

Manuscript 1051

---

## Organizational Challenges: The Impact of Role Clarity on Burnout in a Technology Division

Jessica Arriaza

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.pepperdine.edu/swbj>



Part of the [Applied Behavior Analysis Commons](#), [Industrial and Organizational Psychology Commons](#), [Organizational Behavior and Theory Commons](#), and the [Organization Development Commons](#)

---

### **Abstract**

Organizations grapple with challenges such as burnout, turnover, and low job satisfaction. Studies indicate that emotional exhaustion, influenced by job demands and available resources, impacts job performance positively or negatively. This quantitative study uses secondary data from the Work, Family, and Health Study to investigate the relationship between role clarity and burnout within Tomo, the technology division of a Fortune 500 company in the United States. The findings reveal a significant inverse correlation between role clarity and burnout, with participants reporting "Never" experiencing burnout more likely to have well-defined roles. Supported by chi-square and linear regression analyses, these results emphasize the pivotal role of role clarity in mitigating burnout, aligning with existing literature. While offering valuable insights for organizational strategies to enhance employee satisfaction and performance, the study acknowledges generalizability and data quality limitations, prompting suggestions for future research to explore this relationship across diverse industries.

## **Organizational Challenges: The Impact of Role Clarity on Burnout in a Technology**

### **Division**

Burnout, turnover, and low job satisfaction are recognized as the most pressing challenges organizations face (Schmidt et al., 2012). According to Brhane and Zewdie (2018), employees constitute a vital component of the organizational workplace, and meeting their needs is integral to fostering heightened productivity and job satisfaction. Acknowledging and addressing the diverse needs of employees can lead to a more engaged and content workforce. When organizations prioritize the well-being and fulfillment of their employees, it contributes to increased productivity and enhances overall job satisfaction (Brhane & Zewdie, 2018). Recognizing the significance of this reciprocal relationship between employee needs and organizational outcomes is essential for creating a positive and thriving work environment. Job demands and available resources contribute to emotional exhaustion, or burnout, and can either enhance or impede job performance (Kloutsiniotis & Mihail, 2020). Furthermore, it is necessary to acknowledge that employees' perceptions of their roles within an organization can vary, and this perception can substantially influence their emotional, mental, and physical welfare, potentially exacerbating the risk of burnout. This study seeks to explore the relationship between role clarity and burnout within the context of Tomo, the technology division of a Fortune 500 company, shedding light on the intricate dynamics that contribute to employee well-being and overall organizational performance.

### **Literature Review**

#### ***Role Clarity***

Role clarity is a crucial aspect of organizational psychology that refers to how employees understand their roles, responsibilities, and expectations within the workplace (Abraham et al.,

2022). Clear and well-defined roles reduce vagueness and uncertainty, contributing to a healthier work environment. It contrasts role ambiguity, characterized by uncertainty and lack of understanding regarding an individual's expectations, tasks, functions, and responsibilities in the workplace (Wu et al., 2019). Wu et al. (2019) emphasize that role ambiguity is a personal stressor, often leading individuals to depend more on supervisors and resulting in a heightened sense of burnout. This stressor is particularly problematic due to insufficient information required for motivation and success, as underlined by Schmidt et al. (2012).

Role clarity is paramount for employees to feel secure, establish meaningful goals, and experience satisfaction in accomplishing their responsibilities. Lind and van den Bos (2002) stress the need for roles to be well-defined and effectively communicated to employees. However, the implications of role clarity extend beyond the individual level, impacting the organization. Employees who lack role clarity are more susceptible to errors, incomplete tasks, and the inadvertent assumption of additional responsibilities, which can hinder productivity and overall organizational performance. Clear communication and defining roles are, therefore, essential for individual and collective success within an organization.

### ***Burnout***

Burnout, a widespread concern in contemporary workplaces, is characterized by persistent and prolonged work-related stress, leading to a range of adverse outcomes. This phenomenon is marked by decreased personal fulfillment, isolation from social relationships, and emotional exhaustion (Rožman & Tominc, 2019). Pioneer research conducted by Maslach (2011) has been instrumental in our understanding of burnout. Maslach's work resulted in developing the Maslach Burnout Inventory (MBI). This widely used tool identifies three key

dimensions of burnout: a) emotional exhaustion, b) depersonalization, and c) personal achievement.

