

## The Effect of Social Support and Self-Efficacy on Burnout in Working Students

Enjang Maulana<sup>1</sup>, Arif Rahman Hakim<sup>2</sup>, Mohammad Iqbal<sup>3</sup>

Universitas Buana Perjuangan Karawang<sup>123</sup>

Corresponding email: [ps22.enjangmaulana@mhs.ubpkarawang1.arif.hakim@ubpkarawang.ac.id2](mailto:ps22.enjangmaulana@mhs.ubpkarawang1.arif.hakim@ubpkarawang.ac.id2),

[Mohammad.iqbal@ubpkarawang.ac.od3](mailto:Mohammad.iqbal@ubpkarawang.ac.od3)

### ARTICLE INFO

#### Article History

Submission: 08-06-2026

Received: 09-06-2026

Revised: 10-06-2026

Accepted : 12-06-2026

#### Keywords

Social Support;

Self-Efficacy;

Burnout;

Working Students;

Psychology

DOI:10.59066/ijoms.v5i1.2537

### ABSTRACT

This study aims to determine the effect of social support and self-efficacy on burnout in working students. This study uses a quantitative approach with a causal associative method. The population in this study were working students with a sample of 227 respondents obtained using the Convenience Sampling technique. The data analysis technique used multiple linear regression analysis with the help of SPSS version 25.0. The results showed that social support has a significant negative effect on burnout with a significance value of 0.000 ( $p < 0.05$ ). Self-efficacy also has a significant negative effect on burnout with a significance value of 0.002 ( $p < 0.05$ ). Simultaneously, social support and self-efficacy have a significant effect on burnout with a significance value of 0.000 ( $p < 0.05$ ). The results of the coefficient of determination test showed an R Square value of 0.177, which means that social support and self-efficacy contributed 17.7% to burnout in working students, while the remaining 82.3% was influenced by other factors outside this study. This study shows that social support and self-efficacy can help reduce burnout levels in working students.

This is an open access article under the [CC BY-SA](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/) license.  
Copyright© 2026 by Author. Published by CV. Archipelago Digital Era



### Introduction

Pursuing higher education changes one's status from pupil to student. The ages between 18 and 25 are considered to be the transition from late adolescence to early adulthood, when individuals begin pursuing higher education and assume the personal responsibilities inherent in student status. (Hulukati & Djibran, 2018). Students pursuing higher education have the primary goal of learning and developing their thinking skills. Therefore, it is crucial for them to participate in the entire learning process on campus to achieve optimal academic results and complete their studies on time. (Nurardiansyah et al., 2023).

Continuing education to a higher level is not easy, as students must meet various complex needs. Based on this opinion Mardelina and Muhson (2017), Students' educational needs are diverse and must be met to ensure the learning process is uninterrupted. These needs include tuition fees, stationery, textbooks, photocopying, training, research, and internships related to their field of study. Internet access and various other costs that support academic activities at university are also crucial. Increasing living costs force students to seek solutions by working while studying.

Nurardiansyah et al. (2023) stated that the number of students studying while working continues to increase. According to Supartono et al. (2023) The phenomenon of students studying while working is nothing new. Based on data from the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) cited by Nurardiansyah et al. (2023) that approximately 40% of students work more than 20 hours per week. This increase is also driven by the numerous job opportunities available to students. Adriati and Damayanti (2023) The increasing cost of living is the main factor that encourages students to seek additional sources of income while studying.

In general, studying while working can have both positive and negative effects on students. Hamra and Widiasih (2024) The positive aspects of studying while working include helping to ease the burden of parents' education costs, providing new experiences, and fostering financial independence. However, Hamra and Widiasih (2024) also argue that the negative impacts that may arise include difficulty managing time and maintaining concentration between work and study, physical and mental fatigue, delays in completing studies and experiencing burnout.

Schaufeli et al. (2009) states that burnout is a psychological condition which is a response to prolonged chronic stress. Ulfa and Aprianti (2021) states that in certain situations where someone cannot avoid difficulties or suffering, individuals with self-resilience are able to face various life challenges on their own. However, if an individual is unable to cope, the continued buildup of stress can lead to burnout.

Based on a survey conducted by Gallup Workplace as quoted by Marisa and Utami (2021) In 2018, approximately 67% of workers in the United States reported experiencing burnout at varying levels of frequency, while in Germany, approximately 2.7 million workers also experienced similar conditions. In the same year, 23% of workers reported experiencing job exhaustion, and another 44% experienced symptoms of burnout.

