

The Relationship between Social Support and Burnout in Employee X at Y Ltd Palembang

Fadly Ramadhan¹, Desy Arisandy²

^{1,2}Universitas Bina Darma, Palembang, Indonesia

Email: fadlyramadhan183@gmail.com

Abstract

This study aims to determine the relationship between social support and burnout on Employee X at Y Ltd Palembang. The hypothesis put forward in this study is that there is a very significant relationship between social support and burnout for Employee X at Y Ltd Palembang. The total population in this study was 219 X employees who were used as samples. The sampling technique using simple random sampling technique. Measuring tools used in this study is the scale of burnout and social support. The analysis technique used a simple regression analysis technique with the help of SPSS version 20. The results of research data analysis with a computer using the SPSS version 20 for windows program, showed a correlation coefficient (r) of 0.386, a coefficient of determination (R Square) of 0.157, and a value of $p = 0.000$. The results of the analysis obtained show that there is a very significant relationship between social support and burnout for Employee X at Y Ltd Palembang of 15.7%.

Keywords: Burnout, Social Support, Relationship, Employee.

A. INTRODUCTION

For an organization or company, human resources (HR) is a very important factor (Yeni & Niswati, 2012). Human resources as workers are the main driving force in any industry in the current era of globalization (Siwi, 2005). An organization should not be separated from workers because it is workers who play a role in determining the progress, smoothness, profit and success of the organization (Eduard, 2011).

Changes that are currently happening globally and several other trends require organizations to look for new ways to survive in intense competition and succeed in organizational operations (Kazlauskaitė & Bučiūnienė, 2008). Further explained in general, it is currently believed that human resources and management in an organization function as a strategic asset for the organization. Current changes trigger companies or government agencies to make changes in organizing, managing, and utilizing their personnel/HR departments effectively (Dessler, 2010).

Y Ltd Palembangin Palembang is a company engaged in the business of supplying building materials. Y Ltd Palembangwas founded in 1995, precisely on October 10, 1995. Currently, Y Ltd Palembangfaces quite tough challenges when

working in the field. To serve customer requests, employees are required to be professional, have global insight, have high abilities, have a high work style and be able to provide optimal service to customers (Andika & Imam, 2015). Currently Y Ltd Palembang has a total of 100 employees. There are operational employees and warehouse employees. In the operational section, employees have tasks such as promoting goods, controlling production costs, taxation, and managing employees at Y Ltd Palembang. While employees in the warehouse department have duties such as loading and unloading goods, lifting and unloading goods, to sending goods according to the delivery destination.

Fereshti and Fatkhurohman (2012) state that employees are not too vulnerable to stressful work demands, employees must be able to maintain their mental health, which in the end will continue to enjoy all work pressures in a relaxed and stress-free manner. Stress will be a problem for employees and organizations if it leads to burnout (Rizka, 2013). Maslach and Leiter (2005) argue that "Job burnout is a negative emotional reaction to a job, created through long attendance in high stress workplaces". That is, burnout is a negative emotional reaction that occurs in the work environment when an individual experiences prolonged stress. Spector (2008) states that burnout is a psychological state of an employee who experiences pressure at work for a long period of time. Meanwhile, according to Gonul and Gokce (2014), burnout is a prolonged response related to stressors that continually occur in the workplace where the result is a mix between the worker and his work.

An organization or company needs to understand the dimensions of burnout to prevent or minimize burnout. According to Maslach (2003) there are several dimensions of burnout, namely (1) emotional exhaustion, a state in which a person loses control over his emotions, (2) depersonalization, a state in which a person begins to ignore the task given or does not complete the task on time, (3) reduced personal accomplishment (decreased self-achievement), characterized by reduced self-confidence of an employee in completing their tasks, being pessimistic when dealing with tasks.

Most of the research on burnout is focused on professions that generally lead to service professions, such as doctors, teachers, and other public service workers. However, burnout does not only occur in someone who works as a service provider, burnout is also found in many other jobs, namely in organizational and industrial fields (Maslach, Jackson, & Leiter, 1996). According to a Xero survey, 77% of small business owners feel the effects of burnout at work, and 87% of entrepreneurs experience work-related stress even while on vacation (Prokofyeva, 2017).

Based on the results of observations made by researchers at Y Ltd Palembang on Tuesday, May 16 2022 data obtained for six employees that employees experienced indications of burnout, including not being alert at work, looking tired and lethargic when getting assignments, sleepy at work, many employees resting or sitting around during working hours, to those who play gadgets such as cellphones. Based on the results of interviews conducted on Tuesday, May 16 2022, the six warehouse employees and employees of Y Ltd Palembang, the result is that

employees who work in warehouses feel pressured by the target of delivering goods to all clients by their superiors. If energy has been drained and exhausted after carrying out a fairly strenuous job, employees are more easily emotional so that they become angry quickly and easily bicker or argue with other employees and even with their superiors. When referring to the burnout dimension put forward by Maslach (2003), the employee is indicated to be experiencing emotional exhaustion, when individuals feel that their emotional resources have been drained and exhausted. Employees who work in the warehouse also reveal that if they feel pressured and feel bored with the various demands of the tasks given, employees often reduce their involvement in work, in the division of tasks they only want lighter tasks, and tend to be more selective in serving clients (subjective), employees find it difficult to accept orders from their superiors. For employees in the operational section, employees also feel very bored and bored with their work, this is due to the demands of working to use a computer for eight hours every day.

