



Examining the effect of work-life integration on burnout among Indonesian employees

Debora Glorya Kartini Nababan¹ and Aftina Nurul Husna¹

¹Faculty of Education and Psychology, Universitas Negeri Semarang, Semarang, Indonesia

ABSTRACT

Background: Burnout remains a critical occupational health issue in Indonesia. While previous studies often focus on static Work-Life Balance, modern workplace requires a dynamic Work-Life Integration (WLI) approach, yet dimensions mitigating burnout remain unclear.

Purpose: This study investigates how WLI affects employee burnout and identifies specific dimensions acting as protective factors or stressors, alongside demographic boundary conditions.

Method: A cross-sectional survey involved 355 employees ($M_{age} = 32.08$, $SD = 10$; 67.9% male and 32.1% female) across Western, Central, and Eastern Indonesia. Data were collected using the Maslach-Trisni Burnout Inventory ($\alpha = .916$) and transadapted Work-Life Indicator Scale with internal consistency for WLI dimensions ranging from $\alpha = .664$ to $.837$. Regression and correlation analyses were conducted using SPSS and Multigroup Analysis (PLS-MGA) using SmartPLS.

Findings: Multidimensional WLI predicts burnout ($R^2 = 17.6\%$). Work Identity ($b = -.269$) and Boundary Control ($b = -.131$) protect against burnout, whereas Non-Work Interrupting Work acts as a stressor. PLS-MGA reveals that Work Interrupting Non-work intensifies burnout specifically among permanent and single employees.

Implications: This study highlights the roles of Work Identity and Boundary Control in mitigating burnout, while identifying Non-Work Interrupting Work as a stressor. Organizations should strengthen professional development, boundary autonomy, and distraction management to promote employee well-being.

KEYWORDS

Work-life integration; burnout; boundary control; work identity

ARTICLE HISTORY

Received 27 December 2025

Revised 14 May 2026

Accepted 9 October 2026

Introduction

Burnout is a global phenomenon recognized by the WHO as a syndrome caused by chronic work stress that has not been successfully managed (World Health Organization, 2019). Freudenberger (1975) was the first to use the term “burnout” to describe emotional exhaustion and loss of motivation at work. Subsequently, Maslach et al. (2001) reinforced, developed, and formalized this concept into a multidimensional theoretical framework that is still widely used today. Maslach defines burnout as “a psychological syndrome in response to chronic interpersonal stressors on the job, characterized by three key dimensions: overwhelming exhaustion, feelings of cynicism and detachment from the job, and a sense of ineffectiveness and lack of accomplishment” (Maslach et al., 2001). The phenomenon of burnout has become one of the occupational health issues that has received increasing global attention over the past two decades. According to the World Health Organization (WHO), burnout is included in the International Classification of Diseases (ICD-11) as a phenomenon of work fatigue, but it is not categorized as a medical condition. Mental and emotional exhaustion and decreased self-esteem are signs of long-term fatigue (Sujanah et al., 2021).

The prevalence of burnout at the global level is quite alarming. Globally, research on burnout has been conducted extensively in the health, education, and corporate sectors, with

consistent findings that burnout has a negative impact on performance and mental health (Maslach et al., 2001). Longitudinal studies show that burnout is associated with the intention to leave work and decreased satisfaction (Bakker & Costa, 2014). A Southeast Asian study of 4,338 full-time workers found that 62.91% of respondents reported high or very high levels of burnout, with the highest rates in the Philippines at 70.71% and Singapore at 66.84% (Aziz & Ong, 2024). Additionally, a global survey of office workers revealed that approximately 44% of respondents reported experiencing high daily stress and burnout due to constant work pressure (Gallup, 2023). This fact confirms that burnout is not only an individual problem but also a systemic issue in the modern workplace.

In Indonesia, a similar phenomenon has been observed with an equally high prevalence. A review of the literature shows that the prevalence of burnout among Indonesian healthcare workers prior to the pandemic ranged from approximately 19.8% to 62.85%, depending on the location and research method (Simbolon & Bashabih, 2023). Burnout can occur in various types of jobs, but the most vulnerable professions are those with high emotional demands, long working hours, and high work pressure. Previous research on burnout has focused on human service professions such as nurses and teachers, where they are considered most vulnerable to burnout. However, burnout is not limited to social service professions but also spreads to other professions such as bank employees and managers (Soelton et al., 2022).

Research in Indonesia consistently shows that burnout is a cross-sectoral phenomenon, affecting professionals in education, healthcare, manufacturing, agriculture, and other industries. Reported prevalence rates are generally high, averaging above 40% and in some contexts reaching 80–100%. Such figures highlight the severity of burnout as an occupational health concern, underlining its potential to increase turnover and absenteeism while diminishing productivity and overall organizational effectiveness (Bakker & Costa, 2014; Lamuri et al., 2023; Soelton et al., 2022; Palupi & Pandjaitan, 2022).

Burnout is described as a psychological syndrome that arises as a prolonged response to chronic workplace stress (World Health Organization, 2019). It is further explained as consisting of emotional exhaustion (feelings of being emotionally overextended and drained by one's work), depersonalization (a negative, excessively detached response toward recipients of one's service or care), and lack of personal accomplishment (feelings of incompetence and lack of achievement at work) (Demerouti, 2024; Maslach et al., 2001). This shows that burnout is a complex condition that develops when work stress becomes persistent and unmanaged.

Burnout is distinct from stress, depression, and ordinary fatigue. While stress is typically a short-term response to external demands, burnout reflects a prolonged and unmanaged condition that emerges when such stress becomes chronic (work stress that is persistent, recurring, and unresolved) (Salvagioni et al., 2017; World Health Organization, 2019). Unlike depression, which often involves pervasive feelings of hopelessness and loss of interest in nearly all aspects of life, burnout is specifically tied to the occupational context and is characterized by exhaustion, cynicism, and reduced professional efficacy (Koutsimani et al., 2019). Similarly, ordinary fatigue is largely physical and can be alleviated by adequate rest, whereas burnout persists even after rest, since emotional exhaustion represents only one of its dimensions (Bianchi, 2018).

Burnout does not appear suddenly, but develops from an accumulation of stressors originating from work demands and personal life. From a work perspective, burnout is often triggered by high workloads, time pressure, role conflicts, emotional demands, lack of control over work, and minimal support from supervisors or organizations (Bakker & Costa, 2014; Demerouti, 2024; Li et al., 2025). Meanwhile, from a personal life perspective, stressors can

include family responsibilities, financial pressure, poor sleep quality, and difficulties in maintaining a balance between work and personal life (He et al., 2025). If these various stressors persist without adequate coping mechanisms, they will cause chronic tension that depletes an individual's emotional, cognitive, and physical resources, ultimately triggering burnout (Demerouti, 2024).

