

Job Satisfaction and Work Engagement as Mediators Between Workload and Employee Burnout at PT Pesta Pora Abadi Malang

Lutfi Septia Nova^{1*}, Syaiful Arifin², Moh. Nur Singgih³
Magister Manajemen, Universitas Merdeka Malang, Indonesia
Corresponding Author: Lutfi Septia Nova lutfiseptiaa8@gmail.com

ARTICLE INFO

Keywords: burnout, employees, job satisfaction, work engagement, workload

Received : 10, January

Revised : 14, February

Accepted: 27, March

©2026 Nova, Arifin, Singgih : This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).



ABSTRACT

Burnout is a condition of chronic work-related stress that can negatively affect employee performance if not properly managed. Various internal and external factors are known to influence burnout levels. This study aims to examine the mediating roles of job satisfaction and work engagement in the relationship between workload and burnout. The participants consisted of all employees in the Human Capital and Legal Divisions of PT Pesta Pora Abadi, total 230 individuals. The instruments used in this study were the Workload Scale, Utrecht Work Engagement Scale-9 (UWES-9), Generic Job Satisfaction Scale, and Burnout Scale. Data were analyzed using mediated regression analysis with the assistance of Hayes' PROCESS Macro (Model 4). The results indicated that workload has a significant effect on burnout through two mediation pathways, namely job satisfaction and work engagement.

INTRODUCTION

PT Pesta Pora Abadi operates in the food and beverage (F&B) industry and has experienced rapid growth in recent years, becoming a market leader in the spicy noodle segment. Its main brand, Mie Gacoan, has expanded to numerous cities across Indonesia and has absorbed a large number of workers. This rapid expansion reflects the company's strong business performance and requires effective organizational support, particularly from the Human Capital (HC) and Legal departments, which play strategic roles in sustaining organizational growth.

As part of its expansion strategy, the company continuously opens new restaurant outlets in various cities. This ongoing expansion creates considerable challenges for the Human Capital department in ensuring the timely availability of qualified human resources. Several core functions within HC, such as recruitment, compensation and benefits, and industrial relations, are required to operate efficiently in order to meet organizational targets. For instance, the recruitment team must fulfill workforce demands for newly established restaurants and production facilities within limited timeframes. At the same time, the Legal division carries substantial responsibilities related to business expansion, including managing operational permits, preparing and reviewing employment contracts, and handling various legal matters associated with organizational growth.

High job demands accompanied by strict deadlines place both divisions under considerable work pressure. When such working conditions persist without adequate organizational support, they may negatively affect employees' psychological well-being. Employees are valuable organizational assets; therefore, organizations need to create supportive working conditions that enable employees to perform optimally and maintain their well-being.

The work environment plays a crucial role in organizational functioning (Chori, 2022). A supportive and comfortable work environment can enhance employees' work quality and productivity (Al-Omri & Okasheh, 2017). A conducive work environment allows employees to focus more effectively on their tasks, thereby improving productivity (Tahir, 2015). Conversely, an unfavorable work environment may increase the risk of burnout among employees (Montero-Marin et al., 2013).

Burnout has become a prevalent issue in modern organizations. According to Maslach, Schaufeli, and Leiter (2001), burnout is a psychological condition characterized by emotional exhaustion, reduced motivation, and decreased involvement in work as a result of prolonged emotional stress, leading to both physical and mental fatigue. Freudenberger (1974) further described burnout as a condition arising from continuous exposure to excessive job demands over time.

Previous studies have shown that burnout negatively affects employee outcomes, including job performance (Sanchez-Gomez & Bresó, 2020; Sneha, 2020) and organizational commitment (Akdemir, 2019; Sokal, Trudel, & Babb, 2021). In addition, burnout has been associated with higher levels of absenteeism

(Dyrbye et al., 2019) and turnover intention (Ivancevic & Maricic, 2020), which may ultimately reduce organizational effectiveness.

Factors influencing burnout can generally be classified into personal and situational factors. Personal factors originate within the individual and include characteristics such as hardiness personality (Chori, Winarsunu, & Hasanati, 2022), work engagement (Ivancevic & Maricic, 2020; Salmela-Aro, 2019), self-efficacy (Malinen & Savolainen, 2016), and psychological empowerment (Gong, Li, & Niu, 2021). Situational factors, on the other hand, refer to external conditions such as workload (Amri et al., 2020; Diehl et al., 2021), work environment (Shaheen & Mahmood, 2020), job satisfaction (Alakhras, 2022), and social support (Amri et al., 2020).

Workload refers to the amount of work assigned to an employee within a given period of time (Inegbedion et al., 2020). When workload increases, employees must invest more time and energy to meet job demands. This may deplete personal resources that could otherwise be allocated to personal life and social relationships. If such conditions persist, excessive workload may lead to stress that negatively affects psychological well-being (Hobfoll et al., 2018). Individuals differ in their capacity to manage job demands, and increasing workload may reduce their ability to work without experiencing fatigue (Rusmiati, Harjadi, & Fitriani, 2021).

