Original article

Job burnout and related factors among employees of a private distribution company in building materials business

Sarochapatch Techarojanakan[1], Siriluck Suppapitiporn[2,*]

[1]Program in Mental Health, Department of Psychiatry, Faculty of Medicine, Chulalongkorn University,Bangkok, Thailand
[2]Department of Psychiatry, Faculty of Medicine, Chulalongkorn University, Bangkok, Thailand

Abstract

Background: Burnout has impacted the quality of life in both workers' physical and mental aspects. In building materials business, the competition is more intense. Providing exceptional service to customers to gain market share and growth of online sales in COVID-19 leads to facing more responsibilities with limited resource. This study could raise awareness to preventive and protective solution for the employees.
Objective: This study aimed to identify the level of job burnout and related factors among employees of a private distribution company in building materials business.
Methods: A cross-sectional study was conducted on 331 employees of a private distribution company in the building materials business from January 2022 to April 2022. The data was collected by an online survey using a demographic and a work-related questionnaire, the World Health Organization Quality of Life Brief – Thai (WHOQOL-BREF-THAI), the Revised - Thai Multi-dimensional Scale of Perceived Social Support (r-Thai-MSPSS), and the Maslach Burnout Inventory – General Survey (MBI-GS) in Thai version.
Results: The study found the high level of job burnout among subjects in each dimension, emotional exhaustion was 46.2%, cynicism was 48.9%, and professional efficacy was 45.9%. Chi-square test showed that some personal and work-related factors were associated with job burnout in emotional exhaustion and cynicism domain. The risk factors of high level in job burnout in emotional exhaustion and cynicism domain were 1 – 10 years of work experience, non-management level, and heavy workload. The long working hour (> 8 hours/day) was a risk factor in emotional exhaustion domain. Low – moderate level of QOL was a risk factor of job burnout in all dimensions. Low-moderate level of social support was a predictive factors of job burnout in cynicism and professional efficacy domain.
Conclusion: Almost half of employees experienced the high level of job burnout in at least 1 dimension. The results could raise awareness in the organization for the preventive and protective solutions to reduce employee job burnout effectively.

Keywords: Burnout, private employee, quality of life, social support.

***Correspondence to: Siriluck Suppapitiporn,** Department of Psychiatry, Faculty of Medicine, Chulalongkorn University, Bangkok 10330, Thailand.
E-mail: siriluckspp@gmail.com
Received: May 7, 2022
Revised: June 15, 2022
Accepted: July 20, 2022

Nowadays, burnout has impacted the quality of life in both workers' physical and mental aspects. [1] Burnout has been an interesting topic for researchers in many countries. There are various theories, developed models, and researches in these few decades and plenty of them focus on human service careers, especially in healthcare workers. [2]

In 2019, World Health Organization (WHO) officially classified burnout as an occupation phenomenon in the 11th Revision of the International Classification of Diseases (ICD-11). It is defined as a syndrome resulting from chronic workplace stress that has not been successfully managed in the context of work or occupation only. [3]

In 2019, the College of Management, Mahidol University study of 1,280 subjects found that the state enterprise officer, private sector employees, and government employees had a high level of burnout, respectively. The main factor correlated to burnout was work overload. [4]

In the recession of economic activity and the COVID-19 pandemic, the organizations need to lay off workers to reduce their operating costs. The result of this situation leads to an increase of more workloads and responsibilities to the employees. Currently, digital communication technologies connect people easily and faster, employees must be ready for work that may occupy their leisure time and affect chronic work stress. [5] Moreover, living in a city with high population density, high cost of living, traffic congestion, pollution, high competition, and loneliness or isolation, all these factors can affect the quality of life.

Recently, the research about job burnout has been mostly studied in healthcare workers such as physicians, nurses, and social workers. In contrast, private company employees have been rarely studied in Thailand. The labor indicator from the National Statistical Office showed that 40.4% of employment was private-sector employees. [6] Furthermore, the competition is more intense in the building materials business than ever. Providing exceptional service to existing customers, applying any strategies, or expanding the business-to-customer model are the key factors in achieving and maintaining a competitive advantage. [7] During the COVID-19 pandemic, the online sales of building materials increased 3 times compared to the offline channel. [8] The employees need to adjust themselves while facing more responsibilities to online customers that could affect mental health and work stress. Accordingly, this study aimed to study job burnout and related factors among the employees of a private distribution company in building materials business. The result of this study should raise awareness of job burnout and be a benefit to the organization for creating a positive work environment and supportive workplace that can boost employee mental health.