When referring to the burnout dimension put forward by Maslach (2003), the employee is indicated to be experiencing depersonalization (depersonalization), where when individuals feel bored with various demands so they will ignore the requests demanded by the job. Furthermore, if you are already experiencing emotional exhaustion and feel bored with work demands, usually employees will experience a decrease in work and tend to give a negative assessment of their work results, employees feel dissatisfied with their own work and feel they cannot help much for other employees. prefer light work only because they feel unable to do work with heavier tasks. This shows an indication of reduced personal accomplishment according to the burnout dimension proposed by Maslach (2003), that employees who experience reduced personal accomplishment will never be satisfied with their own work and feel they have never done anything, which is beneficial to himself and others. Based on the results of observations and interviews that have been conducted, four out of six X employees at Y Ltd Palembang experienced burnout. This can be seen from the characteristics that they complain about with reference to the burnout dimension proposed by Maslach (2003).

Every employee should be able to deal with burnout well in a job (Maslach, 2001). Organizations expect organizational employees to be proactive, show initiative, self-directed, and be responsible for the individual's own development and performance (Bakker, et al., 2008). In other words, organizations need organizational employees who are energetic, dedicated, and fully concentrated on their work, or have a bond with their work. This was added by the opinion of Muhammad et al. (2013) who said that it is highly desirable that burnout can be avoided by employees so that they are able to improve professional attitudes in carrying out work.

Burnout often occurs in the world of work due to routine and high pressure in daily life (Ramon & Anita, 2007). This is also reinforced by the opinion of Muchinsky (2000), that burnout tendencies can be experienced by employees from various fields

if they are under excessive pressure and drain energy so that they experience ongoing frustration. Individuals who experience burnout can drain almost all of the energy they have, so this tends to make it more difficult for someone to concentrate on work, or other work distractions (Zulkarnain & Pulungan, 2014). This is supported by the statement of Maslach and Jackson (1984) (in Anbar & Eker, 2008) that burnout is an important problem in work life because it has an influence on performance, service quality, increased absenteeism, organizational commitment, job satisfaction and health problems related to stress. Research conducted by Reza, et al. (2011) found that burnout is an important variable because burnout is an index to show weak individual performance at work which will affect attitudes, physical and mental health and will ultimately impact behavior.

According to Maslach & Leiter (1997) burnout is caused by several factors, which include: 1) Work environment (inadequate social support from colleagues, inadequate social support from superiors, excessive workload, role conflict, number of individuals who must be served, responsibilities that must be carried, low control of work, and lack of stimulation at work, 2) Individual characteristics, these sources can be classified into two factors, namely demographic factors which refer to gender differences between women and men and perfectionist factors individuals who always try to do the job to perfection, and 3) Emotional involvement with receiving services or clients, when working to serve others must be patient and understand others in a state of crisis, frustration, fear and pain.

In this study, the study was directed at work environment factors that allow employees to experience burnout at work. La Fellete (in Sumaryani, 1997) says that the psychological work environment is not visible but actually exists and will be felt by someone when entering the work environment of an organization. Employees who have a positive assessment of their psychological work environment means that employees feel that their psychological work environment is good, giving rise to high morale and will inhibit the rate of burnout in employees. Conversely, employees who feel their psychological environment is threatening, stressful and uncomfortable will more easily suffer from stress and have the potential to experience burnout (Berliner, 2005).

Forms of the psychological environment that can cause employees to experience burnout include inadequate social support from colleagues (Maslach & Leiter, 1997). This is supported by the statement that social support from colleagues has the potential to cause burnout (Caputo, 1991; Cherniss, 1980; Pines and Arosen, 1989; Maslach, 1982). The results of research conducted by Shropshire & Kadlec (2012) with research subjects on IT (Information and Technology) staff found that social support from colleagues had a negative and significant effect on burnout. The higher the support received, the lower the burnout. Another study conducted by Labiib (2013) with research subjects on nurses also found the same thing, that social support from colleagues has a negative and significant effect on burnout. The higher the support received, the lower the burnout. In addition, research conducted by Wulandari (2013) on the relationship between perceptions of social support from

colleagues and burnout at bank tellers shows that there is a very significant negative relationship between perceptions of social support from colleagues and burnout at bank tellers.

This was reinforced by the results of interviews conducted on May 16 with six employees, the results obtained were that employees complained about a lack of attention support, positive ratings, or encouragement to get ahead from co-workers, so that employees were less motivated in doing work. When referring to the dimensions of social support according to Sarafino (2011), employees are indicated not to receive emotional support or appreciation support, which includes expressions of empathy, concern, positive appraisal, and encouragement to move forward which causes the recipient of support to motivate work. Employees also complain about the lack of help from colleagues so that employees have quite a hard time solving and dealing with problems in the company.

When referring to the dimensions of social support according to Sarafino (2011), employees are indicated not to receive instrumental support which is direct and real assistance, such as financial assistance or assistance in carrying out certain tasks. Employees also complain that they don't get much advice or suggestions from colleagues, as a result employees feel confused in understanding situations or when taking action or solving problems. When referring to the dimensions of social support according to Sarafino (2011), it is indicated that employees do not receive informational support, such as giving advice, directions, suggestions, or feedback about how individuals do things. Another thing stated by employees is that between employees and co-workers they rarely spend time together to carry out an activity, especially when it is outside of working hours. This shows an indication of the absence of group support or social networks which refers to the dimensions of social support according to Sarafino (2011), when there is availability of other individuals to spend time with.

