

The Effect of Work-Life Balance and Workload on Burnout in Employees at a Sugar Processing Company in West Java

Hilman Wikhyat¹⁾, Dharliana Hardjokowikarto²⁾, Juwita³⁾

^{1,2,3)} Program Studi Manajemen, Fakultas Ekonomi dan Bisnis, Universitas Swadaya Gunung Jati

*Corresponding Author

Email: hilman.122020412@ugj.ac.id

Abstract

The rapid development of marketplaces as digital business actors in electronic transactions has significantly increased technology-based economic activities in Indonesia. However, the dominance of standard form contracts that are unilateral and exclusionary has created an imbalance in bargaining positions between business actors and consumers. This study focuses on examining how the construction of marketplace liability as digital business actors is formulated in electronic transaction agreements, as well as evaluating the effectiveness of the consumer protection legal regime in Indonesia in regulating such practices comprehensively. The findings indicate that, normatively, the legal framework through the Consumer Protection Law, the Electronic Information and Transactions Law, and their implementing regulations has regulated the prohibition of liability limitations and the obligations of electronic system providers. However, in practice, marketplaces tend to utilize standard clauses to shift risks to sellers and consumers, resulting in a deviation between norms (das sollen) and practice (das sein). Moreover, the factual role of marketplaces, which includes controlling transaction systems, managing funds, and determining dispute resolution mechanisms, demonstrates that marketplaces can no longer be positioned as passive intermediaries. Rigid and incomplete consumer protection often results in unfair compensation. This situation demands reforming marketplace accountability through stronger regulations, limiting conditions that harm consumers, and providing an independent dispute resolution system for fairness.

Keywords: *Work-Life Balance, Workload, Burnout.*

INTRODUCTION

The dynamics of the workforce in Indonesia indicate that increasing demands for productivity and organizational efficiency are often accompanied by high levels of work pressure experienced by employees. Various industrial sectors, including the manufacturing sector, face strict production targets, long working hours, and limited human resources. These conditions require employees to balance job demands with their personal lives. When work-life balance is not achieved and workload exceeds individual capacity, the risk of burnout increases, characterized by physical, mental, and emotional exhaustion as well as decreased work motivation. Prolonged burnout not only affects employees' psychological well-being but also has the potential to disrupt organizational effectiveness in achieving its goals.

Such phenomena are commonly found in manufacturing companies in West Java, where work is characterized by high intensity. Demands to meet production targets, complete tasks within specific deadlines, shift work systems, and limited workforce availability in certain conditions can increase employees' perceived workload. On the other hand, these conditions may reduce employees' opportunities to fulfill personal life needs, perform family roles, and obtain adequate rest time. If this situation continues without proper management, employees are at risk of experiencing burnout, which is characterized by emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and reduced personal accomplishment.

Previous studies have shown that the relationship between work-life balance, workload, and burnout has produced inconsistent findings. Rahmadyah (2021) found that workload has a positive and significant effect on burnout syndrome among employees of PT. Perkebunan Nusantara X Pabrik Gula Tjoekir, although burnout was not able to mediate the effect of

workload on employee performance. Mustika et al. (2023) found that workload has a positive effect on job burnout, while work-life balance has a negative effect on job burnout, and burnout is able to mediate the effect of both variables on employee performance. Meanwhile, Wibawa et al. (2025) found that both workload and work-life balance significantly affect burnout and also identified the mediating role of work-life balance in the relationship.

These differences in findings indicate a research gap regarding the consistency of the effects of work-life balance and workload on burnout across different organizational contexts. In addition, most previous studies have been conducted in service sectors and government institutions, while studies on burnout in manufacturing companies in West Java remain relatively limited.

Based on this gap, this study offers novelty by simultaneously examining the effect of work-life balance and workload on burnout among employees in manufacturing companies in West Java. Unlike Rahmadyah (2021), which focused on burnout as a mediating variable between workload and performance, this study positions burnout as the main dependent variable by examining the direct effects of work-life balance and workload. Furthermore, the studies by Mustika et al. (2023) and Wibawa et al. (2025) were conducted in the service sector, which has different job characteristics compared to the manufacturing sector. Therefore, this study is expected to provide new empirical evidence regarding the determinants of burnout in a manufacturing work environment characterized by high productivity demands, strict production targets, and different levels of work pressure compared to other sectors.