Materials and methods

A cross-sectional descriptive study was used as a research methodology. A total of 331 subjects, was calculated by Yamane's formula with a 95% confidence level. The online questionnaire was sent to 1,383 employees in distribution company in building materials business. The population had to meet inclusion criteria comprising of the employee in all levels (operation, supervisor, management level), 1-year experience, and willingness to participate in this study by giving consent. The exclusion criteria were the person who was on vacation, personal leave, sick leave, maternity leave, ordination leave or study leave, and a temporary employee. There were 350 subjects completed the online questionnaire and 331 met the criteria (24.0%) which was included in this study.

All subjects were invited to provide information by using an online questionnaire. This study consisted of five sections: 1) demographic data; 2) job-related data; 3) World Health Organization Quality of Life Brief – Thai (WHOQOL-BREF-THAI) available for the public, translated and developed by Mahantanirankul S, *et al*. [9] with Cronbach's alpha coefficient of 0.8406; 4) Revised - Thai Multi-dimensional Scale of Perceived Social Support (r-Thai-MSPSS) developed by Wongpakaran T, *et al*. [10] with Cronbach's alpha coefficient of 0.91 for the student group and 0.87 for the patient group; 5) Maslach Burnout Inventory – General Survey (MBI-GS) in Thai version developed by Maslach C, *et al*. and translated to Thai by Kleebbua C. [11] with Cronbach's alpha coefficient of 0.832, 0.901, and 0.839 for emotional exhaustion, cynicism, and professional efficacy respectively.

This study was approved by the Institutional Review Board (IRB), the Faculty of Medicine, Chulalongkorn University (COA no. 584/64).

Statistical analysis

All data were analyzed by using IBM SPSS version 22.0 for Windows. Descriptive statistics were

used to describe the characteristics of the sample population including the frequency, percentage, mean, standard deviation (SD) odd ratio (OD) and 95% confidence interval (CI). Pearson's Chi-square test was used for finding the association among factors related to job burnout. Logistics regression was used to predict the probability of related factors to job burnout by using the forward likelihood ratio. $P < 0.05$ was considered statistically significant.

Results

Demographic data

In the study of 331 employees, most of them were male (57.4%) at the age of 31 – 40 years (61.0%) with Bachelor's Degree (60.1%), and more than half were single (54.1%) with no children (71.3%). Mostly the subjects were Buddhist (91.5%) and living in Bangkok (55.9%). The type of residence is a house (69.2%). Around a quarter of subjects had average income between 40,001 – 60,000 THB (25.4%). Most of them had adequate income with savings (75.5%) and a low level of family burden (48.6%). The majority of subjects had no medical disease (83.4%) and were non-smokers (82.5%) also light drinkers (68.3%). Most of them exercised sometimes (60.1%) and had between 6 – 8 hours of sleep (77.9%) (Table 1).

Table 1. Demographic data (n = 331).

Demographic data	N (%)	Demographic data	N (%)
Gender		**Income (THB)**	
Male	190 (57.4)	≤20,000	6 (1.8)
Female	141 (42.6)	20,001 - 40,000	55 (16.6)
Age (years)		40,001 - 60,000	84 (25.4)
21 – 30	54 (16.3)	60,001 - 80,000	64 (19.3)
31 – 40	202 (61.0)	80,001 - 100,000	42 (12.7)
41 – 50	63 (19.0)	>100,000	80 (24.2)
51 – 60	12 (3.6)	**Economic status**	
(Min = 22, Max = 59, Mean = 36.5, SD = 6.6)		Adequate income with savings	250 (75.5)
Education		Adequate income without savings	69 (20.8)
Lower than Bachelor's Degree	13 (3.9)	Inadequate income	12 (3.6)
Bachelor's Degree	199 (60.1)	**Family burden**	
Master's Degree	116 (35.0)	Low	161 (48.6)
Doctorate Degree	3 (0.9)	Moderate	146 (44.1)
Marital status		High	24 (7.3)
Single	179 (54.1)	**Medical disease**	
Married	145 (43.8)	No	276 (83.4)
Separated	3 (0.9)	Yes	55 (16.6)
Divorced	3 (0.9)	**Smoking**	
Widowed	1 (0.3)	Never	273 (82.5)
Children		Quit	38 (11.5)
No children	236 (71.3)	Current smoking	20 (6.0)
1	53 (16.0)	**Drinking**	
2	39 (11.8)	Never	66 (19.9)
3	2 (0.6)	Quit	20 (6.0)
4	1 (0.3)	Occasionally	226 (68.3)
Religion		Often	19 (5.7)
Buddhism	303 (91.5)	**Exercise**	
Christianity	10 (3.0)	Usually	69 (20.8)
Islam	6 (1.8)	Sometimes	199 (60.1)
Others	12 (3.6)	Never	63 (19.0)
Hometown		**Hour of sleep (hours)**	
Bangkok	185 (55.9)	3 – 5	69 (20.8)
Upcountry	146 (44.1)	6 – 8	258 (77.9)
Type of residence		9 – 10	4 (1.2)
House	229 (69.2)	(Min = 3, Max = 10, Mean = 6.2, SD = 1.0)	
Condominium	92 (27.8)		
Apartment	10 (3.0)		