According to data from Ceoworld Magazine quoted by Niahara and Nurfitri (2025) Indonesia, particularly Jakarta, ranks 6th out of 69 countries with the highest burnout rate. Meanwhile, a report from CNN Indonesia.com, cited by Niahara and Nurfitri (2025) Research shows that approximately 77.3 percent of people have experienced burnout. This condition is largely caused by the need to be on call 24/7 (46.7 percent), followed by excessive workload (38.7 percent), and too many meetings (14.6 percent).

Furthermore, DataIndonesia.id quoted by Andreas et al. (2025) The phenomenon of burnout, physical and mental exhaustion due to work pressure, is increasingly common among Generation Z in Indonesia. This is caused by excessive workloads, lack of recognition, and an unsupportive work environment. According to a survey conducted by Populix, cited by Andreas et al. (2025) The most common symptoms of burnout experienced by Generation Z include constant fatigue (27%), feelings of worthlessness (21%), and sleep disturbances (15%). Additionally, 11% of respondents reported experiencing depression, 10% experiencing irritability, 8% experiencing frequent headaches, and 3% reporting starting to hate their jobs.

Based on initial observations and the results of a pre-research questionnaire conducted by researchers in October 2025 on 22 Psychology students of Buana Perjuangan University Karawang who were studying while working. Based on the results of the study, it was found that most working students experienced high levels of burnout, indicated by 95.24% of respondents feeling emotionally exhausted due to feeling burdened, easily feeling bored and losing enthusiasm, 90.48% often running out of energy referring to the condition when working students felt that their physical and mental energy was no longer sufficient to carry out daily activities optimally, and 85.71% felt stressed and lacked rest time due to the difficulty of balancing responsibilities between studying and work.

In addition, unstructured interviews were also conducted by the researcher with two working students and showed that the burnout experienced by working students does not only stem from academic activities and work separately, but also comes from the accumulation of demands from both roles. The responsibilities as students who have to attend lectures, do assignments, and prepare for exams, as well as work demands such as work targets, a busy work schedule, and limited rest time, cause physical, emotional, and mental fatigue. These conditions indicate the potential for burnout in working students due to difficulties in balancing academic and work roles. These findings indicate that working Psychology students experience quite high levels of pressure and this condition has the potential to cause burnout.

Burnout is a syndrome characterized by emotional exhaustion and a cynical attitude that refers to an individual's tendency to be negative, maintain psychological distance, and lose interest and involvement in the activities they undertake, especially in individuals who work in the field of serving others (Maslach & Jackson, 1981). Maslach and Leiter (2016) explains that burnout is a condition of psychological exhaustion that arises from prolonged pressure and stress in work and academic activities. Meanwhile, Bakker and Costa (in Marisa & Utami, 2021) argues that burnout is a syndrome characterized by chronic fatigue, a cynical attitude toward work, and low self-actualization. Adawiyah and Blikololong (2018) Burnout is a condition that arises from high work pressure, leaving individuals feeling emotionally and psychologically exhausted and losing their ability to adapt. This condition is generally triggered by excessive work stress.

Maslach (in Alpa'izi et al., 2024) burnout consists of three main aspects, namely emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and decreased personal accomplishment (low personal accomplishment). Meanwhile, according to Demerouti et al. (2001) Burnout consists of two main dimensions: exhaustion and disengagement. Exhaustion refers to a state of physical, emotional, and cognitive exhaustion, while disengagement is characterized by a psychological detachment from work. This conceptualization was later developed in the Oldenburg Burnout Inventory (OLBI), which emphasizes that burnout is not limited to service professions but can occur in various contexts, including higher education (Demerouti & Bakker, 2008). Schaufeli and Taris (2005) explains that burnout is not only related to fatigue, but is also characterized by a decrease in individual involvement in the work and activities undertaken. Lee and Ashforth (1996) explains that the emergence of burnout can be influenced by a number of factors, one of which is low social support.

Social support is a condition in which an individual receives attention, assistance, and empathy from those around them, including family, friends, and coworkers, so that the individual feels understood, accepted, and cared for when facing various life challenges. Sarafino (in Indriani et al., 2025) Social support is defined as the presence of those closest to a person, such as family, siblings, or friends, who provide assistance, encouragement, and attention to individuals facing problems, so that they feel supported and less alone in facing them. Social support is understood as an individual's perception of the availability of support resources that can help reduce the symptoms and impact of stress. Support this usually comes from people who are close to the individual in their daily life, such as family or friends (Zimet et al., 1988).

Social support is defined as an individual's view of the level of attention, assistance and understanding received from the social environment around him (Cohen & Wills, 1985). Sarafino (in Hamzah, 2019) explains that social support consists of four main aspects, namely emotional support, instrumental support, informative support and appreciation support. Meanwhile, according to Zimet et al. (1988) put forward three aspects of social support based on sources of support from friends, family, and other individuals around them. The link between social support and mental well-being is also supported by recent research findings exploring the strategic role of social support in the workplace.