The urgency of this study lies in the importance of burnout prevention as part of sustainable human resource management in manufacturing companies. Unaddressed burnout can reduce the quality of working life, increase physical and emotional exhaustion, affect employees' psychological health, and ultimately impact organizational productivity. Meanwhile, the characteristics of manufacturing work, which are heavily influenced by production targets and strict deadlines, make employees more vulnerable to burnout. Therefore, research on the effect of work-life balance and workload on burnout is essential to provide empirical evidence for manufacturing companies in West Java in formulating human resource policies that support employee well-being while maintaining a healthy, productive, and sustainable work environment.

RESEARCH METHODS

This study uses an associative quantitative approach to analyze the relationship between the independent variable, namely work-life balance, and the dependent variable in the form of workload, as stated by Sugiyono (2023). Quantitative approach was chosen because this study aims to test hypotheses about the influence and causal relationships between variables using numerical data that are analyzed statistically. The population in this study is all employees of a sugar processing company in West Java totaling 160 people. Sampling technique using probability sampling with simple random sampling method, so that each member of the population has the same chance of being selected. Determination of the number of samples was carried out using the Slovin formula with an error rate of 5%, resulting in a sample of 114 respondents.

The type of data used in this study consists of primary data and secondary data. Primary Data obtained directly through the distribution of questionnaires offline (offline) to respondents in order to dig up information related to conditions, perceptions, and experiences in accordance with the variables of the study. Meanwhile, secondary data were obtained from various sources such as scientific journals, reference books, and relevant previous research as a theoretical foundation and support for analysis. The data collection technique used a 5-point Likert scale to

measure respondents ' attitudes and perceptions, with values ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree. Furthermore, data analysis techniques are carried out using statistical analysis methods with the help of SPSS software to test the relationship and influence between variables in the study.

Table 1. Variables Measuremen

Variables	Indicators	Codes	Statements
Work Life Balance (X1) Fisher (in Adiningtiyas & Amy., 2016)	Time Balance	X1.1	I am able to divide my time between work and personal life quite well.
		X1.2	My job still allows me to have time for personal or family activities.
		X1.3	I try to maintain a balance of time between work and life outside of work.
	Involvement Balance	X1.4	I can stay focused on work without neglecting my personal life.
		X1.5	I feel that my involvement in work and personal life is fairly balanced.
		X1.6	I am able to carry out both work and personal life roles simultaneously.
	Work Satisfaction Balance	X1.7	I feel fairly satisfied with the balance between my work and personal life.
		X1.8	I feel comfortable carrying out my work without greatly disturbing my personal life.
Workload (X2) (Omar et al.,2015)	On Time / Timeliness	X2.1	I am required to complete work according to the specified deadlines.
		X2.2	Work deadlines sometimes make me feel rushed.
	Working Hours	X2.3	My working hours sometimes feel quite long.

		X2.4	Long working hours sometimes make me feel tired.
Working Overtime		X2.5	I have completed work during holidays or break times.
		X2.6	Working during holidays sometimes affects my personal time.
Working quickly		X2.7	I am required to work quickly in completing tasks.
		X2,8	The demand to work quickly sometimes makes work feel heavier.
Activities Affected by Workload		X2.9	Workload sometimes affects my personal activities outside of work.
		X2.10	Heavy workloads sometimes reduce my time for personal activities.
Staying Up Late Due to Work		X2.11	I have stayed up late because I had to complete work.
		X2.12	Work sometimes reduces my nighttime rest.
Having No Energy Left at the End of Work		X2.13	At the end of the workday, my energy is sometimes already reduced.
		X2.14	I feel tired after completing a full day of work.
Having Little Time Pressure		X2.15	I feel time pressure when completing my work.
Busy and Difficult to Focus While Working		X2.16	Busy work conditions sometimes make it difficult for me to focus while working.
Burnout (Y) (Leiter & Maslach., 2014)	Emotional exhaustion	Y.1	I feel mentally exhausted because of work demands.