Work-related data

Less than half had a work experience between 1 – 10 years (43.2%) in supervisor position (75.2%) of distribution business (30.5%) and customer service business (13.0%) respectively. Mostly the workplace-based was in the headquarter or main office (84.0%). A hybrid workplace was mainly a working model (72.2%). Most of them used personal vehicle (77.3%) and spent the commute time from home to work was around 30 – 60 minutes (47.1%). The majority of participants worked 5 days a week (86.1%) with 8 – 10 working hours (87.3%) average at 9.1 hours a day and sometimes exceed their normally scheduled working hours as overtime (64.0%). The benefit from the company mostly was adequate (83.1%). The workload in moderate level (50.8%) was closed to the heavy workload (48.6%) (Table 2).

Quality of life data

The quality of life level was mostly in moderate level at 75.8%, high level at 21.8%, and low level at 2.4% respectively (Table 2).

Social support data

Most of subject had the high level of social support at 61.6%, moderate level at 37.2%, and low level at 1.2% (Table 2).

Job burnout data

Maslach Burnout Inventory – General Survey (MBI-GS) found that the high level of emotional exhaustion cynicism, and professional efficacy were 46.2%, 48.9%, and 45.9% sequentially. There was 28.1% of high level of burnout with 1 domain, 26.6 of high level of burnout with 2 domains, and 19.9% of high level of burnout with all domains (Table 3).

Table 2. Work-related data, quality of life, and social support data (n = 331).

Work-related data	N (%)	Work-related data	N (%)
Work experience (years)		**Working model**	
1 – 10	143 (43.2)	Office	11 (3.3)
11 – 20	137 (41.4)	Office and fieldwork	45 (13.6)
21 – 30	46 (13.9)	Office and work from home	239 (72.2)
> 30	5 (1.5)	Work from home	36 (10.9)
(Min = 1, Max = 36, Mean = 12.7, SD = 6.9)		**Work commute**	
Work position		Personal vehicle	256 (77.3)
Operation	28 (8.5)	Public transport	55 (16.6)
Supervisor	249 (75.2)	Walk	6 (1.8)
Management	54 (16.3)	Company vehicle	14 (4.2)
Department		**Commute time (minutes)**	
Marketing Office	20 (6.0)	< 30	125 (37.8)
Business Transformation	9 (2.7)	30 - 60	156 (47.1)
Strategic Planning	6 (1.8)	> 60	50 (15.1)
Customer Services Business	43 (13.0)	**Working days**	
Supply Chain Management	23 (6.9)	5	285 (86.1)
Customer Experience	12 (3.6)	6	40 (12.1)
Dealer Based Retail	7 (2.1)	7	6 (1.8)
Distribution Business	101 (30.5)	(Min = 5, Max = 7, Mean = 5.2, SD = 0.4)	
Central Sourcing	14 (4.2)	**Working hours**	
Credit and Financial Technology	18 (5.4)	8 – 10	289 (87.3)
Information Technology	15 (4.5)	11 – 12	29 (8.8)
Home Retail	29 (8.8)	> 12	13 (3.9)
Nexter Digital	14 (4.2)	(Min = 8, Max = 13, Mean = 9.1, SD = 1.4)	
Large Store Project	2 (0.6)	**Overtime**	
Business-to-Business	18 (5.4)	Always	106 (32.0)
Workplace		Sometimes	212 (64.0)
Headquarters / main office	278 (84.0)	Never	13 (3.9)
Regional	37 (11.2)		
Branch	2 (0.6)		
Headquarters / Regional / Branch	14 (4.2)		

Table 2. (Con) Work-related data, quality of life, and social support data (n = 331).

