

The Human Cost of Fabric: Impact of Leadership Styles on the Employee Burnout Crisis in Textile Production

Beban Manusiawi dalam Produksi Tekstil: Dampak Gaya Kepemimpinan terhadap Krisis Kelelahan Kerja yang Mendalam

Dian Pertiwi¹, Faiz Fatihul 'Alwan²

^{1,2}Department of Educational and Psychology, Semarang State University, Indonesia
Email: ¹dianppertiwii@gmail.com, ²faizfatihul@mail.unnes.ac.id

Artikel Info

Riwayat Artikel:

Penyerahan 19/12/2025
Revisi 01/05/2026
Diterima 01/06/2026

Keywords:

Burnout;
Leadership Style;
Production Employees;
Textile Industry;

ABSTRACT

Burnout is a state of occupational exhaustion frequently experienced by production employees due to high physical and operational job demands. This study aims to determine the relationship between leadership style and burnout among employees in the production department of the textile industry. This research employs a quantitative approach with correlational method, involving 214 respondents obtained through purposive sampling techniques. The instruments used are the leadership style Path Goal Theory and the Copenhagen Burnout Inventory (CBI), with data analysis performed using the Spearman's Rho correlation test. The results show that there is no significant relationship between leadership style and burnout ($\rho = 0.075$; $p = 0.272 > 0.05$). These findings indicate that the burnout experienced by employees is more closely related to physical job demands and working conditions rather than the leadership style of superiors. Consequently, in the context of production work, the influence of leadership style on burnout tend to be limited.

ABSTRAK

Burnout merupakan kondisi kelelahan kerja yang sering dialami karyawan produksi akibat tingginya tuntutan kerja fisik dan operasional. Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk mengetahui hubungan antara gaya kepemimpinan dan burnout pada karyawan departemen produksi industri tekstil. Penelitian ini menggunakan pendekatan kuantitatif dengan metode korelasional, dengan jumlah responden sebanyak 214 orang yang diperoleh melalui teknik purposive sampling. Instrumen yang digunakan adalah skala gaya kepemimpinan Path Goal Theory dan Copenhagen Burnout Inventory (CBI), dengan analisis data menggunakan uji korelasi Spearman's Rho. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa tidak terdapat hubungan yang signifikan antara gaya kepemimpinan dan burnout ($\rho = 0.075$; $p = 0.272 > 0.05$). Temuan ini menunjukkan bahwa burnout yang dialami karyawan lebih berkaitan dengan tuntutan kerja fisik dan kondisi kerja dibandingkan dengan gaya kepemimpinan atasan. Dengan demikian, dalam konteks produksi pengaruh gaya kepemimpinan terhadap burnout cenderung terbatas.

Kata Kunci:

Burnout;
Gaya Kepemimpinan;
Karyawan Produksi;
Industri tekstil;

Copyright (c) 2026 Dian Pertiwi & Faiz Fatihul 'Alwan

Correspondence:

Dian Pertiwi

Department of Educational and Psychology, Semarang State University, Indonesia
Email: dianppertiwii@gmail.com



INTRODUCTION

Burnout has become a prevalent issue in today’s professional world. This condition occurs when job demands are persistent and exceed an individual’s capacity to manage them, resulting in emotional, physical, and mental exhaustion (WHO, 2019). Furthermore, burnout contributes to a decline in energy, motivation, and employee work effectiveness (Schaufeli & Greenglass, 2001). Given its extensive impact, understanding burnout is essential to identifying how this condition manifests within the work environment.

Kristensen et al. (2005) explain that burnout affects not only an individual’s psychological state but also diminishes work effectiveness, engagement, and job satisfaction. Generally, burnout emerges when job demands are persistent and exceed an individual’s capacity to manage them. Under such conditions, employees may feel overwhelmed by heavy workloads, constrained by time, and suffer from prolonged exhaustion, which increases the risk of occupational errors (Christy & Sholihati, 2017). This situation demonstrates that poorly managed work pressure can impair work quality, particularly in roles that require a fast-paced rhythm.

Within an organizational context, burnout can lead to a decline in work quality, an increase in errors, and high risk of turnover. This phenomenon is reflected in exit interview data from a manufacturing company, which indicates that the majority of employees resigned due to factors related to work pressure.

