Jurnal Ekonomi
Volume 13 , Number 02, 2024, DOI 10.54209/ekonomi.v13i02
ESSN 2721-9879 (Online)
https://ejournal.seaninstitute.or.id/index.php/Ekonomi

The Influence Of Workload, Physical Work Environment, And Job Burnout On The Performance Of Public High School Teachers In Palembang City

Naurah Nazhifah[1], Zunaidah[2], Yos Karimudin[3], M. Ichsan Hadjri[4], Wita Farla WK[5]
Program Studi Ilmu Manajemen Konsentrasi Manajemen SDM, Fakultas Ekonomi, Universitas Sriwijaya, Palembang, Indonesia, Jalan Srijaya Negara, Bukit Lama, Kec. Ilir Barat I, Kota Palembang, Sumatera Selatan[1,2,3,4,5]

Article Info
Keywords:
Workload
Physical Work Environment
Job Burnout
Performance
Teachers

ABSTRACT
This study aims to empirically prove and analyze various factors affecting the performance of public high school teachers in Palembang. It investigates the impact of workload, the influence of the physical work environment, and the effects of job burnout on teacher performance. Additionally, the study assesses the combined effect of these factors on teacher performance. By doing so, the research seeks to provide a comprehensive understanding of how workload, physical work environment, and job burnout contribute to the performance of public high school teachers in Palembang.The research employed a quantitative approach, utilizing numerical data and measurements. Conducted at public high schools in Palembang, the study focused on public high school teachers (PNS) as its subjects. It aimed to examine the impact of workload, physical work environment, and burnout on teacher performance. The population consisted of public high school teachers in Palembang, with a sample of 279 teachers selected through proportional random sampling. Data collection was carried out using closed questionnaires directly filled out by the teachers; the workload, physical work environment, and burnout questionnaires were completed by the teachers, while the performance questionnaires were filled out by the vice principals. These questionnaires were based on theoretical foundations and relevant dimensions, tailored to meet the research objectives. Data analysis was performed using SPSS software, release 22. Based on the analysis, several conclusions have been drawn. Firstly, workload has a positive but not significant impact on teacher performance. Secondly, the physical work environment has a positive and significant influence on teacher performance. Thirdly, job burnout negatively and significantly affects teacher performance. Lastly, workload, physical work environment, and job burnout collectively have a simultaneous and significant effect on teacher performance. These findings highlight the importance of managing workload and enhancing the physical work environment to improve teacher performance while addressing job burnout to prevent its negative impact.

Corresponding Author:
Naurah Nazhifah
Universitas Sriwijaya
Jalan Srijaya Negara, Bukit Lama, Kec. Ilir Barat I, Kota Palembang, Sumatera Selatan
01032682024003@student.unsri.ac.id

Jurnal Ekonomi
Volume 13 , Number 02, 2024, DOI 10.54209/ekonomi.v13i02
ESSN 2721-9879 (Online)
https://ejournal.seaninstitute.or.id/index.php/Ekonomi

INTRODUCTION

Human resources are one of the essential factors needed to carry out all activities within an organization. These human resources are assigned specific activities in their respective fields to achieve the organization's goals, which will not be realized if the human resources within the organization do not play an active role (Hasibuan, 2016). In the field of education, teachers are human resources who contribute by delivering material to students. Additionally, teachers play a role in enhancing the quality of human resources in education, where "teachers are a crucial component in determining the success of educational activities" (Yohanita, 2018).

Teacher performance is highly demanded to be excellent because good teacher performance reflects a teacher's professional quality. Conversely, poor performance indicates a teacher's failure to respect their profession (Siregar, 2023). The quality of a teacher's work can be seen in their success in performing their duties or in comparing their achievements with performance standards and expectations. This is based on the primary output measure of an organization, the efficiency of using scarce resources, member satisfaction, and the organization's adaptability or responsiveness to changes (Waryani, 2021). Certainly, teachers must have commitment and professionalism to perform their duties to improve the quality of teaching, thus enhancing their performance (Sunyoto et al., 2019).

One factor that influences the level of performance is workload (Soeltan et al., 2021). According to Hart, workload is the interaction between workers and their job, work environment, skills, behavior, and perceptions (Murni in Haryono et al., 2019). Haryono (2019) adds that workload is the intensity of work that becomes a source of stress for workers. Sari & Hastono (2022) state that workload can be divided into two categories: excessive workload and below-average workload. Both types of workload can cause teachers to experience burnout (Fahamsyah, 2017).

In Indonesia, according to the Ministry of National Education Regulation No. 39 of 2009, Article 1, Paragraph 1, the workload for teachers is at least 24 hours. Both certified and uncertified teachers must work 24 hours, where certified teachers fulfill this to receive a salary, while uncertified teachers do so to receive an allowance (Yuliani et al., 2022). The workload assigned to teachers includes core and additional tasks. The core tasks include "planning lessons, delivering lessons, assessing learning outcomes, guiding and training students, and performing additional duties related to the core tasks according to the teacher's workload" (Hasibuan & Munasib, 2020). Teachers are expected to perform these tasks well. The fulfillment of the 24-hour teaching requirement is stated in the Ministry of National Education Regulation No. 15 of 2018, where teachers are required to engage in core activities and additional tasks if their teaching hours are less than 24 hours. At the high school level, the number of teaching hours is 18 hours per week (24 × 45 ÷ 60), with the remaining 19.5 hours per week allocated for other core duties and functions. The remaining working hours complete the 37.5 hours per week stipulated in the Ministry of National Education Regulation No. 15 of 2005 on Basic Education Service Standards (SPM) in districts/cities, Article 2, Paragraph 2, Point b, Clause 5, stating that "each teacher must

Jurnal Ekonomi
Volume 13 , Number 02, 2024, DOI 10.54209/ekonomi.v13i02
ESSN 2721-9879 (Online)
https://ejournal.seaninstitute.or.id/index.php/Ekonomi

work 37.5 hours per week at an educational unit, including planning lessons, delivering lessons, assessing learning outcomes, guiding and training students, and performing additional duties."