Work-related data	N (%)	Quality of life data	N (%)
Benefits		Low	8 (2.4)
Inadequate	55 (16.6)	Moderate	251 (75.8)
Adequate	275 (83.1)	High	72 (21.8)
More than adequate	1 (0.3)		
Workload		**Social support data**	**N (%)**
Low	2 (0.6)	Low	4 (1.2)
Moderate	168 (50.8)	Moderate	123 (37.2)
Heavy	161 (48.6)	High	204 (61.6)

Table 3. Job burnout in all dimensions (n = 331).

Variables	Level of job burnout		
	Low N (%)	Moderate N (%)	High N (%)
Emotional exhaustion (Min = 0, Max = 30, Mean = 15.6, SD = 8.7)	114 (34.4)	64 (19.3)	153 (46.2)
Cynicism (Min = 0, Max = 30, Mean = 12.3, SD = 8.6)	87 (26.3)	82 (24.8)	162 (48.9)
Professional efficacy (Min = 0, Max = 36, Mean = 24.9, SD = 7.5)	106 (32.0)	73 (22.1)	152 (45.9)

Various factors affect job burnout

According to Table 4, the Chi-square test examined the association between studied factors and job burnout.

Age, marital status, number of children, type of residence, average income, economic status, family burden, exercises, hour of sleep, work experience, work position, work commute, commute time, working hours, workload, quality of life, and social support were associated with job burnout in emotional exhaustion domain ($P < 0.05$).

The factors that related to job burnout in cynicism domain were age, education level, marital status, number of children, average income, economic status, exercises, work experience, work position, work commute, commute time, working hours, benefit, workload, quality of life, and social support ($P < 0.05$).

Quality of life and social support were the factors that related to job burnout in the professional efficacy domain ($P < 0.05$).

According to Table 5, the logistic regression was used to predict the correlation between job burnout and related factors. The employees who had a work experience 1 - 10 years (OR = 1.848, $P < 0.05$), position in non-management level (OR = 3.716, $P < 0.01$), more than 8 working hours a day (OR = 2.065, $P < 0.01$), heavy workload (OR = 2.130, $P < 0.01$) and low-moderate level of quality of life (OR = 2.148, $P < 0.05$), can predict the increase of job burnout in this domain as the risk factors.

Regarding cynicism domain, the factors that can predict the increase of job burnout are a work experience 1 - 10 years (OR = 2.398, $P < 0.01$), position in non-management level (OR = 2.971, $P < 0.01$), heavy workload (OR = 2.449, $P < 0.01$), low-moderate level of quality of life (OR = 2.777, $P < 0.01$), and low-moderate level of social support life (OR = 1.855, $P < 0.05$)

The last domain of job burnout is professional efficacy. The result showed that the factors which can predict the increase of job burnout in this domain were low-moderate level of quality of life (OR = 2.428, $P < 0.01$), and low-moderate level of social support life (OR = 2.161, $P < 0.01$).

Table 4. Associations among related factors and job burnout in all domains.