Research conducted by Akbar and Soetjiningsih (2023) The results of the study show the magnitude of the contribution of social support to burnout by 16.9%. Meanwhile research from Alpa'izi et al. (2024) showed that social support had an effect on burnout in retail employees in Purwakarta, with a contribution of 4.9%. Apart from social support, burnout in students can be influenced by low self-efficacy, according to Maslach et al. (2001) One of the contributing factors comes from individual aspects, particularly personality characteristics. One of these personality characteristics is low self-confidence in one's abilities, or self-efficacy.

Low self-efficacy can make individuals doubt their ability to cope with academic demands, thereby increasing vulnerability to burnout. Chemers et al. (2001) explains that self-efficacy is related to an individual's belief in their ability to face academic demands and resolve various challenges effectively. Bandura (in Novrianto et al., 2019) explains that self-efficacy is an individual's belief in their ability to carry out the actions necessary to achieve the desired results. Meanwhile, according to Rimm and Jerusalem (in Novrianto et al., 2019) Self-efficacy is related to an individual's ability to control and adapt to their environment, thus enabling individuals to face various challenges effectively and encouraging the development of more active life goals.

Furthermore, Bandura (in Novrianto et al., 2019) states that self-efficacy plays an important role in influencing how individuals think, feel, motivate themselves, and determine the behavior they display. Feist and Feist quoted by Sadaria et al. (2024) explains that self-efficacy is an individual's belief in their ability to control themselves and influence their surroundings. Chemers et al. (2001) explains that students with high levels of self-efficacy tend to be able to set more challenging success targets, have flexibility in dealing with lecture problems, and show better academic performance compared to students with low self-efficacy.

Bandura (in Ulfa & Aprianti, 2021) Self-efficacy refers to an individual's belief in their ability to achieve a certain level of performance, which in turn influences the events in their life. Self-efficacy influences how a person feels, thinks, motivates themselves, and acts. These beliefs produce diverse impacts through four main processes: cognitive, motivational, affective, and selection. Bandura (in Novrianto et al., 2019) He stated that self-efficacy is composed of three main dimensions, namely the first is magnitude, which is the extent to which an individual assesses the level of difficulty of the task he will undertake; the second is strength, which is the degree of an individual's belief in his ability to complete a particular task; and the third is generality, which refers to the extent of an individual's belief in applying this ability to various task contexts.

Students who experience high levels of burnout and low self-efficacy tend to have poor problem-solving skills. This condition makes them more susceptible to stress and depression. If stress is persistent and excessive, it can trigger burnout (Sadaria et al., 2024). In addition, according to Sadaria et al. (2024) Burnout can also lead to behaviors such as laziness in completing assignments, lack of interest in learning, being easily stressed, and even reducing students' quality of life. Research conducted by Retno and Priyatama (2014) shows that self-efficacy contributes effectively to burnout by 14.1%. In addition, research conducted by Ulfa and Aprianti (2021) shows that the magnitude of the influence of self-efficacy on burnout is 28.5% and the correlation between self-efficacy and burnout is negative.

Based on the above description, the high level of burnout among working students is a significant issue that requires serious attention, as it can impact individual psychological, academic, and productivity conditions. The novelty of this study lies in the integration of social support and self-efficacy in explaining burnout in working students, a phenomenon

that has rarely been studied together. This research is also supported by pre-research that shows a tendency towards burnout in working students, making it highly relevant to the conditions of students who must face both academic and work demands. This condition emphasizes the importance of factors that can help reduce burnout, namely social support as an external source and self-efficacy as an internal belief considered important to help working students manage stress and maintain a healthy psychological condition. Therefore, this study aims to examine the effect of social support and self-efficacy on burnout in working students in the Psychology Study Program, Buana Perjuangan University, Karawang.

## Method

This research uses a quantitative approach that emphasizes processing numerical data with statistical analysis. The method used is the causal associative method, which aims to determine the cause-and-effect relationship between two or more variables (Sugiyono, 2018). This study included two independent variables: social support and self-efficacy, and one dependent variable: burnout. Multiple linear regression was used for data analysis.

