Computer Self-Efficacy, Work Stress, and Burnout in Gen Z in Mentoring Communities

Nadia Hartono, Susana Prapunoto
Universitas Kristen Satya Wacana, Indonesia
E-mail: nadiaa.hrtn@gmail.com

*Correspondence: nadiaa.hrtn@gmail.com

KEYWORDS	ABSTRACT
computer self-efficacy; work stress; burnout	Currently, awareness of mental health has begun to grow among Generation Z. Mental health is very important considering that poor mental health can affect work performance and health. In the current era, Gen Z has started to become the majority in the world of work, so it is very important for Gen Z to be able to adapt to the world of work to prevent burnout. Burnout has many causes, including the inability to manage stress and also low self-efficacy. The purpose of this research is to determine the effective contribution of computer self-efficacy and work stress to burnout in Gen Z in the Mentorin community. The method used in this research is quantitative research with multiple linear regression analysis. Based on the research that has been carried out, it was found that computer self-efficacy and work stress are significant predictors on burnout. A limitation found in the conduct of this study was the dissemination of questionnaires online which could not guarantee that subjects would fill out a given scale.

Introduction

With the development of the times, mental health began to become the focus and priority of every individual. This is due to Gen Z being aware of the importance of mental health and voicing mental health issues. Several studies show that Gen Z is relatively more likely to seek mental health help (Garnham, 2022). Poor mental health can affect performance and health. Based on research conducted by (Carmichael, A., Coe, E. H., & Dewhurst, 2022), it was found that many symptoms of depression, anxiety, and burnout arise due to low mental health of employees in Asia. According to (Madina, K., & Kusuma, 2022), Generation Z is a generation of individuals born between 1995-2012 (Salleh et al., 2017). Based on the Central Bureau of Statistics regarding the 2020 Population Census, Gen Z dominates the Indonesian population with 27.59% of the total population and the majority of Generation Z is in the working age category (Anggarini, 2022). Although the majority are in the working age category, based on research by (Salleh et al., 2017), Generation Z has the characteristics of hypertext mindset, over-protected, lack of communication skills, and instant gratification. This can cause Gen Z to become easily stressed when dealing with the real world, and this is supported by the

2023 Cigna International Health survey which states that 91% of Gen Z feel stressed and 98% experience symptoms of burnout (Carnegie, 2023). Not only stress, but the ability to adapt to transitions from college and work life can also affect an individual's burnout rate. This is supported by the Deloitte Global 2022 Gen Z and Millennial Survey involving millennials and more than 14,000 Generation Z. The results of the survey are 40% of Generation Z want to leave their jobs within two years and 46% of Generation Z report that they feel burnout because of their work environment (Fox, 2022).

Burnout can result from stress in the workplace that is not resolved, causing emotional fatigue, personality changes and decreased personal achievement (Syamsu et al., 2019) (Natsir et al., 2015). Burnout can affect the work of employees because employees will withdraw so they do not work optimally. Therefore, a decrease in employee quality and productivity can also be affected due to burnout. Many job demands can cause stress resulting in burnout and causing a decrease in employee health, work quality, and many other things (Maslach & Leiter, 2016). Chronic work stress that has not been successfully managed can also result in burnout syndrome. It is characterized by fatigue, negative feelings towards individuals or work (cynicism), and decreased professional efficacy (Organization, 2019). Work demands also have a positive and significant influence on burnout in Gen Z employees in DKI Jakarta (Tambuwan & Sahrani, 2023).