The development of stressors into burnout can be explained through the dynamic interaction between an individual and their environment (Afonso et al., 2022). Stress is not only viewed as an automatic response, but also as a process of cognitive assessment and continuous coping efforts. When demands from work or personal life are evaluated (primary appraisal) as threatening and individuals perceive their coping resources (secondary appraisal) as insufficient, the situation generates prolonged stress that may eventually develop into burnout. Thus, burnout is not solely the result of work & life conditions, but rather a failure in the appraisal process that is not supported by effective coping strategies. In this context, work-life integration is positioned as a behavioral approach that reflects how individuals manage and navigate these demands in everyday life (de Cordova et al., 2024).

According to Lazarus and Folkman (in Ghaffari et al., 2021), there are two types of coping strategies. Problem-focused coping (PFC) strategies attempt to eliminate or change the source of stress, while emotion-regulation coping strategies are ways of dealing with stress triggers by focusing on changing the way a person thinks or feels about a situation or something. Zhang et al. (2023) found that PFC is more effective in reducing work stress and burnout risk than emotion-focused coping (EFC), as this strategy allows individuals to actively seek solutions or instrumental support to overcome sources of stress. PFC strategies can help reduce burnout through concrete steps such as effective time management, sharing responsibilities, and reorganizing the boundaries between work and personal life to remain flexible yet controlled (Bruschwein & Gettle, 2020). This approach can be realized through boundary management and work-nonwork balance crafting practices, which enable individuals to allocate their time, energy, and attention more evenly so that work pressure does not develop into burnout (Kerksieck et al., 2024). In conclusion, among the various forms, the most relevant strategy for the current generation, which tends to be flexible, is the boundary crafting approach, as it is closely related to the concept of Work-Life Integration (WLI) (Adisa et al., 2022).

WLI is an approach to role management that emphasizes the interconnectedness and synergy between the domains of work and personal life, so that the two are not viewed as completely separate entities, but rather as areas that can support and enrich each other (Kossek et al., 2012). WLI is a concept that enables individuals to manage the demands of work and personal life simultaneously to improve well-being, with the view that the two can support each other (Rachmawati & Santoso, 2021). According to Greenhaus and Allen (2011), WLI is a process in which individuals create ways to combine and adapt to the demands of work and personal life so that both can run in harmony. In this context, WLI serves as a crucial form of coping, as it allows employees to manage work demands and personal life in a more balanced manner. This integration not only provides additional resources but also increases positive appraisal of stressors, thereby reducing the risk of chronic stress developing into burnout (Kossek et al., 2012).

WLI is conceptually distinct from the traditional framework of Work-Life Balance (WLB). While WLB is defined as an individual's perception that work and non-work activities are compatible and promote growth in accordance with current life priorities (Kalliath & Brough, 2008, as cited in Gragnano et al., 2020), WLB frameworks often suffer from a tendency to adopt a "one-size-fits-all" approach that neglects individual differences in job roles and personal

circumstances (Yadav et al., 2022). In contrast, WLI focuses on a more fluid and integrative approach where these domains support and enrich each other (Kossek et al., 2012). Prioritizing WLI over WLB in this study is based on the premise that contemporary employment demands a dynamic role fusion rather than a static, generalized division of time. This integrative approach provides flexibility in managing professional and personal needs, which is essential to foster well-being and prevent chronic stress from escalating into burnout (Idrus, 2024; Spurk & Straub, 2020).

Several experts have defined work-life integration (WLI) and proposed its aspects. According to Chauhan & Rai (2024), WLI is divided into five aspects, namely individual and self, work and career, home and family, community and relationships, and health and well-being. Meanwhile, Bulut et al. (2024), through qualitative studies, identified five main aspects, namely workplace flexibility, support networks, personal well-being, career advancement, and work-life conflict. However, among these various frameworks, the researchers chose to use the aspects proposed by Kossek et al. (2012). The aspects of WLI according to Kossek initially include: a) segmentation–integration, which refers to the extent to which individuals separate or combine work and personal life roles; b) flexibility, which is the degree of freedom in arranging when, where, and how work is done; and c) permeability, which is the extent to which demands from one domain (work or family) can enter another domain.

Furthermore, Kossek developed these aspects into five operational dimensions in his measurement scale, namely Non-Work Interrupting Work (NIW), which refers to behaviors where personal needs interrupt work tasks; Work Interrupting Non-Work (WIN), capturing behaviors where work demands interrupt personal time; Boundary Control (BC), defined as the individual's perceived control over boundary crossings; Work Identity (WI), reflecting the centrality of the career role in one's self-concept; and Family Identity (FI), which indicates the importance of family or non-work roles to the individual. Researchers chose Kossek's framework because this model can be applied across cultures, professions, and generations, and its dimensions are fundamental to understanding integration behaviors, role identity, conflict, enrichment, and boundary control/flexibility (Kossek et al., 2012).

Various studies show that Work-Life Integration (WLI) has a positive relationship with psychological well-being and job satisfaction, and plays a protective role against burnout. Referring to Maslach's definition of burnout as a psychological syndrome resulting from chronic work stress characterized by exhaustion, cynicism, and reduced self-efficacy (Maslach et al., 2001), satisfaction with WLI has been shown to reduce symptoms of emotional exhaustion and depersonalization. Longitudinal studies on doctors and research on nurses confirm that although high workloads remain a risk factor, satisfaction with WLI can significantly reduce these negative effects (Shanafelt et al., 2022). Thus, WLI not only functions as a coping mechanism but also as a crucial source of resilience in maintaining work-life balance and preventing burnout.

Although various international studies have consistently shown a negative relationship between work-life balance (WLB) satisfaction and work-related fatigue, research in Indonesia remains relatively limited. Most studies here have thoroughly examined the relationship between work-life balance (WLB) and work fatigue across various sectors such as corporations, services, and manufacturing (Galis et al., 2022; Hasanah et al., 2023; Mauliddiyah & Widyastuti, 2025). These findings confirm that a balance between work and personal life can reduce work fatigue; however, the WLB approach tends to be static and does not sufficiently capture the dynamics of modern workplaces. WLI emerges as both a critique and a solution offering an integrative perspective; unfortunately, WLI research in Indonesia remains very scarce and generally treats integration as a single, unidimensional concept (Rizki, 2025). Therefore, the urgency of this study

is to fill this gap by examining WLI in a multidimensional manner. Unlike previous studies that tend to oversimplify the work-life relationship, this study dissects the specific dimensions of the framework proposed by Kossek et al. (2012).

Given these considerations, there is an urgent need for comprehensive research examining the relationship between work-life integration (WLI) and burnout among employees across the geographical locations of Indonesia. This study aims to fill this gap, while also providing theoretical contributions by expanding the understanding of protective mechanisms against burnout, as well as practical contributions for organizations in designing HR policies that are more responsive to the needs of employees in Indonesia. Based on this rationale, this study proposes two hypotheses. First, work-life integration mitigates burnout. Second, each dimension of work-life integration will have a different effect on burnout. Thus, this study is expected to identify which aspects of WLI play the most significant role in helping to overcome burnout.