Empirical evidence indicates that workload is positively associated with burnout. Khan et al. (2019) found that workload is positively related to burnout dimensions, particularly emotional exhaustion, while supervisory and coworker support moderate the relationship between workload and burnout. Higher levels of social support were shown to reduce both workload perceptions and burnout levels.

The present study assumes that workload does not influence burnout directly but operates through mediating variables, namely job satisfaction and work engagement. Job satisfaction is defined as a pleasurable emotional state resulting from an individual's evaluation of their work experiences (Locke, 1976). It reflects overall quality of life, including social relationships, family life, and health, and influences outcomes such as performance, absenteeism, and employee turnover. Low job satisfaction may contribute to prolonged stress and increase the risk of burnout (Lee, 2018).

Anwar (2022) reported a negative relationship between workload and job satisfaction. When employees perceive that they lack sufficient ability, knowledge, or skills to manage their job demands, dissatisfaction may arise. Excessive workload, high organizational demands, and long working hours reduce employee well-being and performance. Employees who experience low job satisfaction are more likely to experience prolonged stress, which may eventually lead to burnout.

In addition to job satisfaction, work engagement plays a critical role in the development of burnout. Kanungo (1982) defined work engagement as the extent to which individuals are physically, emotionally, and cognitively involved in their work, such that work becomes a central part of their identity. Employees

with high levels of work engagement tend to demonstrate enthusiasm, dedication, and strong involvement in their tasks.

Empirical findings by Alexias, Papandreopoulou, and Togas (2024) indicate that work engagement is significantly associated with burnout. Specifically, vigor is negatively related to emotional exhaustion and depersonalization, while positively related to personal accomplishment. Dedication shows a positive relationship with personal accomplishment and a negative relationship with depersonalization. Absorption is positively associated with personal accomplishment and negatively associated with emotional exhaustion and depersonalization. The strongest association was observed between dedication and personal accomplishment, suggesting that higher dedication corresponds to greater perceived achievement.

Furthermore, Schaufeli, Bakker, and Van Rhenen (2009) demonstrated that high workload can reduce work engagement, particularly when job demands are not balanced with adequate resources. This indicates that workload not only contributes directly to exhaustion but also indirectly influences burnout by weakening work engagement.

Based on the discussion above, this study aims to examine the mediating roles of job satisfaction and work engagement in the relationship between workload and burnout. High workload may cause employees to experience excessive pressure and fatigue, thereby reducing their level of job satisfaction. At the same time, heavy workload may diminish employees' physical, emotional, and cognitive involvement in their work. Decreases in job satisfaction and work engagement subsequently reduce motivation and work enthusiasm, ultimately increasing the risk of burnout. Therefore, this study proposes that job satisfaction and work engagement mediate the effect of workload on burnout.

THEORETICAL REVIEW

Recent findings by Wang (2024) support this perspective, showing that excessive workload significantly reduces work engagement, especially when organizational support and job control are insufficient. Within the Job Demands-Resources (JD-R) framework, an imbalance between job demands and available resources drains employees' energy, weakens motivation, and reduces engagement. As work engagement declines, the likelihood of burnout increases due to the loss of enthusiasm, dedication, and attachment to work.

The Job Demands-Resources (JD-R) theory is widely applied to examine how workplace conditions influence employee well-being and performance (Bakker & Demerouti, 2017). Developed roughly fifteen years ago, the JD-R model was initially designed to explain burnout, a prolonged form of work-related psychological stress marked by emotional exhaustion (feeling drained and depleted), mental disengagement (cynicism and reduced enthusiasm), and diminished personal effectiveness (self-doubt regarding one's abilities and contributions at work). Later, the model was expanded to include work engagement, defined as a positive and fulfilling psychological condition characterized by vigor (high energy and resilience), dedication (a sense of

meaning, pride, and challenge), and absorption (deep concentration and enjoyment in work activities).

According to the JD-R framework, all occupations involve both job demands and job resources. Fundamentally, the model proposes two core psychological mechanisms. The first is a stress process, in which excessive job demands combined with insufficient resources can lead to burnout and result in negative outcomes such as absenteeism, reduced performance, limited work capacity, and weaker organizational commitment. The second is a motivational process, where sufficient job resources promote work engagement, which in turn contributes to positive outcomes including stronger organizational commitment, retention intentions, extra-role behaviors, improved employee safety, and enhanced job performance.

H1: Workload has a significant effect on burnout.

H2: Workload has a significant effect on job satisfaction.

H3: Workload has a significant effect on work engagement.

H4: Job satisfaction has a significant effect on burnout.

H5: Work engagement has a significant effect on burnout.

H6: Workload has a significant effect on burnout through job satisfaction.

H7: Workload has a significant effect on burnout through work engagement.