Burnout can also be caused by work stress felt by employees and can be potentially negative on organizations and individuals (Natsir et al., 2015). Stress arises based on a person's adaptability to excessively demanding stimuli in the psychological or physical individual (Moorhead & Griffin, 2013). Generally, stress is caused by two stressors namely organizational stressors and life stressors. Organizational stressors include task demands, physical demands, role demands, and interpersonal demands, while life stressors represent life changes and traumas. Both of these stressors can lead to burnout, individual consequences, and organizational consequences. Individual consequences consist of 3 aspects, namely behavioral, psychological and medical. Organizational consequences consist of decreased performance, absenteeism, and decreased motivation. Based on research conducted by (Natsir et al., 2015) it is said that there is a relationship between work stress and burnout. It was also found in research on emergency room and ICU nurses at Bekasi City Hospital that there is a significant relationship between work stress and burnout (Prestiana & Purbandini, 2012). However, in (Fakhsianoor & Dewi, 2014)research conducted at RSUD ULIN Banjarmasin, it was found that there was no significant relationship between work stress and burnout. The mechanisms that can be used to manage and cope with stress in the workplace are divided into two. First, individual mechanisms consisting of exercise, relaxation, time and role management, and having support groups. Second is the organizational mechanism consisting of institutional programs and collateral programs. Institutional programs include work design, work schedule, culture, and supervision. While stress management programs, health improvement programs, sabbaticals, and other programs are included in collateral programs (S P Robbins & Judge, 2022).

There are two causes of burnout: situational predictors consisting of workload, control, reward, community, fairness, and values; and individual predictors consisting of age, personality type, and gender (Maslach & Leiter, 2017). However, there are not many studies that can support these individual predictors, although there is a tendency that these individual predictors do not play a major role as a source of burnout (Maslach & Leiter,

Nadia Hartono, Susana Prapunoto

2017). However, work attitudes such as workers' responses and expectations to their work can be determined from the worker's sense of ability to do and complete their work.

In addition to work stress, (Maslach & Leiter, 2017) also mentioned that self-efficacy also plays a role in individual burnout. According to (Stephen P Robbins & Judge, 2017), self-efficacy is when a person believes himself to have the ability to do something. Meanwhile, according to Bandura (1995), self-efficacy is a person's belief in his ability to manage so that the individual has control of his life in order to have readiness so that the results become easy to predict. Bandura's theory of self-efficacy was then developed by Compeau & Higgins in the concept of technology into computer elf-efficacy.

In today's companies, the ability to use computers is needed. From what is observed in the new generation, Gen Z, the issue of self-efficacy is more focused on computer self-efficacy. According to Compeau & Higgins (Teo & Van Schalk, 2009), computer self-efficacy is an individual's belief in his ability to use computers to complete his tasks. According to Compeau & Higgins (1995), there are 3 dimensions in self-efficacy computers, namely magnitude, strength, and generalizability (Claggett & Goodhue, 2011). Based on research, computer self-efficacy has a significant relationship with burnout and contributes 36.48% (Siddiq, 2023). Not much research has been done on computer self-efficacy and burnout, therefore, this topic is interesting to do. In previous studies, many used the subject of employees from a company or agency while the subject of this study will be taken from a community. This research will be carried out in the Mentorin community because the volunteers in Mentorin also work and study, and based on the results of observations there is a decrease in productivity and motivation from the volunteers. According to the exit survey, 41.7% of volunteers resigned due to personal reasons such as scheduling conflicts, time management, and new responsibilities, while 33.3% wanted to focus on work and the remaining 25% resigned due to study. Therefore, research will be conducted on the effect of computer self-efficacy and work stress on burnout in the Mentorin community.

This research aims to explore the novel intersection of computer self-efficacy, work stress, and burnout among volunteers in the Mentorin community, distinctively focusing on a population outside traditional corporate settings. Unlike previous studies predominantly involving employees from organizations, this study shifts attention to community volunteers who balance work, study, and volunteer commitments. The novelty lies in investigating how computer self-efficacy—a person's belief in their ability to use computers—impacts burnout, considering its significant relationship identified in prior research but limited exploration in community settings. By examining this underexplored context, the research seeks to contribute valuable insights into factors affecting burnout among community volunteers, shedding light on potential interventions to enhance their well-being and productivity. The findings aim to inform practical strategies to mitigate burnout, thereby benefiting not only volunteer organizations like Mentorin but also similar community-driven initiatives worldwide.

Research Methods

This study is a quantitative study with multiple linear regression analysis to see the form of the relationship between variables X1 and X2, namely computer self-efficacy and work stress against variable Y, namely burnout.
In this study there are three variables studied, namely:
1. The independent variable (X1) in this study was *computer self-efficacy*.

2. The independent variable (X2) in this study was work stress.
3. The dependent variable (Y) in this study was *burnout*.