Variables	Emotional exhaustion			Cynicism			Professional efficacy		
	Low and moderate n (%)	High n (%)	*P*-value	Low and moderate n (%)	High n (%)	*P*-value	Low and moderate n (%)	High n (%)	*P*-value
Age (years)									
21 – 30	24 (44.4)	30 (55.6)	< 0.001***	20 (37.0)	34 (63.0)	< 0.001***	33 (61.1)	21 (38.9)	0.522
31 – 40	99 (49.0)	103 (51.0)		94 (46.5)	108 (53.5)		106 (52.5)	96 (47.5)	
> 40	55 (73.3)	20 (26.7)		55 (73.3)	20 (26.7)		40 (53.3)	35 (46.7)	
Education									
Lower than Bachelor's Degree	8 (61.5)	5 (38.5)	0.623	10 (76.9)	3 (23.1)	0.005**	8 (61.5)	5 (38.5)	0.772
Bachelor's Degree	103 (51.8)	96 (48.2)		88 (44.2)	111 (55.8)		109 (54.8)	90 (45.2)	
Higher than Bachelor's Degree	67 (56.3)	52 (43.7)		71 (59.7)	48 (40.3)		62 (52.1)	57 (47.9)	
Marital status									
Single/separated/divorced/ widowed	89 (47.8)	97 (52.2)	0.014*	85 (45.7)	101 (54.3)	0.027*	100 (53.8)	86 (46.2)	0.896
Married	89 (61.4)	56 (38.6)		84 (57.9)	61 (42.1)		79 (54.5)	66 (45.5)	
Children									
No	118 (50.0)	118 (50.0)	0.030*	111 (47.0)	125 (53.0)	0.021*	132 (55.9)	104 (44.1)	0.286
Yes	60 (63.2)	35 (36.8)		58 (61.1)	37 (38.9)		47 (49.5)	48 (50.5)	
Type of residence									
House	133 (58.1)	96 (41.9)	0.019*	122 (53.3)	107 (46.7)	0.227	119 (52.0)	110 (48.0)	0.248
Condominium/Apartment	45 (44.1)	57 (55.9)		47 (46.1)	55 (53.9)		60 (58.8)	42 (41.2)	
Income (THB)									
≤ 40,000	33 (54.1)	28 (45.9)	0.001**	29 (47.5)	32 (52.5)	< 0.001***	41 (67.2)	20 (32.8)	0.073
40,001 - 80,000	64 (43.2)	84 (56.8)		56 (37.8)	92 (62.2)		75 (50.7)	73 (49.3)	
> 80,000	81 (66.4)	41 (33.6)		84 (68.9)	38 (31.1)		63 (51.6)	59 (48.4)	
Economic status									
Adequate income with savings	148 (59.2)	102 (40.8)	0.002**	139 (55.6)	111 (44.4)	0.014*	131 (52.4)	119 (47.6)	0.439
Adequate income without savings	27 (39.1)	42 (60.9)		26 (37.7)	43 (62.3)		42 (60.9)	27 (39.1)	
Inadequate income	3 (25.0)	9 (75.0)		4 (33.3)	8 (66.7)		6 (50.0)	6 (50.0)	
Family burden									
Low	94 (58.4)	67 (41.6)	0.026*	88 (54.7)	73 (45.3)	0.141	94 (58.4)	67 (41.6)	0.281
Moderate	77 (52.7)	69 (47.3)		73 (50.0)	73 (50.0)		72 (49.3)	74 (50.7)	
High	7 (29.2)	17 (70.8)		8 (33.3)	16 (66.7)		13 (54.2)	11 (45.8)	
Exercise									
Usually	45 (65.2)	24 (34.8)	0.013*	39 (56.5)	30 (43.5)	0.016*	42 (60.9)	27 (39.1)	0.159
Sometimes	108 (54.3)	91 (45.7)		108 (54.3)	91 (45.7)		109 (54.8)	90 (45.2)	
Never	25 (39.7)	38 (60.3)		22 (34.9)	41 (65.1)		28 (44.4)	35 (55.6)	

Table 4. (Con) Associations among related factors and job burnout in all domains.