Method

Research Design

This study employed a quantitative approach with a cross-sectional survey design to examine the influence of Work-Life Integration (WLI) on burnout among employees. The research model consists of WLI as the independent variable and job burnout as the dependent variable. WLI is operationalized based on the framework by Kossek et al. (2012), defined as the extent to which individuals integrate their personal and professional lives, which is reflected in five dimensions: non-work interrupting work (NIW), work interrupting non-work (WIN), boundary control (BC), work identity (WI), and family identity (FI) (Kossek et al., 2012). Meanwhile, burnout is operationalized as a psychological syndrome characterized by three key dimensions: emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and reduced personal accomplishment (Maslach et al., 2001).

Participants

This study involved employees from various industrial sectors in Indonesia. The inclusion criteria were individuals who were: (1) currently employed with any work arrangement (full-time, contract, remote, etc.); (2) aged 20 years or older; (3) had a minimum work tenure of one year at their current company; and (4) regardless of marital status.

The sampling technique utilized was non-probability sampling using a convenience sampling based on three geographical strata: Western, Central, and Eastern Indonesia, to ensure cross-regional representation (Wang, 2024). This approach was selected due to practical research constraints, including limited time, access, and resources to reach the entire national workforce, alongside the fact that the population is classified as an infinite population, as the exact number of the population cannot be determined with certainty. The minimum sample size was determined using G*Power 3.1 software (Faul et al., 2009), which indicated that 115 respondents were required to achieve a statistical power of .80 with a significance level of .05 and a medium effect size. In practice, a total of 358 responses were initially collected. Following a rigorous data screening process, 3 responses were excluded due to indications of unengaged responses (e.g., displaying patterned answers or straight-lining), which compromised the data quality. Consequently, the final valid sample size used for analysis was 355 respondents, which still exceeds the minimum requirement calculated by G*Power.

Instruments

Burnout was measured using the Maslach-Trisni Burnout Inventory (M-TBI), originally developed by Maslach & Jackson (1981) and adapted to the Indonesian context by

Widhianingtanti & van Luijtelaar (2022). This instrument comprises 22 items measuring three core dimensions of burnout: emotional exhaustion, depersonalization (cynicism), and reduced personal accomplishment. Responses were recorded on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). The instrument demonstrated excellent internal consistency with a Cronbach's Alpha of .916. Construct validity testing confirmed that the items possessed adequate item-total correlations, indicating the instrument's suitability for assessing burnout among Indonesian employees.

The Work-Life Indicator Scale (WLIS) was adapted to ensure semantic and cultural equivalence within the Indonesian context. The translation process involved two independent reviewers with international academic backgrounds in Psychology and Human Development who conducted the forward and back translation. Subsequently, the translated version was subjected to expert judgment by a senior academic in Psychology to establish content validity. The validation focused on evaluating the items for linguistic clarity, cultural appropriateness for the Indonesian workforce, and conceptual alignment with the original constructs by Kossek et al. (2012). Feedback from this expert review was synthesized to refine the phrasing, resulting in the final Indonesian version of the scale.

In addition, to better reflect the local communication context, several contextual adjustments were incorporated; for instance, the original item "I respond to personal communications (e.g., emails, texts, and phone calls) during work" was adapted to "*Saya membalas komunikasi pribadi (misalnya email, WhatsApp, dan telepon) selama bekerja.*" To evaluate the psychometric properties of the adapted scale, a scale validation study involving 216 respondents was subsequently conducted. During this validation phase and the subsequent Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA), a total of nine items were excluded from the final model. These items were dropped not only due to poor empirical fit indicators within the statistical structural model but also based on their conceptual characteristics. Substantively, the contents of these specific items were deemed non-essential to the core construct, and theoretically, their underlying indicators could be sufficiently backed up and represented by the remaining items in the scale.

Therefore, their removal was fully justified to ensure measurement precision without compromising the theoretical integrity of the dimensions. Following the exclusion of these items, the final structural model demonstrated an empirical fit, yielding a Comparative Fit Index (CFI) value of .913, an Incremental Fit Index (IFI) value of .915, and an RMSEA value of .057, which is well below the .08 threshold. Furthermore, the analysis showed good internal consistency across all five final dimensions: Non-Work Interrupting Work ($\alpha = .707$), Work Interrupting Non-Work ($\alpha = .811$), Boundary Control ($\alpha = .837$), Work Identity ($\alpha = .664$), and Family Identity ($\alpha = .696$). All remaining items had significant factor loadings ($p < .001$), thus ensuring the scale's structural validity. Similar to the burnout scale, items were scored on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree).

Data Analysis

Data analysis was performed systematically following a structured process. The initial stage involved data preparation and data cleaning; a total of 358 initial responses were screened, resulting in the exclusion of three unengaged responses due to patterned or straight-lining answers to ensure data quality, leaving 355 valid responses for final evaluation. Following the cleaning process, classical assumption tests were conducted to verify that the data met the requirements for linear regression. This phase included testing for normality, linearity, heteroscedasticity, and multicollinearity, which was diagnosed via Tolerance and Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) values. Subsequently, hypothesis testing was carried out using multiple

linear regression analysis to evaluate two structural models: Model 1 tested the global total score of Work-Life Integration (WLI) against burnout, while Model 2 applied a multi-dimensional approach treating the five individual dimensions of WLI as multiple predictors against burnout. In both models, the coefficient of determination (R^2) was calculated to determine the percentage of variance in burnout explained by the predictors, while the F-test was used to assess the overall model fit, and the t-test evaluated the partial significance of each dimension. Prior to the regression, a bivariate correlation analysis (Pearson's r) was performed to map the baseline interrelationships between the dimensions. Additionally, independent t-tests were conducted to explore variations across demographic characteristics. All statistical computations and data management were executed using IBM SPSS Statistics version 25 for Windows. Additionally, Partial Least Squares Multigroup Analysis (PLS-MGA) was performed using SmartPLS 4 with a nonparametric bootstrapping approach (5,000 resamples, $p < .05$) to evaluate path coefficient differences across gender, employment status, and marital status.

Result

The results of the descriptive analysis, presented in **Table 1**, show the profile of the participants in this study. The sample was dominated by male respondents (67.9%) and centered on the productive age group of 26–50 years (57.7%), reflecting the current demographics of the Indonesian workforce. In terms of employment, most participants worked in the industrial sector (68.7%), with a significant proportion having permanent (full-time) employment status (43.4%). The majority of respondents were in the early to mid-stage of their careers, as indicated by their length of service of less than 10 years (a combined 73.5% for durations of less than 10 years). Geographically, the sample was concentrated in Western Indonesia (68.7%), and a slight majority of respondents were married (53.5%).