Results and Discussions

Research Scene Orientation and Research Data Collection

Research will be conducted within the Mentorin Community, a community that offers *mentoring* services for recent graduates to prepare them for the world of work as well as professionals who want to develop their abilities. Data will be collected by distributing questionnaires to Mentorin volunteers born in 1995-2012. The questionnaires will be distributed on June 21, 2023 and June 22, 2023. The obstacle that I might face is the time of data collection that is quite dense.

Research Participants

Mentorin community volunteers who fall into the Gen Z category or *volunteers* born in 1995 – 2012.

Table 1 Statistics Volunteer Mentor

		JK	BORN
N	Valid	31	31
	Missing	0	0

Table 2
Volunteer Mentorin Sex Statistics

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Man	10	32,3	32,3	32,3
	Woman	21	67,7	67,7	100,0
	Total	31	100,0	100,0	

Table 3
Statistics of the Year of Birth of Volunteer Mentorin

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1995	1	3,2	3,2	3,2
	1996	2	6,5	6,5	9,7
	1998	1	3,2	3,2	12,9
	1999	6	19,4	19,4	32,3
	2000	3	9,7	9,7	41,9
	2001	7	22,6	22,6	64,5
	2002	9	29,0	29,0	93,5
	2003	1	3,2	3,2	96,8
	2004	1	3,2	3,2	100,0
	Total	31	100,0	100,0	

Discrimination Power Test

Skala I *Computer Self-efficacy* (CSE)

Try out

The *computer self-efficacy* scale has 40 items consisting of 23 *favourable* items and 17 *unfavourable items*. Of the total 40 items, 29 of them were declared valid and 11 others were declared void because they had a value of (<0.300).

Table 4
Results of the Computer Self-efficacy Scale Try Out Discrimination Power Test

No	Dimension	Item			
		Favorable	Deciduous	*Unfavorable*	Deciduous
1	*Computer Experience*	1, 2, 5, 8, 9	3, 4, 6, 7, 10	-	-
2	*Familiarity*	11, 12, 16, 19, 21, 22, 34, 37, and 39	18, 26, 28, 30	13, 14, 15, 17, 20, 23, 24, 25, 29, 31, 32, 33, 35, 36, and 38	27, 40
	Total	14	9	15	2

Research

The *computer self-efficacy* scale has 29 items consisting of 14 *favourable* items and 14 *unfavourable items*. Of the total 29 items, 22 of them were declared valid and 10 others were declared void because they had a value of (<0.300).

Table 5
Computer Self-efficacy Scale Discrimination Power Test Results

No	Dimension	Item			
		Favorable	Deciduous	*Unfavorable*	Deciduous
1	*Computer Experience*	2	1, 3, 4, 5	-	-
2	*Familiarity*	6, 7, 11, 13, 16, 24, 27, and 29	15	8, 9, 10, 12, 14, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 23, 25, 25, and 28	22
	Total	9	5	14	1

Scale II Work Stress (SK)

Try out

The work stress scale has 20 items consisting of 19 *favourable* items and 1 *unfavourable item*. Of the total 20 items, 15 of them were declared valid and 5 others were declared void because they had a value of (<0.300).

Table 6
Power Test Results of Discrimination Try Out Work Stress Scale

No	Dimension	Item			
		Favorable	Deciduous	*Unfavorable*	Deciduous
1	*Work overload*	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8	-	-	-
2	*Role Expectation Conflict*	12	9, 10, and 11	-	-
3	*Work-life Balance*	13	14 and 15	16	-
4	*Coworker Support*	17, 18, 19, and 20	-	-	-
	Total	14	5	1	-

Research

The work stress scale has 15 items consisting of 14 *favourable* items and 1 *unfavourable item.* Of the total 215 items, 8 of them were declared valid and 7 others were declared void because they had a value of (<0.300).

Table 7
Results of the Work Stress Scale Discrimination Power Test

No	Dimension	Item			
		Favorable	Deciduous	*Unfavorable*	Deciduous
1	*Work overload*	1, 4, 5, and 8	2, 3, 6, and 7	-	-
2	*Role Expectation Conflict*	9	-	-	-
3	*Work-life Balance*	-	10	11	-
4	*Coworker Support*	12 and 13	14 and 15	-	-
	Total	7	7	1	-

Skala III *Burnout* (BO)

Try out

The *burnout* scale has 21 items that are all *favourable items*. Of the total 21 items, 13 of them were declared valid and 8 others were declared void because they had a value of (<0.300).