The detailed allocation of hours is specified in the task distribution decree issued by the principal, ensuring each teacher receives teaching hours according to the number of class groups. If after task distribution, a teacher has less than 24 hours, they can make up for it by performing additional duties (e.g., class advisor, project organizer) or obtaining a task decree at another school in need of their services. Additionally, teachers with families allocate time at home to balance household management and work responsibilities, such as grading exams and preparing lesson plans for the learning process. In practice, it is found that some teachers exceed the required working hours, where the 24-hour teaching requirement can extend due to the preparation of lesson plans and grading done outside of working hours. Teachers also feel that the working hours are too long, breaks are inadequate (sometimes used for meetings), and the work pace is demanding. Teachers also have to work on school tasks at home due to insufficient working hours.

The work environment also influences an individual's performance (Hutagalung, 2022). According to Akob et al. (2020), the work environment encompasses all the equipment, surroundings, work methods, and influences on individual or group work. The workplace environment must meet the needs of teachers in performing their duties. Mangkunegara (2017) states that the work environment includes all physical, psychological, and regulatory aspects that affect job satisfaction and productivity. A good work environment positively impacts teachers, making them satisfied with their work and achieving productivity. Jobs prone to burnout include healthcare workers, teachers, and lecturers due to the required human interaction and emotional challenges (Rudiyanto & Hanifah, 2021). The numerous activities inside and outside the classroom required of teachers can negatively impact, leading to fatigue, reduced motivation to participate in the learning process, and burnout (Agustin et al., 2020). This situation is characterized by severe fatigue and a lack of enthusiasm for teaching activities (Fatmawati, 2018). Burnout symptoms include physical exhaustion, psychological fatigue, intellectual fatigue, and low motivation (Agustin et al., 2020). Burnout is defined as the conflict of different role demands and perceived exhaustion due to many tasks in a short time or multidimensional challenges, manifesting as emotional exhaustion, cynicism, and reduced productivity (Maslach et al., 1996).

According to Maslach et al. (1996), the workload and time pressure to complete tasks are strongly associated with burnout, particularly emotional exhaustion. Additionally, workload relates to worker anxiety and frustration from numerous tasks, causing workers to neglect some job aspects and their lives (Grobelna, 2021). Wen et al. (2020) add that workers facing excessive tasks experience emotional exhaustion. The fatigue from workload also affects teacher performance when continuous tasks force teachers to balance work inside and outside school. Teachers feel their energy gradually depletes due to work demands and excessive tasks. Workload can occur in three conditions: equal to standards, too high, and too low or below capacity (Rolos et al., 2018). Low workload leads to

Jurnal Ekonomi
Volume 13 , Number 02, 2024, DOI 10.54209/ekonomi.v13i02
ESSN 2721-9879 (Online)
https://ejournal.seaninstitute.or.id/index.php/Ekonomi

inefficiency due to many workers, while high workload with few workers causes physical and psychological fatigue (Herminingsih & Kurniasih, 2018).

Several studies show the influence of variables. Syamsu et al. (2019) found that workload positively and significantly affects burnout. In contrast, Rizqiansyah et al. (2017) found that workload does not affect burnout. Dewi (2018) found a relationship between the work environment (temperature) and work fatigue, but not with noise. Badri (2020) found a significant relationship between the physical work environment and work stress and between the non-physical work environment and work stress. Priantoro (2018) found a relationship between workload and work environment and burnout. Khasanah & Saputra (2023) found that workload and burnout significantly affect performance, with workload negatively impacting performance if high and positively if low. Similarly, high burnout reduces performance, while low burnout improves it. Wangi et al. (2020) found that workload does not negatively and significantly affect performance, but the work environment positively and significantly impacts performance. Maini & Tanno (2021) found that workload positively but insignificantly affects performance. Hustia (2020) found that the work environment significantly affects performance. Ahmad et al. (2019) found that job stress and workload partially do not significantly affect performance. Siahaan & Bahri (2019) found that the work environment positively but insignificantly impacts performance.

This study aims to empirically prove and analyze several factors influencing the performance of public high school teachers (PNS) in Palembang City. Firstly, the study will evaluate the impact of workload on teacher performance. Secondly, it will analyze how the physical work environment affects teacher performance. Thirdly, the study aims to identify the influence of job burnout on teacher performance. Finally, it will comprehensively examine the combined effect of workload, physical work environment, and job burnout on the performance of public high school teachers in Palembang City. Through an empirical approach, this study is expected to provide comprehensive evidence on significant factors determining teacher performance, serving as a foundation for policy-making to enhance the quality of education in Palembang.

METHOD

The type of research employed is a quantitative approach based on numerical data and measurements. This study was conducted at high schools in Palembang, focusing on public high school teachers (PNS) as the research subjects. Additionally, the study examines the impact of workload, physical work environment, and burnout on teacher performance. The population of this study consists of public high school teachers in Palembang. A sample of 279 teachers was selected using proportional random sampling.