Table 1.
Demographic of Respondents

Category	<i>n</i>	%
Gender		
Male	241	67.9
Female	114	32.1
Age		
≤ 25 years	124	34.9
26-50 years	205	57.7
50-60 years	26	7.3
Employment Sector		
Industrial	244	68.7
Healthcare	35	9.8
Mining	18	5.1
Shipping	13	3.6
Others	45	12.8
Employment Status		
Permanent (Full-time)	154	43.4
Contract (Fixed-term)	96	27.0
Outsourcing	92	25.9
Others	13	3.7
Tenure		
<2 years	111	31.3
3-5 years	97	27.3
6-10 years	53	14.9
11-20 years	44	12.4
>20 years	50	14.1

Table 1.
Demographic of Respondents

Category	<i>n</i>	%
Region of Indonesia		
Western Indonesia (Sumatra, Java, and surrounding areas)	244	68.7
Central Indonesia (Kalimantan, Bali, Nusa Tenggara)	57	16.1
Eastern Indonesia (Sulawesi, Maluku, Papua)	54	15.2
Marital Status		
Single	161	45.4
Married	190	53.5
Divorced	4	1.1

Descriptive statistical analysis provides an overview of the distribution of average scores on the main variables and their dimensions. Based on data processing, the average burnout score among respondents was 49.84 ($SD = 11.05$), while in the Work-Life Integration (WLI) variable, the Work Interrupting Non-Work (WIN) dimension recorded the highest average score ($M = 13.06$; $SD = 3.85$) and the Family Identity (FI) dimension had the lowest average ($M = 7.01$; $SD = 1.70$). This indicates that respondents tend to experience work interruptions to their personal time more often than the other dimensions.

In addition to the descriptive overview above, the analysis continued with a Pearson correlation test to detect the direction and strength of the relationship between the variables studied. Specifically, the Non-Work Interrupting Work (NIW) dimension was found to have a correlation coefficient (r) value with burnout, but the strength of the relationship was relatively low ($r = .191$, $p < .01$). This finding implies that personal matters interfering with work contribute to burnout, but the contribution is not significant. Conversely, a significant negative relationship was shown by the Work Identity (WI) dimension ($r = -.351$), Boundary Control (BC) ($r = -.248$), and Family Identity (FI) ($r = -.223$), which means that the higher the score on these aspects, the lower the level of burnout experienced. Meanwhile, the Work Interrupting Non-work dimension did not show a significant correlation with burnout. A summary of the results of the descriptive statistical analysis and correlations between variables is presented in full in **Table 2** below.

Table 2.
Descriptive Statistics and Correlation Between Variables and Dimensions

Variable	Min	Max	M	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6
Burnout (Y)	22	83	49.84	11.05	-					
WLI (X)	23	70	42.44	6.40	-.131*	-				
NIW	3	15	7.43	2.63	.191**	.550**	-			
WIN	5	25	13.06	3.85	.008	.752**	.309**	-		
BC	3	10	7.86	1.65	-.248**	.288**	-.134*	-.083	-	
WI	2	10	7.08	1.66	-.351**	.548**	-.089	.251**	.276**	-
FI	2	10	7.01	1.70	-.223**	.398**	.038	-.075	.241**	.387**

Note. WLI = Work-Life Integration; NIW = Non-work Interrupting Work; WIN = Work Interrupting Non-work; BC = Boundary Control; WI = Work Identity; FI = Family Identity; M = Mean; SD = Standard Deviation; * = $p < .05$; ** = $p < .01$

The research hypothesis was tested using regression analysis techniques specifically designed to evaluate two different measurement models. This approach was applied to compare

the predictive effectiveness of using variables globally versus in detail. Model 1 was established to test the effect of variable X (WLI) on Y (Burnout) using a total score approach, where researchers calculated the total score of X as a single predictor. Meanwhile, Model 2 utilized a multi-dimensional approach, where researchers calculated the individual scores of each WLI dimension to serve as multiple predictors. By testing these dimensions simultaneously against variable Y, the model aimed to identify which specific facets of integration have the most significant impact on burnout, rather than assuming a uniform influence from a total score.

In Model 1 testing (using total scores from the WLI), the results of the analysis showed that the WLI as a whole had a significant effect on burnout, but its predictive power was very limited ($R = .131$; $R^2 = .017$; $F = 6.141$; with $p = .014$ ($p < .05$). Although this model is appropriate (fit), the value of the coefficient of determination (R^2) is very small, only .017. This means that the use of the total WLI score can only explain 1.7% of the variance in burnout, implying that there are other factors that have a greater contribution in influencing burnout. Model 2 shows an increase in effect when the five dimensions are treated as independent predictors ($R = .420$; $R^2 = .176$; $F = 14.956$ dengan $p = <.001$). The coefficient of determination value was obtained (R^2) as large as .176, which means that the WLI dimensions are able to explain 17.6% of the variance in the burnout variable. The results of the analysis can be seen in **Table 3**.

Partial testing revealed varying dynamics of influence among the five predictors, with three being effective: Non-Work Interrupting Work ($\beta = .150$; $t = 2.841$ dengan $p = .005$); Work Identity ($\beta = -.269$; $t = -4.623$ with $p < .001$) and Boundary Control ($\beta = -.131$; $t = -2.530$ dengan $p = .012$). On the other hand, the other two dimensions (Work Interrupting Non-Work and Family Identity) shows no effect ($p > .05$). Of the three dimensions that proved effective, two dimensions (Work Identity and Boundary Control) showed a negative direction in line with the research hypothesis (reducing burnout), while the Non-Work Interrupting Work dimension showed a positive relationship. This implies that personal matters that intrude into working hours have only a very limited impact; these interruptions exist, but their contribution to increased burnout is relatively small compared to the mitigating effect of work identity factors.

According to the statistical test results in **Table 4** below, the Work Identity dimension was identified as the variable with the most dominant negative influence. This finding indicates that the stronger an employee's professional identity, the more effective it serves as a protective factor against the development of work fatigue. In addition, the Boundary Control dimension was also proven to be effective in mitigating burnout symptoms, which confirms the importance of having full control over work boundaries.

Table 3.

Results of Regression Analysis of Work-Life Integration on Burnout

Model	R	R ²	Adj.R ²	Std. Error	F	p
1	.131	.017	.014	10.968	6.141	.014
2	.420	.176	.165	10.097	14.956	<.001

Note. Model 1, involving predictor X as the total score. Model 2, dimensions X as predictors

Table 4.*Multiple Linear Regression Analysis of WLI Dimension on Burnout*

Variable/ Dimension	Unstandardized Coefficients (B)	Standardized Coefficients (β)	t	p	Description
(Constant)	68.527	-	17.124	<.001	-
NIW	.629	.150	2.841	.005	Significant (+)
WIN	-.033	.011	.205	.838	n.s
BC	-.880	-.131	-2.530	.012	Significant (-)
WI	-1.788	-.269	-4.623	<.001	Significant (-)
FI	-.601	-.092	-1.682	.093	n.s

Note. NIW = Nonwork Interrupting Work.; WIN = Work Interrupting Nonwork; BC = Boundary Control; WI = Work Identity; FI = Family Identity

To examine potential variations across demographic profiles, a Partial Least Squares Multigroup Analysis (PLS-MGA) was conducted. The analysis evaluated structural path differences across gender (Male vs. Female), employment status (Permanent vs. Contract), and marital status (Married vs. Single). The detailed comparison across demographic groups is presented in **Table 5**.