**Emotional Exhaustion.** Emotional exhaustion, or burnout, is associated with complex and taxing work conditions (Maslach & Jackson, 1986). Distinguishing burnout from depression, it is suggested that symptoms might alleviate during periods of rest, such as holidays (Maslach, 2011). The measurement scale for burnout assesses feelings of being emotionally stretched thin and lacking emotional reserves. Role clarity plays a significant role in contributing to burnout, as research conducted by Li et al. (2023) reveals a positive connection between role conflict and the intention to leave a job, while increased job demands and reduced job resources are closely tied to burnout.

**Depersonalization.** Depersonalization is a component of burnout, involving a lack of empathy towards others, like clients or colleagues, and maintaining emotional distance, such as with cynical remarks and a general sense of callousness (Maslach, 2011). The scale used to measure this aspect assesses how impersonal someone's interactions are with those they serve, such as clients or patients. Depersonalization is characterized by an indifferent and distant attitude toward those one serves (Maslach & Jackson, 1986).

**Personal Achievement.** The personal achievement assessment in burnout evaluation plays a pivotal role in maintaining emotional balance amidst the challenges of exhaustion and depersonalization experienced in the workplace (Maslach, 2011). It serves as a vital mechanism to uphold a sense of fulfillment and positivity regarding one's professional accomplishments (Maslach & Jackson, 1986). The assessment aims to measure an individual's perceived competence and success in interactions with colleagues, clients, or patients, and recognizing

personal achievements can lead to satisfaction and motivation, thus mitigating the adverse effects of burnout (Li et al., 2023).

The consequences of burnout are far-reaching and have a detrimental impact on both individuals and organizations. Research conducted by Lee and Eissenstat (2018) unveiled a host of negative associations with burnout, including heightened risks of substance abuse, increased fatigue, exhaustion, persistent insomnia, heightened anxiety, depression, subpar job performance, elevated absenteeism rates, intentions to resign, higher turnover rates, diminished job satisfaction, and reduced commitment. Addressing burnout is imperative for maintaining a healthy and productive workforce and safeguarding the well-being of both employees and the organizations they serve.

### **Purpose Statement**

The existing literature provides compelling evidence of a positive relationship between role clarity and burnout. As underscored by Lee and Eissenstat (2018), a deficiency in employee role clarity can result in exhaustion, subsequently contributing to a decline in job performance. This correlation highlights the critical significance of understanding and effectively communicating roles within an organization to mitigate burnout and foster employee well-being. The primary objective of this study is to investigate and confirm the relationship between burnout and role clarity. By shedding light on this crucial interplay, the study aims to contribute valuable insights that can be used to inform organizational strategies, enhance employee satisfaction, and ultimately boost overall performance.

### **Research Question**

The following research question, null hypothesis, and alternative hypothesis will guide this study:

What is the relationship between role clarity and burnout for Tomo (the technology division of a Fortune 500 company)?

### ***Hypothesis***

H<sub>0</sub>: There is no relationship between role clarity and burnout for Tomo.

H<sub>A</sub>: There is a relationship between role clarity and burnout for Tomo.

### **Methodology**

This study employs a secondary dataset for conducting quantitative analysis. The subsequent sections will provide insights into the origin of the data, the selected variables, and the analytical methods employed to address the research question. To perform this analysis, STATA software (StataCorp, 2021) was used to compute descriptive statistics and Chi-Square analysis. STATA, a powerful statistical tool, facilitated the systematic examination of the dataset to draw meaningful conclusions.

### **Data**

This study harnessed longitudinal sample data derived from the comprehensive Work, Family, and Health Study (WFHS). The WFHS surveyed two Fortune 500 companies, namely Tomo and Leef. This research endeavor focused on analyzing the dataset about Tomo, an anonymized pseudonym denoting the information technology division within one of these companies. Tomo encompasses a broad organizational scope, comprising 26 sites, each divided into 56 study groups. These groups exhibit varying sizes, ranging from 7 to 60 employees, representing a diverse cross-section of corporate employees across 26 unique technology offices.

Data collection transpired over an extended period, from September 2009 to December 2012. The data acquisition process entailed multiple waves, spanning four distinct phases, including a baseline assessment (Wave 1) and subsequent assessments at 6-month intervals

(Wave 2 at six months, Wave 3 at 12 months, and Wave 4 at 18 months). This longitudinal approach enables us to capture and analyze the dynamics and changes in role clarity, burnout, and their interrelationship over time, providing a comprehensive view of their evolving connection within the organization.

## **Variables**

The researcher examined two primary categorical variables to address the research question: role clarity and burnout. These variables were carefully selected to explore the interplay between employees' perceptions of their roles and the experience of burnout within the organization. This strategic selection allows us to explore the relationship between these crucial factors and their impact on employee well-being and performance.