Sampling was conducted using a nonprobability sampling technique through Convenience Sampling, a sampling technique based on the researcher's ease in reaching respondents who fit the research characteristics. In its implementation, the researcher first requested permission from the lecturer in charge of the course to enter the class and conduct data collection. After obtaining permission, the researcher visited several classes in the Psychology Study Program at Buana Perjuangan University, Karawang, and distributed questionnaires to students who met the criteria as working students. Therefore, respondents were selected based on availability, willingness to participate, and ease of access for the researcher in obtaining research data. This data was collected using a questionnaire. The population of this study was 600 working students of the Psychology Study Program at Buana Perjuangan University, Karawang. Based on the Issac and Michael table with a 5% error rate, the number of samples used was 227 working students from the study program.

Data collection in this study was conducted using a survey method using a questionnaire. Three scales were used: the burnout scale (Oldenburg Burnout Inventory/OLBI), the social support scale (Multidimensional Scale of Perceived Social Support/MSPSS), and the self-efficacy scale (General Self-Efficacy Scale/GSES). All three used a Likert scale model to measure participants' responses to the statements given. The burnout scale (Oldenburg Burnout Inventory/OLBI) developed by Demerouti et al. (2001) has 16 items, then consists of 13 items adapted from Anggara et al. (2020) which measures the dimensions of Exhaustion and Disengagement, after three invalid items were removed. This scale has a reliability with a Cronbach's Alpha of 0.731.

The Multidimensional Scale of Perceived Social Support (MSPSS), developed by Zimet et al. (1988) then adapted by Sulistiani et al. (2022) consists of 12 items that measure support from family, friends, and significant others. The General Self-Efficacy Scale

(GSES), an Indonesian adaptation version by Novrianto et al. (2019) measuring individual confidence in facing various situations using a Likert scale.

Prior to use, all scales were tested for validity and reliability through tryouts and item analysis using SPSS version 25.0 to ensure the measurement tools were valid and reliable for student workers as research subjects. The tryout process began by distributing questionnaires to students who met the criteria for student workers, and a total of 47 student workers completed the questionnaires. Next, the tryout data were analyzed using SPSS version 25.0 through validity and reliability tests.

Validity testing was carried out using Corrected Item-Total Correlation with the criteria for valid items if they have a value of more than 0.30.(Azwar, 2017). The results of the validity test on the burnout scale showed that the Corrected Item-Total Correlation value ranged from 0.379 to 0.699. On the social support scale, the Corrected Item-Total Correlation value ranged from 0.649 to 0.831. Meanwhile, on the self-efficacy scale, the Corrected Item-Total Correlation value ranged from 0.472 to 0.726. All items on the three scales met the validity criteria because they had values above 0.30.

Next, reliability testing was conducted using the Cronbach's Alpha coefficient. The analysis showed that the burnout scale had a Cronbach's Alpha value of 0.833, the social support scale a value of 0.943, and the self-efficacy scale a value of 0.891. Based on these results, all instruments had a high level of reliability and were deemed suitable for use in the main study.

Data analysis in this study was conducted in stages using a quantitative approach. First, a normality test was conducted to determine whether the data for each variable had a normal distribution, which is important for determining the appropriate type of statistical analysis. Next, a linearity test was used to ensure a linear relationship between the independent and dependent variables. Hypothesis testing was conducted using multiple linear regression analysis to determine the functional and causal relationships between social support and self-efficacy on burnout. Then, a coefficient of determination test was used to measure the percentage contribution of the independent variables to the dependent variable. Finally, a categorization test was conducted to group respondents into several levels based on the scores of the measured variables, thus providing a more structured description of the levels of burnout, social support, and self-efficacy.

## **Results and Discussion**

### **Demographic Data**

Based on the results of data collection, this study involved 227 respondents of working students from the Psychology Study Program of Buana Perjuangan University, Karawang. Respondents consisted of 56 men and 171 women. In terms of age, the majority of respondents were in the 18–21 years range, as many as 122 people (53.7%), followed by the 22–26 years age group as many as 87 people (38.3%), 27–32 years old as many as 15 people (6.6%), 33–37 years old as many as 2 people (0.9%), and more than 38 years old as many as

1 person (0.4%). Based on the length of work, the most respondents worked less than 5 hours per day as many as 75 people (33.0%), 4–8 hours as many as 63 people (27.8%), exactly 8 hours as many as 56 people (24.7%), and more than 8 hours as many as 33 people (14.5%). Meanwhile, in terms of semester, respondents were dominated by students in semesters 5-6, amounting to 70 people (30.8%), followed by students in semesters 1-2, amounting to 57 people (25.1%), students in semesters 7 and above, amounting to 53 people (23.3%), and students in semesters 3-4, amounting to 47 people (20.7%).

