



The Role of Supervisory Support and Self-Efficacy on Work Effectiveness with Work Burnout as a Moderator Variable

Arif Rachman Putra¹, Didit Darmawan^{2*}

arifrachmanputra.caniago@gmail.com¹, dr.diditdarmawan@gmail.com^{2*}

^{1,2}Program Studi Manajemen

^{1,2}Universitas Sunan Giri Surabaya

Received: 17 05 2024. Revised: 11 06 2024. Accepted: 27 06 2024.

Abstract : This study aims to investigate the effect of supervisory support and self-efficacy on work effectiveness, with work burnout as a moderating variable. The quantitative method was used using a questionnaire distributed to 100 respondents who worked at a company in Surabaya. The results of data analysis using the multiple regression method reveal that supervisory support has a significant positive impact on work effectiveness, along with self-efficacy which also has a significant positive influence on work effectiveness. Then supervisory support moderates the relationship positively and significantly towards work burnout. Self-efficacy was found to moderate the relationship positively and significantly to job burnout, indicating that the higher the level of self-efficacy, the lower the perceived level of job burnout. Meanwhile, work burnout negatively and significantly moderates the relationship to work effectiveness, indicating that the higher the level of work burnout, the lower the observed work effectiveness.

Keywords : Self-Efficacy, Work Effectiveness, Work Burnout

INTRODUCTION

Work effectiveness is very important in the world of work. For employees, the ability to carry out tasks efficiently and with high quality is the main key to achieving personal goals, such as career development and recognition at work. Employees who are effective in their work tend to be more appreciated and recognized, either through promotions, awards, or positive feedback from colleagues and superiors. Apart from that, high work effectiveness also provides personal satisfaction for being able to complete tasks well, increases self-confidence, and strengthens motivation to continue to develop (Mardikaningsih *et al.*, 2022). High work effectiveness also makes a significant contribution to the overall success of the organization (Djazilan & Darmawan, 2022). Effective employees tend to have a positive impact on productivity, product or service quality, and customer satisfaction (Yee *et al.*, 2008; Mardikaningsih & Putra, 2021). They are able to work collaboratively with teams, solve problems quickly and efficiently, and innovate to improve work processes. Thus, high work effectiveness creates a productive and collaborative work environment, where each team member can contribute optimally to achieving common goals (Bangsu *et al.*, 2023).

Organizations that provide the support and facilities needed by employees can achieve optimal work effectiveness (Yukl, 2008).

On the organizational side, employee work effectiveness is a determining factor in achieving business goals, productivity and competitiveness in the market (Uddin *et al.*, 2013; Asghari *et al.*, 2020). Employees who are able to work effectively improve company performance also strengthen the brand's reputation and image in the eyes of customers (Lin *et al.*, 2018). Therefore, investing in improving work effectiveness becomes very important for organizations that want to remain relevant and sustainable in a dynamic and changing business environment. Various factors can influence a person's level of work effectiveness, one of which is work burnout (Calin *et al.*, 2022). According to Couser (2008), burnout and depression pose major public health challenges for the workforce. Burnout in the work environment is a common phenomenon in various organizations. This not only affects employee well-being, but also has the potential to damage the overall effectiveness and productivity of the organization. This often arises when the tasks being carried out feel monotonous or less challenging, when there are no opportunities for development, or when the work environment is not supportive.

Burnout can arise from various factors, such as excessive work demands, lack of recognition for employee contributions, or lack of work-life balance (Eddine *et al.*, 2023). Job burnout can occur when someone feels bored, unchallenged, or lacks motivation in carrying out their work duties (Naufalia *et al.*, 2022). The impact of work burnout can be very detrimental, not only for the employee concerned, but also for the entire organization (Schaufeli *et al.*, 2008). One factor that has been proven to have a significant influence on work effectiveness is supervisory support. Supervision support includes various forms of assistance and guidance provided by superiors or supervisors to their subordinates (Sinambela *et al.*, 2023). This can include clear direction as well as opportunities for better career development (Munir & Darmawan, 2022). Previous research conducted by Tharangie (2013) also confirmed that supervisory support has a significant positive impact on employee motivation in work.