METHODOLOGY

This study employed a quantitative, non-experimental research design. According to Creswell (2012), a quantitative approach enables researchers to formulate objective and measurable research questions and hypotheses. A mediation approach was applied to examine the effect of workload on burnout, with job satisfaction and work engagement serving as mediating variables.

The study was conducted within the scope of Human Resource Management, focusing on factors associated with employee burnout in an organizational setting. The research involved employees from the Human Capital and Legal divisions of PT Pesta Pora Abadi, Malang, which were selected due to their strategic roles and relatively high job demands. At the time of data collection, the population consisted of 230 employees. All members of the population were included as research participants through a saturated sampling technique. The inclusion of employees across different job levels was intended to obtain a comprehensive overview of workload, job satisfaction, work engagement, and burnout, thereby allowing the findings to reflect the overall psychological condition of employees within the studied divisions and to provide more representative insights for organizational evaluation and improvement.

Workload was defined as an individual's capacity to manage physical, mental, and temporal job demands, and was measured using the NASA-TLX dimensions, namely mental demand, physical demand, temporal demand, performance, effort, and frustration level. Job satisfaction was defined as an individual's evaluative and emotional response to their job, encompassing psychological, physical, social, and financial aspects. Work engagement was

conceptualized as a positive and fulfilling work-related state characterized by vigor, dedication, and absorption. Burnout was defined as a psychological condition characterized by emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and reduced personal accomplishment.

The data used in this study were primary data collected directly from respondents through an online questionnaire distributed via Google Forms. Measurement instruments were adapted from well-established scales. Workload was measured using an adapted NASA-TLX scale consisting of 18 items representing six dimensions. Job satisfaction was assessed using the Generic Job Satisfaction Scale developed by MacDonald and MacIntyre (1997), with adjustments made to ensure proportional representation of its four aspects. Work engagement was measured using the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (UWES-9) developed by Schaufeli and Bakker (2004). Burnout was measured using a scale based on the three dimensions proposed by Maslach and Jackson (1981), consisting of 12 items. All instruments were modified to employ a four-point Likert scale ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree to facilitate respondent understanding.

Data analysis was conducted using SPSS software. The analytical procedures included item discrimination testing, reliability testing, normality testing, and correlation analysis. Mediation analysis was performed using the PROCESS Macro by Hayes (Model 4) to examine the mediating roles of job satisfaction and work engagement in the relationship between workload and burnout.

RESULTS

General Description of Research Participants

In this section, you must provide us with each step taken to accomplish your studies. You must not put too much the result of descriptive statistics here; on the other hand, it should be summarized in an easier to read table or graphs. You must not forget the numbers for every table and chart presented in your paper.

Table 1. Demographic Characteristics of Research Participants

Characteristics	Frequency (N)	Percentage (%)
Division		
Human Capital	122	53,0%
Legal	108	47,0%
Age		
20-25 years	130	56,5%
26-30 years	57	24,9%
31-35 years	27	11,7%
36-40 years	16	6,9%
Gender		
Male	97	42,2%
Female	133	57,8%
Position		
Managerial	31	13,5%

Supervisor	56	24,3%
Staff	143	62,2%
Total	230	100%

The participants of this study consisted of 230 employees from the Human Capital and Legal divisions of PT Pesta Pora Abadi (Mie Gacoan) in Malang. The majority of respondents were from the Human Capital division (53%), while 47% were from the Legal division. In terms of age, most participants were between 20–25 years old (56.5%), whereas the smallest proportion was aged 36–40 years (6.9%). Based on gender, female employees constituted the majority of the sample (57.8%), compared to male employees (42.2%). Regarding job level, most respondents held staff positions (62.2%), followed by supervisors (24.3%), while managerial employees represented the smallest group (13.5%).

Table 2. Item Discrimination Test of Workload (Initial Analysis)

Aspect	Item	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Result
Physical demand	X1	0,547	Valid
	X2	0,113	Not Valid
	X3	0,587	Valid
Effort	X4	0,679	Valid
	X5	0,683	Valid
	X6	0,157	Not Valid
Mental demand	X7	0,543	Valid
	X8	0,757	Valid
	X9	0,697	Valid
Temporal demand	X10	0,564	Valid
	X11	0,679	Valid
	X12	0,683	Valid
Frustration level	X13	0,547	Valid
	X14	0,587	Valid
	X15	0,543	Valid
Performance	X16	0,757	Valid
	X17	0,697	Valid
	X18	0,193	Not Valid

Based on Table 2, three items (X2, X6, and X18) had corrected item-total correlation values below 0.30 and were therefore removed. A second item analysis was then conducted.

Table 3. Item Discrimination Test of Workload (Final)

Aspect	Item	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Result
Physical demand	X1	0,566	Valid
	X3	0,588	Valid
Effort	X4	0,682	Valid

	X5	0,700	Valid
Mental demand	X7	0,542	Valid
	X8	0,769	Valid
	X9	0,724	Valid
Temporal demand	X10	0,562	Valid
	X11	0,682	Valid
	X12	0,700	Valid
Frustration level	X13	0,566	Valid
	X14	0,588	Valid
	X15	0,542	Valid
Performance	X16	0,769	Valid
	X17	0,724	Valid
Physical demand	X1	0,566	Valid
	X3	0,588	Valid
Effort	X4	0,682	Valid

Based on Table 3, all 15 remaining workload items demonstrated corrected item-total correlation values above 0.30 and were therefore considered valid.

