-12. https://jurnalmahasiswa.stiesia.ac.id/index.php/jirm/article/view/449

Sagala, EJ, & Ardi, RP (2017). The Influence of Job Stress on Employee Performance: A Case Study of Lecturers at Telkom University. Management E-Proceedings, 4(1), 221-228.https://openlibrarypublications.telkomuniversity.ac.id/index.php/manajemen/artikel/tampilan/4170

Siswadhi, F. (2016). Analysis of the Influence of Service Quality and Employee Performance of the Kerinci Regency National Defense Agency on Public Satisfaction. Jurnal Manfaat, 1(3), 177-183.http://dx.doi.org/10.22216/jbe.v1i3.720

Sofiana, E., Wahyuarini, T., & Novieyana, S. (2020). The Effect of Workload and Job Stress on the Performance of Teaching Staff at Pontianak State Polytechnic. Inovbiz: Journal of Business Innovation, 8(1), 1-15.https://doi.org/10.35314/inovbiz.v8i1.1128

Sundari, PRS, & Meria, L. (2022). The Effect of Workload Through Burnout and Job Satisfaction on Turnover Intention. Adi Bisnis Digital Interdisciplinary Journal, 3(2), 14-29.https://doi.org/10.34306/abdi.v3i2.785

Wardani, LMI & Amalia, NW (2021). Psychological Capital, Job Insecurity, and Burnout. Nem Publisher

Wulandari, T., & Fajrah, S. (2021). The Relationship between Health Worker Training and Officer Performance at Community Health Centers. Scientific Journal of Public Health, 21(2) 56-61. Retrieved fromhttps://journal.stik-ij.ac.id/index.php/kesmas/article/view/141