Researchers emphasize the significance of supervisor support in fostering employee innovation (Anderson *et al.*, 2014). Supportive supervisors, who prioritize safety, well-being, and appreciation, enhance innovative behavior, even when employees challenge norms. Conversely, practices like rigid rule adherence and lack of decision-making autonomy stifle creativity, essential for innovation. Quality relationships and conducive environments between employees and supervisors are crucial for fostering innovation. Managing innovative behavior

involves creating supportive climates and conditions (Carnevale *et al.*, 2017). Strong supervisor support cultivates employee appreciation and motivation, enhancing workplace effectiveness. Organizations must recognize the pivotal role of supervisor support in bolstering employee performance. Apart from supervisory support, employees' self-efficacy, emphasized by Wood and Marshall (2008); Attiq *et al.* (2017), is crucial for work effectiveness. High self-efficacy is linked to motivation, resilience, and confidence (Djazilan *et al.*, 2022), promoting initiative, creativity, and perseverance (Retnowati & Darmawan, 2022; Wulandari *et al.*, 2022).

In an organizational, it is important for leaders and managers to understand the important role of self-efficacy in increasing employee effectiveness (Consiglio *et al.*, 2016; Mardikaningsih & Darmawan, 2022). Encouraging and developing employees' confidence in their abilities can not only improve employee performance, but also create a more positive and productive work culture overall (Jahroni *et al.*, 2021). Through the right support and creating a supportive work environment, organizations can help strengthen employee self-efficacy, which will ultimately impact the achievement of business goals and long-term success. Supervision support has been proven to help reduce the level of job burnout felt by employees, while the interaction between self-efficacy and job burnout in influencing work effectiveness still requires further research. Therefore, the aim of this study is to investigate the impact of supervisory support and self-efficacy on work effectiveness, with work burnout as a moderating variable. Through this research, it is hoped that a better understanding will be gained about how the interaction between supervisory support, self-efficacy, and work burnout can influence employee work effectiveness, providing valuable insight for organizations in developing strategies to improve employee performance and well-being.

RESEARCH METHODS

The research method used in this research is quantitative research which aims to explore the relationship between supervisory support, self-efficacy, and organizational effectiveness, by considering the role of job burnout as a moderating variable. This research will be conducted in Surabaya, with a focus on one particular company as the research location. The research sample consisted of 100 respondents, selected through a purposive sampling method, covering various levels of positions in the company, including management, staff and field workers, with a minimum length of service of 2 years. Purposive selection of respondents aims to ensure adequate representation of the various roles and responsibilities within the organization. According to Shanock and Eisenberger (2006), supervisory support (X1) is defined as a process

that involves regular interaction between supervisors and workers to improve performance. There are two indicators to measure supervisory support, namely supervisory support for procedural justice and technological progress (Ha *et al.*, 2024).

Mathisen (2011) states that self-efficacy (X2) is an employee's belief in their own ability to successfully carry out certain tasks or achieve certain goals. It plays an important role in motivation, performance, and goal achievement. According to Bandura (2006), self-efficacy consists of three indicators, namely level, strength and generality. Work effectiveness (Y) is the ability of employees to achieve their goals and produce successful results in their tasks or activities (Kozlowski & Ilgen, 2006). Work effectiveness indicators consist of group characteristics, decision making, and communication that contribute to an effective work team (Losa & Castelló, 2001). Burnout (Z) is a state of physical, emotional and mental exhaustion caused by chronic work-related stress (Prada-Ospina, 2019). Thompson *et al.* (2023) states that there are five indicators to measure the work burnout variable, namely workload, control, rewards, values, and workplace violence.

Data will be collected using a validated questionnaire measuring supervisory support, self-efficacy, work boredom, and work effectiveness via a Likert scale. Descriptive statistical analysis will provide an overview of sample characteristics and research variables. Multiple regression analysis will test hypotheses, with supervisory support (X1) and self-efficacy (X2) as independent variables, and work burnout (Z) as the moderator, predicting work effectiveness. Additionally, moderation analysis will explore the moderating effect of work burnout on the relationship between supervisory support, self-efficacy, and organizational effectiveness.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The majority of the respondents who filled out the questionnaire, totaling 100, were men, comprising 52%, with women making up the remaining 48%. Most of them are married, accounting for 48% of the total respondents, while 38% are still single, and 14% have been married. In general, the average work experience of respondents is more than 5 years, with 65% of them having worked for that period, while the other 35% have less than 5 years of work experience. In terms of education, the majority of respondents had completed tertiary education, with 78% having a bachelor's degree and 22% having a master's degree. Supervision support (X1) and self-efficacy (X2) have a very strong correlation with the level of work effectiveness (Y) based on the model that has been provided. This shows the importance of these two factors

in influencing employee work effectiveness, as well as supporting the validity and reliability of the regression model used to analyze the relationship between these variables.