Table 1. Reasons for Resignation Among Production Department Employees (April-June 2025)

No.	Reason for Leaving	n	%
1.	Anxiety regarding the company’s condition	2	5%
2.	Work environment	10	16%
3.	Compensation & Benefit (C&B)	17	28%
4.	Health reasons	2	3%
5.	Career path	6	10%
6.	Issue with supervisor	11	18%
7.	Workload overload	6	10%
8.	Not specified	6	10%
Total		61	100%

The most dominant reason is compensation and benefits (28%), followed by issue with supervisors (18%), an uncomfortable work environment (16%), and work overload, which emerges as a significant factor (10%). These conditions indicate the presence of work pressure that potentially triggers burnout, this is particularly relevant in the production department, which faces higher output demands and a faster work pace compared to other departments.

The burnout phenomenon among production employees aligns with various previous studies

indicating that working conditions play a pivotal role in triggering occupational fatigue. High workloads, time pressure, and unsupportive work environments are known to increase the risk of burnout, particularly in roles requiring high consistency and intensity (Nadapdap et al., 2024; Afiansyah & Adi, 2024). These findings suggest that when job demands persist without being balanced by adequate capacity and resources, employees become more vulnerable to both physical and psychological exhaustion.

In a dynamic industrial context, working conditions that demand are often followed by heightened workloads and rotational work schedules, specifically night shifts that creating a greater physical and psychological burden on production employees. Such conditions not only affect a worker’s capacity to meet targets but also increase the risk of physical and mental fatigue, which serves as a precursor to burnout in manufacturing environments (Fhauzan & Ali, 2024; Trimala et al., 2023; Ramadani et al., 2019; Busti et al., 2023). The subsequent impact of burnout is also evident in increased turnover intentions due to prolonged exhaustion (Daffa et al., 2024). These findings underscore that poorly managed working conditions affect not only individual well-being but also have broader implications for performance quality and organizational sustainability.

Beyond working conditions, several studies indicate that leadership style also influences employee burnout levels, although the direction and strength of this relationship remain somewhat inconsistent. Dwiyanto & Sularso (2017) demonstrate that leadership style significantly affects job burnout among contract educators at the University of Jember, suggesting that the way leaders direct and interact with their staff can impact employees psychological burnout, whereas democratic leadership tends to correlate with lower burnout levels, this due to employee involvement in decision-making processes and the provision of support in task execution (Husaeni & Wiratno, 2020; Due et al., 2020).

However, other studies presents divergent results. Transformational leadership style is not always capable of mitigating the negative impact of quantitative job demands on the onset of burnout, particularly in high-pressure work environment (Marua et al., 2022; Kemala & Farlis, 2025). Furthermore, some studies reveal that the influence of leadership style on burnout is on direct, rather it is mediated by contextual factors such as social support, organizational climate, and perceptions of workplace fairness (Nisa & Salim, 2025). These inconsistent findings suggest that the relationship between leadership style and burnout is highly dependent job characteristics and the organizational environment, thereby necessitating further investigation within work contexts that involve high physical and operational demands, such as the production department.

While extensive research has examined the predictors of burnout, existing literature remains heavily concentrated within the public service, healthcare, and education sectors. Consequently, empirical insights into production workers particularly within the textile industry remain sparse. Furthermore, the correlation between leadership styles and burnout has yielded inconsistent findings, suggesting that this relationship may be moderated by distinct job characteristics and organizational environments.

In this context, leadership style is defined as the approach leaders employ to direct and support employees in managing occupational demands (House, 1996). Drawing on Path-Goal Theory, leader behavior is instrumental in helping subordinates navigate work-related stress. Within production departments, the interplay of stringent targets, shift work, and high physical and mental strain exacerbates the risk of burnout if not properly mitigated by effective leadership. Consequently, investigating textile production employees is essential not only to broaden the existing literature but also to test consistency of leadership's influence amidst the rigid and demanding dynamics of a manufacturing environment.

RESEARCH METHODS

Research Design

This study employs a quantitative approach, a research method that emphasizes the collection and analysis of numerical data to systematically examine social phenomena. A quantitative approach allows researchers to objectively measure research variables and analyze the relationship between them using statistical techniques (Dani et al., 2025).

Research Subjects

The population in this study consists of all employees in the production department of a textile company, totaling approximately 469 individuals. Sampling was conducted using a simple random sampling technique, in which every member of the population has an equal opportunity to be selected as a research respondent (Firmansyah & Dede, 2022). This technique was employed to provide an equal chance for all production department employees to participate as research subjects. The sample size was determined using the G*Power software version 3.1.9.7, with an assumed effect size of 0.15, a significance level (α) of 0.05, and statistical power of 0.95. Based on these calculations, a minimum requirement of 89 respondents was obtained.