		Y.2	Heavy workloads sometimes make my energy decrease quickly.
		Y.3	I sometimes feel less enthusiastic when starting work.
	Depersonalization	Y.4	I have felt less enthusiastic about the work I do.
		Y.5	Work pressure sometimes affects my mood while working.
		Y.6	I sometimes feel that work becomes a burden when tasks are too many.
	Accomplishment	Y.7	I feel that the results of my work are sometimes not in line with my expectations.
		Y.8	I have felt less satisfied with the results of my own work.

Source: Compiled by the authors (2026)

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Table 1. Respondents' Characteristics (N = 114)

Categories	Possible Answers	F	%
Age	< 25 years old	8	7.02%
	25–34 years old	46	40.35%
	35–44 years old	35	30.70%
	> 45 years old	25	21.93%
Gender	Male	104	91.23%
	Female	10	8.77%
Educational Background	Senior High School/Vocational High School	72	63.16%
	Diploma	30	26.32%
	Bachelor's Degree	12	10.53%
Work Status	Production Division	61	53.51%

Categories	Possible Answers	F	%
	Administration and Others	18	15.79%
	Human Resources	35	30.70%
Length of Employment	1–5 years	57	50.00%
	6–10 years	9	7.89%
	> 10 years	48	42.11%

Source: Processed Data (2026)

Table 2. Validity Test

Variable	Statement	r-count	r-table	Remarks
Work life balance	1	0.771	0.184	Valid
	2	0.781	0.184	Valid
	3	0.661	0.184	Valid
	4	0.608	0.184	Valid
	5	0.589	0.184	Valid
	6	0.584	0.184	Valid
	7	0.771	0.184	Valid
	8	0.781	0.184	Valid
Workload	1	0.753	0.184	Valid
	2	0.751	0.184	Valid
	3	0.678	0.184	Valid
	4	0.773	0.184	Valid
	5	0.736	0.184	Valid
	6	0.797	0.184	Valid
	7	0.795	0.184	Valid
	8	0.826	0.184	Valid
	9	0.791	0.184	Valid
	10	0.761	0.184	Valid
	11	0.738	0.184	Valid
	12	0.744	0.184	Valid
	13	0.795	0.184	Valid
	14	0.758	0.184	Valid
15	0.689	0.184	Valid	
16	0.748	0.184	Valid	
Burnout	1	0.808	0.184	Valid
	2	0.786	0.184	Valid
	3	0.790	0.184	Valid
	4	0.812	0.184	Valid
	5	0.829	0.184	Valid
	6	0.863	0.184	Valid
	7	0.788	0.184	Valid
	8	0.838	0.184	Valid

Source: Data Processing with SPSS software version 25 (2026)

Based on the results of the validity test for all questionnaire items on the Work Life Balance (X1), Workload (X2), and Burnout (Y) variables, it was found that all calculated r values (r count) for each item were greater than the r table value of 0.184 at a 5% significance level. The r count values for the Work Life Balance variable ranged from 0.584 to 0.781, the Workload variable ranged from 0.678 to 0.826, and the Burnout variable ranged from 0.786 to 0.863. These results indicate that all indicators

across the three variables are able to accurately and precisely measure the constructs under study. Therefore, all questionnaire items are declared valid and suitable for use as research instruments in this study.

Table 3. Reability Test

Variable	Cronbach's Alpha Value	Remarks
Work Life Balance	0,845	Reliable
Workload	0. 950	Reliable
Burnout	0. 927	Reliable

Source: Data Processing with SPSS software version 25 (2026)

Based on the results of the reliability test using Cronbach's Alpha, the alpha values obtained were 0.845 for the Work Life Balance variable, 0.950 for the Workload variable, and 0.927 for the Burnout variable. All Cronbach's Alpha values are above the minimum required threshold of 0.70, indicating that each variable has a very high level of internal consistency. Therefore, all research instruments are declared reliable and appropriate for use as data collection tools in this study.