Based on the factors above, the researcher chose the social support of colleagues as an independent variable in this study. This is because individuals who have close relationships with other individuals such as friends will improve their ability to manage the problems they face every day. The work environment is one of the causes of success in carrying out a job but can also cause a failure in carrying out a job.

Specifically, social support at work comes from the support of superiors and co-workers that occurs through social interaction at work. Kusasi (2018) said that there is a relationship between co-workers' social support for burnout. Other research conducted by Woodhead, Northrop, and Edelstein (2019) explains that there is a negative relationship between co-workers' social support for burnout. Based on the theory linking coworkers' social support and burnout, as well as previous research which showed a negative relationship between coworkers' social support and burnout, researchers will use coworkers' social support as an independent variable in this study.

Based on the results of an interview with employee X (personal communication May 16 2022), S stated that when I was sad, no one cared about my friends, S also felt co-workers tended to be busy with their own affairs at work. The results of an interview conducted with employee X, with the initials R (personal communication May 16, 2022), stated that my supervisor was not sensitive to the problems I faced besides that when there was a problem, my friends tended not to care and refused to listen to stories about my feelings. Based on the results of interviews with employee X in care with the initials B (personal communication 16 May 2022) B said that when I experience difficulties at work, my colleagues provide information or input to me and my colleagues want to answer my questions about difficulties at work.

From the results of interviews conducted with employee X on guard with the initials P (personal communication May 16 2022) employee X said my co-worker did not want to explain how to do a job correctly, when I made a mistake and when I had problems at work, my co-worker as if busy with his own activities. Furthermore, the researcher interviewed employee X with the initials M (personal communication 17 May 2022) M said that my boss taught me new skills to improve my ability to work. The results of an interview conducted with employee X escort with the initials E (personal communication 17 May 2022) E said my friend considered the problem I was facing not important to talk about and ignored me even though I was able to finish the job on time.

At work, employees also cannot be separated from the conditions of the work environment. One of the factors causing burnout in employees is unfavorable working conditions. The discrepancy between what employees expect and what the company provides to their employees, such as a lack of support from superiors and the existence of unhealthy competition between colleagues is a condition of the psychological work environment that can affect the emergence of burnout in employees. Therefore, the company must create as much as possible a good psychological work environment so that it creates a sense of solidarity, a sense of security, a sense of acceptance and appreciation and a feeling of success in employees. According to La Fellete (in Sihotang, 2018) says that social support is not visible but is real and will be felt by someone when entering the work environment. To find out this situation can be known through individual perceptions of the work environment.

Employees who have a positive assessment of the work environment means that employees feel that the work environment is good, giving rise to high morale and will inhibit the rate of burnout in employees. The environment also supports employees in reducing the burnout intensity they experience. This support can come from coworkers, fellow employees or superiors, thus making the work environment full of pressure that causes burnout more enjoyable. Because the effect of burnout without good social support can result in physical disturbances, poor performance, and low productivity for employees (Daisy, 2019).

Several studies conducted by Dierendonck, Schaufeli, and Buunk (2018) add that social support is important in efforts to neutralize burnout. Furthermore Dierendonck, et al. (2018) said that the occurrence of burnout among employees may be due to not using the social environment in an effort to help employees reduce burnout. Then in the research conducted by Wulandari (2019) explained that social support significantly affects burnout that occurs in employees. In general, social support according to Sarafino (2018) social support refers to comfort, care, self-esteem or any other form of assistance received from other people or groups. Therefore, the existence of social support makes individuals feel confident that they are loved, valued so that they can reduce the symptoms of burnout they experience. Conversely, the absence of social support can cause tension and increase the occurrence of burnout in individuals.

Social support was originally defined based on the presence of many individuals providing social support. Then this definition developed so that the definition of social support does not only include the number of friends who provide social support, but also includes satisfaction with the support provided (Sarason et al, in Ogden, 2019).

The social support discussed in this study is related to support that comes from the work environment, such as support from superiors and co-workers. The support received in the work environment will make individuals more valuable, enthusiastic, feel safe and feel accepted in the workplace. Provision of high social support from the work environment can bring positive attitudes and behavior towards the organization. The benefits of social support at work are that it can increase productivity, clarify self-identity, increase self-esteem, improve psychological well-being, self-adjustment, improve and maintain physical health, and manage the pressures faced (Adicondro & Purnamasari, 2018).

B. METHOD

1. Identification of Research Variables

Based on the research objectives and hypotheses in the previous research chapter, it is known that the variables in this study are: 1) The dependent variable: burnout; 2) The independent variable: social support

2. Social Support

Social support is a social relationship that provides assistance in the form of care and appreciation for Employee X at Y Ltd Palembang. Social support variable is measured by social support scale. The social support scale used by the researcher is a scale that was compiled by the researcher himself. The preparation of the scale was carried out by referring to aspects of social support based on the theory put forward by House (Andarini & Fatma, 2019).

3. Burnout

Burnout is exhaustion both physically and emotionally which causes the development of negative self-concept, lack of concentration, and poor work attitude among employees of Employee X at Y Ltd Palembang. The burnout variable is measured by the burnout scale. The burnout scale used by researchers is using a scale that was compiled by the researchers themselves. The preparation of the scale was carried out by referring to aspects of burnout based on the theory put forward by Maslach, Schaufeli and Leiter (2018).