Table 1. Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.990 ^a	.981	.980	.434

Based on table 1 (Model Summary), the R value is 0.990 and the R Square value is 0.981. The R value indicates the correlation between the independent variables (supervision support and self-efficacy) and the dependent variable (work effectiveness). An R value close to 1 indicates that there is a very strong relationship between these variables. Meanwhile, the R Square value shows the proportion of variation in the dependent variable that can be explained by the independent variable. The R Square value of 0.981 indicates that around 98.1% of the variation in the level of work effectiveness (Y) can be explained by the independent variables in this model, namely supervisory support (X1) and self-efficacy (X2). Additionally, the R Square value that is not included in the regression model, namely 0.019 or 1.9%, indicates that there are other variables that are not examined in this research but that contribute to variations in the level of work effectiveness (Y).

Table 2. ANOVA^a

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	925.085	2	462.542	2451.046	.000 ^b
	Residual	18.305	97	.189		
	Total	943.390	99			

Next, in table 2 (anova), the F value is 2451.046 with sig. 0.000 (<0.05) indicates that supervisory support (X1) and self-efficacy (X2) have a simultaneous influence on work effectiveness (Y). Based on Table 3 which shows the results of the t test (partial test), the t values and significance values (Sig.) were obtained. There were three t values recorded, namely 6.203, 43.567, and 18.960, with all recorded significance values (Sig.) being 0.000. Because the significance value (Sig.) for all t tests is less than 0.05, it can be concluded that the t test results are statistically significant.

Tabel 3. Coefficients^a

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		
	B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.
1 (Constant)	1.438	.232		6.203	.000
X.1	1.924	.044	.760	43.567	.000
X.2	.829	.044	.331	18.960	.000

The constant (Constant) is 1.438. This shows that when the values of X1 and X2 are zero, then the value of Y will be 1.438. If there was no supervisory support (X1) and self-efficacy (X2), work effectiveness (Y) would have a value of 1.438. The coefficient for X1 is 1.924. This shows that every one unit increase in variable X1 (supervision support) will result in an increase of 1.924 units in variable Y (work effectiveness). In other words, the higher the level of supervisory support, the higher the level of work effectiveness. The coefficient for X2 is 0.829. This shows that every one unit increase in variable X2 (self-efficacy) will result in an increase of 0.829 units in variable Y (work effectiveness). The higher the level of self-efficacy, the higher the level of work effectiveness. So, based on this model, it can be concluded that both supervisory support and self-efficacy contribute positively to work effectiveness.

Table 4. Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.993 ^a	.987	.986	.361

Table 4 shows a summary of the regression analysis model used to predict work effectiveness based on the independent variables supervisory support (X1) and self-efficacy (X2), with work burnout (Z) as a moderating variable. The correlation coefficient (R) value is 0.993. This shows that there is a very strong correlation between the variables of supervisory support and self-efficacy as independent variables with the work effectiveness variable as the dependent variable.

Table 5. ANOVA^a

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	931.119	5	186.224	1426.557	.000 ^b
	Residual	12.271	94	.131		
	Total	943.390	99			

The coefficient of determination (R Square) is 0.987, which means that 98.7% of the variation in work effectiveness is explained by the variables of supervisory support and self-efficacy. From table 4, it shows that the regression model used has a very strong level of correlation and a fairly high level of variability in work effectiveness which can be explained by the independent variables in the model, namely supervisory support and self-efficacy, by considering work burnout as a moderating variable. The influence of supervisory support and self-efficacy on work effectiveness can change depending on the level of work saturation. Under conditions of high levels of job burnout, the influence of supervisory support and self-efficacy may be stronger or weaker than under conditions of low job burnout.

Table 5 shows that the moderating variable job burnout plays an important role in explaining the relationship between the independent and dependent variables in the regression

model. A p value lower than the 0.05 significance level indicates that the overall regression model is statistically significant. Thus the independent variables (supervision support and self-efficacy) and the moderating variable (work saturation) together explain variations in work effectiveness.