Table 8
Burnout Scale Try Out Discrimination Power Test Results

No	Dimension	Item			
		Favorable	Deciduous	*Unfavorable*	Deciduous
1	Emotional exhaustion	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9		-	-
2	Achievement	17	10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16	-	-
3	Sinism	20, 21, 22	18, 19	-	-
	Total	13	8	-	-

Research

The *burnout* scale has 13 items that are all *favourable items*. Out of a total of 13 items, all were declared valid because the value was above 0.300.

Table 9
Burnout Scale Discrimination Power Test Results

No	Dimensi	Item			
		Favorable	Deciduous	*Unfavorable*	Deciduous
1	Emotional exhaustion	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9	-	-	-
2	Achievement	10	-	-	-
3	Sinism	11, 12, 13	-	-	-
	Total	13	-	-	-

Reliability Test
Skala I *Computer Self-efficacy* (CSE)
Try out

Table 10
Results of First Round of Reliability Test Try Out Computer Self-efficacy Scale

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.898	40

In the first round of item discrimination testing, *Alpha Cronbach's results* were obtained of 0.898 out of 40 items tested.

Table 11
Results of the Second Round of Reliability Test Try Out Computer Self-efficacy Scale

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.920	29

In the second round of item discrimination testing, *Alpha Cronbach's results* were obtained of 0.920 from 29 items tested. Therefore, it can be concluded that this scale has perfect reliability, and can be used as a measuring instrument with a total of 29 items. Research

Table 12
Results of the First Round of Reliability Test of Computer Self-efficacy Scale

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.908	29

In the first round of item discrimination testing, *Alpha Cronbach's results* were obtained of 0.908 from 29 items tested.

Table 13
Results of the Second Round of Reliability Test Computer Self-efficacy Scale

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.932	23

In the second round of item discrimination testing, *Alpha Cronbach's results* were obtained of 0.932 out of 23 items tested. Therefore, it can be concluded that this scale has perfect reliability, and can be used as a measuring instrument with a total of 23 items.

Scale II Work Stress (SK)
Try out

Table 14
Results of First Round Reliability Test Try Out Work Stress Scale

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.824	20

In the first round of item discrimination testing, *Alpha Cronbach's results* were obtained of 0.824 out of 20 items tested.

Table 15
Results of the Second Round of Reliability Test Try Out Work Stress Scale

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.864	15

In the second round of item discrimination testing, *Alpha Cronbach's results* were obtained at 0.864 out of 15 items tested. Therefore, it can be concluded that this scale has perfect reliability, and can be used as a measuring instrument with a total of 15 items.

Research

Table 16
Results of the First Round of Reliability Test of Work Stress Scale

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.723	15

In the first round of item discrimination testing, *Alpha Cronbach's results* were obtained at 0.723 out of 15 items tested.

Table 17
Results of the Second Round of Reliability Test of Work Stress Scale

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.743	8

In the second round of item discrimination testing, *Alpha Cronbach's* results were obtained of 0.743 from 8 items tested. Therefore, it can be concluded that this scale has perfect reliability, and can be used as a measuring instrument with as many as 8 items.

Skala III *Burnout* (BO)
Try Out

Table 18
First Round Reliability Test Results Try Out Burnout Scale

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.810	22

In the first round of item discrimination testing, *Alpha Cronbach's results* were obtained of 0.810 from 22 items tested.

Table 19
Results of the Second Round of Reliability Test Try Out Burnout Scale

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.906	13

In the second round of item discrimination testing, *Alpha Cronbach's results* were obtained at 0.906 out of 13 items tested. Therefore, it can be concluded that this scale has perfect reliability, and can be used as a measuring instrument with a total of 13 items.
Research

Table 20
Burnout Scale First Round Reliability Test Results

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.919	13

In the first round of item discrimination testing, *Alpha Cronbach's* results were obtained at 0.919 out of 13 items tested. Therefore, it can be concluded that this scale has perfect reliability, and can be used as a measuring instrument with a total of 13 items.

