

Organizational Climate and Burnout: A Systematic Review of the Role of Salary, Administration, and Workplace Relationships

¹Ravel Anwar, ²Agusman Harefa

¹²Fakultas Ilmu Sosial dan Politik, Universitas Nusa Cendana

Jl. Adi Sucipto, Penfui, Kelapa Lima, Kupang City, East Nusa Tenggara 85001, Indonesia.

*Correspondence E-Mail: ravel.anwar@staf.undana.ac.id, agusman.harefa@staf.undana.ac.id

Abstract— *The world of work has undergone a fundamental shift, with post-pandemic phenomena such as "The Great Resignation" revealing employee burnout as a critical operational and financial challenge. Addressing burnout—a syndrome characterized by emotional exhaustion, cynicism, and professional inefficacy—has become crucial to organizational sustainability. Burnout is not an individual failure but a response to a dysfunctional Organizational Climate. This systemic approach contrasts with traditional research, which is often fragmented. While the burnout literature is extensive, research frequently operates in "silos," focusing on a single stressor (e.g., only social support or only role overload). Understanding the interaction between financial, bureaucratic, and social stressors remains limited. This article explores the roles of Salary, Administrative Burden, and Workplace Relationships in relation to burnout, using a Systematic Literature Review (SLR) analyzing a final corpus of N=50 articles (2015-2025) through thematic analysis. Findings indicate that burnout is an ecosystem failure requiring holistic intervention. Thematic analysis confirms that Salary is perceived as 'justice' and 'reward,' Administrative Burden as a cognitive 'hinderance demand,' and Workplace Relationships (especially POS and leadership) as the strongest 'protective resource.' However, the primary challenge lies in the interaction of stressors: high administrative burdens and toxic workplace relationships can demonstrably nullify the positive effects of adequate compensation.*

Keywords: Burnout; Organizational Climate; Salary; Administrative Burden; Workplace Relationships; Systematic Literature Review; JD-R Model

I. INTRODUCTION

The world of work has undergone a fundamental shift. In the post-pandemic era, the phenomenon known as "*The Great Resignation*" has revealed a more profound, long-simmering crisis within organizations: employee burnout [1]. This is not merely a passing feeling of fatigue; the World Health Organization (WHO) has officially classified it as an "*occupational phenomenon*". It is a real syndrome born from chronic workplace stress that has not been successfully managed [2][3].

Global statistics paint a bleak picture. The Gallup [1] "*State of the Global Workplace 2025*" report, for instance, highlights a workforce at a "breaking point". Global employee engagement declined to 21% in 2024, a significant two-point drop equivalent to the decline seen during the COVID-19 pandemic. Concurrently, while daily stress levels slightly decreased, they remain exceptionally high at 40% globally. This phenomenon is no longer merely a personal or "*soft*" issue; it has evolved into a severe operational and financial burden. This recent drop in engagement alone is estimated to have cost the global economy US\$438 billion in lost productivity.

The costs of this burnout are manifested in various aspects. It is clearly evident in skyrocketing

turnover rates, which force organizations to incur significant costs to recruit and train replacements [4][5]. Its impact is also felt in increased absenteeism and a palpable decline in productivity. Various institutions, such as the Society for Human Resource Management (SHRM), have long estimated that the cost of losing an employee can range from 50% to 200% of an employee's annual salary. Clearly, burnout is a primary driver behind these figures [6]. Therefore, understanding and managing the root causes of burnout is no longer a secondary initiative for the HR department; it is a strategic imperative for organizational sustainability.

To dissect this problem academically, precise conceptual understanding is essential. Historically, burnout is best defined through the "*Areas of Worklife*" model pioneered by Maslach and Leiter [7]. It is not a single thing, but a psychological syndrome with three interrelated dimensions: (1) Emotional Exhaustion, the feeling of depleted emotional and mental energy; (2) Cynicism or Depersonalization, the development of an indifferent, negative, or detached attitude towards one's job and the people in it; and (3) Reduced Professional Efficacy, the feeling of no longer being competent or able to achieve and make an impact [8]. This tripartite definition is crucial



because it shifts the focus from what was once considered an individual failure or weakness to an understandable response to a dysfunctional work environment [9].

