WWW.IJRPR.COM

International Journal of Research Publication and Reviews

Journal homepage: www.ijrpr.com ISSN 2582-7421

Understanding and Mitigating Employee Burnout in Modern Work Environments: A Multifaceted Investigation

Ashwini S

Management stdent, Jain (Deemed to be university) CMS Business School, Bangalore,Karnataka, India

A B S T R A C T

Employee burnout is a pervasive phenomenon with significant implications for both individuals and organizations in modern work environments. This research paper presents a multifaceted investigation aimed at understanding the causes, consequences, and potential interventions for burnout among employees. The study examines the interplay of individual-level factors, organizational dynamics, and contemporary stressors in shaping burnout experiences. A quantitative research design is employed, utilizing survey questionnaires to collect data from a purposive sample of employees across diverse industries. Data analysis techniques include descriptive statistics, regression analysis, correlation analysis, and hypothesis testing. The findings reveal several key factors contributing to burnout, including high workload, lack of organizational support, maladaptive coping mechanisms, and the impact of reduced self-regulatory activities. Burnout is associated with negative outcomes for both individuals (e.g., decreased job satisfaction, increased turnover intentions) and organizations (e.g., reduced productivity, compromised organizational effectiveness). Managerial implications highlight the importance of promoting work-life balance, enhancing social support systems, optimizing job design, and fostering a culture of well-being within organizations. The study concludes by discussing theoretical implications, limitations, and avenues for future research, emphasizing the need for collaborative efforts to address burnout and promote employee well-being in modern work environments.

Keywords: Employee Burnout, Emotional Exhaustion, Cynicism, Professional efficacy

1. INTRODUCTION:

Employee burnout has emerged as a critical concern in modern work environments, posing significant challenges for individuals, organizations, and society at large. Defined as a state of physical, emotional, and mental exhaustion resulting from prolonged stress and overwork, burnout has profound implications for employee well-being, job performance, and organizational effectiveness (Maslach et al., 2001). In recent years, the prevalence of burnout has been on the rise, fueled by factors such as increasing job demands, rapid technological advancements, organizational restructuring, and the global COVID-19 pandemic (Schaufeli et al., 2009; World Health Organization, 2019). As employees struggle to cope with mounting pressures and uncertainties, burnout has become a pressing issue that warrants urgent attention from researchers, practitioners, and policymakers. The study seeks to unravel the underlying mechanisms and dynamics of burnout and explore potential avenues for prevention and intervention. Through a quantitative research design, utilizing survey questionnaires and statistical analyses, the study shoews the relationships between individual-level factors, organizational dynamics, contemporary stressors, and burnout outcomes.

This research paper is structured as follows: following this introduction, the subsequent sections will review the relevant literature on burnout, identify research gaps, delineate theoretical underpinnings, and outline the scope and objectives of the study. Subsequent sections will detail the research methodology, including data collection procedures, variables of interest, and statistical analyses. The findings of the study will be presented and discussed, highlighting key insights.

2. RESEARCH ANALYSIS:

A survey dataset containing 203 observations is collected. Scores for unhealthy self-care(SC), unhealthy relationship with work(RW), unhealthy work environment(WE), Low self-esteem(SE), Emotional exhaustion (EE), Cynicism(CY), low professional efficacy(PE) and Burnout(BO) is calculated. These scores are then summarized using descriptive analysis.

2.1 Cornbach's alpha reliability test:

H0: There is no significant internal consistency in the questionnaire scales, indicated by alpha value below threshold 0.7.

H1: There is a significant internal consistency in the questionnaire scales, indicated by alpha value above threshold 0.7.

Cornbach's Alpha Reliability Analysis			
No. of Items	Summated variances of items	Variance of score	Alpha value
23	39.3532	287.804	0.903

Fig.1. Table for Cornbach's alpha

Since the alpha value is more than threshold value 0.7 null hypothesis is rejected. Therefore, it can be concluded that there is internal consistency in the questionnaire. When the alpha value calculated from Cronbach's alpha analysis exceeds the threshold value (in this case, 0.7), the null hypothesis is rejected.