Data collection was carried out through closed questionnaires filled out directly by the teachers using provided forms (questionnaires on workload, physical work environment, and burnout were completed by the teachers, while performance questionnaires were filled out by the vice principals). These questionnaires were developed based on theoretical foundations and relevant dimensions, tailored to meet the research objectives. Data analysis

Jurnal Ekonomi
Volume 13 , Number 02, 2024, DOI 10.54209/ekonomi.v13i02
ESSN 2721-9879 (Online)
https://ejournal.seaninstitute.or.id/index.php/Ekonomi

techniques in this study involve using SPSS (Statistical Program for Social Science) software, release 22.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Normality Test

To determine whether the variables used are normally distributed, a normality test is performed. The normality test is assessed using the Kolmogorov-Smirnov value, comparing the obtained probability with a significance level of α = 0.05. Hypotheses:

- H0: The population data is normally distributed.
- H1: The population data is not normally distributed.

Decision basis based on probability:

- If the p-value (probability) is > 0.05, the data is normally distributed.
- If the p-value (probability) is < 0.05, the data is not normally distributed.

Table 1. Normality Test

One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test

		Unstandardized Residual
N		279
Normal Parameters[a,b]	Mean	.0000000
	Std. Deviation	6.31386248
Most Extreme Differences	Absolute	.054
	Positive	.048
	Negative	-.054
Test Statistic		.054
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)		.051[c]

a. Test distribution is Normal.
b. Calculated from data.
c. Lilliefors Significance Correction.

Source: SPSS 22 Output, 2024

Based on Table 1, the obtained significance value (Asymp. Sig. 2-tailed) is 0.051. According to the Kolmogorov-Smirnov normality test, it can be concluded that the data is normally distributed because 0.051 > 0.05. Thus, the data meets the normality requirement for the regression model.

Multicollinearity Test

This test is conducted to determine whether there is a correlation among the independent variables. Multicollinearity is assessed using the tolerance value and its inverse, the variance inflation factor (VIF). The decision criteria are:

If the tolerance value is < 0.1 and the VIF value is > 10, multicollinearity occurs.
If the tolerance value is > 0.1 and the VIF value is < 10, multicollinearity does not occur.

Jurnal Ekonomi
Volume 13 , Number 02, 2024, DOI 10.54209/ekonomi.v13i02
ESSN 2721-9879 (Online)
https://ejournal.seaninstitute.or.id/index.php/Ekonomi

Table 2. Multicollinearity Test

Model	Collinearity Statistics	
	Tolerance	VIF
Workload (x_1)	.998	1.002
Physical Work Environment (x_2)	.813	1.230
Job Burnout(x_3)	.812	1.231

Source: SPSS 22 Output, 2024

Based on Table 2:

a. For workload (x_1), the tolerance value is 0.998 > 0.1, and the VIF value is 1.002 < 10, indicating no multicollinearity among the independent variables.
b. For physical work environment (x_2), the tolerance value is 0.813 > 0.1, and the VIF value is 1.230 < 10, indicating no multicollinearity among the independent variables.
c. For job burnout (x_3), the tolerance value is 0.812 > 0.1, and the VIF value is 1.231 < 10, indicating no multicollinearity among the independent variables.

Heteroscedasticity Test

This test is conducted to determine whether there is a variance inequality in the residuals (Ghozali, 2018). This is observed using the Glejser test, which regresses the absolute residuals to identify if the regression model indicates heteroscedasticity. Decision criteria for the Glejser test:

If the significance value is > 0.05, the data does not indicate heteroscedasticity.

If the significance value is < 0.05, the data indicates heteroscedasticity.

Table 3. Heteroscedasticity Test

Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	1.136	.685		1.658	.098
	Workload	-.005	.010	-.031	-.509	.611
	Physical Work Environment	-.013	.012	-.071	-1.066	.287
	Job Burnout	-.007	.014	-.033	-.494	.622

a. Dependent Variable: ABS_RES

Source: SPSS 22 Output, 2024

Based on Table 3, using the Glejser test, the significance values for the independent variables with absolute residuals are > 0.05, indicating that the regression model does not exhibit heteroscedasticity.

Autocorrelation Test

The autocorrelation test is conducted to determine whether there is a correlation between the errors in a regression model over different periods. This is assessed using the Durbin-Watson statistic, with two critical values as boundaries: dL (lower bound) and dU

Jurnal Ekonomi
Volume 13 , Number 02, 2024, DOI 10.54209/ekonomi.v13i02
ESSN 2721-9879 (Online)
https://ejournal.seaninstitute.or.id/index.php/Ekonomi

(upper bound). The decision criteria are: If the Durbin-Watson value falls between dU and 4-dU, the regression model is free from autocorrelation and is considered appropriate for use.

Table 4. Autocorrelation Test

Model Summary[b]

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Durbin-Watson
1	.717[a]	.514	.508	6.348	1.889

a. Predictors: (Constant), Job Burnout, Workload, Physical Work Environment

b. Dependent Variable: Teacher Performance

Source: SPSS 22 Output, 2024

Based on Table 4, the Durbin-Watson test shows a value of 1.889 with 3 independent variables and 279 samples. From the Durbin-Watson table for n = 279 and k = 3, the values are dL = 1.81846 and dU = 1.78970. Since the Durbin-Watson value falls within the range 1.78970 (dU) < 1.889 < 2.2103 (4-dU), it can be concluded that the regression model is free from autocorrelation.

Multiple Linear Regression Analysis

This analysis is conducted to determine the influence of independent variables on the dependent variable both partially and simultaneously. It is also used to test the formulated hypotheses. The data used are the average values of the statements or indicators of the variables.