### ***Independent Variable***

In this study, the independent variable under scrutiny is role clarity. This categorical variable is derived from participants' responses to a specific question: "You know exactly what is expected of you on your job." This query is an integral component of the Michigan Organizational Assessment Questionnaire (MOAQ), a well-established instrument designed to assess employees' understanding of their job expectations (Cammann et al., 1983).

Participants conveyed their responses on a Likert scale that ranged from "1" (indicating Strongly Disagree) to "5" (indicating Strongly Agree). Notably, a score of "5" signifies a heightened level of role clarity, indicating that the employee clearly understands what is expected of them in their job role. This variable provides a quantifiable measure of the extent to which employees perceive their roles to be clearly defined and understood.

### ***Dependent Variable***



In this analysis, the dependent variable of paramount importance is burnout. Burnout, a multifaceted construct, was operationalized using a set of categorical variables gleaned from responses to three specific questions. These questions aimed to gauge the frequency with which participants experienced the following feelings:

- (a) "You feel emotionally drained from your work."
- (b) "You feel burned out by your work."
- (c) "You feel used up at the end of the workday."

These questions were adapted from the widely recognized Maslach Burnout Inventory (MBI), which comprises distinct dimensions encompassing emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and reduced personal accomplishment (Maslach & Jackson, 1986). It is important to note that this analysis focused solely on the emotional exhaustion subscale of the MBI.

Participants articulated their responses using a Likert scale that spanned from "1" (indicating Never) to "7" (indicating Every Day). This scale enabled participants to express the extent and frequency of their emotional experiences related to burnout, ranging from infrequent or rare occurrences (Never) to consistent and persistent feelings (Every day). These responses serve as the basis for assessing and understanding the presence and severity of emotional exhaustion, a core dimension of the broader construct of burnout.

### **Analytical Technique**

Descriptive statistics, a chi-square test, and a linear regression analysis will be conducted to answer the research question and examine burnout and role clarity. Analytical tools for analysis were selected due to variables being categorical variables.

### **Results**

## Descriptive Statistics

Descriptive statistics were calculated for each variable (role clarity and burnout questions 1-3). Presented in Table 1 are the mean, standard deviation, variance, min, max, and count of the sample. For burnout, question 1 (M = 4.37, SD = 1.61), question 2 (M = 3.79, SD = 1.67), and question three (M = 4.18, SD = 1.7) means represent responses for Likert response four (A few times a month) in feeling emotionally drained, burned out, and used up at the end of the day.

*Note: The median does not provide helpful information since responses are Likert Scale.*

**Table 1.** Summary Statistics Table (n =3,684)

Variable	Mean	Std. Dev.	Variance	Min	Max
Role Clarity	3.933	.861	.7405847	1	5
Burnout Q1	4.367	1.61	2.593418	-4	7
Burnout Q2	3.791	1.684	2.834934	1	7
Burnout Q3	4.179	1.707	2.914038	-4	7

## Quantitative Analysis

Quantitative analysis was conducted to answer the research question: What is the relationship between role clarity and burnout for Tomo? Exploratory attempts were made with chi-square analysis testing.

### *Chi-Square*

A chi-square analysis was conducted due to having two categorical variables and a research question to see if a relationship between role clarity and burnout exists. Results indicate a significance in the relationship between the two variables. A chi-squared test was done for each variable: burnout question one ( $X^2$  (28, N = 3,684) = 333.9863, p =0.000), critical value is 55.476, burnout question two ( $X^2$  (24, N = 3,684) = 478.6661, p =0.000), critical value is 49.728, and burnout question three ( $X^2$  (28, N = 3,684) = 336.875, p =0.000), critical value is 55.476.

The chi-squared probability is less than .05, at 0.00 for all questions. The null hypothesis is rejected since the critical values are less than the chi-square test statistics.

Burnout question one (Table 2) looked at participants feeling emotionally drained from their work and comparing with role clarity, the greatest association seen in this table were the participants who indicated experiencing burnout *a few times a month* (528) and *a few times a week* (488) and *agree* that they understand their role. This signifies that participants with role clarity experience burnout more often than those who do not know precisely what is expected from them. For those who experienced burnout every day, 107 participants agreed to understand their role, while 13 participants strongly disagreed with understanding their role (13) and experiencing burnout every day.