Research Instrument

Data collection was conducted using written questionnaires distributed directly to respondents were provided with explanations regarding the study's objectives and procedures and were required to sign an informed consent form. The confidentiality and

anonymity of respondent data were guaranteed in accordance with ethical research principles.

The research instrument consisted of two measurement scales. The leadership style variable was measured using a scale based on Path-Goal Theory developed by House (as cited in Husna et al., 2025). This scale comprises 7 items covering 4 dimensions of leader behavior: directive, supportive, participative, and achievement-oriented. The leadership style scale utilized a 5-point Likert scale, consisting of 5 response alternatives: Strongly Agree (SS), Agree (S), Somewhat Agree (KS), Disagree (TS), and Strongly Disagree (STS). This scale yielded a Cronbach's Alpha (α) value of 0.911, indicating that the items possess high reliability.

The burnout variable was measured using the Copenhagen Burnout Inventory (CBI), which has undergone validity and reliability testing for the Indonesian version using the Rasch Model by Angeline et al. (2025). The CBI was originally introduced by In this study, the CBI was measured using a 5-point Likert scale, with each question consisting of 5 response options: "5 = Always", "4 = Often", "3 = Sometimes", "2 = Seldom", and "1 = Never". The scale includes 19 items distributed across 3 domains or subscales: personal burnout, work-related burnout, and client-related burnout. For the purposes of this study, the latter was modified into coworker-related burnout to better suit the conditions of production department employees. This scale yielded a Cronbach's Alpha (α) value of 0.917, demonstrating excellent reliability.

Data Analysis Techniques

Data were analyzed using correlation techniques with the aid of Jamovi software. Prior to the analysis, the data underwent classical assumption tests, including normality and linearity tests, to ensure that the prerequisites for regression analysis were met.

RESEARCH RESULTS

Table 2. Demographic Characteristic of Respondents (N=214)

Characteristics	Frequency (n)	Percentage (%)
Age		
18-30	92	43%
31-40	53	24,8%
41-50	55	25,7%
51-60	14	6,5%
Gender		
Male	204	95,3%
Female	10	4,7%
Marital Status		
Married	140	65,4%
Unmarried	74	34,6%
Work System		
Shift	192	89,7%
Non-shift	22	10,3%

Tenure		
< 1 year	31	14,5%
1-5 years	33	15,4%
> 5 years	150	70,1

According to the data presented in Table 2, the respondent profile is predominantly characterized by the 18-30 age group (43%), male gender (95,3%), and married status (65,4%). Furthermore, the vast majority of participants operate under a shift system (89,7%) and possess over five years of tenure (70,1%). These findings indicate that the sample is primarily composed of productive age male workers with extensive professional experience within shift-based work environments.

Descriptive statistical analysis was conducted to establish the categories for each research variable. This categorization utilizes a normal distribution approach, based on the assumption that individual scores serve as estimates for a normally distributed hypothetical population (Azwar, 2023). This approach is employed to provide an overview of the respondents scores within the context of a theoretical distribution.

Table 3. Descriptive Statistics

Variable	N	Min	Max	Mean	SD
Leadership Style	214	17	35	29.9	3.91
Burnout	214	21	74	41.0	10.5

Based on Table 3, descriptive statistical analysis shows that leadership style has a mean score of 29.9 with relatively homogeneous data variation (SD = 3.91). Meanwhile, burnout has a mean score of 41.0 with a higher degree of variation (SD = 10.5), indicating that the levels of work exhaustion vary considerably among respondents.

Table 4. Descriptive Categorization of Leadership Style

Interval Formula	Interval	Category	f	%	μ
$X \leq (\mu - 1\sigma)$	$X > 39$	High	0	0%	
$(\mu - 1\sigma) < X \leq (\mu + 1\sigma)$	$22 \leq X \leq 39$	Moderate	203	95%	30,5
$X > (\mu + 1\sigma)$	$X < 22$	Low	11	5%	

Based on Table 4, the categorization results show that respondents perceptions of leadership style are dominated by the moderate category (95%). Only a small percentage of respondents rated the leadership style in the low category (5%), and no respondents rated in the high category. The mean score for leadership style falls within the moderate range, indicating that the leadership styles perceived by respondents tend to be average and relatively uniform.