Table 4. Item Discrimination Test of Job Satisfaction

Aspect	Item	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Result
Psikologis	KP1	0,466	Valid
	KP3	0,647	Valid
	KP5	0,600	Valid
	KP8	0,570	Valid
Fisik	KP2	0,584	Valid
	KP7	0,662	Valid
Sosial	KP4	0,638	Valid
	KP9	0,600	Valid
Finansial	KP6	0,601	Valid
	KP10	0,581	Valid

Based on Table 4, all ten job satisfaction items exceeded the minimum criterion of 0.30 and were therefore retained.

Table 5. Item Discrimination Test of Work Engagement

Aspect	Item	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Result
Vigor	WE1	0,425	Valid
	WE2	0,340	Valid
	WE3	0,577	Valid
Dedication	WE4	0,442	Valid
	WE5	0,512	Valid
	WE6	0,331	Valid
Absorption	WE7	0,309	Valid

WE8	0,481	Valid
WE9	0,442	Valid

Based on Table 5, all ten job satisfaction items exceeded the minimum criterion of 0.30 and were therefore retained.

Table 6. Item Discrimination Test of Burnout (Initial)

Aspect	Item	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Result
Emotional Exhaustion	Y1	0,073	Not Valid
	Y2	0,574	Valid
Depersonalization	Y3	0,365	Valid
	Y4	0,059	Not Valid
	Y5	0,495	Valid
	Y6	0,384	Valid
	Y7	0,082	Not Valid
	Y8	0,695	Valid
Personal Accomplishment	Y9	0,495	Valid
	Y10	0,165	Not Valid
	Y11	0,578	Valid
	Y12	0,342	Valid

Based on Table 6, four items (Y1, Y4, Y7, and Y10) were removed due to low corrected item-total correlation values. A second analysis was conducted using the remaining items.

Table 7. Item Discrimination Test of Burnout (Final)

Aspect	Item	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Result
Emotional Exhaustion	Y2	0,614	Valid
Emotional Exhaustion	Y3	0,442	Valid
Depersonalization	Y5	0,574	Valid
	Y6	0,452	Valid
	Y8	0,704	Valid
Personal Accomplishment	Y9	0,554	Valid
Personal Accomplishment	Y11	0,591	Valid
	Y12	0,375	Valid

Based on Table 7, all eight remaining burnout items met the validity criterion and were retained for further analysis.

Table 8. Reliability Test Results

Variable	Number of Item	Cronbach Alpha
Workload	15	0,926

Job Satisfaction	10	0,874
Work Engagement	9	0,744
Burnout	8	0,819

Based on Table 8, all variables showed Cronbach's alpha values greater than 0.70, indicating good internal consistency. Therefore, all measurement instruments used in this study were considered reliable and suitable for further statistical analysis.

General Analysis of Research Participants

Table 9. Reliability Test Results

Variable	Mean	Standard Deviation	Category	
			Rendah	Tinggi
Workload	2,06	0,37	115 (50,0%)	115 (50,0%)
Job Satisfaction	2,60	0,27	96 (41,7%)	134 (58,3%)
Work Engagement	2,54	0,35	125 (54,3%)	105 (45,7%)
Burnout	2,10	0,36	96 (41,7%)	134 (58,3%)

Based on Table 9, the distribution of respondents across the research variables is as follows. For workload, 115 respondents (50.0%) reported low workload, while another 115 respondents (50.0%) reported high workload. Regarding job satisfaction, 96 respondents (41.7%) had low job satisfaction, whereas 134 respondents (58.3%) had high job satisfaction. For work engagement, 125 respondents (54.3%) were classified as having low work engagement, and 105 respondents (45.7%) had high work engagement. Finally, for burnout, 96 respondents (41.7%) experienced low burnout, while 134 respondents (58.3%) experienced high burnout.