**Table 1. Respondent Overview**

Demographic Data	Categorization	N	%
Gender	Man	56	24.7%
	Woman	171	75.3%
Age	18–21 Years	122	53.7%
	22–26 Years	87	38.3%
	27–32 Years	15	6.6%
	33–37 Years	2	0.9%
	>38 Years	1	0.4%
Length of work	< 5 Hours	75	33.0%
	4–8 Hours	63	27.8%
	8 Hours	56	24.7%
	> 8 Hours	33	14.5%
Semester	Semester 1–2	57	25.1%
	Semester 3–4	47	20.7%
	Semester 5–6	70	30.8%
	Semester 7 and above	53	23.3%

### Normality Test

The normality test is conducted to determine whether the research data are normally distributed, thereby providing a basis for selecting either parametric or non-parametric statistical analyses (Hakim et al., 2022). The significance value (Asymp. Sig) is used as the basis for decision making in the normality test. (Sugiyono, 2018). Based on the results of the normality test analyzed using SPSS version 25.0, the Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed) value is 0.097. Because this value is greater than 0.05 ( $0.097 > 0.05$ ), it can be concluded that the research data is normally distributed.

**Table 2. Normality Test**

	Unstandardized Residual
N	227
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.097c

**Linearity Test**

**Table 3. Linearity Test**

Variables	Source	Information	F	Sig.
Burnout* Social Support	Between Groups	Linearity	39,174	.000
		<i>Deviation from Linearity</i>	1,306	.114
Burnout* Self-Efficacy	Between Groups	Linearity	2,290	.000
		<i>Deviation from Linearity</i>	1,306	.086

Based on the analysis results in the table above, the relationship between social support and burnout obtained a significance value of Linearity of 0.000 ( $0.000 < 0.05$ ) so that the data is linear, in addition to the value of Deviation from Linearity of 0.114 ( $0.114 > 0.05$ ) so that the data is classified as linear. Furthermore, the relationship between self-efficacy and burnout obtained a significance value of Linearity of 0.000 ( $0.000 < 0.05$ ). in addition to the value of Deviation from Linearity of 0.086 ( $0.086 > 0.05$ ) so that the data is classified as linear. Thus, it can be concluded that all variables in the study have a linear relationship.

**Multiple Linear Regression Test**

**Partial Test**

**Table 4. Partial Test**

Model	B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.
Social Support	-.101	.025	-.273	-3,955	.000
Self-Efficacy	-.164	.052	-.216	-3.135	.002

In regression analysis, the regression coefficient indicates the direction of the relationship and the magnitude of the influence of the independent variable on the dependent variable. A positive coefficient indicates a unidirectional relationship, while a negative coefficient indicates an inverse relationship (Sugiyono, 2018). Based on the results of multiple linear regression analysis, the social support variable obtained a regression coefficient (B) of -0.101 with a significance value of 0.000 ( $p < 0.05$ ). A negative coefficient value indicates that the direction of the influence of social support on burnout is negative. This means that the higher the social support received by working students, the lower the burnout level tends to be. Conversely, the lower the social support received, the higher the burnout level tends to be.

The findings of this study are supported by previous research from Alpa'izi et al. (2024), Akbar and Soetjningsih (2023) which shows that social support has a negative relationship with burnout. Individuals who receive high levels of social support tend to have lower levels of burnout due to the emotional and psychological support that helps them cope with the various demands and pressures they experience. These findings also indicate that social support is a resource that helps working students cope with the simultaneous demands

of academics and work. Support provided by family, friends, and significant others can help individuals reduce psychological distress, receive assistance when facing difficulties, and improve their ability to cope with stress.

The results of this study can be explained through the burnout theory put forward by Demerouti et al. (2001), which states that burnout consists of two main dimensions: exhaustion and disengagement. Exhaustion is a state of physical, emotional, and cognitive exhaustion due to excessive demands, while disengagement is an individual's tendency to withdraw and develop a negative attitude towards the activities undertaken. High social support can help working students reduce emotional exhaustion arising from the demands of lectures and work, and prevent the emergence of attitudes of distance or disengagement from academic activities or work. Thus, the higher the social support an individual receives, the lower the likelihood of exhaustion and disengagement, which are indicators of burnout.

The self-efficacy variable obtained a regression coefficient (B) of -0.164 with a significance value of 0.002 ( $p < 0.05$ ). A negative coefficient value indicates that the direction of the influence of self-efficacy on burnout is negative. This means that the higher the self-efficacy of working students, the lower the burnout level tends to be. Conversely, the lower the self-efficacy, the higher the burnout level tends to be.

The results of this study indicate that an individual's belief in their ability to cope with various academic and work demands plays a significant role in reducing burnout. Student workers with high self-efficacy tend to be more confident in completing tasks, overcoming obstacles, and coping with the pressures that arise during their roles as students and workers.