Research Results

Descriptive Statistical Results

Table 21
Descriptive Statistical Results

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
X1_CSE	31	84,00	143,00	117,1935	14,04616
X2_SK	31	31,00	63,00	48,6452	7,28262
Y_B	31	14,00	50,00	33,3548	9,85410

Valid (listwise)	N	31

Based on the data obtained, the results of the minimum, maximum, mean, and standard deviation values are obtained as in the table above. In the variable X1, namely *computer self-efficacy*, a minimum value of 84 and a maximum value of 143 are obtained. The mean obtained is 117.193 with a standard deviation of 14.046, this shows that the spread of the data varies because the standard deviation value is lower than the mean value.

In variable X2, namely work stress, a minimum value of 31 and a maximum value of 63 were obtained. While the mean of work stress is 48.645 with a standard deviation of 7.283. Then it can be concluded that the spread of data for the work stress variable varies because the standard deviation value is lower than the mean value.

For variable Y, namely *burnout*, the minimum value and maximum value are 14 and 50. The standard deviation of the *burnout* variable is 9.854 with a mean of 33.354. It shows that the spread of data varies because the mean value is higher than the standard deviation value.

Assumption Test Results
Try Out *Assumption Test Results*
Normality Test

Table 22
Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test Try Out One-Sample Normality Test Results

		Y	X1	X2
N		38	38	38
Normal Parameters[a,b]	Mean	36,08	110,55	48,74
	Std. Deviation	10,540	14,939	9,708
Most Extreme Differences	Absolute	0,068	0,096	0,111
	Positive	0,068	0,096	0,111
	Negative	-0,043	-0,096	-0,067
Test Statistic		0,068	0,096	0,111
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)		.200[c,d]	.200[c,d]	.200[c,d]
a. Test distribution is Normal.				
b. Calculated from data.				
c. Lilliefors Significance Correction.				
d. This is a lower bound of the true significance.				

Based on the table above, it is found that *Asymp. Sig (2-tailed)* of 0.2 (p>0.05). Then it can be concluded that the data is normally distributed.
Linearity Test

Table 23
Try Out Linearity Test Results

			Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Y * X1	Between Groups	(Combined)	3166,846	28	113,102	1,078	0,483
		Linearity	714,903	1	714,903	6,816	0,028
		Deviation from Linearity	2451,943	27	90,813	0,866	0,639
	Within Groups		943,917	9	104,880		

		Total	4110,763	37			
Y * X2	Between Groups	(Combined)	2757,180	22	125,326	1,389	0,259
		Linearity	1674,865	1	1674,865	18,560	0,001
		Deviation from Linearity	1082,315	21	51,539	0,571	0,883
	Within Groups		1353,583	15	90,239		
	Total		4110,763	37			

Based on the table above, it can be concluded that the data Y and X1 and the data Y and X2 are linear.

Multicollinearity Test

Table 24
Try Out Multicollinearity Test Results

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients			Collinearity Statistics	
		B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.	Tolerance	VIF
1	(Constant)	29,654	12,406		2,390	0,022		
	CSE	-0,221	0,086	-0,313	-2,578	0,014	0,968	1,033
	SK	0,632	0,132	0,582	4,802	0,000	0,968	1,033

a. Dependent Variable: BO

Based on the table above, X1 and X2 have a tolerance value of 0.968 > 0.1 and have a VIF value of 1.033 < 5 so that it can be concluded that there are no symptoms of multicollinearity in the regression model.

Research Assumption Test Results

Normality Test

Table 25
Kolmogorov-Smirnov One-Sample Normality Test Results

		X1_CSE	X2_SK	Y_B
N		31	31	31
Normal Parameters[a,b]	Mean	117,1935	48,6452	33,3548
	Std. Deviation	14,04616	7,28262	9,85410
Most Extreme Differences	Absolute	0,107	0,170	0,104
	Positive	0,075	0,170	0,069
	Negative	-0,107	-0,084	-0,104
Test Statistic		0,107	0,170	0,104
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)		.200[c,d]	.023[c]	.200[c,d]

a. Test distribution is Normal.

b. Calculated from data.

c. Lilliefors Significance Correction.

d. This is a lower bound of the true significance.