Hypothesis Testing Results

Tabel 10. Hypothesis Testing Results

Path	β	p value	95% Confidence Interval	
			LLCI	ULCI
Workload → Job satisfaction → Burnout				
Direct effect				
Workload → burnout (c')	0,597	0,000	0,500	0,693
Workload → Job satisfaction (a ₁)	-0,134	0,005	-0,227	-0,041
Job satisfaction → burnout (b ₁)	-0,192	0,005	-0,325	-0,060
Total effect				
Workload → burnout (c ₁)	0,622	0,000	0,526	0,718
Indirect effect (axb)				
Workload → Job satisfaction → burnout	0,026		0,004	0,062
Workload → Work engagement → Burnout				

Direct effect				
Workload → burnout (c')	0,588	0,000	0,493	0,684
Workload → Work engagement (a ₂)	-0,182	0,003	-0,300	-0,063
Work engagement → burnout (b ₂)	-0,187	0,000	-0,290	-0,084
Total effect				
Workload → burnout (c ₂)	0,622	0,000	0,526	0,718
Indirect effect (axb)				
Workload → Work engagement → Burnout	0,034		0,010	0,066

The analysis showed that workload has a significant effect on burnout, with a coefficient of 0.622 and a p-value of 0.000 ($p < 0.05$). The 95% confidence interval (LLCI = 0.526; ULCI = 0.718) does not include zero, confirming that this effect is statistically significant. The positive relationship indicates that the higher the workload experienced by employees, the higher the level of burnout. Therefore, the first hypothesis is supported.

Workload was also found to have a significant negative effect on job satisfaction, with a coefficient of -0.134 and a p-value of 0.005 ($p < 0.05$). The confidence interval (LLCI = -0.227; ULCI = -0.041) does not include zero, reinforcing the statistical significance of this effect. This negative relationship suggests that as workload increases, employees' job satisfaction decreases. Thus, the second hypothesis is accepted.

Similarly, workload significantly affects work engagement, with a coefficient of -0.182 and a p-value of 0.003 ($p < 0.05$). The confidence interval (LLCI = -0.300; ULCI = -0.063) excludes zero, indicating a statistically significant effect. The negative coefficient implies that higher workload is associated with lower work engagement. Consequently, the third hypothesis is supported.

Job satisfaction was found to have a significant negative effect on burnout, with a coefficient of -0.192 and a p-value of 0.005 ($p < 0.05$). The confidence interval (LLCI = -0.325; ULCI = -0.060) does not include zero, confirming the significance of this effect. This negative relationship indicates that higher job satisfaction reduces the level of burnout among employees. Therefore, the fourth hypothesis is accepted.

Work engagement also has a significant negative effect on burnout, with a coefficient of -0.187 and a p-value of 0.000 ($p < 0.05$). The confidence interval (LLCI = -0.290; ULCI = -0.084) does not include zero, showing a statistically significant effect. This suggests that employees with higher work engagement experience lower burnout. Hence, the fifth hypothesis is supported.

The mediating role of job satisfaction in the relationship between workload and burnout was confirmed, with a mediation coefficient of 0.026 and a confidence interval (LLCI = 0.004; ULCI = 0.062) that does not include zero,

indicating statistical significance. According to Baron and Kenny (1986), mediation occurs when both the effect of the independent variable on the mediator and the effect of the mediator on the dependent variable are significant, as shown in hypotheses 2 and 4. Therefore, job satisfaction is proven to mediate the effect of workload on burnout, and the sixth hypothesis is accepted.

Finally, work engagement was found to mediate the relationship between workload and burnout, with a mediation coefficient of 0.034 and a confidence interval (LLCI = 0.010; ULCI = 0.066) that does not include zero. This indicates a significant mediation effect, confirming that work engagement serves as a mediator in the effect of workload on burnout. Thus, the seventh hypothesis is supported.

DISCUSSION

The Effect of Workload on Burnout

Based on the analysis, the results show that workload has a significant effect on burnout. This means that the higher the workload employees experience, the more likely they are to feel physically and emotionally exhausted at work. This is in line with Anggraini and Idulfilastri (2023), who found that high workload triggers burnout among employees at PT X, especially when work pressure continues without sufficient rest.

This situation can also be explained using the Job Demands-Resources (JD-R) model by Bakker and Demerouti (2007). The model explains that high job demands, such as excessive workload, drain employees' physical and psychological energy, which can lead to burnout if not balanced with adequate support or resources at work. Therefore, this study supports previous findings that workload is one of the main factors that contribute to burnout. This becomes an important point for organizations, especially in managing task distribution, work hours, and creating a more sustainable work system to reduce the risk of burnout among employees.

The Effect of Workload on Job Satisfaction

Based on the analysis, the results show that workload has a significant effect on job satisfaction. This aligns with the findings of Novita, Beny, and Hanoky (2022), who stated that work engagement can mediate the influence of job crafting, perceived organizational support, and work-life balance on job satisfaction. Excessive or too high workload can lead to stress, burnout, and decreased quality of work life. Employees who face high job demands with low control over their tasks tend to experience higher stress levels and lower job satisfaction. On the other hand, a balanced workload that matches individual capacity tends to increase job satisfaction. Employees feel they can complete tasks effectively without experiencing excessive stress. A moderate workload, which provides challenges without being overwhelming, often enhances a sense of achievement and motivation, which in turn improves job satisfaction.

Research by Bakker and Demerouti (2007) explains that when job resources, such as social support and opportunities for personal development, are adequate, employees can manage high workloads more effectively, which in turn enhances

job satisfaction. A study by Schaufeli and Bakker (2004) also shows that in service-oriented or human-interaction-based jobs (such as in healthcare or education), excessive workload can cause emotional exhaustion and reduce job satisfaction. Conversely, in more structured, task-oriented jobs (for example, in manufacturing or technology), employees may be better able to handle higher workloads, so the impact on job satisfaction is relatively smaller.