Table 5. Descriptive Categorization of Burnout

Interval Formula	Interval	Category	f	%	μ
$X \leq (\mu - 1\sigma)$	$Y > 53$	High	41	19%	
$(\mu - 1\sigma) < X \leq (\mu + 1\sigma)$	$33 \leq Y \leq 53$	Moderate	144	67%	42,8
$X > (\mu + 1\sigma)$	$Y < 33$	Low	29	14%	

Based on Table 5, the categorization results indicate that the majority of respondents experience a moderate level of burnout (67%). Respondents with high and low burnout levels account for 19% and 14% of the total sample, respectively. The mean burnout score falls within the moderate category, suggesting that, general, respondents experience work exhaustion at a moderate level, however the segment of respondents with high burnout levels warrants further attention.

Tabel 6. Normality Test

Test	Statistics	Sig.
Kolmogorov-Smirnov	0.0955	0.040
Shapiro-Wilk	0.9674	< .001

Based on Tabel 6, a residual normality test was conducted to evaluate the distribution of the residuals in the regression model. The Shapiro-Wilk test results showed a significance value of $p < .001$, while the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test yielded $p = 0.040$. Since both p -values are below the significance threshold of $\alpha = 0.05$, it can be concluded that the assumption of residual normality was not met.

To address this violation, a Robust Standard Error procedure was applied in the inferential analysis. This approach is crucial for maintaining the validity of hypothesis testing and ensuring accurate p -value estimates, despite the non-normal distribution of the residual data.

Table 7. Homogeneity Test

Test	Statistics	df1	Sig.
Breusch-Pagan	1.35	1	0.245

Based on Table 7, the assumption of homogeneity of residual variance (Homoscedasticity) was tested using the Breusch-Pagan Test. The test yielded a significance value of $p = 0.245$. Since this p -value exceeds the significance threshold of 0.05, it can be concluded that the assumption of homoscedasticity was met. This indicates that the error variance of the model remains constant across all values of the predictor variable.

Tabel 8. Correlation Test

Correlation	Spearman's ρ	Sig.
Total X \rightarrow Total Y	0.053	0.440

Based on Table 8, a Spearman's Rho non-parametric correlation test was conducted to measure the strength

and direction of the relationship. The results show a correlation coefficient (ρ) of 0.053, indicating an extremely weak correlation (approaching zero). The significance test yielded a p -value of 0.440, which is greater than 0.05. Consequently, the results demonstrate that there is no significant relationship between Leadership Style and Burnout.

Table 9. Partial Correlation Analysis of Personal Burnout (Y1)

Dimension	Spearman's ρ	P	
Directive Leadership (X1)	0,005	0,938	Insignificant
Supportive Leadership (X2)	0.024	0,722	Insignificant
Participative Leadership (X3)	0,052	0,448	Insignificant
Achivement-Oriented Leadership (X4)	-0,017	0,803	Insignificant

Table 9, demonstrates that dimensions within variable X specifically Directive Leadership (X1), Supportive Leadership (X2), Participative Leadership (X3), and Achievement-Oriented Leadership (X4) do not exhibit a significant correlation with Personal Burnout (Y1). Furthermore, the results of the partial correlation analysis regarding Work-related Burnout (Y2) are presented as follows:

Table 10. Partial Correlation Analysis of Work-related Burnout (Y2)

Dimension	Spearman's ρ	P	
Directive Leadership (X1)	-0,030	0,664	Insignificant
Supportive Leadership (X2)	0,065	0,344	Insignificant
Participative Leadership (X3)	0,042	0,538	Insignificant
Achivement-Oriented Leadership (X4)	-0,033	0,627	Insignificant

Table 10 indicates that the dimensions of variable Z comprising Directive Leadership (X1), Supportive Leadership (X2), Participative Leadership (X3), and Achievement-Oriented Leadership (X4) show no significant correlation with Work-related Burnout (Y2). This is evidenced by the significance values (p -value) for each dimension, which exceed the 0.005 threshold. Subsequently, the results of the partial

correlation analysis for Coworker-related Burnout (Y3) are detailed below:

Table 11. Partial Correlation Analysis of Coworker-related Burnout (Y3)

Dimension	Spearman's ρ	P	
Directive Leadership (X1)	0,085	0,218	Insignificant
Supportive Leadership (X2)	0.147	0,032	Significant
Participative Leadership (X3)	0,161	0,019	Significant
Achivement-Oriented Leadership (X4)	0,005	0,941	Insignificant

Table 11 reveals that among the four leadership styles Directive Leadership (X1), Supportive Leadership (X2), Participative Leadership (X3), and Achievement-Oriented Leadership (X4) certain dimensions exhibit a significant relationship with Coworker-related Burnout (Y3). Specifically, Supportive Leadership shows a correlation $\rho = 0.147$ with $p = 0.032$ ($p < 0.05$), while Participative Leadership demonstrates $\rho = 0.161$ with $p = 0.019$ ($p < 0.05$).