Across gender categories, the influence of all five WLI dimensions on burnout remained similar between male and female employees ($p > .05$). For instance, while Work Identity (WI) yielded negative values for both males ($\beta = -.295$) and females ($\beta = -.230$), the resulting gap ($\Delta\beta = -.065$, $p = .672$) confirms that gender does not alter the strength of this relationship.

In terms of employment status, a clear group divergence emerged for the Work Interrupting Non-work (WIN) dimension ($\Delta\beta = .418$, $p = .002$). Interruptions from work into personal life increased burnout among permanent staff ($\beta = .242$), whereas contract personnel showed a negative value ($\beta = -.176$). For all other dimensions—BC, FI, WI, and NIW—the results were nearly identical regardless of employment type ($p > .05$).

Regarding marital status, a statistically meaningful group contrast was observed for the WIN dimension ($\Delta\beta = -.253$, $p = .038$). Specifically, work-to-family interruptions heightened burnout among single employees ($\beta = .158$), whereas married staff exhibited a slightly inverse pattern ($\beta = -.095$). Across the remaining WLI dimensions—BC, FI, WI, and NIW—no notable differences were detected between married and single personnel ($p > .05$).

Table 5.*PLS-MGA Results of WLI Dimensions on Burnout Across Demographic Groups*

Category	Predictor	β Group 1	β Group 2	$\Delta\beta$	p-value	Conclusion
Gender		Male	Female			
	BC	-.123	-.120	-.003	.979	Not Significant
	FI	-.098	-.051	-.047	.746	Not Significant
	WI	-.295	-.230	-.065	.672	Not Significant
	WIN	-.042	.142	-.184	.138	Not Significant
	NIW	-.199	.064	.135	.259	Not Significant
Employment Status		Permanent	Contract			
	BC	-.290	-.045	-.244	.073	Not Significant

Table 5.

PLS-MGA Results of WLI Dimensions on Burnout Across Demographic Groups

Category	Predictor	β Group 1	β Group 2	$\Delta\beta$	p-value	Conclusion
	FI	-.068	-.114	.046	.754	Not Significant
	WI	-.151	-.294	.142	.336	Not Significant
	WIN	.242	-.176	.418	.002	Significant
	NIW	.173	.231	-.058	.656	Not Significant
Marital Status		Married	Single			
	BC	-.163	-.102	-.061	.605	Not Significant
	FI	-.112	-.075	-.038	.765	Not Significant
	WI	-.347	-.175	-.171	.237	Not Significant
	WIN	-.095	.158	-.253	.038	Significant
	NIW	.082	.234	-.152	.200	Not Significant

Note. NIW = Nonwork Interrupting Work.; WIN = Work Interrupting Nonwork; BC = Boundary Control; WI = Work Identity; FI = Family Identity; $\Delta\beta$ = Path Difference

To explore the specific linear structures at the interdimensional level, a complementary bivariate analysis was performed. A bivariate Pearson correlation was conducted to examine the specific relationships between the dimensions of Work-Life Integration (NIW, WIN, BC, WI, FI) and Burnout (EX, PA, CY) across all respondents (N=355). The results indicated that none of the Work-Life Integration dimensions had a significant linear correlation with any of the Burnout dimensions, as all Sig. (2-tailed) values exceeded the $\alpha = .05$ threshold, specifically for Exhaustion (NIW: $p=.735$; WIN: $p=.358$; BC: $p=.051$; WI: $p=.702$; FI: $p=.714$), Personal Accomplishment (NIW: $p=.413$; WIN: $p=.673$; BC: $p=.659$; WI: $p=.383$; FI: $p=.739$), and Cynicism (NIW: $p=.613$; WIN: $p=.353$; BC: $p=.958$; WI: $p=.955$; FI: $p=.877$).

Aligned with these findings, integrating these multigroup results with the main structural model shows that the overall relationship between WLI dimensions and burnout is largely consistent across the entire sample. Most WLI dimensions show weak or non-significant effects regardless of demographic differences. However, the MGA reveals an important exception regarding Work Interrupting Non-work (WIN). Rather than affecting all employees equally, work interruptions into personal life increase burnout specifically among permanent and single employees, while contract and married employees show no such negative reaction. This indicates that employment stability and marital status act as key conditions that shape how work-life interruptions impact employee burnout.

Discussion

In empirical terms, this study successfully demonstrates that Work-Life Integration (WLI) plays a significant role in predicting employee burnout, with the multidimensional approach offering a substantially higher explanatory power than the global total score model. When dissected multidimensionally, the findings reveal varying structural dynamics across the five distinct WLI dimensions, which can be categorized into three distinct outcomes: significant negative predictors, non-significant predictors, and a significant positive predictor. Specifically, Work Identity and Boundary Control emerged as significant negative predictors that effectively mitigate burnout. Conversely, Work Interrupting Non-Work and Family Identity showed no significant effect on burnout levels. Most notably, Non-Work Interrupting Work displayed a contradictory trend, operating as a significant positive predictor that escalates burnout.

This variation reinforces that the protective effect against burnout is not driven by aggregate integration scores but by distinct behavioral facets, thereby challenging the generalizations of previous studies (Shanafelt et al., 2022). The specific effectiveness of Work Identity and Boundary Control as protective factors confirms that role integration mitigates work fatigue only when backed by psychological alignment and personal agency, representing the achievement of 'synergy' within the balance crafting framework (Kerksieck et al., 2024). Psychologically, Work Identity functions as an internal cognitive anchor; when employees highly value their professional role within their self-concept, it creates a sense of purpose that replenishes emotional resources, thereby blocking the resource depletion stage of burnout.

This dominant buffering effect aligns with the findings of Li et al. (2025), which highlight that a robust professional identity allows high workloads to be interpreted as positive challenges rather than threatening stressors. Parallel to this, Boundary Control operates as a vital psychological shield, providing a sense of autonomy over role transitions. This perceived control minimizes the anxiety caused by unpredictable boundary crossings, allowing individuals to mentally detach from professional stressors during non-work hours, which directly prevents chronic emotional exhaustion from escalating into burnout. These findings strongly support the foundational principles of Boundary Theory (Ashfort et al., 2000) and echo empirical evidence from Vaziri et al. (2020), Allen et al. (2021), and Rapp et al. (2021), proving that active boundary management tactics serve as strategic coping mechanisms superior to simply allowing roles to merge without a clear strategy (Bruschwein & Gettle, 2020).

In contrast to the protective factors, the statistical insignificance of Work Interrupting Non-Work (WIN) and Family Identity (FI) challenges traditional assumptions regarding the inherent toxicity of role blurring. Descriptively, although respondents frequently report experiencing work interruptions during their personal time, this dynamic does not directly translate into occupational burnout. From a demographic and social role perspective, since the majority of the participants are within their prime productive ages and early-to-mid career stages, they are predominantly situated in the career establishment phase (Yunita & Melsan, 2023).