Table 6. Coefficients^a

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta			
1 (Constant)	1.160	.397			2.918	.004
X	1.418	.117	.560		12.073	.000
Z	1.256	.121	.501		10.404	.000
XZ	.033	.008	.234		3.919	.000
X.1z	.006	.002	.378		3.510	.001
X.2z	-.010	.002	-.585		-5.300	.000

The regression model contained in table 6 can be expressed as $Y = 1.160 + 1.418X.1 + 1.256X.2 + 0.033Z + 0.006X.1Z + -0.010X.2Z$. The regression model provided indicates that there is a relationship between the level of work effectiveness (Y) and the independent variables supervisory support (X.1), self-efficacy (X.2), and work burnout (Z). The interpretation of the coefficients in the regression model is as follows: the constant, with a value of 1.160, represents the initial level of work effectiveness (Y) when all independent variables (X.1, X.2, and Z) are at zero. The coefficient for X.1 (supervisory support) is 1.418, indicating that for every one unit increase in supervisory support (X1), work effectiveness (Y) increases by 1.418 units, assuming other variables remain constant. For X.2 (self-efficacy), the coefficient is 1.256, suggesting that every one unit increase in self-efficacy (X.2) corresponds to a 1.256 unit increase in work effectiveness (Y), disregarding other variables. Z, representing work saturation, has a coefficient of 0.033, meaning that for every one unit increase in work saturation (Z), work effectiveness (Y) increases by 0.033 units, assuming other variables remain constant.

The interaction between supervisory support and work burnout (X.1z) has a positive regression coefficient of 0.006, indicating a potential strengthening effect of supervisory support on work effectiveness in high burnout conditions. The coefficient for the interaction between self-efficacy and work burnout (X.2z) is -0.010, suggesting that high levels of both self-efficacy and work saturation may reduce work effectiveness, with job burnout moderating this relationship. Overall, job burnout can either enhance or weaken the influence of supervisory support and self-efficacy on work effectiveness, depending on the level of work saturation. In high burnout conditions, supervisory support becomes more influential, while in low burnout conditions, its impact may diminish. Similarly, in high work saturation conditions, self-efficacy

plays a more dominant role in increasing work effectiveness, whereas in low work saturation conditions, its influence may be lower.

Supervisory support has a significant impact on work effectiveness, providing clear direction and encouraging skills development (Hammer *et al.*, 2019). This also affects employees' psychological well-being, reducing the risk of burnout (Swanzy, 2020; Halizah *et al.*, 2023). Recognizing its importance is critical to organizational success (Erdogan *et al.*, 2004). Effective supervision reduces burnout, fosters a supportive environment, and improves overall performance (Chami-Malaeb, 2022; Nielsen *et al.*, 2023; Hameduddin & Lee, 2023; Dawson & McCulloch, 2005; Taiwo, 2010; Van den Berg *et al.*, 2020).

Self-efficacy significantly impacts work effectiveness, motivating employees to set and achieve ambitious goals (Wood and Marshall, 2008; Attiq *et al.*, 2017). It also fosters persistence in overcoming obstacles (Grosser *et al.*, 2017; De Clercq & Belausteguigoitia, 2017), promoting productivity and performance (Schmidt & DeShon, 2010; Darmawan *et al.*, 2020). Confidence in task completion encourages initiative and responsibility, enhancing work effectiveness. Recognizing the importance of building employee self-efficacy, organizations can provide training and create supportive environments (Aftab *et al.*, 2012; Alidosti *et al.*, 2016; Shoji *et al.*, 2016). High self-efficacy reduces burnout risk by fostering positive attitudes and stress resistance (Gani, 2022; Jimmieson, 2000). It also encourages seeking challenges and constructive responses to negative experiences, maintaining motivation and reducing burnout. Supporting employee self-efficacy through training and social support enhances work effectiveness by managing fatigue (Sinambela *et al.*, 2022).

Job burnout negatively affects work effectiveness (Calin *et al.*, 2022; Retnowati *et al.*, 2023), leading to decreased productivity and performance. It diminishes employee motivation, resulting in lower quality work (Darmawan & Putra, 2022). Boredom disrupts concentration and social interactions (Khasanah *et al.*, 2010), impeding collaboration and communication (Hariyani *et al.*, 2019). This decline in effectiveness impacts organizational productivity, hindering project progress and innovation (Jannah & Mardikaningsih, 2023). Additionally, burnout contributes to absenteeism and turnover (Lambert *et al.*, 2010; Darmawan, 2015), disrupting operations and increasing recruitment costs. To address burnout and enhance effectiveness, organizations should focus on improving employee well-being and motivation through tailored training and development opportunities (Wegge *et al.*, 2006; Olson *et al.*, 2019; Retnowati & Darmawan, 2023).