Conversely, Directive Leadership (X1) and Achievement-Oriented Leadership (X4) do not show a significant correlation with Coworker-related Burnout, as their significance values exceed the 0.05 threshold.

DISCUSSION

The results of the Spearman's Rho correlation test indicate that there is no significant relationship between leadership style and burnout ($\rho = 0.075$; $p = 0.272 > 0.05$), leading to the rejection of the research hypothesis. This finding is consistent with the study by Putri Masduki et al. (2021) which states that leadership style does not correlate with burnout. These results suggest that the burnout experienced by production employees is not directly influenced by the leadership style of their superiors.

The results showing no relationship between leadership style and burnout may be influenced by the demographic characteristic of the respondents. Descriptive statistical results indicate that approximately 95% of respondents perceive their superior's leadership style to be in the moderate category. This suggests that the low variation in the independent variable may reduce that the model's ability to detect a significant relationship. This condition could be influenced by several factors such as age, gender, work systems, and length of service.

This study is dominated by workers aged 18 to 30 years (43%) who are in their productive years and experience moderate levels of burnout (42.8%). At this stage, individuals are still in the process of adjusting to job demands, making them vulnerable to burnout caused by work requirements, role ambiguity, and environmental adaptation (Indiawati et al., 2022). Furthermore, in a production environment, leadership style is not always able to reduce structural work demands. Consequently, burnout is more heavily influenced by work pressure rather than leadership factors (Nugroho & Lestari, 2022).

Furthermore, the respondents in this study are predominantly male (95.3%). In the context of production work, which is physical and operational in nature, this condition shows a compatibility between workforce characteristics and job demands. Research indicates that men have a higher risk of experiencing burnout compared to women (Aulia & Rita, 2021). This situation may cause work pressure to be perceived more as an inherent part of job requirements, meaning it is not directly influenced by leadership factors. Consequently, the influence of leadership style on burnout becomes less dominant.

Working conditions in the production sector, characterized by high output targets, repetitive physical tasks, and shift work systems, serve as the primary sources of occupational fatigue. In this study, the vast majority of respondents work under a shift system (89.7%; n=192), which is associated with increased work fatigue (Trimala et al., 2023). This finding is supported by research showing that job demands and target pressures contribute to occupational exhaustion, even more dominantly than relational factors (Darmasari, 2022; Munawaroh, 2020). This persistent fatigue tends to develop into work-related burnout (Kristensen et al., 2005), illustrating the strong influence of operational conditions on the emergence of burnout.

Length of service also plays a role in the burnout conditions of employees. In this study, the majority of respondents have been employed for more than 5 years (70.1%). A long tenure is associated with an increased risk of burnout due to the continuous accumulation of job demands. This finding is consistent with Julia et al. (2025) who demonstrate that employees with longer years of service are more vulnerable to burnout. Such conditions indicate that burnout is more influenced by job demands than by leadership factors, thereby explaining why no significant relationship was found between leadership style and burnout.

This finding is also reinforced by other studies showing that high and sustained job demands have a direct relationship with burnout and can predict burnout in the long term (Romero-Carazas et al., 2024; Lehtiniemi et al., 2023). This emphasizes that within a production work environment, structural factors play a more dominant role in influencing burnout.

However, the results of this study differ from those of Ajami & Jayanegara (2024) in the healthcare sector, which found a significant relationship between leadership style and burnout. This difference suggests that the influence of leadership is contextual. In professions that emphasize interpersonal interaction, leadership plays a more powerful role, whereas in the production industry, which is dominated by physical and operational demands, burnout is more heavily influenced by working conditions.