4. Research Subject

The population is defined as the group of subjects who wish to generalize the research results. Or the population is all the subjects investigated. The population is a generalized area consisting of objects/subjects that have certain qualities and characteristics that are determined by the researcher to be studied and then drawn conclusions. (Cholid and Ahcmadi, 2019). In this study, the population is employee X at Y Ltd Palembang, totaling 219 respondents. The sample size to be taken in this study is obtained from Issac and Michael's table as follows:

From Issac and Michael it can be seen that because the population size is 219 and close to 220, the sample size taken is 140. So, the number of students taken as a sample is 140 people. Sampling techniques are divided into two groups, namely probability sampling and non-probability sampling. In this study, researchers used probability sampling. According to Sugiyono (2017) probability sampling is a sampling technique that provides equal opportunities or opportunities for each element or employee of the population to be selected as a sample. Probability sampling consists of simple random sampling, proportionate stratified random sampling, disproportionate stratified random, area sampling (cluster) sampling. In this study, researchers used simple random sampling, then according to Sugiyono (2019) Simple Random Sampling is taking employee samples from a population that is carried out randomly without regard to the strata in that population. The tryout scale of this research is the rest of the population of 79 X employees at Y Ltd Palembang.

5. Method of Collecting Data

In this study the authors used data collection techniques by distributing questionnaires to respondents. The questionnaire is a data collection technique that is carried out by means of a set of questions or questions written to the respondent to answer. Questionnaires are an efficient data collection technique when the researcher knows exactly the variable to be measured and knows what can be expected from the respondent. In addition, the questionnaire is also suitable for use when the number of respondents is quite large and spread over a large area. Questionnaires can be in the form of closed or open statements/questions, can be given to respondents directly or sent via post or the internet. (Sugiyono, 2019). The following is data collection based on the technique, namely through:

6. Questionnaire

Questionnaire is a data collection technique that is carried out by giving a set of questions or written statements to respondents to answer. Questionnaires are an efficient data collection technique if researchers know with certainty the variables to be measured and know what can be expected from respondents (Sugiyono, 2019).

The validity in this study uses ecological validity, namely by looking at the natural limitations of the subject, as well as whether or not there is coherence of research results with real limitations and the research conducted is relatively unaffected by the presence of researchers during the study (Poerwandari, 2007). The purpose of using Ecological Validity is to ensure that the behavioral responses elicited really represent the behavior of the subject correctly related to the research focus, namely future orientation.

Research reliability using audit trail (Audit Trail). The purpose of researchers using the Audit Trail is to obtain the meaning of the inspection through traces that are tracked or researched, so that there is confidence that what the researcher reports is true as it is. For example, if the data collection comes from notes, archives, photographs, or recordings, the researcher must state that the method was used in collecting the data. Likewise, in analyzing data, researchers must state which method was used, so that the research process is open in general or the public for criticism and examination (Veronica et al., 2022).

Data analysis is the process of arranging data sequences, organizing them into patterns, categories, and basic descriptive units (Moleong, 2018). In this study, the steps in analyzing the data are: a) Formulate a copy of the verbatim interview (interview) and the results of observations (observation); b) Search category; c) Describe the categories; and d) Discuss research results.

C. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

1. Test Results Measuring Instruments / Try Out

Based on the data obtained through the testing phase of the measuring instrument, then validity and reliability. Calculations to test the validity and reliability of the two scales were carried out with the help of the SPSS (Statistical Package For Social Science) version 20.0.

2. Trial Scale Validity

This validity measurement is done by calculating the score coefficient of the subject item concerned. Through the item discriminating index, it is possible to find items that are suitable for use and items that are not feasible (failed) in research. Testing the validity of the items measuring tools in this study using the Alpha Cronbach technique with a minimum limit of the correlation coefficient is considered satisfactory if it reaches 0.30 (Azwar, 2012).

The burnout scale, which totaled 60 items, was then carried out item analysis, the researcher used a minimum correlation coefficient of 0.3 so that 50 items were valid and 10 items were invalid (failed) which was done 1 time. In the first analysis,

there were eleven items that failed, namely item numbers 3,7,11,20,21,42,57,58,59,60 item. For more details can be seen in table 1 below:

Table 1. Item Distribution of Try Out Results on a Burnout Scale

No.	Aspects	Indicator	Valid Items		Σ	Fall Items		Σ
			Fav	Unfav		Fav	Unfav	
1.	Emotional exhaustion	Physically tired, mentally tired, emotionally tired, lack of focus / lack of attention, indifferent to the environment	1, 2, 4, 5, 12, 13, 14, 15, 22, 23, 24, 25	31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 41, 43, 44, 45, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55	26	3,11,21	42	4
2.	Depersonalization	Keeping distance from others, being cynical with others	6, 16, 17, 26, 27	36, 37, 46, 47, 56	10	7	57	2
3.	Reduced Esteem	Self- Not confident, less interest in work, dissatisfied with yourself	8, 9, 10, 18, 19, 28, 29, 30	38, 39, 40, 48, 49, 50	14	20	58,59, 60	4
Amount			25	25	50	5	5	10

Then the valid items were rearranged into a scale for collecting research data. The distribution of burnout scale items for research can be seen in the following table:

Table 2. Burnout Scale Distribution for Research

No.	Aspects	Indicator	Item		Amount
			Fav	Unfav	
1.	Emotional exhaustion	Physically tired, mentally tired, emotionally tired, lack of focus / lack of attention, indifferent to the environment	1, 2, 4, 5, 12, 13, 14, 15, 22, 23, 24, 25	31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 41, 43, 44, 45, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55	26
2.	Depersonalization	Keeping distance from others, being cynical with others	6, 16, 17, 26, 27	36, 37, 46, 47, 56	10
3.	Reduced Esteem	Self- Not confident, less interest in work, dissatisfied with yourself	8, 9, 10, 18, 19, 28, 29, 30	38, 39, 40, 48, 49, 50	14
Amount					50

The Social Support Scale, which has a number of items, has been analyzed for validity with a minimum limit of the correlation coefficient of 0.30. In order to obtain 41 valid items and 19 invalid items which were analyzed once. In the first analysis, there are six items that fall, namely 1, 2, 3, 10, 11, 12, 13, 23, 27, 28, 32, 37, 41, 42, 46, 47, 53, 56, 58.