Based on the table above, it is found that *Asymp. Sig (2-tailed)* X1 and Y of 0.2 (p>0.05). Then it can be concluded that the data is normally distributed. However, it was also found that *Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)* of X2 was 0.023 (p<0.05) so it can be concluded that the data X2 is not normally distributed.

Linearity Test

Table 26
Linearity Test Results

			Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Y_B * X1_CSE	Between Groups	(Combined)	2675,597	25	107,024	2,253	0,186
		Linearity	765,892	1	765,892	16,124	0,010
		Deviation from Linearity	1909,705	24	79,571	1,675	0,297
	Within Groups		237,500	5	47,500		
	Total		2913,097	30			
Y_B * X2_SK	Between Groups	(Combined)	2344,180	17	137,893	3,151	0,021
		Linearity	1328,539	1	1328,539	30,358	0,000
		Deviation from Linearity	1015,641	16	63,478	1,450	0,252
	Within Groups		568,917	13	43,763		
	Total		2913,097	30			

Based on the table above, it can be concluded that the data Y and X1 and the data Y and X2 are linear.

Multicollinearity Test

Table 27
Multicollinearity Test Results

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients			Collinearity Statistics	
		B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.	Tolerance	VIF
1	(Constant)	19,999	17,809		1,123	0,271		
	X1_CSE	-0,200	0,100	-0,285	-1,999	0,055	0,835	1,198
	X2_SK	0,757	0,193	0,559	3,919	0,001	0,835	1,198

a. Dependent Variable: Y_B

Based on the table above, X1 and X2 have a tolerance value of $0.835 > 0.1$ and have a VIF value of $1.198 < 5$ so that it can be concluded that there are no symptoms of multicollinearity in the regression model.

Hypothesis Test Results
Multiple Regression Test

Table 28
Model Summary Results of Multiple Regression Test

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.709[a]	0,502	0,474	7,648

a. Predictors: (Constant), SK, CSE

Based on the table above, it can be concluded that there is an influence between X1 and X2 on Y with an R value of 0.709 with an influence given of 50.2%. This means that X1 and X2 have a great influence on Y.

Table 29
Anova Multiple Regression Test Results

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	2063,633	2	1031,816	17,641	.000[b]
	Residual	2047,130	35	58,489		
	Total	4110,763	37			
a. Dependent Variable: BO						
b. Predictors: (Constant), SK, CSE						

Based on the table above, it is known that F count 17.641 > F table 3.267 with a significance of 0.000 (p<0.05) means that X1 and X2 have a significant influence on the variable Y.

Table 30
Multiple Regression Test Coefficients Results

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		
		B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.
1	(Constant)	29,654	12,406		2,390	0,022
	CSE	-0,221	0,086	-0,313	-2,578	0,014
	SK	0,632	0,132	0,582	4,802	0,000
a. Dependent Variable: BO						

Based on the table above, *computer self-efficacy* has a significance value of 0.014 (p<0.05) which can be concluded that the variable *computer self-efficacy* has a significant relationship with *burnout*. While work stress has a significance value of 0.000 (p < 0.01) which means that the variable work stress also has a very significant relationship with *burnout*.

Discussion

Based on research conducted on the Mentorin Community, it was found that *computer self-efficacy* and work stress have a significant influence on *burnout*. This is supported by the research of Hasanah *et al*. (2022) which states that self-efficacy and work stress are simultaneous or partial predictors of *burnout*. Therefore, the higher the *computer self-efficacy* and the lower the work stress in *volunteers* in the organization, the lower the *burnout* they experience. There are several factors that can affect *burnout* in the Mentorin Community, namely the workload of the work and tasks of volunteers. While the factor that helps volunteers to alleviate *burnout* is the support received in the community. Based on the research of (Weni et al., 2023), *burnout* is significantly affected by workload, which is one dimension of work stress and a factor that affects *burnout*. In (Siddiq, 2023) research, factors such as organizational characteristics, personality, and several other things, including *computer self-efficacy* can significantly affect *burnout*. Therefore, the hypothesis that *computer self-efficacy* is a predictor of *burnout* is accepted. According to (Maslach & Leiter, 2017), *burnout* can also be affected by work stress. If the stress experienced from the community and workplace cannot be managed properly, then individuals will easily feel *burnout*.