This environment is referred to by academics as the Organizational Climate [10]. Essentially, it is the collective "*atmosphere*" or "*feel*" of the workplace [10][11]. It is the shared perception employees have of their environment what is valued, what is ignored, what is supported, and what is "*punished*" reflected in daily policies, practices, and procedures [13]. This climate ultimately determines how an employee experiences job demands and the extent of the job resources they feel they possess to cope [13][14].

Although burnout is widely recognized as a significant problem, academic studies on this phenomenon are often highly fragmented [6]. Research tends to get trapped in "*silos*" focusing on a single stressor. Researchers frequently study one variable in-depth, such as the impact of leadership [15][16][17] or the effect of autonomy, while ignoring other crucial factors [19]. This siloed approach fails to capture the reality of the employee experience, where various stressors do not occur in isolation but rather interconnect, accumulate, and interact.

For example, a large portion of the literature (henceforth Study A) has focused extensively on workplace relationships (*social support*) and burnout [19][20][21]. Using the popular Job Demands-Resources (JD-R) framework, these studies convincingly demonstrate that support from supervisors and colleagues is a vital "*resource*" [23], [24]. Positive relationships, whether through Perceived Organizational Support (POS) [24][25] or supportive leadership communication [26][27], can be a psychological buffer that mitigates the negative impact of job demands [29]. This literature is rich, exploring how a supportive climate [30], leadership [30][31], and feeling valued [5] contribute to well-being.

On the other hand, a second group of research (Study B) focuses on structural demands. However, this focus is often limited to concepts like role overload [32][33] or role stress [15]. While important, this research usually overlooks more "*mundane*" yet chronic structural issues, such as rigid bureaucracy and convoluted administrative burdens. The limitation of focusing solely on social support (Study A) is that it ignores structural problems that cannot be solved through interpersonal relationships alone. An

empathetic manager (Study A) might reduce stress, but they are often powerless against the fact that their employees are drowning in an inefficient system (Study B).

The limitations of these two isolated approaches indicate a clear research gap. There is a significant lack of synthesis examining how these different types of stressors interact. A single thing rarely causes an employee's burnout. It is likely a "*perfect storm*" of Financial Stressors (a salary perceived as disrespectful an area surprisingly underrepresented in recent climate studies), exacerbated by Bureaucratic Stressors (*administrative burden*), and worsened by a scarcity of Social Resources (poor workplace relationships or an unsupportive boss) [35].

This article is presented to fill this gap. The primary objective of this research is to map, synthesize, and critically analyze the roles of Salary, Administrative Burden, and Workplace Relationships as crucial components of the organizational climate that contribute to burnout [35][36]. Using a Systematic Literature Review (SLR) methodology, this study will examine how the existing literature (e.g., 2015-2025) discusses these three factors. This synthesis is expected to provide a more complete and integrated understanding of the burnout ecosystem [38] and to offer practical insights for leaders seeking to design more holistic and humane interventions [9].

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

To analyze the complex interaction among various workplace stressors, a robust theoretical framework is required. The Job Demands-Resources (JD-R) model [39] has become the dominant framework in the burnout and well-being literature [14].

The JD-R theory posits that every occupational environment has its own characteristics that can be classified into two general categories: Job Demands and Job Resources. The model postulates two main, parallel psychological processes:

1. *The 'Health Impairment' Process*: This process is driven by Job Demands, which are aspects of the job that require sustained physical or psychological effort. High demands chronically deplete employee energy, eventually leading to exhaustion and burnout [6].
 - a. In this research, Administrative Burden is mapped as a primary Job Demand,



specifically as a bureaucratic "*hindrance demand*".

