



(MUDIMA)



## Work Stress of Lecturers in the Perspective of Educational Management

Khasanah<sup>1\*</sup>, Soewarto Hardhienata<sup>2</sup>, Sri Setyaningsih<sup>3</sup>

Pakuan University

**Corresponding Author:** Khasanah [khasanah.pase@gmail.com](mailto:khasanah.pase@gmail.com)

### ARTICLE INFO

*Keywords:* Educational Management

*Received* : 2 February

*Revised* : 20 March

*Accepted* : 23 April

©2025 Khasanah, Hardhienata, Setyaningsih: This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the [Creative Commons Atribusi 4.0 Internasional](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).



### ABSTRACT

This study aims to analyze the direct and indirect effects of servant leadership, organizational climate, work productivity, workload, and compensation on lecturer work stress in private universities. Using a quantitative approach with path analysis, data were collected through questionnaires from 200 lecturers selected via proportional stratified random sampling. The analysis showed that workload and compensation act as intervening variables influencing work stress. Results indicate that servant leadership and organizational climate significantly reduce stress both directly and indirectly through workload and compensation. Lecturer productivity also indirectly affects stress via compensation. These findings underscore the importance of educational management practices that prioritize balanced workload distribution, fair compensation, and supportive leadership to reduce work-related stress among lecturers

## INTRODUCTION

Work-related stress among university lecturers has become a global concern, particularly due to increasing demands in teaching, research, and administrative duties (Skaalvik & Skaalvik, 2017). In Indonesia, the issue is compounded by institutional limitations, high expectations, and limited support, which contribute to elevated stress levels and decreased performance (Kurniawan & Syafiq, 2021). According to Lazarus and Folkman's (1984) transactional model of stress, stress occurs when individuals perceive that environmental demands exceed their coping resources. This model is relevant for lecturers whose workloads are often misaligned with institutional support.

Several studies have shown that leadership style, organizational climate, and compensation practices are significant factors influencing academic staff well-being (Lee et al., 2020; Nisa, 2023). Servant leadership, which focuses on empowering subordinates and prioritizing their well-being, has been linked to reduced stress and increased job satisfaction (Eva et al., 2019). A positive organizational climate marked by transparency and fairness further strengthens this effect (Ramadhani & Trianasari, 2021).

Moreover, compensation is a critical factor affecting motivation and stress. When compensation aligns with performance, it fosters satisfaction and reduces stress (Nisa, 2023). On the contrary, workload remains a dominant source of stress, particularly when lecturers face excessive responsibilities without proportional rewards (Dhanuput, 2020).

This study builds on prior research by examining the direct and indirect pathways through which servant leadership, organizational climate, and productivity influence lecturer stress via workload and compensation.

## METHODS

This research used a quantitative approach with survey methods and path analysis. The population comprised full-time lecturers at private universities in Tangerang. A sample of 200 respondents was selected using proportional stratified random sampling.

The research instrument was a structured questionnaire developed and validated through a pilot test with 30 lecturers from Universitas in

Tangerang. Validity was assessed using item-total correlations with a threshold of  $\geq 0.30$  (Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994), and reliability was confirmed using Cronbach's Alpha  $\geq 0.70$  (George & Mallery, 2003).

Variables measured included: Y (Work Stress): Measured using the Brief Job Stress Questionnaire (BJSQ).  $X_1$  (Servant Leadership): Measured through scales adapted from Eva et al. (2019).  $X_2$  (Organizational Climate): Based on indicators of transparency, fairness, and support.  $X_3$  (Work Productivity): Based on research output, teaching effectiveness, and community engagement.  $X_4$  (Workload): Measured using NASA-TLX.  $X_5$  (Compensation): Includes salary, incentives, and rewards.

Path analysis was conducted using SPSS with bootstrapping for indirect effects.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This study aims to identify and analyze the influence of servant leadership variables, organizational climate, lecturer work productivity, workload, and compensation on lecturer work stress at UMT, using a path analysis approach.

### 1. Direct and Indirect Influence Between Variables

The results of the path analysis show that there is a direct and indirect influence between the independent variables on work stress (Y) as the dependent variable. The following is a detailed description:

#### a. The Influence of Servant Leadership on Work Stress

The path coefficient value from servant leadership ( $X_1$ ) to work stress (Y) is -0.316, with a significance value of  $0.003 < 0.05$ , indicating that the influence is significant and negative. This means that the higher the lecturer's perception of servant leadership, the lower the level of work stress they experience.

This finding supports the results of previous research by Eva et al. (2019), which showed that servant leadership has a significant impact on improving employee psychological well-being. In the context of higher education, leaders who apply the principle of serving will create a supportive, collaborative, and empathetic work atmosphere,

which contributes to reducing psychological stress in lecturers.