Table 5. Multiple Linear Regression Analysis Results

Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	36.793	4.265		8.627	.000
	Workload	.080	.063	.053	1.269	.206
	Physical Work Environment	.924	.078	.554	11.878	.000
	Job Burnout	-.516	.090	-.268	-5.753	.000

a. Dependent Variable: Teacher Performance

Source: SPSS 22 Output, 2024

Table 5 shows the regression equation from the study where the constant value is 36.793, workload (x_1) is 0.080, physical work environment is 0.924, and job burnout is -0.516. Based on the regression analysis results, the regression equation is:

$$\mathbf{Y = 36.793 + 0.080x_1 + 0.924x_2 - 0.516x_3 + e}$$

From this regression equation, the following conclusions can be drawn:

1. The constant value of 36.793 means that if x_1 is 0, the teacher performance value is 36.793, indicating that teacher performance will still exist even without involving workload. The regression coefficient for workload (x_1) is 0.080, indicating that for

Jurnal Ekonomi
Volume 13 , Number 02, 2024, DOI 10.54209/ekonomi.v13i02
ESSN 2721-9879 (Online)
https://ejournal.seaninstitute.or.id/index.php/Ekonomi

every 1 unit increase in x_1, teacher performance increases by 0.080, so an increase in teacher workload leads to an increase in teacher performance.

2. The constant value of 36.793 means that if x_2 is 0, the teacher performance value is 36.793, indicating that teacher performance will still exist even without involving the physical work environment. The regression coefficient for the physical work environment (x_2) is 0.924, indicating that for every 1 unit increase in x_2, teacher performance increases by 0.924, so an improvement in the physical work environment leads to an increase in teacher performance.
3. The constant value of 36.793 means that if x_3 is 0, the teacher performance value is 36.793, indicating that teacher performance will still exist even without involving job burnout. The regression coefficient for job burnout (x_3) is -0.516

Partial Test

The test is conducted by comparing the value of the calculated t (t-value) with the t-table value at a 5% error rate (α = 0.05). If the calculated t-value obtained is positive and t-value ≥ t-table, then the alternative hypothesis is accepted, indicating that the independent variable individually affects the dependent variable. Conversely, if the value obtained is negative, the decision rule is -t-value ≤ -t-table, then the alternative hypothesis is accepted, indicating that the independent variable individually affects the dependent variable. Moreover, the t-test can be used to determine the extent to which each independent variable influences the dependent variable by looking at the t-value of each variable. Table 6 shows the results of the partial test.

Table 6. Partial Test

Coefficients[a]

Model	T	Sig.	Describe
(Constant)	8.627	.000	Significant
Workload	1.269	.206	Not Significant
Physical Work Environment	11.878	.000	Significant
Job Burnout	-5.753	.000	Significant

a. Dependent Variable: Teacher Performance

Source: SPSS 22 Output Results, 2024

The t-table value depends on the probability α and the degree of freedom (df), where df = number of samples - number of variables. In this study, it was obtained that df = 279 - 4, thus df = 275. By using α = 0.05, the t-table value is 1.650.

Partial Test of Workload on Teacher Performance

The hypothesis test for the impact of $x_1$on (Y) states that based on the t-statistic probability test in Table 6., with tcalculate = 1.269 < t table = 1.650 and sig. = 0.206, which is greater than 0.05, the workload variable does not affect the teacher performance variable. In other words, workload has a positive and insignificant effect on teacher performance. The hypothesis testing results in this study indicate that workload has a positive and insignificant effect on teacher performance. Therefore, H1, which states that

Jurnal Ekonomi
Volume 13 , Number 02, 2024, DOI 10.54209/ekonomi.v13i02
ESSN 2721-9879 (Online)
https://ejournal.seaninstitute.or.id/index.php/Ekonomi

there is a negative and significant effect between the workload variable (x_1) and teacher performance (y), is rejected.

Partial Test of Physical Work Environment on Teacher Performance

The hypothesis test for the impact of x_2 on (Y) states that based on the t-statistic probability test in Table 6. with tcalculated = 11.878 > ttable = 1.650 and sig= 0.000, which is less than 0.05, the physical work environment variable affects the teacher performance variable. In other words, the physical work environment has a positive and significant effect on teacher performance. The hypothesis testing results in this study indicate that the physical work environment has a positive and significant effect on teacher performance. Therefore, H2, which states that there is a negative and significant effect between the physical work environment variable (x_2) and teacher performance (y) is accepted.

Partial Test of Job Burnout on Teacher Performance

The hypothesis test for the impact of (x_3) on Y states that based on the t-statistic probability test in Table 6. with tcalculate = -5.753 < ttable = -1.650 and sig. = 0.000, which is less than 0.05, the job burnout variable affects the teacher performance variable. In other words, job burnout has a negative and significant effect on teacher performance. The hypothesis testing results in this study indicate that job burnout has a negative and significant effect on teacher performance. Therefore, H3, which states that there is a negative and significant effect between the job burnout variable (x_3) and teacher performance Y is accepted.

Simultaneous Test of Variables (x_1, x_2, x_3) on Y

This test is conducted to examine the combined effect of the independent variables on the dependent variable Y. This test is conducted using the F-test. The results of this test are shown in Table 7.

Table 7. Simultaneous Test of Variables (x_1, x_2, x_3) on Y

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	11699.297	3	3899.766	96.769	.000[b]
	Residual	11082.431	275	40.300		
	Total	22781.728	278			

a. Dependent Variable: Teacher Performance

b. Predictors: (Constant), Job burnout, Workload, Physical Work Environment

Source: SPSS 22 Output, 2024

Table 7. is an ANOVA table that explains the validity of the regression model when the calculated F-value (Fhitung) is greater than the critical F-value (Ftabel) at a 5% error rate (α = 0.05). This indicates that the independent variables collectively have a significant effect on the dependent variable. The critical F-value (Ftabel) depends on the probability α and the degrees of freedom (df). There are two degrees of freedom (df) to determine the critical F-value: the numerator df (N1) and the denominator df (N2). Here, dfN1 equals the number of variables minus one, thus dfN1 = 4 - 1 = 3, while dfN2 equals the number of samples minus

Jurnal Ekonomi
Volume 13 , Number 02, 2024, DOI 10.54209/ekonomi.v13i02
ESSN 2721-9879 (Online)
https://ejournal.seaninstitute.or.id/index.php/Ekonomi

the number of variables, thus dfN2 = 279 - 4 = 275. Therefore, if the probability α = 0.05, the critical F-value is Ftabel(N1, N2) = F(3, 275) = 2.64.