- b. Salary (*Compensation*), when perceived as low or unfair, also functions as a chronic Job Demand (*stressor*) that signals a lack of reward [5][40] and fuels cynicism.
2. *The 'Motivational' Process*: This process is driven by Job Resources, which are aspects of the job that are functional in achieving work goals, reducing demands, or stimulating personal growth. These resources foster work engagement [41].
 - a. In this research, Workplace Relationships are mapped as the most critical social Job Resource.
 - b. A supportive climate [30], Perceived Organizational Support (POS) [25][26], and supportive leadership [15, 22, 40] function as a "*buffer*" that mitigates the impact of stressors [29].

This systematic review aims to synthesize how these three factors (*financial stressors, bureaucratic stressors, and social resources*) interact to shape the organizational climate [11] that predicts burnout.

III. RESEARCH METHODS

This study utilizes a Systematic Literature Review (SLR) methodology. This approach is based on the need to synthesize and critically analyze fragmented findings on the antecedents of organizational climate and burnout. Secondary data sources are leveraged to gather in-depth insights from existing academic literature [42].

The PRISMA (*Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses*) protocol was adopted to ensure methodological transparency and replicability. The analysis is based on a selection of secondary data sources, primarily peer-reviewed journal articles identified from prominent academic databases (e.g., Scopus and EBSCO). The publication timeframe was explicitly restricted to 2015-2025. To accurately capture the fragmented literature (aligning with the identified research gap), a broad search strategy was adopted. The primary Boolean search string applied to the databases was: ("*Burnout*" OR "*Emotional Exhaustion*") and ("*Organizational Climate*" OR "*Salary*" OR "*Compensation*" OR "*Administrative Burden*" OR "*Bureaucracy*" OR "*Workplace Relationships*" OR "*Social Support*") [43].

The use of the "OR" operator on these independent variables was essential to gather both isolated studies (e.g., those linking only burnout to salary) and more in integrative studies. The goal of this strategy was to collect the fragmented corpus for synthesis. Inclusion criteria (e.g., empirical articles in English) and exclusion criteria (e.g., non-research articles) were applied to filter the final corpus.

The PRISMA selection process began with 1,300 articles identified through database searching. The initial corpus was managed, and duplicates were identified and removed (n=400), using Mendeley reference management software. Subsequently, 900 articles were screened based on title and abstract relevance, and 825 were excluded. This left 75 articles eligible for full-text review. Of these, N=50 articles met all inclusion criteria upon in-depth review and constituted the final corpus for thematic synthesis.

A thematic analysis approach [44] was used to analyze the final corpus. Coding and pattern synthesis from the final N=50 articles were facilitated using NVivo (Version 14) to organize and manage the data extracts. In this article, thematic analysis was applied to identify, categorize, and synthesize recurring patterns. The key themes examined include: (1) The Impact of Salary and Distributive Justice, (2) The Impact of Administrative Burden, and (3) The Impact of Workplace Relationships and Social Support. This use of SLR allows for the synthesis of rich, pre-existing data from multiple perspectives, providing a comprehensive overview of how stressor interactions are evaluated in the literature, without requiring primary data collection.

IV. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Results

4.1 Thematic Analysis Findings

The systematic analysis of the literature corpus (2015-2025) identified three dominant themes that collectively shape the organizational climate and serve as primary predictors of burnout. This finding confirms the gap identified in the introduction: that burnout is an ecosystem phenomenon rather than the result of a single stressor.

4.1.1 Theme 1: Salary and the Crisis of Perceived Justice (Distributive Justice)

The first significant finding from this review is that the contemporary academic literature on burnout (mainly that identified in the reference list)



discusses monetary compensation (*salary*) relatively infrequently. The focus has shifted from "*amount*" to "*meaning*." However, when salary is discussed, it emerges as a potent antecedent to burnout, particularly when linked to feelings of justice and reward.