Table 4. Multiple linear regression analysis

Coefficients ^a					
Model	Regression Coefficient (B)	Std. Error	Beta	t-value	Sig.
Constant	2.888	2.813		1.027	0.307
X1	-.021	.072	-.13	-.287	.775
X2	.474	.024	.892	19.987	<.001

a. Dependent Variable: TOTAL Y

Source: Data Processing with SPSS software version 25 (2026)

Based on the results of the multiple linear regression analysis, the constant value was 2.888, the regression coefficient for the Work Life Balance (X1) variable was -0.021 , and the regression coefficient for the Workload (X2) variable was 0.474 . Thus, the resulting regression equation model is $Y = 2.888 - 0.021X1 + 0.474X2$. These results indicate that when Work Life Balance and Workload are considered constant or equal to zero, the Burnout value is 2.888. The negative regression coefficient of Work Life Balance indicates that as employees' Work Life Balance increases, the level of Burnout tends to decrease. Conversely, the positive regression coefficient of Workload shows that as employees' Workload increases, the level of Burnout tends to increase. Therefore, Work Life Balance plays a role in reducing Burnout, while Workload acts as a factor that increases Burnout among employees.

Table 5. T-test (Partial Test)

Coefficients ^a					
Model	Regression Coefficient (B)	Std. Error	Beta	t-value	Sig.
Constant	2.888	2.813		1.027	0.307
X1	-.021	.072	-.13	-.287	.775
X2	.474	.024	.892	19.987	<.001

a. Dependent Variable: TOTAL Y

Source: Data Processing with SPSS software version 25 (2026)

Based on the results of the partial test (t-test), the significance value for the Work Life Balance (X1) variable was 0.775, which is greater than the 0.05 significance level. This indicates that Work Life Balance does not have a significant effect on Burnout. Therefore, the hypothesis stating that Work Life Balance influences Burnout is rejected. Meanwhile, the Workload (X2)

variable has a significance value of < 0.001 , which is smaller than 0.05, along with a positive regression coefficient. This indicates that Workload has a positive and significant effect on Burnout. Thus, the hypothesis stating that Workload affects Burnout is accepted, meaning that the higher the workload perceived by employees, the higher the level of burnout experienced.

Table 6. F-test (simultaneous F-test)

ANOVA					
Model	Sum of f Square	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Regression	1672.750	2	836.375	210.309	0.000
Residual	441.434	111	3.977		
Total	2114.184	113			
Dependent Variable: TOTAL_Y					
Predictors: (Constant), TOTAL_X1, TOTAL_X2					

Source: Data Processing with SPSS software version 25 (2026)

Based on the results of the simultaneous test (F-test), the calculated F value was 210.309 with a significance level of < 0.001 . This significance value is lower than 0.05, indicating that Work Life Balance and Workload simultaneously have a significant effect on Burnout. Therefore, the hypothesis stating that Work Life Balance and Workload simultaneously influence Burnout is accepted. These results indicate that changes in employees' Burnout levels are not only influenced by each variable individually, but also by the combination of Work Life Balance conditions and Workload experienced by employees.

Table 7. Coefficient of Determination (R)

Model Summary				
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	0.889	0.791	0.787	1.994
Predictors: (Constant), TOTAL_X2, TOTAL_X1				

Source: Data Processing with SPSS software version 25 (2026)

Based on the results of the coefficient of determination test, the R Square value was 0.791, indicating that 79.1% of the variation in Burnout can be explained by Work Life Balance and Workload, while the remaining 20.9% is influenced by other factors outside the variables examined in this study. In addition, the correlation coefficient (R) value of 0.889 indicates that the relationship between the independent variables, namely Work Life Balance and Workload, and the dependent variable, Burnout, is classified as very strong. These results show that the research model has good explanatory power in describing changes in employees' Burnout levels through the two independent variables used in this study.