This finding can be explained through the concept of burnout from Demerouti et al. (2001) which states that burnout is characterized by exhaustion and disengagement. Individuals with high self-efficacy tend to be better able to manage stress and meet the various demands they face, thus less likely to experience emotional or mental exhaustion. Furthermore, Bandura (in Ulfa & Aprianti, 2021) explains that self-efficacy is an individual's belief in their ability to organize and carry out the actions necessary to achieve certain goals. Belief in one's abilities also keeps individuals motivated and engaged in their activities, thereby reducing the tendency to withdraw or have a negative attitude towards work and academics (disengagement). Therefore, high self-efficacy can function as a protective factor that helps reduce burnout in working students.

The results of this study align with previous research showing that self-efficacy has a negative relationship with burnout. Individuals with high self-efficacy tend to be better able to adapt to stressful situations and have a lower risk of burnout than those with low self-efficacy. For working students, self-efficacy is a crucial factor because they are required to manage their time, energy, and attention between academic and work activities. Students who are confident in their ability to manage these various demands are better able to withstand stress, thus reducing the likelihood of experiencing burnout.

### Simultaneous Test

**Table 5. Simultaneous Test**

Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Regression	825,158	2	412,579	24,096	.000

Based on the results of simultaneous multiple regression tests, a significance value of 0.000 was obtained ( $0.000 < 0.05$ ). This indicates that social support and self-efficacy together have a significant influence on the occurrence of burnout in working students in the psychology study program at Buana Perjuangan University, Karawang. Thus, the third hypothesis (Ha3) is accepted and (Ho3) is rejected.

Simultaneously, social support and self-efficacy significantly influence burnout in working students. This finding indicates that burnout is influenced not only by internal factors of the individual but also by external factors originating from the social environment. According to Demerouti et al. (2001), burnout occurs when individuals experience high demands without adequate resources. In this study, social support can be viewed as an external resource that helps individuals cope with pressure, while self-efficacy is an internal resource that helps individuals believe in their ability to meet various demands. The presence of both resources can reduce the emergence of exhaustion and disengagement, thus lowering the level of burnout in working students.

### Coefficient of Determination Test

**Table 6. Coefficient of Determination Test**

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Standard Error of the Estimate
1	.421	.177	.170	4.13791

Based on the results of the coefficient of determination test, the R Square value was 0.177. This indicates that social support and self-efficacy contributed 17.7% to burnout in working students in the psychology study program at Buana Perjuangan University, Karawang. Meanwhile, 82.7% was influenced by other factors outside the variables examined in this study.

## Categorization Test

Table 7. Categorization Test

Variables	Categorization	(n)	Percentage
<b>Social Support</b>	Low	5	2.2%
	Currently	82	36.1%
	Tall	140	61.7%
<b>Self-Efficacy</b>	Low	2	0.9%
	Currently	63	27.8%
	Tall	162	71.4%
<b>Burnout</b>	Low	2	0.9%
	Currently	114	50.2%
	Tall	111	48.9%

Based on the categorization test for the social support variable, the majority of respondents (140 people) were in the high category, followed by 82 (36.1%) in the medium category, and 5 (2.2%) in the low category. This indicates that social support for working students is generally at a high level.

For the self-efficacy variable, the majority of respondents (162 respondents) were in the high category, followed by 63 respondents (27.8%) in the medium category, and 2 respondents (0.9%) in the low category. This indicates that self-efficacy among working-class students is generally high.

Regarding burnout, the majority of respondents (114 respondents) were in the moderate category, followed by 111 (48.9%) in the high category, and 2 (0.9%) in the low category. This indicates that burnout among working students is generally at a moderate level.

### Conclusion

Based on the research results, the level of social support among working-class students in the Psychology Study Program at Buana Perjuangan University, Karawang, is generally high. This indicates that most working-class students receive good support from family, friends, and significant others. Furthermore, their self-efficacy is also high, indicating their confidence in their abilities to cope with academic and work demands.

Meanwhile, burnout levels among working students were generally moderate, meaning they still experienced physical and emotional exhaustion due to the dual demands of being both students and workers, but their levels were still relatively manageable. This study also found that social support and self-efficacy had a significant negative effect on burnout. In other words, the higher the social support and self-efficacy, the lower the burnout levels experienced by working students.

The results of this study indicate that social support and self-efficacy play a significant role in reducing burnout levels in working students majoring in the Psychology Study Program at Buana Perjuangan University, Karawang. These findings imply that burnout prevention efforts need to be implemented by strengthening both external and internal factors. Social support from the surrounding environment can help working students cope with various academic and work demands, while high self-efficacy can increase individual confidence in overcoming various challenges.