In the classic "Areas of Worklife" model, a low or inadequate salary is a primary manifestation of misalignment in the "Reward" area [7]. When employees feel a chronic mismatch between the effort they expend and the rewards they receive (both financial and social), this signals a lack of feeling valued [5] and an absence of professional recognition [40], which in turn triggers the cynicism dimension of burnout.

The analysis shows that a low salary functions not only as a financial stressor (limiting life choices outside of work) but also as a chronic psychological stressor. It is a daily message from the organization to the employee that their contributions are undervalued. The literature on professional recognition strongly supports this. Renger et al. [40] found that recognition—*defined as esteem, respect, and care*—serves as a vital protective factor against burnout. A low salary can be interpreted as a fundamental form of non-recognition.

Thus, in the JD-R framework, an unfair salary functions as a demand that depletes emotional resources. It creates a corrosive climate of distributive injustice, which directly fuels cynicism and emotional exhaustion, regardless of other job demands.

4.1.2 Theme 2: Administrative Burden as a Cognitive Demand

The second theme that emerged prominently is the role of administrative burden. Unlike salary, which is often implicit, the administrative burden was identified as an explicit and highly detrimental Job Demand. Recent literature, particularly in the public and healthcare sectors, highlights role overload as a key predictor of burnout.

A key finding from this synthesis is that burnout is often not caused by the core work itself (e.g., caring for patients, teaching students), but by the accumulation of non-core administrative tasks. These are classic "*hindrance demands*": tasks (like documentation, bureaucracy, reporting) that consume

cognitive time and energy but provide no sense of professional accomplishment.

Pecino et al. [15] found that role stress (including role ambiguity and role conflict, often caused by overlapping administrative demands) is significantly associated with decreased job satisfaction, an antecedent of burnout. In the context of industrial organizations, [11], [12] also identified rigid, bureaucratic organizational climates as contributors to burnout.

Particularly in labor-intensive sectors like healthcare and education, this administrative burden depletes cognitive resources that should be allocated to complex tasks that require empathy and decision-making. When a professional spends more time "*fighting the system*" than doing the work they find meaningful, it directly triggers emotional exhaustion and, critically, feelings of professional inefficacy (the third dimension of burnout)

4.1.3 Theme 3: Workplace Relationships as a Protective Resource

If Themes 1 and 2 are primary drivers of burnout, the third theme identified by the literature is the most potent protective (buffer) factor: Workplace Relationships. A favorable social climate serves as an ever-present, accessible resource that protects employees from stressors.

Thematic analysis shows this resource operates on three levels:

1. Organizational Level (Perceived Organizational Support - POS): The literature consistently shows that when employees perceive their organization as a whole to be supportive and caring of their well-being, burnout decreases. POS functions as a powerful moderator or mediator in the relationship between stress and burnout. This supportive climate fosters engagement and reduces turnover intentions, even during crises.
2. Leadership Level (Immediate Supervisor): This is the most frequently cited social resource. The immediate supervisor is often seen as the "*climate creator*" for their team. The literature is replete with evidence that leadership style directly predicts burnout. Ethical, transformational, or generally



supportive leadership significantly reduces exhaustion. Specifically, behaviors such as "*supervisor communication*" and "*active-empathetic listening*" serve as daily resources. Conversely, passive or poor leadership is a demand in itself.

3. Peer Level (Social Support): This interpersonal resource complements leadership support. A qualitative study by [19] found that supportive peer organizational conditions were essential. Haizlip et al. [21] identified "*mattering*" (feeling valued by peers) as a key factor differentiating engagement from burnout in nurses. Support from colleagues and positive relationships, in general, are fundamental.

In short, Workplace Relationships are the most crucial Job Resource. They provide emotional support to combat exhaustion, instrumental support to navigate administrative demands, and social validation to fight cynicism.

Discussion

4.2 The Interaction of Stressors

The core finding of this review is not the discovery of these three themes in isolation, but the understanding of their interaction. The JD-R model is best used to explain how demands and resources interact. Burnout occurs not just because of high demands (low Salary, high Administration), but because of low resources (poor Workplace Relationships) to cope with them.