Then the valid items were rearranged into a scale for collecting research data. The distribution of social support scale items for research can be seen in the

following table:

Table 3. Distribution of Try Out Result Items Social support scale

No.	Aspects	Indicator	Valid Items		Σ	Fall Items		Σ
			Fav	Unfav		Fav	Unfav	
1.	Emotional Support	Empathy			8	1,2	3	5
		Concern	4,5,6,7	17			11	
		Attention	8,9	20			10	
2.	Award support	Positive appreciation	1 14	35	14	12,13	32	7
		The urge to go forward	15,16,18 ,19	36,38,45			46	
		Positive comparisons of individuals with other individuals	21,22	39,43,44			23 37,41,	
		Immediate assistance with work	24,25,26	40,49		5	42,47	
4.	Information Support	Giving advice		50,54,55 ,57	14	27,28		5
		Giving directions	29,30,31	48,52,59			53	
		Provision of suggestions/feed back	33,34,	51,60			58 56	
Amount			21	20	41	9	10	19

Then the valid items were rearranged into a scale for collecting research data. The distribution of social support items for this study can be seen in the following table:

Table 4. Social Support Scale Distribution For Research

No.	Aspects	Indicator	Item		A
			Fav	Unfav	
1.	Emotional Support	Empathy			8
		Concern	4,5,6,7	17	
		Attention	8,9	20	
2.	Award support	Positive appreciation	1,14	35	14
		The urge to go forward	15,16,18,19	36,38,45	
		Positive comparisons of individuals with other individuals	21,22	39,43,44	
3.	Instrumental support	Immediate assistance with work	24,25,26	40,49	5
4.	Information Support	Giving advice		50,54,55,57	14
		Giving directions	29,30,31	48,52,59	
		Provision of suggestions/feedback	33,34,	51,60	
Amount			21	20	41

3. Trial Scale Reliability

A test tool that is tried repeatedly on the same subject so as to get the same or relatively the same score. the reliability coefficient ranges from 0.00 to 1.00 and there is no definite benchmark. If the reliability coefficient gets closer to 1.00, it means that there is an increasingly perfect consistency of measurement results (Azwar, 2012). The reliability test on the burnout scale shows an alpha reliability value of 0.928 while the reliability test on the social support scale shows a reliability of 0.911. Thus the two scales can be said to have good consistency of measuring instrument results because their reliability value is close to 1.00.

4. Description of Research Data

An overview of the research data can be seen in the table describing the research data for the Burnout and Social Support variables summarized in the following table:

Table 5. Description of Research Data

Variable	Score Obtained (Empirical)				Possible Score (Hypothetical)			
	Mean	SD	XMin	XMax	Mean	SD	Xmin	XMax
<i>Burnout</i>	190.99	26.927	126	252	189	21	50	250
Social Support	208.22	19.857	160	262	211	17	41	205

Information:

Mean : Average value

Xmin : Minimum Total Score

SD : Standard Deviation

Xmax : Maximum Total Score

Empirical scores, namely scores obtained in the field, then scores or scale data obtained by researchers will be calculated or processed using the help of the SPSS (Statistical Package For Social Science) application version 20.0 for Windows. Meanwhile, hypothetical data is estimated data obtained before conducting research. The score obtained from the hypothetical uses several formulas to find Xmax (Maximum Score), namely by calculating the number of valid items with the highest score for each variable, Xmin (lowest score), namely calculating the number of valid items with the lowest score for each variable, to find the mean, standard deviation, Xmax and Xmin.

The empirical score is a score that can be obtained in the field. The empirical mean of the burnout variable is 190.99 with a standard deviation (SD) of 26.927 and the empirical mean of the social support variable is 208.22 with a standard deviation (SD) of 19.857. While the hypothetical score is the score that is expected to be achieved by the research sample. The hypothetical mean on the burnout variable is 189 with a Standard Deviation (SD) of 21. The hypothetical mean on the social support variable is 211 with a Standard Deviation (SD) 17 The formula for finding a hypothetical score is the hypothetical mean formula, namely $\mu = 1/2(X_{max} + X_{min})$ while the hypothetical standard deviation formula is $\sigma = 1/6(X_{max} - X_{min})$, with X_{max} : the subject's maximum score and X_{min} : the subject's minimum score

(Azwar, 2012).

The benefit of the data description in this study is to find out whether the burnout scale and social support are included in the high or low category by categorizing each variable based on the description of the research data above. Arikunto (2013) says that the subject is divided into two categories, namely low and high, so that it can be categorized as follows: scores that are $X \geq M$ as a high category and those that are at $X < (M)$ as a low category.