#### **b. The Influence of Organizational Climate on Work Stress**

The path coefficient between organizational climate ( $X_2$ ) and work stress ( $Y$ ) is  $-0.291$ , with a significance value of  $0.005$ . This means that organizational climate has a significant negative effect on work stress. This means that the better the lecturer's perception of the organizational climate (openness, fairness, participation), the lower the level of work stress experienced.

Support for these results can be found in a study by Widodo and Kristiawan (2022), which states that a healthy organizational climate mediates the impact of work pressure on burnout. In the context of this study, a positive, cooperative, and open-communication work environment reduces the psychological burden experienced by lecturers when facing academic demands.

#### **c. Effect of Work Productivity on Work Stress**

The path coefficient from lecturer work productivity ( $X_3$ ) to work stress ( $Y$ ) is  $-0.204$ , with a  $p$ -value of  $0.026$ . This result indicates a significant negative effect. This means that lecturers who have high work productivity tend to experience lower levels of stress.

The explanation for this result is that high productivity not only reflects work efficiency, but also the ability to manage time and resources. Lecturers who can manage Tri Dharma tasks effectively feel more confident and have control over their workload, which ultimately reduces stress. This is in line with the findings of Ramadhani (2021), which states that work productivity has a positive correlation with job satisfaction and emotional balance.

#### **d. Effect of Workload on Job Stress**

Workload ( $X_4$ ) has a significant positive effect on job stress with a path coefficient of  $0.337$ , and a significance of  $0.001$ . This shows that an increase in workload directly increases the level of stress felt by lecturers.

This data is reinforced by the findings of Dhanuput (2021), which shows that lecturers who face excessive workload during the pandemic experience a significant increase in stress. The imbalance between individual capacity and job demands is the main cause of increased psychological stress among lecturers.

A high workload not only has an impact on quantitative aspects (number of working hours and number of assignments), but also has an impact on the quality of lecturers' personal lives, reducing adequate rest and relaxation time. This is in line with the theory of work stress from Cooper and Marshall (1976), which states that workload is one of the main causes of stress in the workplace.

#### **e. Effect of Compensation on Work Stress**

The results of the study show that compensation ( $X_5$ ) has a negative effect on work stress with a coefficient of  $-0.223$  and a significance value of  $0.013$ . This indicates that a fair and transparent compensation system contributes to reducing the level of stress of lecturers.

Decent compensation provides a sense of security and appreciation for the contributions made. Conversely, dissatisfaction with salary and incentives can trigger emotional tension and decreased motivation. This finding is in line with Nisa's study (2023), which states that perceptions of compensation have a significant effect on work commitment and psychological well-being.

Table 1. Direct Effects of Independent Variables on Lecturer Work Stress

No	Independent Variable	Path Coefficient ( $\beta$ )	Significance (p-value)	Direction of Effect
1	Servant Leadership ( $X_1$ )	-0.316	0.003	Negative
	Explanation	Significant; the higher the servant leadership, the lower the work stress		
2	Organizational Climate ( $X_2$ )	-0.291	0.005	Negative
	Explanation	Significant; a healthy organizational climate reduces work stress		
3	Lecturer Work Productivity ( $X_3$ )	-0.204	0.026	Negative
	Explanation	Significant; high productivity leads to lower levels of stress		
4	Workload ( $X_4$ )	+0.337	0.001	Positive
	Explanation	Significant; increased workload leads to higher stress levels		
5	Compensation ( $X_5$ )	-0.223	0.013	Negative
	Explanation	Significant; fair compensation reduces lecturer stress levels		

Workload ( $X_4$ ) has the strongest direct effect on work stress with the highest positive coefficient (+0.337), indicating that effective workload management is key to reducing stress among lecturers. Servant leadership ( $X_1$ ) and organizational climate ( $X_2$ ) show significant negative effects, meaning they contribute to reducing stress through supportive and communicative environments.

Lecturer productivity ( $X_3$ ) is also a significant factor in stress reduction, suggesting that productive lecturers are better at managing responsibilities, thus experiencing lower stress. Compensation ( $X_5$ ) plays an essential role not only as a motivator but also as a psychological buffer that helps minimize emotional pressure due to work demands.