**Table 2.** Chi-square test of Role Clarity and Burnout Q1

Role Clarity	Burnout Q1							Total
	Never	A few times a year or less	Once a month or less	A few times a month	Once a week	A few times a week	Every day	
STRONGLY DISAGREE	0	1	1	2	1	12	13	30
DISAGREE	1	6	12	55	33	125	45	277
NEITHER	9	41	42	117	75	153	46	484
AGREE	52	250	303	528	282	488	107	2,011
STRONGLY AGREE	56	166	121	237	96	166	40	882
Total	118	464	479	939	487	944	251	3,684
Pearson chi2 (28) = 333.9863 Pr = 0.000								

Burnout question two (Table 3) examined participants feeling burned out by their work. Similar findings were found when comparing with role clarity, as in burnout question one table. Participants that expressed *agree* in understanding their role mostly experienced burnout *a few times a month* (472), the greatest correlation seen in this table. *Strongly disagree* was only selected by 30 total participants, with feelings of burnout mostly found under *every day* and zero participants indicating *never*.

**Table 3.** *Chi-square test of Role Clarity and Burnout Q2*

Role Clarity	Burnout Q2							Total
	Never	A few times a year or less	Once a month or less	A few times a month	Once a week	A few times a week	Every day	
STRONGLY DISAGREE	0	1	1	2	1	10	15	30
DISAGREE	5	16	32	50	38	102	34	277
NEITHER	23	50	81	115	63	116	36	484
AGREE	104	468	377	472	195	327	68	2,011
STRONGLY AGREE	105	276	149	165	64	96	27	882
Total	237	811	640	804	361	651	180	3,684

Pearson chi2 (24) = 478.6661 Pr = 0.000

Burnout question three looked at participants feeling used up at the end of the workday. Similar to burnout questions one and two chi-square tables, when comparing with role clarity, the greatest correlation was that the participants who agreed to understand their role mostly felt burnout *a few times a month* (490).

**Table 4.** *Chi-square test of Role Clarity and Burnout Q3*

Role Clarity	Burnout Q3							Total
	Never	A few times a year or less	Once a month or less	A few times a month	Once a week	A few times a week	Every day	
STRONGLY DISAGREE	0	0	1	4	0	12	13	30
DISAGREE	4	11	20	42	52	108	40	277
NEITHER	17	43	50	106	73	153	42	484
AGREE	100	290	350	490	239	418	124	2,011
STRONGLY AGREE	89	195	135	166	106	146	44	882
Total	210	539	556	808	470	837	263	3,684

Pearson chi2 (28) = 336.8750 Pr = 0.000

**Linear Regression**

Linear regressions were used to analyze the relationship between role clarity and each burnout question variable and are summarized in Tables 5, 6, and 7.

For role clarity and burnout question one (Table 5), role clarity explained a significant proportion of variance in burnout scores,  $R^2 = .06$ ,  $F(6, 3192) = 36.78$ ,  $p < .01$ . The person who responded "Never" Burned out is most likely to have role clarity. Moreover, as individuals progress through the categories from "a few times a year" to "Every day," the likelihood of experiencing role clarity diminishes. The person who responded "Every day" is 27% less likely to have role clarity than the person who "never" feels burned out.

**Table 5.** *Linear Regression Table for Role Clarity and Burnout Q1 (n =3,199)*

ROLE CLARITY	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
VARIABLES	coef	beta	se	ci
ROLE CLARITY				-
1. Burnout Q1	0	0	(0)	0 - 0
2. Few Times a Year or Less	-0.00737	-0.00848	(0.0306)	-0.0674 - 0.0527
3. Once a Month or Less	-0.0206	-0.0240	(0.0305)	-0.0804 - 0.0393
4. Few Times a Month	-0.0602**	-0.0893	(0.0291)	-0.117 - -0.00317
5. Once A Week	-0.0733**	-0.0834	(0.0307)	-0.134 - -0.0131
6. Few Times a Week	-0.164***	-0.240	(0.0291)	-0.221 - -0.107
7. Every day	-0.274***	-0.228	(0.0338)	-0.340 - -0.207
Constant	0.991***		(0.0273)	0.937 - 1.044
R-squared	0.065			

Standard errors in parentheses \*\*\*  $p < 0.01$ , \*\*  $p < 0.05$ , \*  $p < 0.1$

For role clarity and burnout question two (Table 6), role clarity explained a significant proportion of variance in burnout scores,  $R^2 = .07$ ,  $F(6, 3193) = 43.13$ ,  $p < .01$ . Like burnout question one, the person who responded "Never" Burned out is most likely to have role clarity. Categories from "a few times a year" to "Every day," the probability of role clarity decreases. The person who responded "Every day" is 32% less likely to have role clarity than the person who "never" feels burned out; the more role clarity, the less burnout. There is a stronger relationship between burnout question 2 and role clarity than burnout questions one and three.