2.2 Correlation analysis

Spearman's rank correlation analysis:

H0: There is no statistically significant monotonic relationship between the factors

H1: There is a statistically significant monotonic relationship between at least one pair of factors

Spearman's Rank Correlation Coefficient					
	SC	*RW*	*WE*	*SE*	*BO*
SC	1				
RW	0.99985	1			
WE	0.999798	0.999855	1		
SE	0.999773	0.999874	0.999862	1	
BO	0.99977	0.999855	0.999864	0.999849	1
t-test for Spearman's Correlation Coefficient					
	SC	*RW*	*WE*	*SE*	*BO*
SC	1				
RW	0.001221	1			
WE	0.001416	0.0012	1		
SE	0.001501	0.001117	0.001173	1	
BO	0.001513	0.0012	0.001164	0.001227	1

Fig.2. Table for Spearman's Correlation analysis

The Spearman's rank correlation analysis shows significant monotonic relationship between factors. The t- test performed on these coefficients have value less than set alpha = 0.05, which is the level of statistical significance. Therefore, null hypothesis is rejected and it can be concluded that there is a statistically significant monotonic relationship between the factors.

2.3 ANOVA two-way analysis test:

Variable -1: Burnout and Not burnout groups

H0: There is no significant difference between burnout and not burnout sample

H1: There is a significant difference between burnout and not burnout sample

Variable- 2: Observed factors

H0: There is no significant difference between observed factors

H1: There is no significant difference between observed factors

Anova: Two-Factor With Replication

SUMMARY	SC	RW	WE	SE	Total
Burnout					
Count	50	50	50	50	200
Sum	163	165.2	155	150	633.2
Average	3.26	3.304	3.1	3	3.166
Variance	1.321043	0.846106	0.538265	0.329082	0.76221061
Not Burnout					
Count	50	50	50	50	200
Sum	122.3333	128.4	118.75	126	495.483333
Average	2.446667	2.568	2.375	2.52	2.47741667
Variance	1.381451	0.717322	0.584821	0.642449	0.82436599
Total					
Count	100	100	100	100	
Sum	285.3333	293.6	273.75	276	
Average	2.853333	2.936	2.7375	2.76	
Variance	1.504646	0.91061	0.688605	0.53904	

ANOVA

Source of Variation	*SS*	*df*	*MS*	*F*	*P-value*	*F crit*
Sample	47.4147	1	47.4147	59.63607	9.6204E-14	3.86529
Columns	2.496169	3	0.832056	1.046523	0.37185872	2.627672
Interaction	1.566102	2	30.25926	5.127358	0.0172843	3.26345
Within	311.6665	392	0.795068			
Total	363.1434	399				

Fig.3. Table for ANOVA two-way analysis

Variable-1 :

The F statistic is 59.63 and the P- value is 9.6E-14, which is less than 0.05 (set value of statistical significance. Therefore, null hypothesis is rejected and it can be concluded that there is a significant difference between burnout and not burnout sample.

Variable-2:

The F statistic is 1.046 and the P- value is 0.371, which is more than 0.05 (set value of statistical significance. Therefore, null hypothesis is accepted and it can be concluded that there is no significant difference between observed factors.