Discussion

The Effect of Work Life Balance (X1) on Burnout (Y)

The results of the study indicate that Work Life Balance (X1) does not have a significant effect on Burnout (Y), based on the t-test results with a significance value of 0.775, which is higher than 0.05. Although the regression coefficient is negative at -0.021 , indicating that an increase in Work Life Balance tends to reduce Burnout, the effect is not statistically significant. This suggests that, in the context of this study, work-life balance is not the primary factor directly influencing employees' burnout levels. Other factors may play a more dominant role, such as job demands, working conditions, or organizational support, which may have a stronger impact on employee exhaustion.

The Effect of Workload (X2) on Burnout (Y)

The results show that Workload (X2) has a positive and significant effect on Burnout (Y), with a significance value of < 0.001 and a regression coefficient of 0.474. This indicates that the higher the workload experienced by employees, the higher the level of burnout. These findings

reinforce the concept that excessive workload, both in terms of quantity and job pressure, can increase employees' emotional, physical, and mental exhaustion. Therefore, workload is an important factor that must be properly managed by organizations to prevent burnout among employees.

The Simultaneous Effect of Work Life Balance (X1) and Workload (X2) on Burnout (Y)

The results of the simultaneous test (F-test) show that Work Life Balance (X1) and Workload (X2) together have a significant effect on Burnout (Y), with an F value of 210.309 and a significance level of < 0.001 . This indicates that changes in employees' burnout levels are not only influenced by each variable individually, but also by the combined effect of Work Life Balance and Workload. Furthermore, the coefficient of determination (R^2) of 0.791 indicates that 79.1% of the variation in Burnout can be explained by these two variables, while the remaining 20.9% is influenced by other factors outside the research model. The correlation coefficient (R) of 0.889 also indicates a very strong relationship between the independent and dependent variables, suggesting that the research model has strong explanatory power in describing employee burnout.

CONCLUSION

Based on the analysis and discussion of the effect of work-life balance and workload on burnout at in employees of a sugar processing company West Java, it can be concluded as follows. Work-life balance had no significant effect on employee burnout. This is evidenced by the significance value of 0.775 (> 0.05) with a negative regression coefficient. This finding shows that although theoretically work-life balance tends to reduce burnout, in the context of sugar factory operations in West Java, the influence has not been strong enough to suppress burnout directly. This condition indicates that the characteristics of work that are seasonal and oriented to production targets make work-life balance not yet a dominant factor in determining the level of employee burnout. Second, partial workload has a positive and significant effect on employee burnout. This is indicated by the significance value < 0.001 (< 0.05) with a positive regression coefficient of 0.474.

This means that the higher the workload received by employees, both in terms of working hours, time demands, and work intensity, the higher the burnout rate experienced. This finding confirms that workload is the main factor that triggers physical, mental, and emotional fatigue of employees in the sugar factory work environment. Third, work-life balance and workload simultaneously have a significant effect on employee burnout. This is evidenced by the F test with a significance value < 0.001 and the value of the coefficient of determination (R^2) of 0.791. Thus, it can be concluded that 79.1% of the variation in employee burnout can be explained by a combination of work-life balance and workload, while the rest is influenced by other factors outside the research model. The relationship between these variables is in the very strong category, which shows the importance of managing workload and work-life balance in an integrated manner in burnout prevention efforts.

REFERENCES

- Ardiani, W., Setiamy, A. A., & Anggraini, C. A. (2024). *Pengaruh Work Life Balance Dan Job Demand Terhadap Burnout Dengan Mental Health Sebagai Variabel Mediasi Pada PT . Xyz*. 4(1), 626–638.
- Ayu, I. G., Yolanda, A., Cahyadi, I., & Marlina, F. N. (2025). *Pengaruh Beban Kerja dan Work Life Balance terhadap Stres Kerja dengan Dukungan Sosial sebagai Variabel Moderasi (Studi Kasus pada Perawat IGD RSUD Kota Mataram)*. 4(3), 3156–3163.