The clearest case study in the literature is the healthcare and education sector (public sector). Professionals like doctors, nurses, and mental health practitioners often experience a "*perfect storm*":

1. Salary (Demand): While doctors may be well-paid, nurses and teachers often report compensation that is incommensurate with the emotional investment and occupational risks (a perception of injustice).
2. Administration (Demand): These professions are notorious for extreme administrative burdens (e.g., electronic health records, accreditation reporting), which are high-hindrance demands.
3. Workplace Relationships (Resource): Consequently, the only remaining primary

resource preventing mass burnout is the social climate a supportive team and protective managers.

The key takeaway from this synthesis is that these resources and demands can cancel each other out. The literature supports the argument that a high administrative burden can nullify the positive effects of adequate compensation. The financial resource (salary) the employee receives is seemingly "burned" by the cognitive energy and time spent fighting bureaucracy (administrative demand). The employee feels, "*I am paid well, but to do meaningless work*".

Similarly, toxic workplace relationships or interpersonal conflict can nullify the effect of a high salary. The emotional stress from an unsupportive climate or poor leadership drains more energy than compensation can replenish.

In conclusion, a healthy organizational climate is not about maximizing a single element (e.g., high salaries alone), but about balancing demands and resources. Burnout interventions that fail to understand this interaction are destined to fail

4.3 Practical Implications

This thematic synthesis yields several actionable managerial implications for HR practitioners and organizational leaders. Solutions for burnout must be holistic and integrated, not fragmented.

Regarding salary, the findings show the focus must shift from "*amount*" to "*justice*." Organizations must audit their compensation structures for internal equity (equal pay for similar roles) and external equity (market fairness), ensuring that promotion and raise processes are transparent. Furthermore, because a low salary is often interpreted as "*being undervalued*," organizations must proactively implement non-monetary reward systems. This includes creating a culture of recognition, ensuring employees feel valued, and providing structured positive feedback.

In terms of administration, the findings show that administrative burden is a structurally controllable stressor. Leaders must actively "*hunt*" for bureaucracy by conducting regular "*demand audits*" and asking employees: "*What task do you do that wastes the most time for the least value?*" Technology should be used to eliminate work, not just move it (e.g., from paper to an equally complex digital form), and workflows



must be simplified. A frequently overlooked intervention is clearly defining roles, which has been proven to reduce the role overload and ambiguity that fuels burnout [34], [45].

Finally, concerning relationships, the findings show that social resources are the most potent protector. This makes empathetic leadership training a crucial intervention; organizations must train frontline managers in supportive leadership behaviors, ethical leadership, and effective communication, especially active-empathetic listening. Support also cannot depend solely on individual managers; it must be institutionalized through clear policies that demonstrate support for mental well-being, such as flexible work policies or easy access to mental health resources. Given that interpersonal conflict is a strong predictor of burnout, HR must have precise and trusted mechanisms for proactive conflict mediation.

V. CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

This systematic literature review has affirmed that burnout is not an individual failure but a manifestation of a dysfunctional organizational ecosystem. A toxic organizational climate, which consistently drains employees' psychological resources, is a primary predictor of emotional exhaustion, cynicism, and professional inefficacy. A synthesis of the relevant literature (2015-2025) indicates that burnout results from a complex interaction among various demands and resources.

The findings from this review are significant, particularly in identifying the interactions among financial, bureaucratic, and social stressors. It was

found that organizational interventions to address burnout must be holistic and integrated. Efforts to improve Salary (*as a financial resource*) will predictably fail to reduce burnout if Administrative Demands (*as a bureaucratic stressor*) remain high. Therefore, as detailed in the practical implications, this research suggests that organizations must complement fair compensation strategies with structural interventions such as conducting "*demand audits*" and simplifying workflows to mitigate the administrative burdens that nullify financial rewards. Likewise, supportive Workplace Relationships (*as a social resource*) can lose their protective effectiveness when faced with salary injustice and excessive administrative burdens simultaneously.