Variables	Emotional exhaustion			Cynicism			Professional efficacy		
	Low and moderate n (%)	High n (%)	*P*-value	Low and moderate n (%)	High n (%)	*P*-value	Low and moderate n (%)	High n (%)	*P*-value
Hour of sleep (hours)									
≤6	103 (49.5)	105 (50.5)	0.043*	100 (48.1)	108 (51.9)	0.158	108 (51.9)	100 (48.1)	0.306
>6	75 (61.0)	48 (39.0)		69 (56.1)	54 (43.9)		71 (57.7)	52 (42.3)	
Work experience (years)									
1 – 10	59 (41.3)	84 (58.7)	<0.001***	51 (35.7)	92 (64.3)	<0.001***	80 (55.9)	63 (44.1)	0.837
11 – 20	78 (56.9)	59 (43.1)		81 (59.1)	56 (40.9)		72 (52.6)	65 (47.4)	
>20	41 (80.4)	10 (19.6)		37 (72.5)	14 (27.5)		27 (52.9)	24 (47.1)	
Work position									
Operation	16 (57.1)	12 (42.9)	<0.001***	15 (53.6)	13 (46.4)	<0.001***	20 (71.4)	8 (28.6)	0.138
Supervisor	118 (47.4)	131 (52.6)		111 (44.6)	138 (55.4)		129 (51.8)	120 (48.2)	
Management	44 (81.5)	10 (18.5)		43 (79.6)	11 (20.4)		30 (55.6)	24 (44.4)	
Work commute									
Personal / company vehicle	153 (56.7)	117 (43.3)	0.026*	147 (54.4)	123 (45.6)	0.010**	143 (53.0)	127 (47.0)	0.392
Public transport / walk	25 (41.0)	36 (59.0)		22 (36.1)	39 (63.9)		36 (59.0)	25 (41.0)	
Commute time (minutes)									
<30	61 (48.8)	64 (51.2)	0.036*	59 (47.2)	66 (52.8)	0.416	73 (58.4)	52 (41.6)	0.224
30 - 60	82 (52.6)	74 (47.4)		81 (51.9)	75 (48.1)		84 (53.8)	72 (46.2)	
>60	35 (70.0)	15 (30.0)		29 (58.0)	21 (42.0)		22 (44.0)	28 (56.0)	
Working hours									
8	111 (63.8)	63 (36.2)	<0.001***	100 (57.5)	74 (42.5)	0.014*	98 (56.3)	76 (43.7)	0.389
>8	67 (42.7)	90 (57.3)		69 (43.9)	88 (56.1)		81 (51.6)	76 (48.4)	
Benefits									
Inadequate	26 (47.3)	29 (52.7)	0.289	21 (38.2)	34 (61.8)	0.036*	32 (58.2)	23 (41.8)	0.504
Adequate	152 (55.1)	124 (44.9)		148 (53.6)	128 (46.4)		147 (53.3)	129 (46.7)	
Workload									
Low and moderate	112 (65.9)	58 (34.1)	<0.001***	105 (61.8)	65 (38.2)	<0.001***	92 (54.1)	78 (45.9)	0.988
Heavy	66 (41.0)	95 (59.0)		64 (39.8)	97 (60.2)		87 (54.0)	74 (46.0)	
Quality of life									
Low and moderate	124 (47.9)	135 (52.1)	<0.001***	113 (43.6)	146 (56.4)	<0.001***	126 (48.6)	133 (51.4)	<0.001***
High	54 (75.0)	18 (25.0)		56 (77.8)	16 (22.2)		53 (73.6)	19 (26.4)	
Social support									
Low and moderate	58 (45.7)	69 (54.3)	0.020*	52 (40.9)	75 (59.1)	0.004**	51 (40.2)	76 (59.8)	<0.001***
High	120 (58.8)	84 (41.2)		117 (57.4)	87 (42.6)		128 (62.7)	76 (37.3)	

*$P < 0.05$, ** $P < 0.01$,*** $P < 0.001$

Table 5. The prediction of the correlation between related factors and job burnout was tested by logistic regression.

Variables	B	S.E. (B)	*P* - value	Adjusted OR	95% CI of Adjusted OR	
					Lower	Upper
Emotional exhaustion						
Work experience (1 - 10 years)	0.614	0.258	0.017*	1.848	1.114	3.065
Work position (Non-management level[a])	1.313	0.413	0.001**	3.716	1.653	8.353
Working hours (> 8 hours)	0.725	0.263	0.006**	2.065	1.234	3.455
Workload (Heavy workload)	0.756	0.261	0.004**	2.130	1.277	3.550
Quality of life (Low-Moderate QOL)	0.765	0.322	0.017*	2.148	1.144	4.036
Cynicism						
Work experience (1 - 10 years)	0.875	0.262	0.001**	2.398	1.435	4.008
Work position (Non-management level[a])	1.089	0.404	0.007**	2.971	1.347	6.553
Workload (Heavy workload)	0.896	0.250	< 0.001**	2.449	1.501	3.996
Quality of life (Low-Moderate QOL)	1.022	0.337	0.002**	2.777	1.434	5.380
Social support (Low-Moderate social support)	0.681	0.261	0.018*	1.855	1.113	3.090
Professional efficacy						
Quality of life (Low-Moderate QOL)	0.887	0.303	0.003**	2.428	1.341	4.397
Social support (Low- Moderate social support)	0.770	0.238	0.001**	2.161	1.354	3.447

*$P < 0.05$, ** $P < 0.01$*** , $P < 0.001$

[a] Non-management level = operation level, supervisor level

Discussion

This study evaluated the prevalence and factors associated with job burnout among employees of a private distribution company in building materials business. Nearly half of the participants had the high level of job burnout in each dimension. Comparing to the previous studies in pharmaceutical representatives of international pharmaceutical company [12] and corporate employees [13], there were differences in the prevalence of burnout due to the various professions and organizations. Many researches showed that the high level of job burnout mostly occurred to healthcare workers. Hence, this study showed that the private company employees had a job burnout in high level either.