2.4 Regression analysis:

H0: There is no significant linear relationship between independent variable (burnout scores) and dependent variable (factors)

H1: There is a significant linear relationship between independent variable (burnout scores) and dependent variable (factors)

Regression Statistics								
Multiple R	0.709587							
R Square	0.503514							
Adjusted R Squar	0.493484							
Standard Error	0.581721							
Observations	203							
ANOVA								
	df	*SS*	*MS*	*F*	*ignificance F*			
Regression	4	67.9513	16.98782	50.20061	3.99E-29			
Residual	198	67.00296	0.338399					
Total	202	134.9543						
	Coefficients	*Standard Error*	*t Stat*	*P-value*	*Lower 95%*	*Upper 95%*	*Lower 95.0%*	*Upper 95.0%*
Intercept	0.389619	0.172586	2.257529	0.025067	0.049275	0.729962	0.049275	0.729962
SC	0.015272	0.047165	0.323804	0.746428	-0.07774	0.108281	-0.07774	0.108281
RW	0.224843	0.063966	3.515018	0.000545	0.0987	0.350986	0.0987	0.350986
WE	0.281949	0.059247	4.758843	3.75E-06	0.165112	0.398786	0.165112	0.398786
SE	0.261092	0.0634	4.118168	5.61E-05	0.136066	0.386118	0.136066	0.386118

1. Fig.4. Table for Regression analysis

Multiple R value 0.71 indicates strong linear relationship between independent and dependent variables. Almost 50% of dependent values are explained by independent values as indicated by R square. An estimate of standard deviation of error of 0.58 is obtained. Since P value associated with regression is less than 0.05 null hypothesis is rejected and can be concluded that there is a significant linear relationship between burnout scores and factors, unhealthy self-care(SC), unhealthy relationship with work(RW), unhealthy work environment(WE) and Low self-esteem(SE).

3. CONCLUSION:

From the test it can be seen that each factor has an significant effect on burnout. Hence it is crucial to consider each factor and improve the state of these factors in the individual to address the burnout and possibly reduce the negative effects of burnout. In conclusion, addressing employee burnout is crucial for promoting individual well-being and organizational effectiveness. By implementing proactive strategies to mitigate burnout and foster a culture of resilience and well-being, organizations can create environments where employees can thrive and contribute to organizational success.

References

1. Kelly P. Gabriel, Herman Aguinis- 2022. “How to prevent and combat employee burnout and create healthier workplaces during crises and beyond” School of Business, The George Washington University, 2201 G Street NW, Washington, DC 20052, U.S.A. Business Horizons (2022)
2. Mohamed Genedy, Karin Hellerstedt, Lucia Naldi, Johan Wiklund -2023. “. Growing pains in scale-ups: How scaling affects new venture employee burnout and job satisfaction”. Journal of Business Venturing 39 (2024) 106367
3. Anna Bashkirova, Annelies Compagner, Diana M. Henningsen, Jan Treur – 2023. “. An adaptive modelling approach to employee burnout in the context of the big five personality traits”. Cognitive Systems Research 79 (2023) 109–125
4. Joanna Moczydłowska – 2016. “. Organisational reasons of job burnout”. Volume 8 • Issue 2 2016, international society for manufacturing, service and management engineering
5. Ernest W. Brewer, Leslie Shapard, 2014. “Employee Burnout: A Meta-Analysis of the Relationship Between Age or Years of Experience”. TEXAS SOUTHERN UNIVERSITY on December 15, 2014
6. Yun Liu, Jacob Cherian, Naveed Ahmad, Heesup Han, Marta de Vicente-Lama & Antonio Ariza-Montes, 2023. “Internal Corporate Social Responsibility and Employee Burnout: An Employee Management Perspective from the Healthcare Sector”. Psychology Research and Behavior Management 2023
7. Raniasari Bimanti Esthi, Saur Panjaitan, 2023. “The Effect of Work-Life Balance on Turnover Intention Mediated by Burnout”. Management Department, Economics and Business Faculty, Pelita Bangsa University, Indonesia, Jurnal Manajemen, 14 (1) (2023) pp. 29-34

8. Kotaro Shoji, Roman Cieslak, Ewelina Smoktunowicz, Anna Rogala, Charles C. Benight & Aleksandra Luszczynska, 2015. Associations between job burnout and self-efficacy: a meta-analysis". Pages 367-386 | Received 13 Oct 2014, Accepted 09 May 2015, Published online: 14 Jul 2015