CONCLUSION

This study concludes that leadership style does not have a significant influence on burnout among employees in the production department of the textile industry. This finding indicates that the burnout experienced by employees is more heavily dominated by physical and structural job demands rather than leadership style as a job resource. Within the framework of the Job Demands Resources (JD-R) Model, this confirms that the effectiveness of job resources, including leadership, highly depends on the level and characteristics of the job demands faced by employees. In the context of production work, characterized by high output targets, repetitive physical tasks, and shift work systems, tend to emerge as a consequence of structural pressure, making the role of leadership relatively limited in influencing burnout.

These findings suggest that burnout prevention for production employees should prioritize structural interventions, such as managing workloads, setting realistic targets, and designing physical capacity adaptive shift systems. While leadership maintains the organizational climate, improving it alone is insufficient without managing structural job demands. Future research should position job demands as the primary predictor and explore mediating or moderating variables. Additionally, analyzing specific dimensions like work-related burnout could offer deeper insights into exhaustion mechanisms within the manufacturing sector.

REFERENCES

- Afiansyah, M. R., & Adi, A. N. (2024). Pengaruh Beban Kerja dan Stres Kerja terhadap Burnout pada saat Covid-19. *Jurnal Kewirausahaan Dan Inovasi*, 2(2), 543–552. <https://doi.org/10.21776/jki.2023.02.2.20>
- Ajami, W. A., & Jayanegara, O. (2024). Hubungan Gaya Kepemimpinan Transformasional terhadap Burnout Syndrom pada Perawat Rumah Sakit Permata Keluarga Jabeka. *Jurnal Kesehatan Dan Teknologi Medis*, 8(10).
- Angeline, G., Putri, N., & Yudiarto, A. (2025). Penerapan Rasch Model Untuk Validasi Copenhagen Burnout Inventory (CBI) Versi Indonesia. *Syntax Literate: Jurnal Ilmiah Indonesia*, 10(6). <https://doi.org/10.36418/syntax-literate.v10i6.60382>