5. Burnout Research Variable Categories

This study classifies subjects into certain categories. This category aims to place subjects into groups based on the attributes being measured. Classification of subjects is divided into two categories, namely the high category and the low category, research subjects who are categorized as having a high burnout category if the score is $X > M$ and the low category if the score is $X < M$. The following can be seen in the table below:

Table 6. Categorization of the Research Sample Burnout Measurement Tool

Skor	Categorization	N	%
$X > 190.99$	High	71	50.7%
$X < 190.99$	Low	69	49.3%
Total		140	100%

Based on the table above, it can be seen that of the 140 Sabhara employees at Y Ltd Palembang, which was used as a research subject, there were 71 or 50.7% who had high burnout, while 69 or 49.3% had low burnout. So it can be concluded that Employee X's burnout at Y Ltd Palembang has a high burnout rate.

6. Social Support Research Variable Category

This study classifies Social Support scale scores into two categories, namely high and low, this category has the aim of placing individuals into groups based on the attributes measured. Classification of subjects is divided into two categories, namely the high category and the low category, research subjects who are categorized as having high Social Support if the score is $X > M$ and the low category if the score is $X < M$. The following can be seen in the table below:

Table 7. Categorization of the Research Sample Measuring Tool Social Support

Skor	Categorization	N	%
$X > 208.22$	High	67	47.8%
$X < 208.22$	Low	73	52.2%
Total		140	100%

Based on the table above, it can be seen that of the 140 Sabhara Di Y Ltd Palembang employees who were used as research subjects, there were 67 or 47.8% who had high social support while 73 or 52.2% had low social support. So it can be concluded that the social support of Employee X employees at Y Ltd Palembang has a low level of social support.

7. Assumption Test

The assumption test is carried out before the hypothesis test, which in this study tests the assumptions of three tests, namely the normality test, linearity test, and hypothesis testing.

a. Normality Test

The normality test was carried out to find out whether the data from the research variables obtained came from normally distributed data or not. The data analysis technique commonly used in the data normality prerequisite test is the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test. If $p > 0.05$ then it is normally distributed, otherwise if $p < 0.05$ then the data is not normally distributed. The summary of the normality test results can be seen in the following table:

Table 8. Normality Test Results

Variable	KS-Z	P	Information
Burnout	0.821	0.511	Normal
Social Support	1.015	0.255	Normal

Information: KS-Z : Kolmogorov Smirnov test

P : Significance

Based on the table above, the results of the two data obtained through measuring tools made by researchers are normally distributed because they meet the rule $P > 0.05$, it can be seen from the P value of the measuring instrument, namely Burnout $P = 0.511$ ($p > 0.05$) with KS -Z 0.821 and Social Support $P = 0.255$ ($P > 0.05$) with KS-Z 1.015.

b. Linearity Test

The linearity test has the objective of knowing whether the data to be analyzed has a linear relationship or not. In other words, this prerequisite test aims to find out whether the independent variable data is linearly related or not to the dependent variable data. The test rule used is $p < 0.05$, so the relationship between the independent variable (X) and the dependent variable (Y) is stated to be linear and vice versa if $p > 0.05$, the relationship is not stated to be linear. The results of the linearity test between Social Support (X) and Burnout (Y) in this study can be seen in the following table:

Table 9. Linearity Test Results

Variable	F	P	Information
Social Support (X) with Burnout (Y)	25.681	0.000	Linear

Based on the table above, the F value is a coefficient that shows the relationship between the independent variable and the dependent variable with a value of $F = 25.681$ and $P = 0.000$. The F value is a value that indicates how linear the relationship between the independent variable and the dependent variable is. In the table above, the value of $P = 0.000 < 0.05$ indicates that there is a linear relationship between Social Support (X) and Burnout (Y).

c. Hypothesis Testing

Hypothesis testing was carried out using a simple regression analysis technique. The hypothesis test carried out in this study was by using a simple

regression test carried out on Social Support (X) with Burnout (Y), with the following results:

Table 10. Simple Regression Test Results

Variable	R	R ²	P	Information
Social Support with Burnout	0.386	0.157	0.000	Very Significant

Based on the table above, the results obtained are the correlation values between social support and burnout, namely $r = 0.386$ with an R Square value = 0.157 and $P = 0.000$ where $p < 0.01$. This value means that there is a very significant relationship between social support and burnout for employees of Employee X at Y Ltd Palembang. The analysis was carried out using a simple regression test whose results indicated that there was acceptance of the proposed hypothesis. The magnitude of the effective contribution given by the social support variable with burnout is 15.7% ($R^2 = 0.157$) so there is still 84.3% influence from other factors related to burnout but not examined by researchers.

Based on the results of statistical calculations that have been carried out, it proves that there is a very significant relationship between social support and burnout at Di Y Ltd Palembang. The analysis was carried out using a simple regression test whose results indicated that there was acceptance of the proposed hypothesis. These results can be seen from the value of the correlation coefficient $r = 0.386$ with a significance value (P) = 0.000 < 0.01. This shows that there is a significant relationship between social support and burnout at Y Ltd Palembang Palembang towards Employees Employee X at Y Ltd Palembang.

From the results of the analysis, it was obtained that the value of donations given social support with a burnout of $r^2 = 0.157$ or 15.7%. So there is still 84.3% of the influence of other factors related to burnout not examined by researchers, namely many job demands (quantitative job demands), role problems (role problems), lack of self-regulatory activity and related to client demands (client-related demands).