Table 2. Indirect Effects of Independent Variables on Lecturer Work Stress through Mediating Variables

No.	Pathway	Indirect Effect ( $\beta$ )
1	Servant Leadership ( $X_1$ ) $\rightarrow$ Workload ( $X_4$ ) $\rightarrow$ Work Stress (Y)	$(+0.284 \times +0.337) = +0.096$
	Positive indirect effect; higher servant leadership increases workload, which raises stress	
2	Servant Leadership ( $X_1$ ) $\rightarrow$ Compensation ( $X_5$ ) $\rightarrow$ Work Stress (Y)	$(-0.315 \times -0.223) = +0.070$
	Positive indirect effect; better servant leadership improves compensation, which reduces stress	
3	Organizational Climate ( $X_2$ ) $\rightarrow$ Workload ( $X_4$ ) $\rightarrow$ Work Stress (Y)	$(-0.271 \times +0.337) = -0.091$
	Negative indirect effect; good climate reduces workload, thus reducing stress	
4	Organizational Climate ( $X_2$ ) $\rightarrow$ Compensation ( $X_5$ ) $\rightarrow$ Work Stress (Y)	$(+0.225 \times -0.223) = -0.050$
	Negative indirect effect; good climate increases compensation, lowering stress	
5	Work Productivity ( $X_3$ ) $\rightarrow$ Workload ( $X_4$ ) $\rightarrow$ Work Stress (Y)	$(-0.194 \times +0.337) = -0.065$
	Negative indirect effect; higher productivity reduces workload, which reduces stress	

6	Work Productivity ( $X_3$ ) $\rightarrow$ Compensation ( $X_5$ ) $\rightarrow$ Work Stress (Y)	$(+0.181 \times -0.223) = -0.040$
	Negative indirect effect; higher productivity increases compensation, reducing stress	

Positive indirect effects (like in Path 1 and 2) mean that although the initial predictor has a positive or negative relationship with the mediator, the overall impact results in increased stress when passed through that mediator. Negative indirect

effects (Paths 3 to 6) reflect a stress-reducing influence through the mediators. Workload ( $X_4$ ) consistently increases stress when influenced by predictors. Compensation ( $X_5$ ) consistently reduces stress when it serves as a mediator.

Table 3. Summary of Direct, Indirect, and Total Effects on Lecturer Work Stress

No.	Independent Variable	Direct Effect ( $\beta$ )	Indirect Effect ( $\beta$ )	Total Effect ( $\beta$ )
1	Servant Leadership ( $X_1$ )	-0.316	$(+0.096 \text{ via } X_4) + (+0.070 \text{ via } X_5) = +0.166$	-0.150
	Although indirect effects increase stress, overall effect is stress-reducing due to strong direct path			
2	Organizational Climate ( $X_2$ )	-0.291	$(-0.091 \text{ via } X_4) + (-0.050 \text{ via } X_5) = -0.141$	-0.432
	Strong cumulative stress-reducing effect both directly and via mediators			
3	Work Productivity ( $X_3$ )	-0.204	$(-0.065 \text{ via } X_4) + (-0.040 \text{ via } X_5) = -0.105$	-0.309
	Consistently reduces stress through increased control and performance efficiency			

This table highlights that: Organizational Climate ( $X_2$ ) has the strongest total negative effect (-0.432) on lecturer stress, confirming that a healthy, supportive, and participative organizational atmosphere plays a crucial role in mitigating work stress. Work Productivity ( $X_3$ ) also contributes significantly to lowering stress (-0.309), suggesting that productive lecturers who can manage tasks effectively experience less psychological burden. Servant Leadership ( $X_1$ ), while showing a negative direct effect (-0.316), has positive indirect effects through workload and compensation (+0.166). This duality implies that servant leadership must be supported by proper workload and reward systems to be effective in minimizing stress.

## 2. Overall, Path Analysis Model

The path model in this study shows that workload and compensation not only act as independent variables, but also as intervening variables that bridge the indirect effects of

leadership, organizational climate, and productivity on work stress.

For example, the indirect effect of servant leadership on work stress through workload is -0.112, which means that good leadership is able to balance workload, thereby indirectly reducing work stress.

Similarly, high work productivity increases compensation and subsequently reduces work stress. This indirect effect reflects the complex and layered dynamics in human resource management in higher education.

## 3. Managerial Interpretation

Managerially, these results provide a strong basis for university leaders in formulating organizational policies. Strengthening servant leadership and establishing a conducive organizational climate need to be made strategic priorities. In addition, a fair compensation system and realistic workload management must be

improved so that lecturers can work in a healthy and productive atmosphere.

#### **4. Discussion**

Findings confirm that servant leadership and a positive organizational climate significantly reduce lecturer stress both directly and through reduced workloads. Productivity indirectly reduces stress via improved compensation, aligning with prior research by Ramadhani and Trianasari (2021). Workload and compensation are pivotal mediators in managing stress among academic staff.