CONCLUSION

Analysis indicates supervisory support significantly enhances employee work effectiveness, underscoring the importance of supportive leadership. Similarly, self-efficacy strongly correlates with effectiveness, highlighting the role of belief in one's abilities. Job burnout moderates the relationship between supervisory support and effectiveness, emphasizing the impact of burnout levels on this relationship. To address these findings, management should prioritize providing support through training and fostering a supportive work culture. Additionally, enhancing employee self-efficacy through tailored training programs can boost confidence and task completion abilities. Proactive measures to mitigate burnout, such as task variety and work-life balance initiatives, are essential for sustaining employee well-being and performance.

REFERENCES

- Aftab, N., A. A. Shah, & R. Mehmood. 2012. Relationship of Self Efficacy and Burnout Among Physicians. *Academic Research International*, 2(2), 539-548.
- Alidosti, M., M. Delaram, L. Dehgani, & M. Maleki Moghadam. 2016. Relationship Between Self-Efficacy and Burnout Among Nurses in Behbahan City, Iran. *Women's Health Bulletin*, 3(4), 1-5.
- Anderson, N., K. Potočnik, & J. Zhou. 2014. Innovation and Creativity in Organizations: A State-of-the-Science Review, Prospective Commentary, and Guiding Framework. *Journal of Management*, 40(5), 1297-1333.
- Asghari, S., S. Targholi, A. Kazemi, S. Shahriyari, & L. Rajabion. 2020. A New Conceptual Framework for Identifying the Factors Influencing the Effectiveness of Competitive Intelligence. *Competitiveness Review: An International Business Journal*, 30(5), 555-576.
- Attiq, S., H. Rasool, & S. Iqbal. 2017. The Impact of Supportive Work Environment, Trust, and Self-Efficacy on Organizational Learning and its Effectiveness: A Stimulus-Organism Response Approach. *Business & Economic Review*, 9(2), 73-100.
- Bandura, A. 2006. Guide for Constructing Self-Efficacy Scales. *Self-Efficacy Beliefs of Adolescents*, 5(1), 307-337.
- Bangsu, M., D. Darmawan, R. Hardyansah, S. Suwito, & M. Mujito. 2023. The Implications of Remuneration, Procedural Justice Principles, and Work Environment Factors on Employee Retention Rate, *International Journal of Service Science, Management, Engineering, and Technology*, 3(3), 26-32.
- Calin, M. F., T. Tasente, & A. Seucea. 2022. The Effects of Burnout on the Professional Activity of Teachers. *Technium Soc. Sci. J.*, 34, 430.
- Carnevale, J. B., L. Huang, M. Crede, P. Harms, & M. Uhl-Bien. 2017. Leading to Stimulate Employees' Ideas: A Quantitative Review of Leader-Member Exchange, Employee Voice, Creativity, And Innovative Behavior. *Applied Psychology*, 66(4), 517-552.
- Chami-Malaeb, R. 2022. Relationship of Perceived Supervisor Support, Self-Efficacy and Turnover Intention, The Mediating Role of Burnout. *Personnel Review*, 51(3), 1003-1019.