**Table 6.** *Linear Regression Table for Role Clarity and Burnout Q2 (n =3,200)*

ROLE CLARITY	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
VARIABLES	coef	beta	se	ci
ROLE CLARITY				-
2. Few Times a Year or Less	0.00103	0.00148	(0.0219)	-0.0419 - 0.0439
3. Once a Month or Less	-0.0357	-0.0460	(0.0227)	-0.0802 - 0.00891
4. Few Times a Month	-0.0521**	-0.0727	(0.0221)	-0.0955 - -0.00871
5. Once A Week	-0.108***	-0.106	(0.0253)	-0.157 - -0.0578
6. Few Times a Week	-0.186***	-0.236	(0.0229)	-0.231 - -0.141
7. Every day	-0.317***	-0.223	(0.0305)	-0.377 - -0.257
Constant	0.977***		(0.0193)	0.939 - 1.015
R-squared	0.080			

Standard errors in parentheses \*\*\* p<0.01, \*\* p<0.05, \* p<0.1

For role clarity and burnout question three (Table 7), role clarity explained a significant proportion of variance in burnout scores,  $R^2 = .06$ ,  $F(6, 3192) = 31.09$ ,  $p < .01$ . The person who responded "Never" Burned out is most likely to have role clarity. Categories from "a few times a year" to "Every day," the probability of role clarity decreases. The person who responded "Every day" is 22% less likely to have role clarity than the person who "never" feels burned out.

**Table 7.** Linear Regression Table for Role Clarity and Burnout Q3 (n =3,199)

ROLE CLARITY	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
VARIABLES	coef	beta	se	ci
ROLE CLARITY				-
1 Burnout Q3	0	0	(0)	0 - 0
2. Few Times a Year or Less	-0.00145	-0.00178	(0.0243)	-0.0491 - 0.0462
3. Once a Month or Less	-0.0208	-0.0257	(0.0242)	-0.0683 - 0.0268
4. Few Times a Month	-0.0448*	-0.0630	(0.0233)	-0.0905 - 0.000873
5. Once A Week	-0.110***	-0.123	(0.0252)	-0.160 - -0.0609
6. Few Times a Week	-0.155***	-0.215	(0.0234)	-0.201 - -0.109
7. Every day	-0.219***	-0.189	(0.0282)	-0.274 - -0.164
Constant	0.979***		(0.0206)	0.939 - 1.020
R-squared	0.055			

Standard errors in parentheses \*\*\* p<0.01, \*\* p<0.05, \* p<0.1

## **Discussion**

The core objective of this study was to unravel and understand the intricate relationship between role clarity and burnout. The findings derived from the analysis provide substantial insights into this relationship. Notably, a noteworthy and statistically significant connection was observed between role clarity and the experience of burnout among the participants. One of the key observations from this analysis is that participants who indicated experiencing "Never" in terms of burnout were notably more likely to exhibit a heightened sense of role clarity. This finding suggests a strong, inverse relationship between the degree of role clarity and the occurrence of burnout. As participants' burnout experiences escalated from "a few times a year" to "Every day," the likelihood of having a well-defined role clarity decreased proportionally. In other words, as the frequency and severity of burnout increased, the participants were less likely to understand their organizational roles clearly. These results align closely with the existing literature, which consistently underscores the role of clarity in mitigating burnout. The literature review conducted in this study, as exemplified by Lee and Eissenstat (2018), consistently supports the notion that enhancing role clarity can serve as a valuable strategy for reducing burnout among employees.

The findings of this analysis shed light on the pivotal role of role clarity in promoting employee well-being and countering the adverse effects of burnout. They underscore the importance of clear role definitions and communication within organizations to address and prevent burnout. These insights are consistent with the existing body of research and highly relevant for organizations seeking to enhance employee satisfaction, performance, and overall organizational health.

## **Limitations and Future Research**

There were a few limitations to this study. First, the results of this study may not be generalized since the sample of participants included one technology organization. Second, the researcher did not have control over data quality. Third, questions for burnout were from the emotional exhaustion components of the MBI to assess burnout in this secondary dataset. Therefore, future research should incorporate more questions from MBI from the other MBI buckets (emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and reduced personal accomplishment) and replicate the study in other industries, such as healthcare. The benefits of suggested future research would assist with understanding the importance of role clarity in multiple sectors and predict burnout.