At this developmental juncture, a strong orientation toward self-development allows work intrusion to be interpreted adaptively as a necessary career investment rather than a burdensome stressor. Similarly, the lack of significant impact from Family Identity implies that the psychological weight placed on non-work roles does not alter workplace fatigue patterns (Yang et al., 2023). This can be further reviewed through the lens of gender role construction; given the predominance of male respondents in this sample, the traditional role as the primary breadwinner theoretically allows the totality of work to be interpreted as the main form of fulfilling family responsibilities, making family identity conflicts less prominent in the workplace (Kowalewska & Vitali, 2021).

A sharp contradiction to the idealized enrichment hypothesis of integration was observed in the Non-Work Interrupting Work (NIW) dimension, which acts as an explicit stressor that increases burnout. This positive relationship exposes the real limitations and the 'dark side' of the WLI concept, directly refuting the oversimplified expectation that role fusion is universally beneficial and challenging the assumption that integration acts as an automatic protector of employee mental health (Idrus, 2024; Kossek et al., 2012). The underlying psychological mechanism explaining why NIW functions strictly as a stressor lies in the disruption of cognitive continuity and high task-switching costs. When personal or domestic demands frequently spill over into professional hours, it forces continuous shifts in attention, leading to fragmented focus and a severe perceived loss of control over workplace deadlines (Parker et al., 2024). This

recurring cognitive friction accelerates mental fatigue, compounding objective workload pressures and causing a failure of functional synergy where physical integration without psychological control degenerates into a mentally draining intrusion (Hirsch et al., 2024).

These findings must be contextualized within the specific socio-cultural landscape of the Indonesian workforce. Rooted in collectivist values and robust familial structures, the Indonesian professional environment often maintains fluid boundaries between communal obligations and work-related duties (Irawanto et al., 2021). This cultural framework provides a rationale for the high tolerance toward boundary spillover, where domestic interference in the professional domain is socially normalized due to tight-knit familial networks (Rachmawati & Santoso, 2021). Nevertheless, in the absence of structural boundaries, such integration frequently precipitates home-to-work conflict, depleting psychological resources and heightening susceptibility to burnout (Safitri & Saputra, 2023).

Consequently, while Indonesian employees may demonstrate socio-cultural resilience toward role blurring, the psychological cost of chronic cognitive switching remains significant. This suggests that Work-Life Integration (WLI) should be complemented by the stabilizing principles of Work-Life Balance (WLB). Whereas WLI facilitates the management of psychological constructs such as identity and meaning, WLB functions as an essential structural foundation to mitigate physical role conflicts, necessitating a dual approach to prevent integration from culminating in systemic exhaustion (Samtharam & Baskaran, 2023).

As a closing note, the discussion of the strengths of this study provides a solid basis for mapping the direction of future research. Methodologically, this study benefits from a representative sample of 355 respondents, which allows for optimal testing of multidimensional models. To build upon these empirical foundations, several key avenues for future research should be considered. First, future studies are advised to employ longitudinal designs with time-lagged measurements or multi-source assessments to capture causal dynamics over time and minimize single-source self-report bias.

Second, scholars should integrate Work-Life Integration (WLI) and Work-Life Balance (WLB) within a single structural framework—positioning WLB explicitly as a global moderator—while incorporating key Job Demands-Resources (JD-R) factors such as social support and psychological capital. Furthermore, expanding the sample scope to more autonomous industries, such as the technology or creative sectors, is recommended to validate whether WLI strategies exhibit different levels of effectiveness in flexible work ecosystems. Finally, future researchers are expected to include demographic variables, particularly gender, as control covariates in hypothesis testing to ensure findings are free from potential demographic role biases.

Implications

Theoretically, this study advances the literature on occupational health and boundary management by demonstrating that Work-Life Integration (WLI) is not a monolithic protective construct against employee burnout. By evaluating WLI multidimensionally, the findings show that role integration offers psychological protection only when accompanied by strong professional identity and perceived boundary control. This challenges oversimplified theoretical assumptions that fusing work and personal life naturally promotes employee well-being. Furthermore, the empirical evidence highlighting Non-Work Interrupting Work (NIW) as a stressor underscores the cognitive and emotional costs of unmanaged role spillover within organizational settings.

For human resource professionals and organizational leaders, these findings offer specific behavioral strategies to redesign employee well-being interventions rather than relying

on generic organizational support. Given that Work Identity emerged as the most powerful protective factor against burnout, HR departments should shift investments from generic family-gathering activities toward targeted professional growth initiatives. This can be executed by designing structural career development paths, transparent performance recognition programs, and mentorship blueprints that actively strengthen employees' professional self-concept and cognitive alignment with their roles.

In terms of optimizing Boundary Control, organizations must move away from top-down flexibility and instead institutionalize "boundary autonomy". Practically, this requires implementing explicit "right to disconnect" policies and defining core synchronization hours while allowing employees to control their individual transition periods between work and personal domains. Finally, to actively mitigate the psychological fatigue triggered by Non-Work Interrupting Work (NIW), organizations should offer workplace cognitive-crafting training, including structured digital distraction-free windows during intensive task cycles, to safeguard operational focus.

Limitations

Several limitations of this study should be acknowledged. First, the cross-sectional survey design and reliance on single-source self-report measurements may increase the risk of common method bias and prevent establishing definitive causal relationships. Second, the multidimensional Work-Life Integration model accounted for 17.6% of the variance in burnout, indicating that a substantial proportion of variance (82.4%) is explained by unmeasured factors, such as organizational support (supervisor and coworker support) or individual psychological resources (resilience and psychological capital). Third, the sample was predominantly male and concentrated in the industrial/manufacturing sector with rigid on-site work patterns, which may limit the direct generalizability of these findings to highly flexible or remote work settings. Fourth, specific job positions or organizational hierarchies (e.g., staff, middle management, or executive roles) were not recorded in the survey, which restricts further subgroup analysis regarding structural role differences. Finally, gender was not included as a control covariate in the statistical model, which may leave potential demographic biases in the perception of work demands undetected.

Conclusion

This study demonstrates that Work-Life Integration (WLI) is not a universal protective solution against employee burnout, as its impact depends on specific dimensions rather than aggregate role fusion. Evaluating WLI multidimensionally provides a far better predictive model (explaining 17.6% of burnout variance) compared to a global total score (1.7%). Specifically, Work Identity and Boundary Control act as significant protective factors that mitigate burnout by fostering psychological meaning and personal autonomy over role transitions.

In contrast, Non-Work Interrupting Work operates as an explicit stressor that heightens burnout due to cognitive switching costs, while Work Interrupting Non-Work and Family Identity show no significant effect. Ultimately, role integration prevents burnout only when backed by a strong professional identity and boundary autonomy. Without psychological control and structural boundaries, unmanaged role fusion leads to cognitive exhaustion rather than functional synergy.

Additionally, multigroup analyses highlight that Work Interrupting Non-work (WIN) heightens burnout specifically among permanent and single employees. This demonstrates that

employment stability and marital status act as key boundary conditions shaping employee vulnerability to work-life interruptions.