From the F-test results, it was found that the calculated F-value (Fhitung) is 96.769, which is greater than the critical F-value (Ftabel) of 2.64. Additionally, for the significance test, a p-value of 0.000 was obtained, which is less than 0.05. This means that workload, physical work environment, and job burnout collectively have a significant impact on teacher performance. In other words, workload, physical work environment, and job burnout simultaneously have a significant and meaningful influence on teacher performance. The hypothesis testing results in this study indicate that workload, physical work environment, and job burnout collectively have a significant and meaningful influence on teacher performance. Therefore, hypothesis H4, which states that the variables workload (x_1), physical work environment (x_2), and job burnout (x_3) collectively and significantly influence teacher performance (y), is accepted.

A manageable workload for teachers, a physical work environment that supports their activities, and teachers' ability to manage their time to avoid feeling burnout will enhance their performance. The impact of workload indicates that currently, teachers are not overly burdened by their tasks and duties at school, resulting in the workload having a positive but not significant effect on teachers' performance. The existing physical work environment supports teachers in their activities, leading to good performance. However, despite the positive influence of workload and the physical work environment, teachers may feel burnout if they continuously perform the same activities and become too accustomed to a very familiar physical work environment. This study supports previous research conducted by Jalil (2019), Sutisnawati & Sya'roni (2019), Hermawan (2022), Lilis et al. (2023), and Khasanah & Saputra (2023), which stated that there is a simultaneous and significant influence of workload and physical work environment on performance.

Correlation Test (r) and Coefficient of Determination (R^2)

The correlation test shows the relationship between the independent variables (x_1, x_2, and x_3) and the dependent variable (y) as structured in the regression model of the study. Meanwhile, the coefficient of determination indicates the extent of the contribution of each independent variable to the dependent variable. The results from the table below explain the correlation and coefficient of determination of this study.

Table 8. Correlation Test Results (r)

Variables		Workload	Physical Work Environment	Job Burnout	Teacher Performance
Workload	Pearson Correlation	1	.031	-.039	.081
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.601	.522	.176
	N	279	279	279	279
Physical Work Environment	Pearson Correlation	.031	1	-.432	.672
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.601	.	.000	.000
	N	279	279	279	279

Jurnal Ekonomi
Volume 13 , Number 02, 2024, DOI 10.54209/ekonomi.v13i02
ESSN 2721-9879 (Online)
https://ejournal.seaninstitute.or.id/index.php/Ekonomi

Variables		Workl	Physical	Work	Job	Teacher
Job Burnout	Pearson Correlation	-.039	-.432		1	-.510
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.522	.000		.	.000
	N	279	279		279	279
Teacher Performance	Pearson Correlation	.081	.672		-.510	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.176	.000		.000	.
	N	279	279		279	279

Source: SPSS 22 Output, 2024

Based on the results in Table 8. the following conclusions can be drawn:

1. The correlation between the workload variable (x_1) and teacher performance (y) is very low, with a correlation value of r = 0.081, which falls within the range of 0.00 – 0.199. The nature of the relationship is positive, meaning that if the workload increases, teacher performance will also increase.
2. The correlation between the physical work environment variable (x_2) and teacher performance (y) is high, with a correlation value of r = 0.672, which falls within the range of 0.60 – 0.799. The nature of the relationship is positive, indicating that if the physical work environment improves, teacher performance will also improve.
3. The correlation between the job burnout variable (x_3) and teacher performance (y) is moderate, with a correlation value of r = -0.510, which falls within the range of 0.40 – 0.599. The nature of the relationship is negative, meaning that if job burnout increases, teacher performance will decrease.

Table 9. Coefficient of Determination (R^2)

Results of Correlation and Determination Coefficient Analysis for Model 2

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.717[a]	.514	.508	6.348

a. Predictors: (Constant), Physical Work Environment
b. Dependent Variable: Teacher Performance

Source: SPSS 22 Output, 2024

Based on the coefficient of determination test shown in Table 9. the Adjusted R Square is 0.508 or 50.8%. This means that workload, physical work environment, and job burnout collectively contribute 50.8% to the variance in teacher performance. The remaining 49.2% is influenced by other variables not included in this study.

The Impact of Workload on Teacher Performance

The testing of hypothesis 1 (H1) in this study, which states that workload has a negative and significant effect on teacher performance, is rejected because the analysis results show that workload has a negative and insignificant effect on teacher performance. The current workload does not hinder teachers in their work, so their performance does not decrease and is not significantly affected. Understanding this, teacher performance will not

Jurnal Ekonomi
Volume 13 , Number 02, 2024, DOI 10.54209/ekonomi.v13i02
ESSN 2721-9879 (Online)
https://ejournal.seaninstitute.or.id/index.php/Ekonomi

experience a drastic decline due to the workload. It can be concluded that the workload variable has a positive but not very impactful effect on teacher performance at school. This finding supports other studies by Ahmad et al. (2019), Manalu (2020), and Triatmaja et al. (2022), which found that workload positively but insignificantly affects teacher performance. However, this finding contradicts the studies by Jalil (2019), Apriana et al. (2021), Pasaribu et al. (2021), and Hermawan (2022), which found that workload has a negative and significant effect on teacher performance.