The Effect of Workload on Work Engagement

Based on the analysis, the results indicate that workload has a significant effect on work engagement. This finding suggests that the level of workload perceived by employees can influence the extent to which they feel emotionally, cognitively, and physically engaged in their work. High workload, if not accompanied by adequate control and support, has the potential to reduce employees' work engagement.

This result aligns with the study conducted by Wang (2024), which explains that excessive workload can lower an individual's enthusiasm and engagement in the work context. When someone feels overwhelmed by too many or too demanding tasks, work engagement tends to decrease because the individual feels unable to manage the workload optimally.

This is further reinforced by the study of Bakker and Albrecht (2018), which states that work engagement is difficult to maintain when job demands are not balanced with sufficient job resources. The imbalance between demands and resources causes employees to lose intrinsic motivation, feel less empowered, and have insufficient energy and commitment to actively engage in their work.

The Effect of Job Satisfaction on Burnout

Based on the analysis, the results indicate that job satisfaction has a significant effect on burnout. This finding aligns with the study by Payne et al. (2020), which explains that job satisfaction is closely related to burnout among nurses. Employees who feel satisfied with their work are less likely to experience burnout. They also confirmed that social and managerial support play a major role in improving employee well-being and reducing work-related stress.

Job satisfaction often functions as a protective factor that can reduce the likelihood of burnout. Employees who feel satisfied with their jobs tend to have lower stress levels because they feel valued, have control over their work, and perceive their work as meaningful. All of these factors help reduce the psychological pressures that can lead to burnout. Conversely, job dissatisfaction can increase the risk of burnout. When employees feel dissatisfied with their jobs, whether due to poor working conditions, unchallenging tasks, or poor relationships with colleagues and supervisors, they tend to feel isolated and lose motivation. This can make them feel stressed, overwhelmed, and eventually lead to burnout (Alakhras et al., 2022).

The Effect of Work Engagement on Burnout

Based on the analysis, the results indicate that work engagement has a significant effect on burnout. This finding aligns with Aryatno (2019), who found

a negative relationship between work engagement and burnout among police officers. Burnout represents the erosion of an individual's work engagement (Maslach & Leiter, 1997). The rigorous selection process makes new members who are accepted by the institution feel proud and generally committed to their profession when they first start working. However, over time, as they face various challenges during their duties, their level of burnout increases while their work engagement decreases.

Furthermore, the study by Fitriani, Rosilawati, and Ridwansyah (2024) shows that work engagement significantly affects burnout, moderated by happiness at work. If members of the Voting Organizing Group (KPPS) continuously face pressure and demands from their superiors, they are likely to experience work-related stress and, in some cases, resign from their positions.

The Effect of Workload on Burnout through Job Satisfaction

This study shows that job satisfaction mediates the effect of workload on burnout. The findings indicate that a high workload does not directly cause burnout; rather, it first reduces employees' job satisfaction. When someone feels overwhelmed by high job demands but does not gain satisfaction from their work, the likelihood of experiencing emotional, mental, and physical exhaustion increases.

These results are in line with the study by Li et al. (2023) on government employees in China, which demonstrated that job satisfaction significantly mediates the relationship between job stressors, including workload, and job strain (burnout). Employees who are dissatisfied with their work tend to experience psychological stress more easily, especially as job demands increase. Furthermore, Gil et al. (2022) found that high workload is negatively correlated with job satisfaction among healthcare workers in inpatient units. When employees feel that the demands placed on them are not balanced with adequate support or recognition, their job satisfaction decreases, increasing the likelihood of burnout. The study by Andrianto and Priyono (2024) further supports these findings. In the context of a logistics company in Indonesia, they found that job satisfaction statistically acts as a mediator in the relationship between workload and burnout. Demanding work conditions, if not accompanied by a sense of satisfaction, can increase the risk of chronic fatigue.

Theoretically, these findings align with the Job Demands and Resources (JD-R) framework. The model explains that high job demands can drain employees' psychological resources, such as job satisfaction (job resources), thereby creating the potential for burnout. Therefore, maintaining and improving job satisfaction is a crucial strategy to mitigate the negative impact of excessive workload.

The Effect of Workload on Burnout through Work Engagement

Based on the analysis, it was found that work engagement mediates the effect of workload on employee burnout. This means that a high workload does not directly cause burnout; rather, it first reduces employees' engagement in their work, which in turn can increase the risk of burnout. Under high job pressure, employees who feel disengaged emotionally, cognitively, and physically are more likely to experience psychological fatigue.