In accorandce with the research of (Siddiq, 2023), *computer self-efficacy* is one of the factors that can affect *burnout*. This is also supported by the results of the research of (Salanova et al., 2002), *computer self-efficacy* has an impact on *burnout* if the subject has low *computer self-efficacy*, then increased self-efficacy in the computer field is needed to reduce the possibility of *burnout*. This is in line with research conducted by (Salanova et

al., 2002) also found that high *burnout* is only found in individuals with low *computer self-efficacy*.

Research (Weni et al., 2023) states that work stress has a positive and significant role in *burnout*. This is also supported by (Adiguna & Suwandana, 2023) who in their research stated that work stress has a significant influence on *burnout*. So, the higher the work stress, the easier it is for individuals to experience *burnout*. Likewise with the results of research (Purwanti et al., 2022) which states that work stress has a very significant influence on *burnout*.

Conclusion

The aim of this study was to find out whether computer self-efficacy and job stress are predictors of burnout in Gen Z in the Mentorin community. The subjects in this study were 31 volunteers in the Mentorin community who are Gen Z. Based on the results of the research that has been done, it can be concluded that computer self-efficacy and work stress have a very significant relationship with burnout.

A limitation found in the conduct of this study was the dissemination of questionnaires online which could not guarantee that subjects would fill out a given scale. In addition, there are many subjects that are difficult to contact so it takes a long time to be able to collect data with a targeted amount.

References

Adiguna, A. A. B. W., & Suwandana, I. G. M. (2023). The Relationship Between Burnout, Work Stress, And Turnover Intention On Non-Permanent (Contract) Employees: Study At The Communication And Information Office Of Badung Regency, Indonesia. *European Journal Of Business And Management Research*, *8*(3), 104–107.

Anggarini, D. T. (2022). Generation Z And Millenial Perspectives To Become Entrepreneurs In The Era Of The Gig Economy: Generation Z And Millenial Perspectives To Become Entrepreneurs In The Era Of The Gig Economy. *Jurnal Ekonomi Dan Manajemen*, *16*(1), 10–26.

Carmichael, A., Coe, E. H., & Dewhurst, M. (2022). *Employee Mental Health And Burnout In Asia: A Time To Act | Mckinsey. Mckinsey&Company.* Https://Www.Mckinsey.Com/Featured-Insights/Future-Of-Asia/Employee-Mental-Health-And-Burnout-In-Asia-A-Time-To-Act

Carnegie, M. (2023). *Are Gen Z The Most Stresed Generation In The Workplace? Bbc Retrieved From.* Https://Www.Bbc.Com/Worklife/Article/20230215-Are-Gen-Z-The-Most-Stresed-Generation-In-The-Workplace#:~:Text=According To Cigna International Health

Claggett, J. L., & Goodhue, D. L. (2011). Have Is Researchers Lost Bandura's Self-Efficacy Concept? A Discussion Of The Definition And Measurement Of Computer Self-Efficacy. *2011 44th Hawaii International Conference On System Sciences*, 1–10.

Fakhsianoor, F., & Dewi, S. (2014). Hubungan Antara Stres Kerja Dengan Burnout Pada Perawat Di Ruang Icu, Iccu Dan Picu Rsud Ulin Banjarmasin. *An-Nadaa: Jurnal Kesehatan Masyarakat (E-Journal)*, *1*(1), 10–13.

Fox, M. (2022). *Here's What Gen Z And Millennials Want From Their Employers Amid The Great Resignation. Cnbc.* Https://Www.Cnbc.Com/2022/05/18/What-Gen-Z-And-Millennials-Want-From-Employers-Amid-Great-Resignation.Html

Garnham, C. (2022). *The Gen Z Mental Health Wave - What Is Causing The Surge? Healthmatch.* Https://Healthmatch.Io/Blog/The-Gen-Z-Mental-Health-Wave-What-Is-Causing-The-Surge

Madina, K., & Kusuma, N. (2022). *Seimbang Atau Burn Out: Menjaga Kesehatan Mental Di Lingkungan Kerja. Green Network Asia - Indonesia.*

Maslach, C., & Leiter, M. P. (2016). Burnout. In *Stress: Concepts, Cognition, Emotion, And Behavior* (Bll 351–357). Elsevier.