- Aulia, A., & Rita, N. (2021). Hubungan Jenis Kelamin, Masa Kerja, Komitmen Organisasi, Gaya Kepemimpinan dan Kejadian Burnout pada Perawat di Rumah Sakit P.P. Tahun 2019. *Jurnal Kesehatan Lentera 'Aisyiyah*, 4, 492–501.
- Azwar, S. (2023). *Penyusunan SKALA PSIKOLOGI* (3rd ed.). Pustaka Pelajar.
- Busti, M. F., Yulihastri, & Rivai, H. A. (2023). Pengaruh Beban Kerja dan Resiliensi terhadap Job Burnout dengan Stres Kerja sebagai Variabel Mediasi. *Jurnal Informatika Ekonomi Bisnis*, 632–640. <https://doi.org/10.37034/infkeb.v5i2.566>
- Christy, A. N., & Sholihati, A. (2017). Pengaruh Stres Kerja Terhadap Kinerja Karyawan The Influence of Job Stress on Employees Job Performance. *Jurnal Riset Bisnis & Investasi*, 3(2).
- Daffa, N., Purnamasari, F., Supriyaningsih, O., Manajemen, P., Syariah, B., Islam, U., Raden, N., & Lampung, I. (2024). Pengaruh Burnout Karyawan, Lingkungan Kerja Non Fisik Dan Kompensasi Terhadap Turnover Intention Karyawan. *Jurnal Manajemen Dan Bisnis (JMB)*, 5(2), 28–35. <https://jurnal.umitra.ac.id/index.php/JEBI/article/view/1641>
- Dani, R., Kasanah, U., Mulya Syamsul, E., Wulan Pujiriyani, D., Piter Nizu Kekri, B., Mohamad Ridwan, A., Tenri Nurkamilah, B., Atmatri Putra, D., Amin, M., Ari Kuncoroyakti, Y., Zulaeha, O., Gradini, E., Elnath Aldi, B., Hanna Febriani, D., Ginting, D., & Rosiana Nita Putri, M. (2025). Desain Penelitian Teori, Metode, dan Implementasi. In M. Pd. T. Sarwandi (Ed.), *Jurnal Penerbit Mifandi Mandiri* (1st ed., Number 01). PT. Mifandi Mandiri Digital. <https://jurnal.mifandimandiri.com/index.php/penerbitmmd/article/view/109>
- Darmasari, E. (2022). Pengaruh Beban Kerja dan Stres Kerja terhadap Produktivitas Kerja Karyawan CV. Sinar Utama Yamaha Kota Samarinda. *Jurnal Administrasi Bisnis FISIPOL UNMUL*, 10(4), 296–302. <https://doi.org/10.54144/jadbis.v10i4.9190>
- Due, M. B., Nursalam, N., & Wahyudi, A. S. (2020). Hubungan Gaya Kepemimpinan dengan Burnout Syndrome dan Kinerja Perawat di Ruang Rawat Inap RSUD Bajawa (Relationship with Leadership Style Burnout Syndrome and Nursing Performance in patients of RSUD Bajawa). *Fundamental and Management Nursing Journal*, 3(1), 8–4. <https://doi.org/10.20473/fmnm.v2i2.17800>
- Dwiyanto, N., & Sularso, R. A. (2017). Pengaruh Gaya Kepemimpinan, Lingkungan Kerja terhadap Keinginan Berpindah Tempat Kerja melalui Kejenuhan (Burnout) Tenaga Kependidikan Kontrak Kerja Universitas Jember. *Relasi: Jurnal Ekonomi*, (2), 347–365. <https://doi.org/10.31967/relasi.v13i2.122>
- Fhauzan, R. F., & Ali, H. (2024). Pengaruh Beban Kerja dan Burnout Terhadap Kinerja Karyawan Melalui Stress Kerja. *Jurnal Pendidikan Siber Nusantara (JPSN)*, 2(4), 169–176. <https://doi.org/10.38035/jpsn.v2i4>
- Firmansyah, D., & Dede. (2022). Teknik Pengambilan Sampel Umum dalam Metodologi Penelitian: Literature Review. *Jurnal Ilmiah Pendidikan Holistik (JIPIH)*, 1(2), 85–114. <https://doi.org/10.55927>
- House, R. J. (1996). Path-Goal Theory of Leadership: Lessons, Legacy, and a Reformulated Theory. *Leadership Quarterly*, 7, 323–352.
- Husaeni, A. F., & Wiratno, A. (2020). Pengaruh Gaya Kepemimpinan Dan Motivasi Terhadap Burnout Pada PT. Indaco Warna Dunia (Regional Sales Purwokerto). *Media Ekonomi*, 20(2), 8–17. <https://doi.org/10.30595/medek.v20i2.11214>
- Husna, F. A. Il, Citriadin, Y., & Hermansyah. (2025). Pengaruh Gaya Kepemimpinan Path Goal Theory terhadap Inovasi Pengajaran Pada Lembaga Pendidikan Islam di Lombok. *Jurnal Manajemen Pendidikan*, 10(2), 339–348. <https://doi.org/10.34125/jmp.v10i2.420>
- Indiawati, O. C., Sya'diyah Hidayatus, Rachmawati, D. S., & Suhardiningsih, A. V. S. (2022). Analisis Faktor yang Mempengaruhi Kejadian Burnout Syndrome Perawat di RS Darmo Surabaya. *CENDEKIA UTAMA: Jurnal Keperawatan Dan Kesehatan Masyarakat*, 11(1), 2022. <http://jurnal.stikeskendekiautamakudus.ac.id>
- Julia, F., Suryono, H., Kriswandana, F., Winarko, W., & Faruk, U. (2025). Pengaruh Beban Kerja Mental, Shift, dan Masa Kerja terhadap Burnout Syndrome Perawat di Rumah Sakit. *JURNAL RISET KESEHATAN POLTEKKES DEPKES BANDUNG*, 17(1), 147–153. <https://doi.org/10.34011/juriskesbdg.v17i1.2679>
- Kemala, E. R., & Farlis, F. (2025). Pengaruh Gaya Kepemimpinan, Lingkungan Kerja dan Burnout Terhadap Work Life Balance Pada Pekerja Perempuan di Universitas Dharma Andalas Melalui Motivasi Sebagai Variabel Intervening. *Jurnal Ekonomi Dan Bisnis Dharma Andalas*, 27(2), 172–185. <https://doi.org/10.47233/jebd.v27i2.1901>
- Kristensen, T. S., Borritz, M., Villadsen, E., & Christensen, K. B. (2005). The Copenhagen Burnout Inventory: A new tool for the assessment of burnout. *Work and Stress*, 19(3), 192–207. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02678370500297720>
- Lehtiniemi, K., Tossavainen, A., Auvinen, E., Herttälampi, M., & Feldt, T. (2023). Do intensified job demands predict burnout? How motivation to lead and leadership status may have a moderating effect. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 14. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1048487>
- Marua, S., Budi Sulistyio Radikun, T., & Sarah Marua, C. (2022). Bagaimana Peran Gaya Kepemimpinan Transformasional dan Resiliensi Terhadap Burnout yang Diakibatkan Tuntutan Kerja Kuantitatif. *Psikostudia Jurnal Psikologi*, 11(3), 442–450. <https://doi.org/10.30872/psikostudia.v11i3>