Among the demographic factors examined, age, education level, marital status, number of children, type of residence, average income, economic status, family burden, exercises and hour of sleep were found to be significantly associated with job burnout. Comparing to the previous studies of Skunpimolrat P. [14] in operation employees, older people have more experience, are more mature, and they are better in dealing with stress and emotion. The employees with higher education degree were found the high level of job burnout since they have more complicated job, complex in communication to other departments, and more responsibilities which is difference from the study of Yongcharoen P. [15] in ship officers of the Royal Thai Navy. Married employees tend to be more stable in line with the previous study of Lerthattasilp T. [16] in psychiatrists in Thailand. Having children has less level of job burnout because the employees are more experienced in dealing with interpersonal and emotional conflicts in line with the study of Vichanjalearnsuk V. [12] in pharmaceutical representatives. There is blurred line between work and living space. Living in condominium may face more stress, isolation, and lack of interpersonal communication that lead to emotional exhaustion which is in accordance with the study of Oakman J, *et al.* [17] High-income employees had higher level of job burnout since they had more responsibilities similarly to the study of Therdthoonphuphuch WS. [18] in licensed lawyers. The employees who had an inadequate income need to work hard for more rewards find part-time job for more income. Regarding to this reason, it caused chronic stress, workload, less leisure time, and job burnout which difference from Ampornmunee N. [19] in police inquiry officials. High level of family burden had a high level of emotional exhaustion due to taking care of family members such as money, parenting, elder care which is not found the association of this factoe in the previous study. [12] Exercising helps people having lower level of job burnout which is compatible with the study of Bretland RJ, *et al.* [20] Sleeping less than six hours each night tends to have

an emotional exhaustion. This result is accordance to the studies of Peterson SA, *et al*. [21] in police officers and Metlaine A, *et al*. [22] in financial workers.

According to work-related factors, work commute, commute time, and benefits are significantly associated with job burnout. Using public transport or walk could be more stress and concerned since it's hard to estimate the commute time, causes health effects from air pollution, and it's considered risky of the COVID-19 epidemic as a contagious disease which is different from the previous study of Barreck A. [23] in Canadian employees. Commute time within 30 minutes may cause the emotional exhaustion because the employees spend less time for commuting and more time for work especially in the evening that also contrast with previous study from Barreck A. [23] As for the benefit, the employees who had insufficient benefit had high level of cynicism which is similar to the study of Maslach C, *et al*. [24] Lack of benefit can lead to loss of job satisfaction.

Logistic regression analysis showed that there were six factors predicting job burnout. This study found that 1 - 10 years working experience was one of the risk factors to the high level of job burnout in emotional exhaustion and cynicism since the older employees have more work experience and more controllable their emotion than the youngers in line with Therdthoonphuphuch WS. [18] which study on the licensed lawyers at the Thai Lawyers Council. Work position in operation and supervisor level was also a risk factor, the higher position the employees get, the more authority they can have. To have a right or be involved foreseeing the future of the organization might be a meaningful thing for employees and might reduce the risk of chronic strain compatibly with the study of Maslach C, *et al*. [25] Long working hours (> 8 hours/day) could predict the high level of job burnout in emotional exhaustion. Nowadays, due to the advance technology, there are many ways to communicate from anywhere conveniently. This is the reason why people can set up the online meeting easily. Although it is a suitable way for remote workers (work from home), the employees spent too much time in meeting and used the leisure time for daily routine which is different from the study of Therdthoonphuphuch WS. [18], showing that less than 8 working hours/day was a predictive to job burnout. Heavy workload could positively impact to job burnout in emotional exhaustion and cynicism. The employees were more intense and stress due to loads of work, multi-tasking, complex condition, and instantly response to online customers. This result is consistent with the previous study of Lertwilai W. [26] in medical technologist. Low-moderate level of quality of life could be predictive factor to job burnout. Comparing to the previous study of Choi YG, *et al*. [27] in workers in one electronics company and Xiao Y, *et al*. [28] in working women, having a high level of quality of life could reduce job burnout since it could increase the well-being and life satisfaction. Lastly, low-moderate level of social support is a risk factor to job burnout in cynicism and professional efficacy. Comparing to the previous studies of Lin QH, *et al*. [29] in managers in a joint venture company and Di Mattei VE, *et al*. [30] in healthcare workers. Social support from family, friends, significant ones, managers, and colleagues is an effective way to deal with stress and may prevent mental health problems. The employees would feel safe and have someone to turn to in times of need or crisis.