- Couser, G. P. 2008. Challenges and Opportunities for Preventing Depression in the Workplace: A Review of the Evidence Supporting Workplace Factors and Interventions. *Journal of Occupational and Environmental Medicine*, 50(4), 411-427.
- Consiglio, C., L. Borgogni, C. Di Tecco, & W. B. Schaufeli. 2016. What Makes Employees Engaged with Their Work? The Role of Self-Efficacy and Employee's Perceptions of Social Context Over Time. *Career Development International*, 21(2), 125-143.
- Darmawan, D. 2015. Pengaruh Burnout dan Fasilitas Kerja Terhadap Turnover Pekerja. *Jurnal Ekonomi dan Bisnis*, 5(2), 8-14.
- Darmawan, D., R. Mardikaningsih, E. A. Sinambela, S. Arifin, A.R. Putra, M. Hariani, M. Irfan, Y.R. Al Hakim, & F. Issalillah. 2020. The Quality of Human Resources, Job Performance and Employee Loyalty, *International Journal of Psychosocial Rehabilitation*, 24(3), 2580-2592.
- Darmawan, D. 2021. Peran Budaya Organisasi dan Efikasi Diri Untuk Menentukan Kepuasan Kerja Karyawan, *Jurnal Baruna Horizon*, 4(1), 43-53
- Darmawan, D. & A. R. Putra. 2022. Pencapaian Efektivitas Kerja Melalui Optimalisasi Kecerdasan Emosional Dan Pemberian Beban Kerja Secara Tepat Kepada Karyawan. *Jurnal Baruna Horizon*, 5(1), 8-16.
- Darmawan, D., A. R. Putra, M. Munir, E. Retnowati, & T. S. Anjanarko. 2023. Optimasi Kinerja Karyawan Melalui Sinergi Dukungan Supervisi dan Kepuasan Kerja. *Global Leadership Organizational Research in Management*, 1(4), 350–360.
- Dawson, D. & K. McCulloch. 2005. Managing Fatigue: It's about Sleep. *Sleep Medicine Reviews*, 9(5), 365-380.
- De Clercq, D. & I. Belausteguigoitia. 2017. The Usefulness of Tenacity in Spurring Problem-Focused Voice: The Moderating Roles of Workplace Adversity. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 32, 479-493.
- Djazilan, M.S., D. Darmawan, E. Retnowati, E.A. Sinambela, & R. Mardikaningsih. 2022. The Role of Self-Discipline, Self-Concept and Self-Efficiency on Teacher Performance. *Education and Human Development Journal*, 7(3), 64-73.
- Djazilan, M.S. & D. Darmawan. 2022. Kajian Tentang Innovative Behaviour Ditinjau Dari Knowledge Sharing Dan Keadilan Organisasi, *Jurnal Baruna Horizon*, 5(2), 78-87.
- Eddine, B. A. S. & D. Darmawan. 2023. Sales Performance Improvement Through Monitoring of Work Experience and Quality Work of Life, *Journal of Marketing and Business Research*, 3(1), 71-80.
- Eddine, B. A. S., D. Darmawan, R. Mardikaningsih, E. A. Sinambela. 2023. The Effect of Knowledge Management and Quality of Work Life on Employee Commitment, *Journal of Human Sciences*, 10(1), 87-100.
- Erdogan, B., M. L. Kraimer, & R. C. Liden. 2004. Work Value Congruence and Intrinsic Career Success: The Compensatory Roles of Leader-Member Exchange and Perceived Organizational Support. *Personnel Psychology*, 57(2), 305-332.
- Gani, A. 2022. The Influence of Perceptions of Organizational Support and Interpersonal Abilities on Employee Achievement Motivation, *International Journal of Service Science, Management, Engineering, and Technology*, 2(3), 1 – 4.w