Although this review successfully identified these interaction patterns, there is an urgent need for further empirical validation. The future research agenda should consider several specific paths. First, longitudinal quantitative (*survey*) studies are needed to test and validate the interaction model between Salary, Administrative Burden, and Workplace Relationships on burnout profiles. Second, intervention studies or quasi-experiments are essential to assess the practical effectiveness of interventions aimed at reducing administrative burdens and employee exhaustion levels. Finally, cross-sectoral analyses should be conducted to compare how these stressor dynamics manifest differently in the public sector (*often high administration*) versus the private sector (*which may have different compensation dynamics*).

VI. REFERENCE

- [1] Gallup Consulting, "State of the Global Workplace," *Empl. Engagem. Insights Bus. Leaders Worldw.*, pp. 1–122, 2025.
- [2] E. Danauskė, A. G. Raišienė, and R. Korsakienė, "Coping with burnout? Measuring the links between workplace conflicts, work-related stress, and burnout," *Bus. Theory Pract.*, vol. 24, no. 1, pp. 58–69, 2023.
- [3] J. Westover, "Beyond Blame: Understanding Workplace Burnout," *Hum. Cap. Leadersh. Rev.*, vol. 13, no. 4, 2024.
- [4] Q. Wang and C. Wang, "Reducing turnover intention: perceived organizational support for frontline employees," *Front. Bus. Res. China*, vol. 14, no. 1, p. 6, 2020.
- [5] A. M. Young, C. Aronoff, S. Goel, M. Jerome, and K. J. Brower, "A Focus on Leadership Communication and Feeling Valued to Prevent Burnout and Turnover Among Healthcare Professionals," *J. Occup. Environ. Med.*, vol. 66, no. 4, pp. 305–309, 2024.
- [6] N. R. Ahmad, I. Ullah, M. U. Aziz, and F. Iqbal, "Investigating Stress, Burnout, and Organizational Factors Contributing to Psychological Well-being at Work," *Rev. Educ. Adm. Law*, vol. 8, no. 1, pp. 29–40, 2025.
- [7] M. P. Leiter and C. Maslach, "Six areas of worklife: a model of the organizational context of burnout," *J. Health Hum. Serv. Adm.*, pp.