Maslach, C., & Leiter, M. P. (2017). Understanding Burnout: New Models. *The Handbook Of Stress And Health: A Guide To Research And Practice*, 36–56.

Moorhead, G., & Griffin, R. W. (2013). Perilaku Organisasi: Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia Dan Organisasi. *Jakarta: Salemba Empat.*

Natsir, M., Hartiti, T., & Sulisno, M. (2015). Hubungan Antara Self Efficacy Dan Stres Kerja Dengan Burnout Pada Perawat Dalam Melakukan Asuhan Hubungan Antara Self Efficacy Dan Stres Kerja Dengan Burnout Pada Perawat Dalam Melakukan Asuhan. *Jurnal Manajemen Keperawatan*, *3*(1), 30–35.

Organization, W. H. (2019). *Nutrition Landscape Information System (Nlis) Country Profile Indicators: Interpretation Guide.*

Prestiana, N. D. I., & Purbandini, D. (2012). Hubungan Antara Efikasi Diri (Self Efficacy) Dan Stres Kerja Dengan Kejenuhan Kerja (Burnout) Pada Perawat Igd Dan Icu Rsud Kota Bekasi. *Soul: Jurnal Pemikiran Dan Penelitian Psikologi*, *5*(2), 1–14.

Purwanti, I., Suyanto, U. Y., Abadi, M. D., Darianto, D., & Liliana, D. (2022). The Role Of Burnout Between Workload, Work Stress, And Employee Performance: Mediation Model. *Kne Social Sciences*, 70–85.

Robbins, S P, & Judge, T. A. (2022). *Organizational Behavior, Update*. Harlow: Pearson Education Limited.

Robbins, Stephen P, & Judge, T. A. (2017). *Organizational Behavior*. Pearson.

Salanova, M., Peiró, J. M., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2002). Self-Efficacy Specificity And Burnout Among Information Technology Workers: An Extension Of The Job Demand-Control Model. *European Journal Of Work And Organizational Psychology*, *11*(1), 1–25.

Salleh, M. S. M., Mahbob, N. N., & Baharudin, N. S. (2017). Overview Of "Generation Z" Behavioural Characteristic And Its Effect Towards Hostel Facility. *International Journal Of Real Estate Studies*, *11*(2), 59–67.

Siddiq, F. H. (2023). Pengaruh Computer Self-Efficacy Terhadap Burnout Pada Dosen Kota Bandung Di Era Pandemi. *Bandung Conference Series: Psychology Science*, *3*(1), 227–234.

Syamsu, N. N., Soelton, M., Nanda, A., Putra, R. L., & Pebriani, P. (2019). Bagaimanakah Konflik Peran Dan Beban Kerja Mempengaruhi Kinerja Karyawan Dengan Burnout Sebagai Variabel Intervening. *Jurnal Ilmiah Manajemen Bisnis*, *5*(1), 1–13.

Tambuwan, E., & Sahrani, R. (2023). Hubungan Antara Tuntutan Kerja Dan Burnout Dengan Motivasi Kerja Sebagai Moderator Pada Karyawan Kalangan Generasi Z Di Dki Jakarta. *Journal On Education*, *5*(2), 3580–3592.

Teo, T., & Van Schalk, P. (2009). Understanding Technology Acceptance In Pre-Service Teachers: A Structural-Equation Modeling Approach. *Asia-Pacific Education Researcher*, *18*(1), 47–66.

Weni, N. N., Kawiana, I. G. P., & Astrama, I. M. (2023). The Effect Of Workload And Work Stress On Employee Performance With Burnout As A Mediation Variable (Case Study At A Health Laboratory In Denpasar City). *International Journal Of Social Science, Education, Communication And Economics (Sinomics Journal)*, *2*(2), 397–410.