The Impact of Physical Work Environment on Teacher Performance

The testing of hypothesis 2 (H2) in this study, which states that the physical work environment has a positive and significant effect on teacher performance, is accepted because the analysis results show that the physical work environment positively and significantly affects teacher performance. The current influence of the physical work environment supports teachers' activities, so their performance does not decrease and is significantly affected. Understanding this, teacher performance will not experience a drastic decline due to a good physical work environment. It can be concluded that a supportive physical work environment variable will affect teacher performance at school. This finding supports other studies by Priyono et al. (2018), Wangi et al. (2020), Rianda & Winarno (2022), and Erni et al. (2022), which found that the physical work environment has a positive and significant effect on teacher performance. However, this finding contradicts the studies by Yusnita et al. (2021), which found that the physical work environment has a positive but insignificant effect, and the studies by Santika & Antari (2020), Nathalia et al. (2021), and Warongan et al. (2022), which found that the physical work environment has a negative and insignificant effect.

The Impact of Job Burnout on Teacher Performance

The testing of hypothesis 3 (H3) in this study, which states that job burnout has a negative and significant effect on teacher performance, is accepted because the analysis results show that job burnout has a negative and significant effect on teacher performance. The current influence of job burnout affects teachers in their work, so their performance will decline if they feel burned out, and it is significant in affecting teacher performance. Understanding this, teacher performance will not experience a drastic decline due to a good physical work environment. It can be concluded that a supportive physical work environment variable will affect teacher performance at school. This finding supports other studies by Apriana et al. (2021), Kuswanto et al. (2022), and Khasanah & Saputra (2023), which found that job burnout has a negative and significant effect on performance. However, this finding contradicts the studies by Kuswanto et al. (2022) and Pradana (2023), which found that job burnout has a positive and significant effect.

The Impact of Workload, Physical Work Environment, and Job Burnout on Teacher Performance

The testing of hypothesis 4 (H4) in this study, which states that workload, physical work environment, and job burnout have a significant effect on teacher performance, is accepted because the analysis results show that these factors significantly affect teacher performance. A manageable workload, a supportive physical work environment, and the

ability of teachers to manage their time to avoid burnout will enhance their performance. The influence of the workload factor shows that teachers are not overly burdened by their tasks and obligations at school, so the workload positively and insignificantly affects teacher performance. The existing physical work environment supports teachers in their activities, resulting in good performance. However, although workload and physical work environment have a positive effect, teachers will feel burnt out if they continuously perform the same activities and become too familiar with the physical work environment. This finding supports other studies by Jalil (2019), Sutisnawati & Sya'roni (2019), Hermawan (2022), Lilis et al. (2023), and Khasanah & Saputra (2023) regarding the influence of one variable on another, but no studies have used all three variables in this research to state that there is a simultaneous and significant influence of workload, physical work environment, and job burnout on teacher performance. Other studies that use similar variables to this study but differ in the job burnout variable include Juandi & Pricilla (2024), where the variables used were workload (X1), physical work environment (X2), and performance (Y). This study found that workload and physical work environment have a positive and significant simultaneous effect.

CONCLUSION

Based on the analysis, several conclusions have been drawn. Firstly, workload has a positive but not significant impact on teacher performance. Secondly, the physical work environment has a positive and significant influence on teacher performance. Thirdly, job burnout negatively and significantly affects teacher performance. Lastly, workload, physical work environment, and job burnout collectively have a simultaneous and significant effect on teacher performance. These findings highlight the importance of managing workload and enhancing the physical work environment to improve teacher performance while addressing job burnout to prevent its negative impact.

REFERENCE

Agustin, M., Setiyadi, R., & Puspita, R. D. (2020). Burnout profile of Elementary School Teacher Education students (estes): Factors and implication of guidance and counseling services. *PrimaryEdu - Journal of Primary Education*, *4*(1), 38–47. https://doi.org/10.22460/pej.v4i1.1640

Ahmad, Y., Tewal, B., & Taroreh, R. N. (2019). Pengaruh stres kerja, beban kerja, dan lingkungan kerja terhadap kinerja karyawan pada PT Fif Group Manado. *Jurnal EMBA : Jurnal Riset Ekonomi, Manajemen, Bisnis Dan Akuntansi*, *7*(3), 2811 – 2820. https://ejournal.unsrat.ac.id/index.php/emba/article/view/23747

Akob, M., Arianty, R., & Putra, A. H. P. K. (2020). The mediating role of distribution Kahns engagement: An empirical evidence of salesforce in Indonesia. *Journal of Asian Finance, Economics and Business*, *7*(2), 249–260. https://doi.org/10.13106/jafeb.2020.vol7.no2.249

Apriana, I. W. A., Edris, M., & Sutono. (2021). Pengaruh beban kerja dan burnout terhadap kinerja pegawai dengan kepuasan kerja sebagai variabel intervening (Studi kasus

pada pegawai Dinas Pemberdayan Masyarakat dan Desa Kabupaten Rembang). *Jurnal Studi Manajemen Bisnis*, *1*(1), 1–19. https://doi.org/10.24176/jsmb.v1i1.8109

Badri, I. A. (2020). Hubungan beban kerja dan lingkungan kerja dengan stres kerja perawat ruangan ICU dan IGD. *Human Care Journal*, *5*(1), 379–390. https://doi.org/10.32883/hcj.v5i1.730

Dewi, B. M. (2018). Hubungan antara motivasi, beban kerja, dan lingkungan kerja dengan kelelahan kerja. *Indones J Occup Saf Heal,* 1–20.