These findings align with the study by Nickum and Desrumaux (2022), which showed that work engagement can weaken the relationship between high workload and burnout among lawyers. Employees who remain engaged, even under high work pressure, tend to manage stress better and prevent chronic exhaustion. Furthermore, the research by Vander Elst et al. (2016) on home-care nurses in Belgium also showed that high workload is positively correlated with burnout and negatively correlated with work engagement. This study emphasizes that work engagement is not only a psychological resource but also serves as a protective mechanism against the destructive effects of prolonged work pressure.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the data analysis and discussion, it can be concluded that workload plays a crucial role in influencing employee well-being. Employees' workload levels are evenly distributed between high and low, with job satisfaction tending to be high, work engagement relatively low, and burnout predominantly high. Workload significantly affects burnout, job satisfaction, and work engagement, where high workload increases the risk of burnout while reducing satisfaction and engagement. Conversely, job satisfaction and work engagement significantly reduce burnout levels and serve as mediators in the relationship between workload and burnout, highlighting the importance of managing workload, enhancing satisfaction, and fostering engagement to minimize the risk of burnout among employees.

The implications of this study suggest that company leaders should pay greater attention to the psychological well-being of employees. Workload has a significant impact on job satisfaction, but its effect largely depends on factors such as the type of work, the balance between job demands and available resources, and the level of social support. Excessive workload can lead to stress, fatigue, and decreased job satisfaction, whereas a balanced and well-managed workload can enhance satisfaction. Therefore, it is essential for organizations to manage workload effectively and provide sufficient resources to support employee well-being.

FURTHER STUDY

Future research is recommended to explore additional variables such as organizational support, leadership style, and work-life balance that may influence employee burnout, as well as to examine different sectors or larger sample sizes to enhance generalizability. Longitudinal studies are also suggested to better understand causal relationships and the long-term mediating role of job satisfaction and work engagement in reducing burnout.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The authors would like to express their sincere gratitude to all parties who contributed to this research, especially the management and employees of PT Pesta Pora Abadi Malang for their cooperation and participation, as well as to academic advisors and colleagues for their guidance, support, and valuable feedback throughout the research process.

REFERENCES

- Akdemir, O. (2019). The effect of teacher burnout on organizational commitment in Turkish context. *Journal of Education and Training Studies*, 7(4), 171-179.
- Alakhras, M., Al-Mousa, D. S., & Lewis, S. (2022). Assessment and correlation between job satisfaction and burnout among radiographers. *Radiography*, 28(2), 283-287. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.radi.2021.11.003>.
- Alexias, G., Papandreopoulou, M., & Togas, C. (2024). Work engagement and burnout in a private healthcare unit in Greece. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 21(2), 1-12. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph21020130>
- Andrianto, A., & Priyono, E. (2024). Determinants of burnout and job satisfaction as mediating variables in employees of PT Multi International Logistic. *Journal of Economics, Finance and Management Studies*, 7(7), 4783-4790. DOI: 10.47191/jefms/v7-i7-95
- Anggraini, M. Z., & Idulfilastri, R. M. (2023). Peran beban kerja terhadap burnout pada karyawan PT X. *Journal on Education*, 5(2), 5212-5218. DOI: 10.31004/joe.v5i2.1081
- Anwar, M. Y. (2022). The impact of workload on job satisfaction and mediating effect of job stress. *Journal of Innovation and Emerging Technologies*, 2(1), 64-73.
- Aryatno, R. M. (2019). The relationship between work engagement and burnout in Ditpolair Korpolairud Baharkam Polri. *Psychological Research and Intervention*, 2(2), 82-88.
- Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2017). Job demands-resources theory: Taking stock and looking forward. *Journal of occupational health psychology*, 22(3), 273. DOI: 10.1037/ocp0000056
- Bakker, A. B., & Albrecht, S. (2018). Work engagement: current trends. *Career Development International*, 23(1), 4-11. DOI:10.1108/cdi-11-2017-0207
- Chori, D. I. M., Winarsunu, T., & Hasanati, N. (2022). The relationship of the hardiness personality and burnout: Mediation by work-life balance. *International Journal of Indian Psychology*, 10(3), 105-118. DOI: 10.25215/1003.010
- Creswell, John W. (2012). *Educational research: planning, conducting, evaluating, quantitative and qualitative research (Fourth Edition)*. United State of America: Pearson Education Inc. (<http://repository.unmas.ac.id/medias/journal/EBK-00121.pdf>)
- Diehl, E., Rieger, S., Letzel, S., Schablon, A., Nienhaus, A., Escobar Pinzon, L.C., & Dietz, P. (2021). The relationship between workload and burnout among nurses: The buffering role of personal, social and organisational resources. *PLoS One*, 16(1). doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0245798.
- Dyrbye, L. N., Shanafelt, T. D., Johnson, P. O., Johnson, L. A., Satele, D. & West, C. P. (2019). A cross-sectional study exploring the relationship between burnout, absenteeism, and job performance among American nurses. *BMC Nursing*, 18(57), 1-8. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12912-019-0382-7>
- Fitriani, M., Rosilawati, W., & Ridwansyah. (2024). Pengaruh employee engagement terhadap burnout dengan happiness at work sebagai variabel