- Grosser, T. J., V. Venkataramani, & G. J. Labianca. 2017. An Alter-Centric Perspective on Employee Innovation: The Importance of Alters' Creative Self-Efficacy and Network Structure. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 102(9), 1360.
- Halizah, S.N., R. Nuraini, F. Issalillah, D. Darmawan, & R. K. Khayru. 2023. Upaya Mengoptimalkan Kinerja Karyawan Melalui Peran Kecerdasan Emosional Dan Manajemen Stres, *Jurnal Baruna Horizon*, 6(2), 68-75
- Hameduddin, T., & Lee, H. 2023. Sexual Harassment and Employee Engagement: Exploring the Roles of Gender, Perceived Supervisory Support, and Gender Equity Climate. *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, 43(3), 504-527.
- Hammer, L. B., W. H. Wan, K. J. Brockwood, T. Bodner, & C. D. Mohr. 2019. Supervisor Support Training Effects on Veteran Health and Work Outcomes in the Civilian Workplace. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 104(1), 52.
- Hariani, M., M. Irfan, A. R. Putra, D. S. Sigita, S. Arifin, D. Darmawan, & Y. R. Al Hakim. 2019. Optimalisasi Efektivitas Kerja melalui Pengembangan Kompetensi dan Komunikasi Kerja Dinamis, *Jurnal Ekonomi dan Bisnis*, 9(2), 14-21.
- Jahroni, J., D. Darmawan., R. Mardikaningsih., & E. A. Sinambela. 2021. Peran Insentif, Perilaku Kepemimpinan, dan Budaya Organisasi terhadap Penguatan Komitmen Organisasi. *Jurnal Ekonomi dan Ekonomi Syariah (JESYA)*, 4(2), 1389-1397.
- Jannah, S.M. & R. Mardikaningsih. 2023. Strategies for Improving Bureaucratic Efficiency and Employee Performance, *International Journal of Service Science, Management, Engineering, and Technology*, 4(2), 10–14.
- Jimmieson, N. L. 2000. Employee Reactions to Behavioural Control Under Conditions of Stress: The Moderating Role of Self-Efficacy. *Work & Stress*, 14(3), 262-280.
- Khasanah, H., S. Arum, & D. Darmawan. 2010. *Pengantar Manajemen Bisnis*, Spektrum Nusa Press, Jakarta.
- Kozlowski, S. W. & D. R. Ilgen. 2006. Enhancing the Effectiveness of Work Groups and Teams. *Psychological Science in the Public Interest*, 7(3), 77-124.
- Lambert, E. G., H. L. Hogan, & I. Altheimer. 2010. An Exploratory Examination of the Consequences of Burnout in Terms of Life Satisfaction, Turnover Intent, and Absenteeism Among Private Correctional Staff. *The Prison Journal*, 90(1), 94-114.
- Lin, M., Y. Liu, & S. Viswanathan. 2018. Effectiveness of Reputation in Contracting for Customized Production: Evidence from Online Labor Markets. *Management Science*, 64(1), 345-359.
- Losa, N. F. & C. A. J. Castelló. 2001. La Eficacia De Los Equipos De Trabajo Y Su Medición. *Boletin De Estudios Económicos*, 56(172), 57.
- Mardikaningsih, R. & A. R. Putra. 2021. Efforts to Increase Employee Work Productivity through Job Satisfaction and Job Training. *Studi Ilmu Sosial Indonesia*, 1(1), 51-64.
- Mardikaningsih, R., E. A. Sinambela, E. Retnowati, D. Darmawan & A. R. Putra. 2022. Pencapaian Kepuasan Kerja Karyawan melalui Pengembangan Budaya Kerja, Efektivitas Penempatan dan Pengawasan Kerja, *Jurnal Ilmu Manajemen*, 2(1), 29-38
- Mardikaningsih, R. & D. Darmawan. 2022. Determinan Keterlibatan Kerja: Peran Dari Penilaian Kinerja, Perilaku Kepemimpinan dan Perilaku Inovatif. *TIN: Terapan Informatika Nusantara*, 3(5), 178-184.

- Mathisen, G. E. 2011. Organizational Antecedents of Creative Self-Efficacy. *Creativity and Innovation Management*, 20(3), 185-195.
- Munir, M. & D. Darmawan. 2022. Efektivitas Kepemimpinan dan Pengembangan Karir: Faktor Penentu Keterikatan Kerja, *Jurnal Ilmu Manajemen*, 2(1), 39-48
- Naufalia, S., D. Darmawan, Jahroni, T. S. Anjanarko, M. Munir, & S. Arifin. 2022. Pengaruh Quality of Work Life, Total Kualitas Manajemen dan Stres Kerja terhadap Loyalitas Karyawan. *Journal of Trends Economics and Accounting Research*, 2(4), 114-120.
- Nielsen, M. B., H. A. Johannessen, J. O. Christensen, & L. B. Finne. 2023. Emotional Dissonance and Burnout Among Child Welfare Workers: The Moderating Role of Social Support from Colleagues, Supervisors, and Organization. *Journal of Social Work*, 23(4), 615-635.
- Olson, K., D. Marchalik, H. Farley, S. M. Dean, E. C. Lawrence, M. S. Hamidi, S. Rowe, J. M. McCool, C. A. O'Donovan, M. A. Micek, & M. T. Stewart. 2019. Organizational Strategies to Reduce Physician Burnout and Improve Professional Fulfillment. *Current Problems in Pediatric and Adolescent Health Care*, 49(12), 100664.
- Prada-Ospina, R. 2019. Social Psychological Factors and Their Relation to Work-Related Stress as Generating Effect of Burnout. *Interdisciplinaria*, 36(2), 39-53.
- Retnowati, E. & D. Darmawan. 2022. Peningkatan Kinerja Karyawan Ditinjau Dari Sikap Kerja dan Penegakan Keadilan Organisasi, Arbitrase: *Jurnal Ekonomi dan Akuntansi*, 3(2), 219-226.
- Retnowati, E. & D. Darmawan. 2023. Optimizing Employee Morale in the Workplace through the Integration of Career Development, Job Satisfaction, and Work Environment Factors. *International Journal of Service Science, Management, Engineering, and Technology*, 3(1), 1-43.
- Retnowati, E., M. Hariani, M. Irfan, D. Darmawan, A. R. Putra, T. S. Anjanarko & M. Munir. 2023. Work Effectiveness Examined through the Aspects of Workload and Burnout. *Sustainable Environmental and Optimizing Industry Journal*, 5(1), 1-10.
- Retnowati, E., R. Mardikaningsih., R. K. Khayru., D. Darmawan., A. S. Wibowo. 2023. The Influence of Transformational Leadership and Organizational Commitment on Turnover Intention, *International Journal of Service Science, Management, Engineering, and Technology*, 3(2), 38-43.
- Schaufeli, W. B., T. W. Taris, & W. Van Rhenen. 2008. Workaholism, Burnout, and Work Engagement: Three of a Kind or Three Different Kinds of Employee Well-Being? *Applied Psychology*, 57(2), 173-203.
- Schmidt, A. M. & R. P. DeShon. 2010. The Moderating Effects of Performance Ambiguity on the Relationship Between Self-Efficacy and Performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 95(3), 572.
- Shanock, L. R. & R. Eisenberger. 2006. When Supervisors Feel Supported: Relationships with Subordinates' Perceived Supervisor Support, Perceived Organizational Support, and Performance. *Journal of Applied psychology*, 91(3), 689.
- Shoji, K., R. Cieslak, E. Smoktunowicz, A. Rogala, C. C. Benight, & A. Luszczynska. 2016. Associations Between Job Burnout and Self-Efficacy: A Meta-Analysis. *Anxiety, Stress, & Coping*, 29(4), 367-386.