- 472–489, 1999.
- [8] N. Gillet, A. J. Morin, P. Colombat, A. Ndiaye, and E. Fouquereau, “Burnout profiles: Dimensionality, replicability, and associations with predictors and outcomes,” *Curr. Psychol.*, vol. 42, no. 6, pp. 4504–4522, 2023.
 - [9] R. Awashreh and H. AlGhunaimi, “Navigating burnout in the public sector: Strategies for enhancing employee well-being and organizational performance,” *Evol. Stud. Imaginative Cult.*, vol. 8, no. 3, pp. 211–225, 2024.
 - [10] A. D’Amato, “From research to action and back again: The long journey of organizational climate—A review of the literature and a summative framework,” *J. Gen. Manag.*, vol. 50, no. 4, pp. 356–373, 2025.
 - [11] A. Djokic, “Impact of organizational climate on employee burnout in an industrial company BT - DIEM: Dubrovnik International Economic Meeting,” vol. 9, no. 1. Sveučilište u Dubrovniku, pp. 1–11, 2024.
 - [12] V. I. Kabalina and C. L. Djokic A, “Organizational climate and employee burnout in an industrial company,” *Russ. Manag. J.*, vol. 21, no. 2, pp. 228–254, 2023.
 - [13] R. Sterling *et al.*, “Identifying and prioritizing workplace climate predictors of burnout among VHA primary care physicians,” *J. Gen. Intern. Med.*, vol. 37, no. 1, pp. 87–94, 2022.
 - [14] N. Gillet, A. J. Morin, and A. R. Blais, “A multilevel person-centered perspective on the role of job demands and resources for employees’ job engagement and burnout profiles,” *Gr. Organ. Manag.*, vol. 49, no. 3, pp. 621–672, 2024.
 - [15] V. Pecino, M. A. Mañas, P. A. Díaz-Fúnez, J. M. Aguilar-Parra, D. Padilla-Góngora, and R. López-Liria, “Organisational climate, role stress, and public employees’ job satisfaction,” *Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health*, vol. 16, no. 10, p. 1792, 2019.
 - [16] J. Gravestock, “A scoping review of the literature pertaining to burnout and leadership in mental health clinicians,” *Leadersh. Heal. Serv.*, vol. 36, no. 3, pp. 293–314, 2023.
 - [17] E. Schwörer, “Transformational Leadership and Burnout within the Swedish Construction Industry.” 2018.
 - [18] L. Webster and R. K. Hackett, “Burnout and leadership in community mental health systems,” *Adm. Policy Ment. Heal. Ment. Heal. Serv. Res.*, vol. 26, no. 6, pp. 387–399, 1999.
 - [19] A. L. Rollins *et al.*, “Organizational conditions that influence work engagement and burnout: A qualitative study of mental health workers,” *Psychiatr. Rehabil. J.*, vol. 44, no. 3, p. 229, 2021.
 - [20] P. Ruisoto Palomera, M. Rodríguez Ramírez, P. A. García López, B. Paladines Costa, S. L. Vaca Gallegos, and V. J. Clemente Suárez, “Social Support Mediates the Effect of Burnout on Health in Health Care Professionals,” *Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health*, vol. 18, no. 1, p. 217, 2021.
 - [21] J. Haizlip, C. McCluney, M. Hernandez, B. Quatrara, and V. Brashers, “Mattering: How organizations, patients, and peers can affect nurse burnout and engagement,” *JONA J. Nurs. Adm.*, vol. 50, no. 5, pp. 267–273, 2020.
 - [22] K. M. J. BELLA, “Exploring the impact of workplace relationships and employee job satisfaction,” *Int. J. Sci. Res. Mod. Sci. Technol.*, vol. 2, no. 8, pp. 55–62, 2023.
 - [23] L. B. Hammer, J. Dimoff, C. D. Mohr, and S. J. Allen, “A framework for protecting and promoting employee mental health through supervisor supportive behaviors,” *Occup. Heal. Sci.*, vol. 8, no. 2, pp. 243–268, 2024.
 - [24] B. H. Ellis and K. I. Miller, “Supportive communication among nurses: Effects on commitment, burnout, and retention,” *Health Commun.*, vol. 6, no. 2, pp. 77–96, 1994.
 - [25] X. Zeng, X. Zhang, M. Chen, J. Liu, and C. Wu, “The influence of perceived organizational support on police job burnout: a moderated mediation model,” *Front. Psychol.*, vol. 11, p. 948, 2020.
 - [26] Z. Xu and F. Yang, “The impact of perceived organizational support on the relationship between job stress and burnout: a mediating or moderating role?,” *Curr. Psychol.*, vol. 40, no. 1, pp. 402–413, 2021.
 - [27] Y. Xu and K. Farris, “The influence of leadership styles and supervisor communication on employee burnout,” *J. Gen. Manag.*, vol. 49, no. 3, pp. 169–179, 2024.
 - [28] I. J. Jonsdottir and K. Kristinsson, “Supervisors’ active-empathetic listening as an important antecedent of work engagement,” *Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health*, vol. 17, no.