- moderasi dalam perspektif manajemen insani. *Jurnal Manajemen Bisnis Digital Terkini*, 1(3), 294-307.
- Gong, Z., Li, M. & Niu, X. (2021). The role of psychological empowerment in reducing job burnout among police officers: a variable-centered and person-centered approach. *SAGE Open*, 1-8. doi.org/10.1177/2158244020983305
- Hobfoll, S. E., Halbesleben, J., Neveu, J.-P., & Westman, M. (2018). Conservation of resources in the organizational context: The reality of resources and their consequences. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 5(1), 103-128. doi:10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-032117-104640
- Inegbedion, H., Inegbedion, E., Peter, A., & Harry, L. (2020). Perception of workload balance and employee job satisfaction in work organisations. *Heliyon*, 6(1), 1-9. doi:10.1016/j.heliyon.2020.e03160
- Ivancevic, S. & Maricic, M. (2020). The relationship between recruiter burnout, work engagement and turnover intention: evidence from Serbia. *Inzinerine Ekonomika-Engineering Economics*, 31(2), 197-210. https://doi.org/10.5755/j01.ee.31.2.24100
- Kanungo, R. N. (1982). Measurement of job and work involvement. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 67(3), 341-349. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.67.3.341
- Khan, F., Rasli, A. M., Yasir, M., & Khan, Q. (2019). Interaction effect of social support: the effect of workload on job burnout among universities academicians: case of Pakistan. *International Transaction Journal of Engineering, Management, & Applied Sciences & Technologies*, 10(13), 1-13.
- Lee, H. J. (2018). How emotional intelligence relates to job satisfaction and burnout in public service jobs. *Rev. Int. Des Sci. Adm.*, 84, 729-745
- Li, Y., Yang, F., Zhang, W., & Zhang, Z. (2023) The mediating role of job satisfaction in the stressor-strain relationship among Chinese government employees. *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications*, 10, 1-8. DOI: 10.1057/s41599-023-02386-3
- Nickum M., & Desrumaux, P. (2022). Burnout among lawyers: Effects of workload, latitude and mediation via engagement and over-engagement. *Psychiatry, Psychology, and Law*, 30(3), 349-361. DOI: 10.1080/13218719.2022.2035840.
- Novita, W., Beny, & Hanoky, A. (2022). Peran work engagement sebagai variabel mediasi terhadap job satisfaction. *Management Sustainable Development Journal*, 4(2), 69-82.
- Rusmiati, E., Harjadi, D., & Fitriani, L. K. (2021). Analysis of the impact of risk and workload on motivation and impact on employee performance. *International Journal of Economics, Bussiness and Accounting Research - IJEBAR*, 5(2), 386-398.
- Salmela-Aro, K., Hietajarvi, L., & Lonka, K. (2019). Work burnout and engagement profiles among teachers. *Front. Psychol.*, 10, 1-8.
- Sanchez-Gomez, M. & Bresó, E. (2020). In Pursuit of work performance: testing the contribution of emotional intelligence and burnout. *International*

- Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 17, 1-13. DOI: 10.3390/ijerph17155373
- Schaufeli, W. B. (2017). Applying the Job Demands-Resources model: A 'how to' guide to measuring and tackling work engagement and burnout. *Organizational dynamics*, 46(2), 120-132. DOI: j.orgdyn.2017.04.008
- Shaheen, F. & Mahmood, N. (2020). Burnout and its predictors: testing a model among public school teachers. *Pakistan Journal of Psychological Research*, 35(2), 355-372. [https://doi.org/ 10.33824/PJPR.2020.35.2.19](https://doi.org/10.33824/PJPR.2020.35.2.19)
- Sneha, K. (2020). Occupational stress, burnout and work performance of government school teachers in port blair, andaman and nicobar islands. *Journal of Xi'an University of Architecture & Technology*, 12(2), 2534-2543.
- Sokal, L., Trudel, L. & Babb, J. (2021). I've had it! Factors associated with burnout and low organizational commitment in Canadian teachers during the second wave of the COVID-19 pandemic. *International Journal of Educational Research Open*, 2(2), 1-9.
- Tahir, M. (2015). Impact of working environment on employee's productivity: A case study of Banks and Insurance Companies in Pakistan. *European Journal of Business and Management*, 7(1).
- Vander Elst, T., Cavents, C., Daneels, K., Johannik, K., Baillien, E., Van den Broeck, A., & Godderis, L. (2016). Job demands-resources predicting burnout and work engagement among Belgian home health care nurses: A cross-sectional study. *Nursing Outlook*, 64(6), 542-556. DOI: 10.1016/j.outlook.2016.06.004
- Wang, Y. (2024). Exploring the impact of workload, organizational support, and work engagement on teachers' psychological wellbeing: A structural equation modeling approach. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 14, 1-13. DOI: 10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1345740