Credit / Acknowledgment

The authors would like to express their sincere appreciation to all participants who generously devoted their time and shared their perspectives for this study. Their voluntary involvement was essential to the completion of this research. Additionally, this work was conducted independently without external financial support or grants from any funding organization.

Author Contribution

DGKN: Conceptualization, Methodology, Data Collection, Formal Analysis, Writing – Original Draft. ANH: Conceptualization, Supervision, Validation, Writing – Review & Editing.

References

- Adisa, T. A., Antonacopoulou, E., Beauregard, T. A., Dickmann, M., & Adekoya, O. D. (2022). Exploring the impact of COVID-19 on employees' boundary management and work-life balance. *British Journal of Management*, 33(4), 1694–1709. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8551.12643>
- Afonso, R. M. B., Pérez-Nebra, A. R., Modesto, J. G., & Zambonato, A. (2022). Negative events, coping and biological markers: An application of transactional model of stress. *Psicologia: Teoria e Pesquisa*, 38. <https://doi.org/10.1590/0102.3772E38520.EN>
- Allen, T. D., Merlo, K., Lawrence, R. C., Slutsky, J., & Gray, C. E. (2021). Boundary management and work-nonwork balance while working from home. *Applied Psychology*, 70(1), 60–84. <https://doi.org/10.1111/apps.12300>
- Ashfort, B. E., Kreiner, G. E., & Fugate, M. (2000). All in a day's work: Boundaries and micro role transitions. *Academy of Management Review*, 25(3), 472–491. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2000.3363315>
- Aziz, A. F. A., & Ong, T. (2024). Prevalence and associated factors of burnout among working adults in Southeast Asia: results from a public health assessment. *Frontiers in Public Health*, 12. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpubh.2024.1326227>
- Bakker, A. B., & Costa, P. L. (2014). Chronic job burnout and daily functioning: A theoretical analysis. *Burnout Research*, 1(3), 112–119. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.burn.2014.04.003>
- Bianchi, R. (2018). Burnout is more strongly linked to neuroticism than to work-contextualized factors. *Psychiatry Research*, 270, 901–905. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychres.2018.11.015>
- Bruschwein, H., & Gettle, L. S. (2020). Multipronged intervention for reducing burnout and increasing resiliency in an interdisciplinary care team. *BMJ Open Quality*, 9(4). <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjoq-2020-001015>
- Bulut, S., Rostami, M., Bulut, S., Bukhori, B., Seyed Alitabar, S. H., Tariq, Z., & Zadhasn, Z. (2024). Work-life integration in women's lives: A qualitative study. *The Psychology of Woman Journal*, 5(1), 36–42. <https://doi.org/10.61838/kman.pwj.5.1.4>
- Chauhan, P., & Rai, S. (2024). Conceptualizing work-life integration: A review and research agenda. *Asia Pacific Management Review*, 29(4), 415–426. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apmrv.2024.10.002>
- Demerouti, E. (2024). Burnout: A comprehensive review. *Zeitschrift Für Arbeitswissenschaft*, 78(4), 492–504. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s41449-024-00452-3>
- de Cordova, P. B., Reilly, L. L., Pogorzelska-Maziarz, M., Gerolamo, A. M., Grafova, I., Vasquez, A., & Johansen, M. L. (2024). A theoretical framework for acute care nurse stress appraisal: Application of the transactional model of stress and coping. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 80(9), 3835–3845. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jan.16061>

- Faul, F., Erdfelder, E., Buchner, A., & Lang, A. G. (2009). Statistical power analyses using G*Power 3.1: tests for correlation and regression analyses. *Behavior research methods*, 41(4), 1149–1160. <https://doi.org/10.3758/BRM.41.4.1149>
- Freudenberger, H. J. (1975). The staff burn-out syndrome in alternative institutions. *Psychotherapy: Theory, Research & Practice*, 12(1), 73–82. <https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1037/h0086411>
- Galis, E. E., & Puspitadewi, N. W. S. (2023). Hubungan work life balance dengan burnout pada karyawan pt.x. *Character: Jurnal Penelitian Psikologi*, 10(03), 888–898. <https://doi.org/10.26740/cjpp.v10i03.57299>
- Gallup. (2023). *State of the global workplace: 2023 report*. Gallup.
- Ghaffari, M., Morowatisharifabad, M. A., Jadgal, M. S., Mehrabi, Y., & Alizadeh, S. (2021). The effectiveness of intervention based on the transactional model on improving coping efforts and stress moderators in hemodialysis patients in Tehran: a randomized controlled trial. *BMC Nephrology*, 22(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12882-021-02592-8>
- Gragnano, A., Simbula, S., & Miglioretti, M. (2020). Work–life balance: Weighing the importance of work–family and work–health balance. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 17(3). 907. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph17030907>
- Greenhaus, J. H., & Allen, T. D. (2011). Work–family balance: A review and extension of the literature. In J. C. Quick & L. E. Tetrick (Eds.), *Handbook of occupational health psychology* (2nd ed., pp. 165–183). American Psychological Association.
- Hasanah, N., Imsar, & Nasution, J. (2023). Analisis pengaruh work life balance dan burnout terhadap kepuasan kerja pada bank muamalat indonesia kc medan balai kota. In *Manajemen dan Bisnis*, 5(2), 117–127. <https://jurnal.uisu.ac.id/index.php/MdB>
- He, S. Y., Chen, X., & Tao, S. (2025). Long commutes, work-life balance, and well-being: A mixed-methods study of Hong Kong's new-town residents. *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 45(1), 135–147. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0739456X231188301>
- Hirsch, P., Moretti, L., Leichtmann, B., Koch, I., & Nitsch, V. (2024). Opportune moments for task interruptions: Examining the cognitive mechanisms underlying interruption-timing effects. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 15. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2024.1465323>
- Idrus, M. I. (2024). Dampak work-life integration terhadap kesejahteraan karyawan dan produktivitas kerja: A systematic literature review. *Journal of Economic, Business and Accounting (COSTING)*, 7(3), 6396–6405. <https://doi.org/10.31539/costing.v7i3.9821>
- Kerksieck, P., Kujanpää, M., de Bloom, J., Brauchli, R., & Bauer, G. F. (2024). A new perspective on balancing life domains: Work–nonwork balance crafting. *BMC Public Health*, 24(1099). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-024-18646-z>
- Kossek, E. E., Ruderman, M. N., Braddy, P. W., & Hannum, K. M. (2012). Work–nonwork boundary management profiles: A person-centered approach. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 81(1), 112–128. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2012.04.003>
- Koutsimani, P., Montgomery, A., & Georganta, K. (2019). The relationship between burnout, depression, and anxiety: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Frontiers in Psychology* 10(284). <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.00284>
- Kowalewska, H., & Vitali, A. (2021). Breadwinning or on the breadline? Female breadwinners' economic characteristics across 20 welfare states. *Journal of European Social Policy*, 31(2), 125–142. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0958928720971094>
- Lamuri, A., Shatri, H., Umar, J., Sudaryo, M. K., Malik, K., Sitepu, M. S., Saraswati, Muzellina, V. N., Nursyirwan, S. A., Idrus, M. F., Renaldi, K., & Abdullah, M. (2023). Burnout dimension profiles among healthcare workers in Indonesia. *Heliyon*, 9(3). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2023.e14519>
- Li, L., Wang, Q., Wang, Q., Chen, Y., Sun, T., Xu, C., & Li, L. (2025). Direct and interactive effects of work stress and professional identity on job burnout among elderly care workers for old people in China: A cross-sectional study. *Healthcare*, 13(14). <https://doi.org/10.3390/healthcare13141635>
- Maslach, C., & Jackson, S. E. (1981). The measurement of experienced burnout. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 2(2), 99–113. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.4030020205>