Based on the results of the burnout categorization data description, it shows that of the 140 Sabhara Di Y Ltd Palembang employees who were used as research subjects, there were 71 or 50.7% who had high burnout while 69 or 49.3% had low burnout. So it can be concluded that employee burnout Employee X at Y Ltd Palembang has a high level of burnout, namely where employees feel lazy to carry out scheduled pickets, due to fatigue with a lot of workload, feel burdened when getting additional assignments and unable to manage anger towards colleagues when having difficulties at work and also often sad when getting excessive assignments. So it can be concluded that burnout for employees Employee X at Y Ltd Palembang has high burnout. Individuals who experience high burnout look gloomy, have a sad mood, have low spirits, become quick-tempered, sensitive, behave hostile and suspicious, not only towards service recipients, but also towards colleagues and superiors. Schaufeli and Buunk (2003).

This relationship is supported by the results of research conducted by Adawiyah and Blikololong (2018). Based on the results of the research analysis that

has been described, the value of $r = -0.601$ is obtained with a significance value of 0.000 ($p < 0.01$). These results indicate that there is a significant negative relationship between social support and burnout. the higher the social support, the lower the burnout, and conversely, the lower the social support, the higher the burnout experienced.

According to Kreitner & Kinicki (2018) burnout is the result of prolonged stress and occurs when a person begins to question his personal values. The impact of burnout can reduce individual performance and effectiveness, as a result of negative attitudes and behavior. The impact of burnout can make individuals irritable, sensitive, feel they are losing attention from the organization, and make individuals have low work performance. In addition, the impact of burnout also causes individuals to become less energetic and less interested in their work (Harnida, 2019).

According to Schaufeli and Buunk (2018), burnout has several causal factors, namely quantitative job demands, role problems, lack of social support, lack of self-regulatory activity) and related to client demands (client-related demands). According to Sarafino (Rokhimah, in Meilianawati 2020) social support is the degree of support given to individuals, especially when needed by people who have a close emotional relationship with that person, social support can refer to comfort, care, self-esteem or any form of assistance received by individuals from other people or groups.

Based on the results of the description of social support categorization data from 140 employees of Employee X at Y Ltd Palembang who were used as research subjects, there were 73 or 52.2% who had high social support while 67 or 57.8% had low social support. So it can be concluded that social support for employees of Employee X at Y Ltd Palembang has low social support.

Adnyaswari and Adnyani (2017) also explained that individuals who do not receive social support tend to feel less loved, do not have an optimistic attitude, so that work performance decreases. Conversely, individuals who get high social support will feel more valued, loved, respected, and accepted by their environment (Sarafino et al., 2011) Social support makes individuals feel confident that they are loved, valued so that they can reduce the burnout symptoms they experience (Lempi, 2009). Conversely, the absence of social support can cause tension and increase the occurrence of burnout in individuals (Purba et al., 2005).

According to Ozbay (2019) social support is needed, especially for physical and psychological health. Overall, it appears that positive, high-quality social support can increase resilience to stress, helping to protect against psychopathological health related problems that a person faces. In contrast to low social support, high social support appears to buffer or protect a person against the effects of mental and physical illness.

Based on the description and results of the data analysis obtained, the researcher concluded that X employees at Y Ltd Palembang experienced high burnout and had low social support and also that the hypothesis in this study was

accepted, while the hypothesis was that there was a very significant relationship between social support and burnout to employees of Employee X at Y Ltd Palembang.

D. CONCLUSION

Based on the results obtained from the data analysis and discussion, the researchers draw the conclusion that there is a very significant relationship between social support and burnout in Employee X Employees at Y Ltd Palembang.

REFERENCES

1. Adawiyah, R. A. R. (2013). Kecerdasan Emosional, Dukungan Sosial dan Kecenderungan Burnout. *Persona: Jurnal Psikologi Indonesia*, 2(2), 99-107.
2. Adda, H. W., & Buntuang, P. C. D. (2018). Persepsi Servant Leadership Perguruan Tinggi di Kota Palu. *Jurnal Ilmu Manajemen Universitas Tadulako (JIMUT)*, 4(1), 81-90.
3. Adnyaswari, N. A., & Adnyani, I. G. A. D. (2017). *Pengaruh Dukungan Sosial dan Burnout terhadap Kinerja Perawat Rawat Inap RSUP Sanglah* (Doctoral dissertation, Udayana University).
4. Amalia, A., Rahayu, M. S., & Khasanah, A. N. (2018). Hubungan antara Dukungan Teman Sebaya dengan Self Regulation Bidang Akademik pada Santri Kelas 1 Aliyah di Pesantren X Bandung. *Prosiding Psikologi*, 779-786.
5. Arnett, J., Chapin, L., & Brownlow, C. (2018). *Human Development: A Cultural Approach*. Pearson Australia Group.
6. Bakker, A. B., & Heuven, E. (2006). Emotional Dissonance, Burnout, and In-Role Performance among Nurses and Police Officers. *International Journal of Stress Management*, 13(4), 423.
7. Cox, M. J., DiBello, A. M., Meisel, M. K., Ott, M. Q., Kenney, S. R., Clark, M. A., & Barnett, N. P. (2019). Do Misperceptions of Peer Drinking Influence Personal Drinking Behavior? Results from a Complete Social Network of First-Year College Students. *Psychology of Addictive Behaviors*, 33(3), 297.
8. Darmawan, A. A. Y. P., Silviandari, I. A., & Susilawati, I. R. (2015). Hubungan Burnout dengan Work-Life Balance pada Dosen Wanita. *Mediapsi*, 1(1), 28-39.
9. Eliyana, E. (2018). Faktor-Faktor yang Berhubungan dengan Burnout Perawat Pelaksana di Ruang Rawat Inap RSJ Provinsi Kalimantan Barat Tahun 2015. *Jurnal Administrasi Rumah Sakit Indonesia*, 2(3).
10. Erez, M. (1994). Towards a Model of Cross-Cultural I/O Psychology. *Handbook of industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 4, 569-607.
11. Gruber, J., Prinstein, M. J., Clark, L. A., Rottenberg, J., Abramowitz, J. S., Albano, A. M., ... & Weinstock, L. M. (2021). Mental Health and Clinical Psychological Science in the time of COVID-19: Challenges, Opportunities, and a Call to Action. *American Psychologist*, 76(3), 409.
12. Gül, Z., & Delice, M. (2011). Police Job Stress and Stress Reduction/Coping Programs: The Effects on the Relationship with Spouses. *Turkish Journal of Police*