For working students, the results of this study are expected to provide a source of information regarding the importance of building positive social support and increasing self-confidence in their abilities to face the demands of college and work. With strong social support and self-efficacy, working students are expected to be able to manage emerging pressures and minimize the risk of burnout.

For the Psychology Study Program at Buana Perjuangan University, Karawang, the results of this study can be used as a consideration in designing student development programs, such as counseling services, academic mentoring, and self-development activities aimed at increasing social support and self-efficacy. These efforts are expected to help working students manage the demands of their dual roles, thereby minimizing burnout.

For future researchers, the results of this study are expected to serve as a reference in developing research on burnout in working students. Future researchers are advised to include other variables that could potentially influence burnout, such as stress coping, resilience, work-life balance, workload, and other psychological factors, to provide a more comprehensive understanding of the factors influencing burnout.

### References

- Adawiyah, R., & Blikololong, J. B. (2018). Hubungan Antara Dukungan Sosial dan Burnout Pada Karyawan Rumah Sakit. *Jurnal Psikologi*, 11(2), 190–199. <https://doi.org/10.35760/psi.2018.v11i2.2264>
- Adriati, G. I. A. W., & Damayanti, I. G. A. R. (2023). Gaya Hidup, Work-Life Balance, Internal Locus of Control Terhadap Kinerja Mahasiswa Pekerja Part-Time di Kota Denpasar. *JUIMA: Jurnal Ilmu Manajemen*, 13(1).
- Akbar, M. T., & Soetjningsih, C. H. (2023). Dukungan Sosial Rekan Kerja dan Atasan dengan Burnout Pada Aparatur Sipil Negara. *Bulletin of Counseling and Psychotherapy*, 4(3). <https://doi.org/10.51214/bocp.v4i3.436>
- Alpa'izi, J., Rahman, P. R. U., & Pratomo, R. Y. (2024). Peran Dukungan Sosial Terhadap Burnout: Studi Regresi pada Karyawan Retail di Purwakarta. *Jurnal Psikologi Dan Konseling West Science*, 2(03), 138–144. <https://doi.org/10.58812/jpkws.v2i03.1536>

- Andreas, A. P., Firmansyah, S. F., & Pradana, H. H. (2025). Studi Fenomenologi Burnout pada Mahasiswa yang Kuliah dan Bekerja. *Psycho Aksara: Jurnal Psikologi*, 3(2), 154–178. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.28926/pyschoaksara.v3i2.1726>
- Anggara, I. M. F., Sari, N. L. W. S., Dwiputra, F., Yanti, K. I., & Widarnandana, I. G. D. (2020). Instrumen Pengukuran Burnout Pada Pekerja Industri Pariwisata di Badung. *Jurnal Psikologi MANDALA 2020*, 4(1), 1–18.
- Azwar, S. (2017). *Metode penelitian psikologi (Edisi 2)*. Pustaka Pelajar.
- Chemers, M. M., Hu, L. T., & Garcia, B. F. (2001). Academic self-efficacy and first-year college student performance and adjustment. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 93(1), 55–64. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.93.1.55>
- Cohen, S., & Wills, T. A. (1985). Stress, Social Support, and the Buffering Hypothesis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 98(2), 310–357.
- Demerouti, E., & Bakker, A. B. (2008). The Oldenburg Burnout Inventory: A good alternative to measure Burnout and engagement. *Handbook of Stress and Burnout in Health Care*, 65(7), 1–25.
- Demerouti, E., Nachreiner, F., Bakker, A. B., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2001). The Job Demands-Resources Model of Burnout. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(3), 499–512.
- Hakim, A. R., Mora, L., & Rahmawati, S. (2022). Analisis data penelitian kuantitatif untuk skripsi. Jakarta: *UAI Press*.
- Hamra, N. El, & Widiasih, P. A. (2024). Strategi Koping Dan Work Life Balance Pada Mahasiswa Yang Bekerja. *Puti Archianti Widiasih*, 4(2), 44–53. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.36805/empowerment.v4i2.1179>
- Hamzah, W. (2019). Pengaruh Beban Kerja dan Dukungan Sosial Terhadap Kelelahan Kerja. *Psikoborneo*, 7(2), 336–343.
- Hulukati, W., & Djibran, Moh. R. (2018). Analisis Tugas Perkembangan Mahasiswa Fakultas Ilmu Pendidikan Universitas Negeri Gorontalo. *Jurnal Bikotetik*, 02(01), 73–114. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.26740/bikotetik.v2n1.p73-80>
- Indriani, R., Anastasya, Y. A., & Safuwani, S. (2025). Gambaran Dukungan Sosial Pada Mahasiswa Tingkat Akhir Yang Bekerja. *INSIGHT: Jurnal Penelitian Psikologi*, 3(3), 423–434.