- Maslach, C., Schaufeli, W. B., & Leiter, M. P. (2001). Job burnout. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 52, 397–422. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.52.1.397>
- Mauliddiyah, D., & Widyastuti, W. (2025). The relationship between work-life balance and workload with burnout in nurses. *Proceeding of International Conference on Social Science and Humanity*, 2(3), 630–641. <https://doi.org/10.61796/icossh.v2i3.97>
- Palupi, V. C., & Pandjaitan, L. N. (2022). Self efficacy dan burnout pada guru. *Keluwih: Jurnal Sosial Dan Humaniora*, 3(1), 28–39. <https://doi.org/10.24123/soshum.v3i1.5225>
- Parker, S. L., Pahor, K., Van den Broeck, A., & Zacher, H. (2024). Effects of perceived illegitimacy of interrupting tasks on employees' cognitive and affective experiences: The mediating role of stress appraisals. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 33(4), 430–445. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1359432X.2024.2319904>
- Rachmawati, M., & Santoso, I. H. (2021). Work-life integration pola kerja baru pemicu kelelahan kerja: Adaptasi baru pada masa pandemi COVID – 19. *Jurnal Manajemen*, 18(1), 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.25170/jm.v18i1.2208>
- Rapp, D. J., Hughey, J. M., & Kreiner, G. E. (2021). Boundary work as a buffer against burnout: Evidence from healthcare workers during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 106(8), 1169–1187. <https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1037/apl0000951>
- Rizki, D. F. (2025). Work-life balance or work-life integration? Case study of furniture industry employees in Cirebon regency, West Java, Indonesia. *Jurnal Inovasi Global*, 3(4). <https://jig.rivierapublishing.id/index.php/rv/index>
- Safitri, R., & Saputra, E. (2023). The impact of work family conflict and burnout on employee performance: Mediation of organizational commitment. *Jurnal Dimensi*, 12(3), 786–794. <https://www.journal.unrika.ac.id/index.php/jurnaldms>
- Salvagioni, D. A. J., Melanda, F. N., Mesas, A. E., González, A. D., Gabani, F. L., & de Andrade, S. M. (2017). Physical, psychological and occupational consequences of job burnout: A systematic review of prospective studies. *PLoS ONE*, 12(10). <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0185781>
- Samtharam, S. R., & Baskaran, S. (2023). Work-life integration and workplace flexibility on life satisfaction, work productivity, and organization commitment: Contextual study. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 13(2). <https://doi.org/10.6007/ijarbss/v13-i2/16340>
- Shanafelt, T. D., West, C. P., Dyrbye, L. N., Trockel, M., Tutty, M., Wang, H., Carlasare, L. E., & Sinsky, C. (2022). Changes in burnout and satisfaction with work-life integration in physicians during the first 2 years of the COVID-19 pandemic. *Mayo Clinic Proceedings*, 97(12), 2248–2258. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mayocp.2022.09.002>
- Simbolon, M., & Bashabih, M. (2023). Burnout and contributing factors to burnout among Indonesian healthcare workers before and during COVID-19 pandemic. *Jurnal Psikiatri Surabaya*, 12(2), 114–125. <https://doi.org/10.20473/jps.v12i2.48468>
- Soelton, M., Nurfakhriansyah, A. R., Apriadi, I., Arief, H., Noermijati, N., & Vizano, N. A. (2022). Mengapa perilaku burnout dikuatirkan oleh para manager di industri manufaktur? *INOBIS: Jurnal Inovasi Bisnis dan Manajemen Indonesia*, 5(4), 461–474. <https://doi.org/10.31842/jurnalinobis.v5i4.244>
- Spurk, D., & Straub, C. (2020). Flexible employment relationships and careers in times of the COVID-19 pandemic. *Journal of vocational behavior*, 119, 103435. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2020.103435>
- Sujanah, W., Pratiwi, A. D., & Akifah, A. (2021). Faktor-faktor yang berhubungan dengan burnout syndrome pada perawat di RSUD Bahteramas, Sulawesi Tenggara. *Jurnal Kesehatan Masyarakat*, 9(5), 675–680. <https://doi.org/10.14710/jkm.v9i5.30697>
- Vaziri, H., Casper, W. J., Wayne, J. H., & Matthews, R. A. (2020). Changes to the work-family interface during the COVID-19 pandemic: Examining predictors and implications using latent transition analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 105(10), 1073–1087. <https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000819>

- Wang, X. (2024). Use of proper sampling techniques to research studies. *Applied and Computational Engineering*, 57(1), 141–145. <https://doi.org/10.54254/2755-2721/57/20241324>
- Widhianingtanti, L. T., & van Luijtelaar, G. (2022). The Maslach-Trisni burnout inventory: Adaptation for Indonesia. *Jurnal Pengukuran Psikologi Dan Pendidikan Indonesia*, 11(1), 1–21. <https://doi.org/10.15408/jp3i.v11i1.24400>
- World Health Organization. (2019, May 28). *Burn-out an “occupational phenomenon”*: *International Classification of Diseases*. <https://www.who.int/news/item/28-05-2019-burn-out-an-occupational-phenomenon-international-classification-of-diseases>
- Yadav, A., Pandita, D., & Singh, S. (2022). Work-life integration, job contentment, employee engagement and its impact on organizational effectiveness: A systematic literature review. *Industrial and Commercial Training*, 54(3), 509–527. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ICT-12-2021-0083>
- Yang, D., Fang, G., Fu, D., Hong, M., Wang, H., Chen, Y., Ma, Q., & Yang, J. (2023). Impact of work-family support on job burnout among primary health workers and the mediating role of career identity: A cross-sectional study. *Frontiers in Public Health*, 11, 1115792. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpubh.2023.1115792>
- Yunita, M., & Melsan. (2023). Pengaruh pengalaman kerja dan kemampuan kerja terhadap pengembangan karir karyawan PT. Jatropha Solutions Manna Bengkulu Selatan. *Jurnal Manajemen Modal Insani Dan Bisnis*, 4(1), 59-65. <https://doi.org/10.61567/jmmib.v4i1.158>
- Zhang, S., Sunindijo, R. Y., Frimpong, S., & Su, Z. (2023). Work stressors, coping strategies, and poor mental health in the Chinese construction industry. *Safety Science*, 159. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssci.2022.106039>