- Munawaroh, S. (2020). Pengaruh Kerja Persepsi Dukungan Organisasi dan Beban Kerja Terhadap Kelelahan Kerja. *Psikoborneo Jurnal Ilmiah Psikologi*, 8(1), 141–146. <https://doi.org/10.30872/psikoborneo.v8i1.4869>
- Nadapdap, N., Panjaitan, F., Damanik, H., & Simanjuntak, S. I. R. (2024). Pengaruh Beban Kerja dan Lingkungan melalui Burnout dan Dampaknya terhadap Kinerja Karyawan. *GENUNG: Entrepreneurship, Management, and Business Journal*, 1(02), 100–114. <https://ejournal.genungmentorshipgroup.com/index.php/gembj/article/view/22>
- Nisa, N. I. C., & Salim, A. (2025). The Effect of Social Support on Employee Burnout: A Leadership Style Perspective. *Psikoborneo Jurnal Ilmiah Psikologi*, 13, 121–127. <https://doi.org/10.30872/psikoborneo.v13i1>
- Nugroho, F. R., & Lestari, P. (2022). Analisis Faktor Penyebab Burnout pada Karyawan di masa Pandemi. *Jurnal Psikologi Dan Kesehatan Mental*, 9(1), 34–45.
- Putri Masduki, M., Ekawati, & Wahyuni, I. (2021). Hubungan antara Karakteristik Demografi Pekerja, Beban Kerja Mental, dan Gaya Kepemimpinan terhadap Burnout pada Staff Administrasi FKM UNDIP. *Jurnal Kesehatan Masyarakat (e-Journal)*, 9(6), 784–792. <http://ejournal3.undip.ac.id/index.php/jkm>
- Ramadani, R., Dharma, S., & Jadmiko, P. (2019). Pengaruh Beban Kerja, Stres Kerja dan Perceived Fairness terhadap Burnout pada Pegawai Badan Kepegawaian dan Pengembangan Sumber Daya Manusia (BKPSDM) Kabupaten Padang Pariaman. *Jurnal Manajemen Universitas Bung Hatta*, 14(2), 6–16. <https://doi.org/10.37301/jmubh.v14i2.14808>
- Romero-Carazas, R., Almanza-Cabe, R. B., Valero-Ancco, V. N., Espíritu-Martínez, A. P., Espinoza-Casco, R. J., Garro-Aburto, L. L., Vizcarra-Quiñones, A. M., Samaniego-Montoya, C. M., Denegri-Velarde, M. I., & Ochoa-Tataje, F. A. (2024). Burnout and Physical Activity as Predictors of Job Satisfaction Among Peruvian Nurses: The Job Demands-Resources Theory. *Journal of Primary Care and Community Health*, 15, 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.1177/21501319241256265>
- Schaufeli, W. B., & Greenglass, E. R. (2001). INTRODUCTION TO SPECIAL ISSUE ON BURNOUT AND HEALTH. *Psychology & Health*, 16(pp), 501–510. <https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/08870440108405523>
- Trimala, A., Damayanti, R., Lutfiya, I., & Rahmania, N. E. N. (2023a). Hubungan Shift Kerja dan Faktor Individu dengan Kelelahan Kerja pada Pekerja Area Produksi Industri Manufaktur. *Journal of Industrial Hygiene and Occupational Health*, 8(1), 36–49. <https://doi.org/10.21111/jihoh.v8i1.9247>
- Trimala, A., Damayanti, R., Lutfiya, I., & Rahmania, N. E. N. (2023b). Hubungan Shift Kerja dan Faktor Individu dengan Kelelahan Kerja pada Pekerja Area Produksi Industri Manufaktur. *Journal of Industrial Hygiene and Occupational Health*, 8(1), 36–49. <https://doi.org/10.21111/jihoh.v8i1.9247>
- WHO. (2019, May). Burn-out an “occupational phenomenon”: International Classification of Diseases. *World Health Organization*. <https://www.who.int/news/item/28-05-2019-burn-out-an-occupational-phenomenon-international-classification-of-diseases>