Erni, M., FoEh, J. E., & Silalahi, E. E. (2022). Pengaruh motivasi, disiplin dan lingkungan kerja terhadap kinerja guru (Deskripsi kajian studi literatur kinerja guru). *Jurnal Ekonomi Manajemen Sistem Informasi (JEMSI)*, *4*(1), 71–81. https://doi.org/10.35760/eb.2018.v23i1.1809

Fahamsyah, E. (2017). Mekanisme hukum dalam pola perusahaan inti rakyat perkebunan. *Jurnal Ilmiah Ilmu Hukum*, *2*(1), 90–122. https://media.neliti.com/media/publications/89923-ID-mekanisme-hukum-dalam-pola-perusahaan-in.pdf

Fatmawati. (2018). Hubungan antara kejenuhan belajar dengan stres akademik. *Psikoborneo: Jurnal Ilmiah Psikologi*, *6*(4), 462–467. https://doi.org/10.30872/psikoborneo.v6i4.4666

Grobelna, A. (2021). Emotional exhaustion and its consequences for hotel service quality: the critical role of workload and supervisor support. *Journal of Hospitality Marketing and Management*, *30*(4), 395–418. https://doi.org/10.1080/19368623.2021.1841704

Haryono, S., Nur'aini, H., & Saad, M. S. M. (2019). The mediating role of work-family conflict on the effects of workload. *Opcion*, *35*(20), 1196–1223

Hasibuan, S. H., & Munasib, A. (2020). Pengaruh kepemimpinan, motivasi dan disiplin kerja terhadap kinerja karyawan. *Maneggio: Jurnal Ilmiah Magister Manajemen*, *3*(2), 247–258. https://doi.org/10.32806/investi.v2i01.96

Hermawan, E. (2022). Faktor yang mempengaruhi kinerja PT. Sakti Mobile Jakarta: Lingkungan kerja, stres kerja dan beban kerja. *Jurnal Ilmu Multidisiplin*, *1*(1), 53–62.

Herminingsih, A., & Kurniasih, A. (2018). The influence of workload perceptions and human resource management practices on employees' burnout. *European Journal of Business and Management*, *10*(21), 19–26.

Hustia, A. (2020). Pengaruh motivasi kerja, lingkungan kerja dan disiplin kerja terhadap kinerja karyawan pada perusahaan WFO masa pandemi. *Jurnal Ilmu Manajemen*, *10*(1), 81–91. https://doi.org/10.32502/jimn.v10i1.2929

Hutagalung, B. A. (2022). Analisa faktor – faktor yang mempengaruhi kinerja pegawai: Kompetensi, motivasi dan lingkungan kerja (penelitian literature review manajemen sumber daya manusia). *Jurnal Manajemen Pendidikan Dan Ilmu Sosial*, *3*(1), 201–210. https://doi.org/10.38035/jmpis.v3i1.866

Jalil, A. (2019). Pengaruh beban kerja, stres kerja dan lingkungan kerja terhadap kinerja Guru Madrasah Aliyah Negeri 2 Kota Palu. *Jurnal Ilmu Perbankan Dan Keuangan Syariah*, *1*(2), 117–134. https://doi.org/10.24239/jipsya.v1i2.14.117-134

Khasanah, U., & Saputra, A. (2023). Pengaruh beban kerja dan kejenuhan kerja terhadap

kinerja perawat RSUD Kota Bandung. *Jurnal Keperawatan BSI*, *11*(1), 58–66.

Kuswanto, T. H., Suarman, & Azhar, F. (2022). Pengaruh kepercayaan diri dan kejenuhan kerja terhadap kinerja guru Sekolah Dasar Negeri Sekecamatan Tanjung Medan Kabupaten Rokan Hilir. *Jurnal Kepemimpinan Dan Pengurusan Sekolah*, *7*(3), 316–

Lilis, Dewi, A. S., & Mahaputra, A. P. (2023). Pengaruh stres kerja, beban kerja dan lingkungan kerja fisik terhadap kinerja karyawan pada Ud Sumber Pangan Sumberagung Kediri. *Musytari: Neraca Manajemen, Akuntansi, Dan Ekonomi*, *2*(10), 101–110.

Maini, Y.-, & Tanno, A. (2021). Pengaruh beban kerja, teamwork dan kepemimpinan terhadap kepuasan kerja dan kinerja pegawai (Studi kasus pada Bappeda Kota Payakumbuh). *Jurnal BONANZA: Manajemen Dan Bisnis*, *2*(1), 31–50. https://doi.org/10.47896/mb.v2i1.360

Manalu, H. (2020). Pengaruh beban kerja dan lingkungan kerja terhadap kinerja karyawan PT. Madu Nusantara Medan. *Jurnal Ilmiah Smart*, *4*(2), 140–147. https://ejournal.unsrat.ac.id/index.php/emba/article/F.R.Tjiabrat

Mangkunegara, A. P. (2017). *Evaluasi kinerja SDM*. Bandung: Refika aditama.

Maslach, C., Jackson, S. E., & Leiter, M. P. (1996). *MBI: The Maslach Burnout Inventory: Manual*. Consulting Psychologists Press.

Nathalia, P. C., Kawiana, I. G. P., & Trarintya, M. A. P. (2021). Pengaruh motivasi berprestasi, kompetensi profesional dan lingkungan kerja fisik terhadap kinerja guru. *Jurnal Manajemen, Kewirausahaan Dan Pariwisata*, *1*(2), 570–580.