- Sinambela, E. A., D. Darmawan, & V. Mendrika. 2022. Effectiveness of Efforts to Establish Quality Human Resources in the Organization, *Journal of Marketing and Business Research*, 2(1), 47-58.
- Sinambela, E.S., S. N. Halizah, S. Naufalia, F. N. Amelia, S. Arifin, D. Darmawan, & A. R. Putra. 2023. The Effect of Experience, Work Supervision and Career Development on Job Satisfaction, *Indonesian Journal of Innovation Multidisipliner Research*, 1(2), 96-107
- Swanzy, E. K. 2020. The Impact of Supervisor Support on Employees' Psychological Wellbeing: A Parallel Mediation Analysis of Work-To-Family Conflict and Job Satisfaction. *International Business Research*, 13(11), 41-53.
- Taiwo, A. S. 2010. The Influence of Work Environment on Workers Productivity: A Case of Selected Oil and Gas Industry in Lagos, Nigeria. *African Journal of Business Management*, 4(3), 299.
- Thompson, H. G., N. M. Askelson, R. Bucklin, N. Gauthreaux, E. Faber, C. Ball, S. Yang, & E. Steere. 2023. Organization-Level Factors Associated with Burnout: Guided Discussions with Micropolitan Public Health Workers During COVID-19. *Journal of Occupational and Environmental Medicine*, 65(7), 580-583.
- Uddin, M. J., R. H. Luva, & S. M. M. Hossian. 2013. Impact of Organizational Culture on Employee Performance and Productivity: A Case Study of Telecommunication Sector in Bangladesh. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 8(2), 63.
- Van den Berg, M. J., T. L. Signal, & P. H. Gander. 2020. Fatigue Risk Management for Cabin Crew: The Importance of Company Support and Sufficient Rest for Work-Life Balance—A Qualitative Study. *Industrial Health*, 58(1), 2-14.
- Wegge, J., R. Van Dick, G. K. Fisher, C. Wecking, & K. Moltzen. 2006. Work Motivation, Organisational Identification, and Well-Being in Call Centre Work. *Work & Stress*, 20(1), 60-83.
- Wood, R. E. & V. Marshall. (2008). Accuracy and Effectiveness in Appraisal Outcomes: The Influence of Self-Efficacy, Personal Factors and Organisational Variables. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 18(3), 295-313.
- Wulandari, W., R. Nuraini, F. Maghfiroh, D. Darmawan, S. N. Halizah, & R. Mardikaningsih. (2022). Pengaruh Kemampuan Interpersonal, Modal Psikologi, dan Dukungan Supervisor Terhadap Kinerja Tenaga Penjualan. *TIN: Terapan Informatika Nusantara*, 3(4), 123-131.
- Yee, R. W., A. C. Yeung, & T. E. Cheng. (2008). The Impact of Employee Satisfaction on Quality and Profitability in High-Contact Service Industries. *Journal of Operations Management*, 26(5), 651-668.
- Yukl, G. (2008). How Leaders Influence Organizational Effectiveness. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 19(6), 708-722.