### **Conclusion**

This study delves into the critical relationship between role clarity and organizational burnout. Its objectives encompassed assessing the extent to which employees understand their role expectations, gauging the prevalence and severity of burnout, and elucidating the potential link between role clarity and burnout. The study involved a substantial sample of 3,684 participants, among whom 79% reported a strong understanding of their roles. The application of Chi-square analysis yielded compelling results, revealing a statistically significant relationship between role clarity and burnout, thus rejecting the null hypothesis. These findings emphasize the pivotal role of role clarity in mitigating burnout and enhancing the well-being of employees. This study offers invaluable insights that can inform organizational strategies to promote employee engagement, reduce burnout, and optimize overall performance.



## References

- Abraham, K. M., Erickson, P. S., Sata, M. J., & Lewis, S. B. (2022). Job satisfaction and burnout among peer support specialists: The contributions of supervisory mentorship, recovery-oriented workplaces, and role clarity. *Advances in Mental Health, 20*(1), 38–50.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/18387357.2021.1977667>
- Brhane, H. & Zewdie, S. (2018). A Literature Review on the Effects of Team Work on Enhancing Organizational Performance. *Journal of Business Management & Social Sciences Research, 7*, 91–97.
- Cammann, C., Fichman, M., Jenkins, G. D., & Klesh, J. (1983). Michigan Organizational Assessment Questionnaire. In S. E. Seashore, E. E. Lawler, P. H. Mirvis, & C. Cammann (Eds.), *Assessing organizational change: A guide to methods, measures, and practices* (pp. 71–138). New York, NY: Wiley-Interscience.
- Kloutsiniotis, P. V., & Mihail, D. M. (2020). Is it worth it? Linking perceived high-performance work systems and emotional exhaustion: The mediating role of job demands and job resources. *European Management Journal, 38*(4), 565–579.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.emj.2019.12.012>
- Lee, Y., & Eissenstat, S. J. (2018). A longitudinal examination of the causes and effects of burnout based on the job demands-resources model. *International Journal for Educational and Vocational Guidance, 18*(3), 337–354. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10775-018-9364-7>
- Lee, Y., & Kim, J.-N. (2017). Authentic enterprise, organization-employee relationship, and employee-generated managerial assets. *Journal of Communication Management, 21*.  
<https://doi.org/10.1108/JCOM-02-2017-0011>

- Li, H., Shi, W., Qian, Y., & Mo, J. (2023). Role Conflict and Turnover Intention among Chinese Social Workers: The Roles of Emotional Exhaustion and Job Autonomy. *Journal of Social Service Research*, 49(5), 607–617.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/01488376.2023.2254805>
- Lind, E. A., & van den Bos, K. (2002). *When fairness works: Toward a general theory of uncertainty management*. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 24, 181–223.  
[doi:10.1016/S0191-3085\(02\)24006-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0191-3085(02)24006-X)
- Maslach, C. (2011). *Burnout and engagement in the workplace: New perspectives: (544732013–003)* [Data set]. American Psychological Association.  
<https://doi.org/10.1037/e544732013-003>
- Maslach, C., & Jackson, S. (1986). *Maslach burnout inventory manual* (2nd ed.). Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Rožman, M., Grinkevich, A., & Tominc, P. (2019). Occupational Stress, Symptoms of Burnout in the Workplace and Work Satisfaction of the Age-diverse Employees. *Organizacija*, 52(1), 46–52. <https://doi.org/10.2478/orga-2019-0005>
- Schmidt, S., Roesler, U., Kusserow, T., & Rau, R. (2014). Uncertainty in the workplace: Examining role ambiguity and role conflict, and their link to depression—a meta-analysis. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 23(1), 91–106.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/1359432X.2012.711523>
- StataCorp. (2021). *Stata Statistical Software: Release 17*. College Station, TX: StataCorp LLC.
- Work, Family and Health Network. *Work, Family, and Health Study (WFHS)*. Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research. <https://doi.org/10.3886/ICPSR36158.v2>

Wu, T.-Y., Chung, P. F., Liao, H.-Y., Hu, P.-Y., & Yeh, Y.-J. (2019). Role ambiguity and economic hardship as the moderators of the relation between abusive supervision and job burnout: An Application of uncertainty management theory. *The Journal of General Psychology*, 146(4), 365–390. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00221309.2019.1585323>