- Bank, P. T., Indonesia, R., & Nirwani, S. (2025). *The Influence of Work-Life Balance and Burnout on the Performance of Relationship Credit Employees at*. 5(2), 194–199.
- Beban, P., Terhadap, K., & Karyawan, K. (2021). *Pengaruh beban kerja terhadap kinerja karyawan melalui burnout syndrome pada pt. perkebunan nusantara x pabrik gula tjoekir*. 9, 355–366.
- Erlinda, N., & Sawitri, D. K. (2025). *The Study of Job Satisfaction : Exploring Work-Life Balance , Job Stress , and Burnout*. 6(5), 4111–4116.
- Fath, A., Savigo, D., Nurhasanah, S., & Febriani, R. (2023). *The Influence of Work-Life Balance on Job Satisfaction with Burnout as an Intervening Variable*. 03(03). <https://doi.org/10.22219/jamanika.v3i03.29582>
- Fhauzan, R. F., & Ali, H. (2024). *Pengaruh Beban Kerja dan Burnout Terhadap Kinerja Karyawan Melalui Stress Kerja*. 2(4), 169–176.
- Galis, E. E. (2023). *Hubungan Work Life Balance Dengan Burnout Pada Karyawan PT . X The Relationship between Work Life Balance and Burnout in PT . X Abstrak Pendahuluan*. 10(03), 888–898.
- Gen, Z. (2025). *Pengaruh Work-Life Balance dan Burnout terhadap Motivasi Kerja Karyawan Generasi Z (Studi Pada PT Gudang Baru Berkah)*. 10(September), 415–428.
- Ikhram, A. A., Tinggi, S., Ekonomi, I., Makassar, A., Selatan, S., Fakultas, I., Barat, U. S., Barat, S., Sekolah, I., Ilmu, T., Amkop, E., & Sulawesi, M. (2019). *PENGARUH WORK LIFE BALANCE TERHADAP BURNOUT DAN KEPUASAN KERJA KARYAWAN (STUDI KASUS PADA PERUSAHAAN LISTRIK NEGARA (PLN) AREA MAKASSAR SELATAN)*. 1(2), 27–34.
- Journal, I. I., & Economics, S. (2024). *No Title*. 7(3), 6206–6223.
- Jurnal, J., Mea, I., & Garut, P. D. F. (2025). *TERHADAP PRODUKTIVITAS KERJA KARYAWAN PADA JIMEA / Jurnal Ilmiah MEA (Manajemen , Ekonomi , dan Akuntansi)*. 9(3), 183–201.
- Kamarullah, H., & Fitriana, D. (2025). *Analisis Pengaruh Beban Kerja dan Stres Kerja terhadap Work-Life Balance Mahasiswa yang Bekerja*. 2(2), 1–20.
- Kerja, B. (2025). *1,2,3 I*. 4(1), 418–427.
- Malang, U. N. (2023). *Work-life Balance and Burnout on Employee : A Systematic Literature Review and Bibliometric Analysis International Journal of Business , Law , and Education*. 4(2), 1207–1213.
- Pendidikan, J., Syaqq, M., Nuromavita, I., & Hakim, M. (2024). *Beban Kerja dan Work Life Balance pada Kinerja Karyawan Generasi Millenial*. 12(2), 750–760.
- Salit, I. G., & Netra, K. (2019). *PENGARUH STRES KERJA , BURNOUT DAN MOTIVASI KERJA TERHADAP KINERJA PERAWAT RSD MANGUSADA KABUPATEN*. 5, 493–524.
- Septiyana, A., & Masdjojo, G. N. (2025). *Pengaruh Work-Life Balance dan Burnout terhadap Kepuasan Kerja dengan Budaya Kerja sebagai Variabel Intervening pada Karyawan Milenial di Kota Semarang*. 6(5), 4029–4041.
- Yancik, Y. (2025). *Pengaruh Work-life balance Dan Beban Kerja Terhadap Kinerja Pegawai Melalui Burnout*. 4(2), 6028–6035.