Studies/Polis Bilimleri Dergisi, 13(3).

13. Hariri, A., & IP, S. (2018). Strategi Personal Branding Pustakawan di Perpustakaan Universitas Muhammadiyah Purwokerto. *Prosiding*.
14. Harter, L. M., Ellingson, L. L., Yamasaki, J., Hook, C., & Walker, T. (2020). Defining Moments... Telling Stories to Foster Well-Being, Humanize Healthcare, and Advocate for Change. *Health Communication*, 35(2), 262-267.
15. Limpanitgul, T., Robson, M. J., Gould-Williams, J., & Lertthaitrakul, W. (2013). Effects of Co-Worker Support and Customer Cooperation on Service Employee Attitudes and Behaviour: Empirical Evidence from the Airline Industry. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management*, 20, 23-33.
16. Mardlotillah, H. (2021). *Hubungan antara Dukungan Sosial dan Nurses Self Efficacy dengan Resiliensi Perawat di Tengah Pandemi Covid-19* (Doctoral dissertation, UIN Sunan Ampel Surabaya).
17. Maslach, C., & Leiter, M. P. (2008). Early Predictors of Job Burnout and Engagement. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 93(3), 498.
18. Maslach, C., Jackson, S. E., & Leiter, M. P. (1997). *Maslach Burnout Inventory*. Scarecrow Education.
19. Ogden, J. (2019). *Health Psychology*, 6e. McGraw Hill.
20. Patty, B. D. (2019). Pengaruh Rekrutmen, Seleksi dan Penempatan Pegawai Terhadap Kinerja Pegawai Pengelolaan Keuangan GKI di Tanah Papua. *Jurnal Manajemen dan Organisasi Review (MANOR)*, 1(2), 151-156.
21. Rizqi, M. H., & Riyanto, A. (2021). Dukungan Sosial dan Job Burnout Pengaruhnya terhadap Kinerja Polisi (Studi Kasus pada Anggota Kepolisian Polrestabes Bandung). *Journal of Economics, Management, Business and Accounting (JEMBA)*, 1(2), 209-218.
22. Safrida, S., Supriadi, S., Nasution, I., & Fahmi, N. A. (2019). Variabel Anteseden Kepuasan Kerja dan Dampaknya terhadap Komitmen Organisasi di SMP Negeri 2 Medan. *Develop*, 3(1), 12-26.
23. Schaufeli, W. B., & Greenglass, E. R. (2001). Introduction to Special Issue on Burnout and Health. *Psychology & Health*, 16(5), 501-510.
24. Shakespeare-Finch, J., & Obst, P. L. (2011). The Development of the 2-Way Social Support Scale: A Measure of Giving and Receiving Emotional and Instrumental Support. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 93(5), 483-490.
25. Sharbatyan, M. H. (2019). The Study of Social Health and Burnout of Teachers (Case Study: Nimblouk Region of Qhaenat, South Khorasan). *Social Development & Welfare Planning*, 11(39), 173-215.
26. Susiyanti, E., Sumardjo, M., & Marzuki, F. (2022). Analysis of the Relationship between Customer Satisfaction and Employee Job Satisfaction (Study at the Research Institute for Ornamental Fish Cultivation). *International Journal of Business, Technology and Organizational Behavior (IJBTOB)*, 2(2), 146-162.
27. Tampi, B., Kumaat, L., & Masi, G. (2013). Hubungan Sikap Dukungan Sosial dengan Tingkat Resiliensi Stres Penyintas Banjir di Kelurahan Taas Kecamatan Tikala Kota Manado. *Jurnal Keperawatan*, 1(1).

28. Tucker, S., Chmiel, N., Turner, N., Hershcovis, M. S., & Stride, C. B. (2008). Perceived Organizational Support for Safety and Employee Safety Voice: The Mediating Role of Coworker Support for Safety. *Journal of occupational health psychology, 13*(4), 319.
29. Van Dierendonck, D., Schaufeli, W. B., & Buunk, B. P. (1998). The Evaluation of an Individual Burnout Intervention Program: The Role of Inequity and Social Support. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 83*(3), 392.
30. Wistarini, N. N. I. P., & Marheni, A. (2019). Peran Dukungan Sosial Keluarga dan Efikasi Diri terhadap Stres Akademik Mahasiswa Baru Fakultas Kedokteran Universitas Udayana Angkatan 2018. *Jurnal Psikologi Udayana Edisi Khusus Psikologi Pendidikan, 164-173*.
31. Woodhead, E. L., Northrop, L., & Edelstein, B. (2016). Stress, Social Support, and Burnout among Long-Term Care Nursing Staff. *Journal of Applied Gerontology, 35*(1), 84-105.