- 21, p. 7976, 2020.
- [29] F. Wu *et al.*, “The relationship between job stress and job burnout: the mediating effects of perceived social support and job satisfaction,” *Psychol. Health Med.*, vol. 26, no. 2, pp. 204–211, 2021.
- [30] A. Hayat and L. Afshari, “Supportive organizational climate: a moderated mediation model of workplace bullying and employee well-being,” *Pers. Rev.*, vol. 50, no. 7/8, pp. 1685–1704, 2021.
- [31] S. Adiawaty and A. Moeins, “The Role of Leadership and Workplace Climate in Promoting Employee Well-Being and Engagement,” *Sinergi Int. J. Psychol.*, vol. 2, no. 2, pp. 94–107, 2024.
- [32] W. Liang, J. Wang, X. Wang, G. Chen, R. Chen, and J. Cheng, “Perceived doctor-patient relationship, authentic leadership and organizational climate on physician burnout: job satisfaction as a mediator,” *BMC Health Serv. Res.*, vol. 24, no. 1, p. 1652, 2024.
- [33] K. Al’Ararah, D. Çağlar, and H. Y. Aljuhmani, “Mitigating job burnout in Jordanian public healthcare: The interplay between ethical leadership, organizational climate, and role overload,” *Behav. Sci. (Basel)*, vol. 14, no. 6, p. 490, 2024.
- [34] J. T. Vullingsh, A. H. De Hoogh, D. N. Den Hartog, and C. Boon, “Ethical and passive leadership and their joint relationships with burnout via role clarity and role overload,” *J. Bus. ethics*, vol. 165, no. 4, pp. 719–733, 2020.
- [35] F. Fraboni, G. Paganin, G. Mazzetti, D. Guglielmi, and L. Pietrantonio, “The intricate pathways from empowering leadership to burnout: A deep dive into interpersonal conflicts, work-home interactions, and supportive colleagues,” *Informing Sci.*, vol. 26, pp. 149–172, 2023.
- [36] S. R. Dinibutun, C. Kuzey, and M. S. Dinc, “The effect of organizational climate on faculty burnout at state and private universities: A comparative analysis,” *Sage Open*, vol. 10, no. 4, p. 2158244020979175, 2020.
- [37] A. M. Headley, K. Witkowski, C. Remington, N. E. Ganapati, and S. L. Contreras, “Trauma-informed organizational climate and its impact on first responder burnout during COVID-19,” *Public Adm. Rev.*, vol. 85, no. 1, pp. 144–164, 2025.
- [38] T. Virani, F. Ismail, and J. Brooke, “Beyond traditional practices: Innovating workplace mental health in the community,” *Healthc. Q.*, vol. 27, no. 3, pp. 28–33, 2024.
- [39] E. Demerouti, A. B. Bakker, F. Nachreiner, and W. B. Schaufeli, “The job demands-resources model of burnout,” *J. Appl. Psychol.*, vol. 86, no. 3, p. 499, 2001.
- [40] D. Renger, M. Miché, and A. Casini, “Professional recognition at work: the protective role of esteem, respect, and care for burnout among employees,” *J. Occup. Environ. Med.*, vol. 62, no. 3, pp. 202–209, 2020.
- [41] F. Bonaiuto, S. Fantinelli, A. Milani, M. Cortini, M. C. Vitiello, and M. Bonaiuto, “Perceived organizational support and work engagement: the role of psychosocial variables,” *J. Work. Learn.*, vol. 34, no. 5, pp. 418–436, 2022.
- [42] H. Snyder, “Literature review as a research methodology: An overview and guidelines,” *J. Bus. Res.*, vol. 104, pp. 333–339, 2019.
- [43] N. A. Hamdani, M. F. Ramdani, and D. S. Puspita, “Perceived Behavioural Control and Subjective Norms Influence on Entrepreneurial Intention,” ... *Soc. Sci.*, 2024, [Online]. Available: <http://ajmesc.com/index.php/ajmesc/article/view/1120>.
- [44] V. Braun and V. Clarke, “Using thematic analysis in psychology,” *Qual. Res. Psychol.*, vol. 3, no. 2, pp. 77–101, 2006.
- [45] G. A. F. Maulan, E. Dinanti, S. Mustika, N. A. Hamdani, and I. Permana, *The Influence of Product Composition Information and Brand Trust on Purchasing Decision*, no. Gcbme 2023. Atlantis Press International BV, 2024.