Priantoro, H. (2018). Hubungan beban kerja dan lingkungan kerja dengan kejadian burnout perawat dalam menangani pasien BPJS. *Jurnal Ilmiah Kesehatan*, *16*(3), 9–16. https://doi.org/10.33221/jikes.v16i3.33

Rianda, S., & Winarno, A. (2022). Pengaruh kompensasi dan lingkungan kerja fisik terhadap kinerja pegawai pada Pt Rajasaland Bandung. *Publik: Jurnal Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia, Administrasi Dan Pelayanan Publik*, *9*(2), 192–203. https://doi.org/10.37606/publik.v9i2.300

Rizqiansyah, M. Z. A., Hanurawan, F., & Setiyowati, N. (2017). Hubungan antara beban kerja fisik dan beban kerja mental berbasis ergonomi terhadap tingkat kejenuhan kerja pada karyawan PT Jasa Marga (Persero) TBK Cabang Surabaya Gempol. *Jurnal Sains Psikologi*, *6*(1), 37. https://doi.org/10.17977/um023v6i12017p37-42

Rolos, J. K. R., Sambul, S. A. P., & Rumawas, W. (2018). Pengaruh beban kerja terhadap kinerja karyawan pada PT. Asuransi Jiwasraya Cabang Manado Kota. *Jurnal Administrasi Bisnis*, *6*(4), 19–27.

Rudiyanto, R., & Hanifah, H. (2021). Peran kejenuhan dalam memediasi lingkungan dan beban kerja terhadap komitmen organisasi. *Jurnal Stie Semarang*, *13*(2), 1–19.

Santika, I. P., & Antari, N. L. S. (2020). Pengaruh lingkungan kerja fisik dan kepemimpinan terhadap semangat kerja untuk meningkatkan kinerja pegawai Rumah Sakit Bhayangkara Denpasar. *Jurnal Ekonomi Dan Pariwisata*, *15*(1), 57–68.

Sari, M. A., & Hastono, S. P. (2022). Analisis beban kerja, burnout syndrome dan kualitas kerja tenaga fungsional Puskesmas Kec. Pulogadung. *Syntax Literate: Jurnal Ilmiah*

Indonesia, *7*(5), 5256–5267.

Siahaan, S., & Bahri, S. (2019). Pengaruh penempatan, motivasi, dan lingkungan kerja terhadap kinerja pegawai. *Maneggio: Jurnal Ilmiah Magister Manajemen*, *2*(1), 16–30. https://doi.org/10.30596/maneggio.v2i1.3402

Siregar, H. R. (2023). Pengaruh budaya sekolah, kompetensi profesional dan komitmen organisasi terhadap kinerja guru SMP Negeri Air Putih Kabupaten Batu Bara. *ALIGNMENT:Journal of Administration and Educational Management*, *6*(1), 130–140. https://doi.org/10.31539/alignment.v6i1.4891

Soeltan, M., Astuti, P., Naswardi, Susilowati, E., & Nugrahati, T. (2021). "Bagaimanakah beban kerja dan stres kerja mempengaruhi kinerja karyawan dengan burnout sebagai variabel mediasi." *Conference on Economic and Business Innovation*, *1*(1), 1–14.

Sunyoto, Y., Lely, N., & Agus, A. (2019). The influence of experience, motivation and professional commitment on employee performance and job satisfaction at the audit firm in Indonesia. *Revista Espacios*, *40*(27), 25–37.

Syamsu, N. N., Soelton, M., Nanda, A., Putra, R. L., & Pebriani, P. (2019). Mempengaruhi kinerja karyawan dengan burnout. *Jurnal Ilmiah Manajemen & Bisnis*, *5*(1), 1–13.

Triatmaja, I. D. R. I., Nelwan, O. S., & Lengkong, V. P. . (2022). Pengaruh beban kerja, stres kerja dan motivasi terhadap kinerja karyawan Fif Group Manado. *Jurnal EMBA : Jurnal Riset Ekonomi, Manajemen, Bisnis Dan Akuntansi*, *10*(3), 377–387. https://doi.org/10.35794/emba.v10i3.41581

Wangi, V. K. N., Bahiroh, E., & Imron, A. (2020). Dampak kesehatan dan keselamatan kerja, beban kerja, dan lingkungan kerja fisik terhadap kinerja. *Jurnal Manajemen Bisnis*, *7*(1), 40–50. https://doi.org/10.33096/jmb.v7i1.407

Warongan, B. U. ., Dotulong, L. O. ., & Lumintang, G. G. (2022). Pengaruh lingkungan kerja dan stres kerja terhadap kinerja karyawan pada PT Jordan Bakery Tomohon. *Jurnal EMBA*, *10*(1), 963–972. https://ejournal.unsrat.ac.id/v3/index.php/emba/article/view/38527

Waryani. (2021). *Dinamika Kinerja Guru dan Gaya Belajar: Konsep dan Implementasi terhadap Prestasi Belajar*. Indramayu: Adab.

Wen, B., Zhou, X., Hu, Y., & Zhang, X. (2020). Role stress and turnover intention of front-line hotel employees: The roles of burnout and service climate. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *11*(36), 1–13. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.00036

Yohanita, P. (2018). Persepsi mahasiswa terhadap kompetensi dosen di Fakultas Ekonomi Unika Soegijapranata. *Ecodunamika*, *1*(2), 1–10.

Yuliani, R., Harun, C. Z., & Yusrizal, Y. (2022). The positive influence of satisfaction and workload on teachers performance. *Journal of Education Research and Evaluation*, *6*(1), 195–201.

Yusnita, I., Amri, F., & Sari, A. E. (2021). Pengaruh lingkungan kerja fisik dan disiplin terhadap kinerja dengan motivasi kerja sebagai variabel moderating pada pegawai di Kantor Camat Kabupaten Kerinci. *Bussman Journal : Indonesian Journal of Business and Management*, *1*(3), 427–442.