- Lee, R. T., & Ashforth, B. E. (1996). A Meta-Analytic Examination of the Correlates of the Three Dimensions of Job Burnout. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 81(2), 123–133.
- Mardelina, E., & Muhson, A. (2017). Mahasiswa Bekerja dan Dampaknya Pada Aktivitas Belajar dan Prestasi Akademik. *Jurnal Economia*, 13(2), 201–209.
- Marisa, P. A. A., & Utami, L. H. (2021). *Kontribusi Stres Kerja dan Hardiness pada Burnout Pekerja*. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.14421/jpsi.v9i1.2077>
- Maslach, C., & Jackson, S. E. (1981). The Measurement of Experienced Burnout. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 2(2), 99–113. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.4030020205>
- Maslach, C., & Leiter, M. P. (2016). Understanding the Burnout experience: Recent research and its implications for psychiatry. *World Psychiatry*, 15(2), 103–111. <https://doi.org/10.1002/wps.20311>
- Maslach, C. Schaufeli, C. H., & Leiter, W. B. & P. (2001). Title Job Burnout JOB BURNOUT. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 52, 397–422. <http://hdl.handle.net/1874/13606Rightshttps://www.uu.nl/en/university-library/license-and-reuse-conditions>
- Niahara, A. F., & Nurfitria, S. (2025). Hubungan Stres Kerja Dengan Burnout Pada Karyawan Divisi Produksi PT. X. *Jurnal Ilmu Psikologi Dan Kesehatan*, 02(03), 78–84.
- Novrianto, R., Marettih, A. K. E., & Wahyudi, H. (2019). Validitas Konstruk Instrumen General Self Efficacy Scale Versi Indonesia. *Jurnal Psikologi*, 15(1), 1–9. <https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.24014/jp.v14i2.6943>
- Nurardiansyah, R., Rahman Hakim, A., & Simatupang, M. (2023). Gambaran Psychological Well-Being Pada Mahasiswa Program Studi Psikologi Yang Bekerja. *Empowerment*, 3(2), 57–63. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.36805/empowerment.v3i2.865>
- Retno, N. W., & Priyatama, A. N. (2014). Tingkat Burnout ditinjau dari Strategi Coping dan Efikasi Diri pada Perawat Rumah Sakit Jiwa Surakarta. *Jurnal Ilmiah Psikologi Candrajiwa*, 3(3), 197–205.
- Sadaria, S. A., Razak, A., & Akmal, N. (2024). Pengaruh Efikasi Diri terhadap Academic Burnout pada Mahasiswa yang Bekerja di Kota Makassar. *Socius: Jurnal Penelitian Ilmu-Ilmu Sosial*, 2(3), 24–30. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.13888498>

- Schaufeli, W. B., Leiter, M. P., & Maslach, C. (2009). Burnout: 35 years of research and practice. *Career Development International*, 14(3), 204–220. <https://doi.org/10.1108/13620430910966406>
- Schaufeli, W. B., & Taris, T. W. (2005). The conceptualization and measurement of Burnout: Common ground and worlds apart. In *Work and Stress* (Vol. 19, Number 3, pp. 256–262). <https://doi.org/10.1080/02678370500385913>
- Sugiyono. (2018). *Metode penelitian kuantitatif, kualitatif, dan R&D*. Bandung: Alfabeta.
- Sulistiani, W., Fajrianti, & Kristiana, I. F. (2022). Validation of The Indonesian Version of The Multidimensional Scale of Perceived Social Support (Mspss): A Rasch Model Approach. *Jurnal Psikologi*, 21(1), 89–103.
- Supartono, Sukardi, Santoso, L. H., & Darmadi, E. A. (2023). Dampak Kuliah Sambil Bekerja Terhadap Aktifitas Belajar Mahasiswa Di Politeknik Tri Mitra Karya Mandiri. *Jurnal IKRAITH-HUMANIORA*, 7(1), 1–8. <https://journals.upi-yai.ac.id/index.php/ikraith-humaniora/issue/archive>
- Ulfa, S., & Aprianti, M. (2021). Pengaruh Efikasi Diri Terhadap Burnout Dan Perbedaannya Berdasarkan Gender. *Psychosophia: Journal of Psychology, Religion, and Humanity*, 3(1), 24–35. <https://doi.org/10.32923/psc.v3i1.1651>
- Zimet, G. D., Dahlem, N. W., Zimet, S. G., & Farley, G. K. (1988). The Multidimensional Scale of Perceived Social Support. *Journal of Personality Assesment*, 52(1), 30–41.