#### **CONCLUSION**

Write a conclusion based on your interpretation of the findings and discussion. The conclusion presents critical points that explain the answers to research questions. In this section, the author can provide input and recommendations. Suggestions present advanced ideas to be developed in subsequent research or practical improvement.

This study highlights the importance of effective educational management in mitigating work stress among lecturers. Institutions should adopt servant leadership practices, foster a positive organizational climate, ensure balanced workloads, and provide performance-based compensation to enhance lecturer well-being. The findings revealed several key conclusions:

1. Servant Leadership significantly reduces job stress through a direct negative effect. However, it also shows positive indirect effects through workload and compensation, suggesting that if not supported by workload regulation and fair compensation, its stress-reducing benefits may be diminished.
2. Organizational Climate demonstrated the most substantial total effect in reducing stress, both directly and indirectly. A transparent, fair, and collaborative academic climate fosters psychological well-being among lecturers.
3. Work Productivity also contributes to stress reduction, indicating that lecturers who manage their academic responsibilities effectively tend to experience lower psychological strain.
4. Workload has a direct positive impact on stress, confirming that excessive academic burdens are

a key source of mental pressure. Without a proper balance between demands and capabilities, lecturers may experience burnout.

5. Compensation negatively affects stress, suggesting that fair and transparent reward systems help mitigate emotional tension and increase lecturers' sense of value and security.

Overall, this study confirms that managing stress in higher education settings requires a comprehensive approach that integrates supportive leadership, healthy organizational climate, reasonable workload, productive work culture, and fair compensation systems. These findings provide practical implications for academic leaders, policymakers, and HR units in private higher education institutions.

#### **FURTHER STUDY**

This study is limited to UMT lecturers. Therefore, further research is suggested to cover a wider area, both geographically and by type of higher education (for example comparing PTS and PTN), in order to increase the generalizability of the findings.

#### **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

The author would like to express his deepest gratitude to all parties who have contributed to the completion of this research. Special thanks are given to the lecturers and Heads of Study Programs at UMT who have generously shared their time, views, and experiences so that this research can be carried out.

The author would also like to thank the academic supervisors and colleagues for their valuable input and encouragement during the research process. Thanks are also given to the reviewers and journal editors for their constructive comments and suggestions.

This research was entirely funded by the author's personal resources, without financial support from any external funding agency or institution. Therefore, the author acknowledges the personal commitment and dedication required to carry out this work independently.

Finally, the author dedicates this paper to all educators who continue to strive to maintain their

well-being and productivity in facing professional challenges.

152–160.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2017.06.006>

## REFERENCES

- Dhanuput, D. (2020). *Hubungan antara Beban Kerja dan Stres Kerja pada Dosen di Masa Pandemi COVID-19*. *Jurnal Ilmiah Psikologi*, 8(2), 121–133. <https://doi.org/10.31219/osf.io/q38ws>
- Eva, N., Robin, M., Sendjaya, S., van Dierendonck, D., & Liden, R. C. (2019). Servant leadership: A systematic review and call for future research. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 30(1), 111–132. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2018.07.004>
- George, D., & Mallery, P. (2003). *SPSS for Windows Step by Step: A Simple Guide and Reference* (4th ed.). Allyn & Bacon.
- Kurniawan, R., & Syafiq, A. (2021). Stres Kerja Dosen pada Masa Pandemi: Studi pada Perguruan Tinggi Swasta. *Jurnal Ilmu Pendidikan dan Sosial*, 10(3), 75–85. <https://doi.org/10.31227/osf.io/8skrv>
- Lee, S., Kim, H., & Lee, H. (2020). Organizational culture and job stress: The mediating effect of trust in leadership. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 17(23), 8964. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph17238964>
- Lazarus, R. S., & Folkman, S. (1984). *Stress, Appraisal, and Coping*. Springer.
- Nisa, N. (2023). Pengaruh Iklim Organisasi dan Promosi Jabatan terhadap Kompensasi dan Dampaknya terhadap Komitmen Kerja Pegawai. *Jurnal Ekonomi dan Manajemen Terapan*, 4(2), 142–155. <https://doi.org/10.25077/jemt.4.2.142-155.2023>
- Nunnally, J. C., & Bernstein, I. H. (1994). *Psychometric Theory* (3rd ed.). McGraw-Hill.
- Ramadhani, D., & Trianasari, N. (2021). Pengaruh Produktivitas Kerja terhadap Kompensasi pada PT Sasjam Riri. *Jurnal Ilmu Manajemen*, 9(1), 18–29. <https://doi.org/10.31219/osf.io/yvb4r>
- Skaalvik, E. M., & Skaalvik, S. (2017). Motivation and burnout in teachers: The role of school context. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 67,