This current study has several limitations. Firstly, this research was a cross-sectional descriptive study. The collected data from the participants could not be a representative of private employees in Thailand. Secondly, during the COVID-19 pandemic, the researcher had to change the collecting data method from offline to online survey since most of employees had to work from home by the company's policy. From this reason, spending time on collecting data was led to the delay from plan. Finally, future study may repeat with a larger and more representative sample from other private companies or more factors that could be associated with job burnout.

Conclusion

In summary, almost half of employees experienced the high level of job burnout at least in 1 dimension. More than 10-year work experience, management level, high level of quality of life, and high level of social support were negatively correlated with emotional exhaustion and cynicism. On the other hand, heavy workload was positively correlated with emotional exhaustion and cynicism domain. Besides, 8 hours a day of working hour was only positively correlated with cynicism. As for the high quality of life and social support, they were protective factors of job burnout in all dimensions. This study would be beneficial for the organization to raise awareness for providing the preventive and protective solution to reduce employee's job burnout and promote employee mental health effectively.

Conflict of interest statement

Each of the authors has completed an ICMJE disclosure form. None of the authors declare any potential or actual relationship, activity, or interest related to the content of this article.

Data sharing statement

The present review is based on the reference cited. Further details, opinions, and interpretation are available from the corresponding authors on reasonable request.

References

1. Sithisarankul P. Burnout. Lor Chula Journal [Internet]. 2019 [cited 2021 Jan 13]; 12-13. Available from: https://chulalongkornhospital.go.th/kcmh/journal/vol41
2. Maslach C, Leiter, M P. Understanding the burnout experience: recent research and its implications for psychiatry. World psychiatry [Internet]. 2016 [cited 2021 Jan 20]; 15(2):103–11. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1002/wps.20311
3. WHO. Burn-out an "occupational phenomenon": International Classification of Diseases [Internet]. 2019 [cited 2021 Jan 5]. Available from: https://www.who.int/news/item/28-05-2019-burn-out-an-occupational-phenomenon-international-classification-of-diseases
4. Department of Mental Health. Burnout in the city [Internet]. 2020 [cited 2021 Jan 14]. Available from: https://www.dmh.go.th/news-dmh/view.asp?id=30176
5. Palitponganpim P. Burn-out Syndrome. Bangkok: Amarin Printing and Publishing; 2019. p.9
6. Social Statistics Division. Labor Index 2019. Bangkok: National Statistics Office; 2020. p. 33
7. PR News. Building Materials in Online Channel 2020 [Internet]. 2020 [cited 2020 Jan 5]. Available from: https://positioningmag.com/1273730.
8. Marketing Oops. SCG Offline to Online in New Normal [Internet]. 2020 [cited 2021 Jan 13]. Available from: https://www.marketingoops.com/exclusive/business-case/scg-offline-to-online-new-normal-data-driven/
9. Department of Mental Health. World Health Organization Quality of Life (WHOQOL–BREF–THAI) [Internet]. 1997 [cited 2019 Dec 24]. Available from: https://www.dmh.go.th/test/whoqol/
10. Wongpakaran T. (Revised) Thai version of the Multidimensional Scale of Perceived Social Support (r- Thai MSPSS). 2020 [cited 2021 Feb 1]. Available from: http://www.wongpakaran.com/index.php?lay=show&ac=article&Ntype=6&Id=539500306.
11. Kleebbua C. Development of the causal model of burnout at work: an application of the job demand-resource model. [Thesis]. Bangkok: Chulalongkorn University; 2009.
12. Vichanjalearnsuk V. Job burnout and related factors among pharmaceutical representatives of international pharmaceutical company. [Thesis]. Bangkok: Chulalongkorn University; 2020.
13. Lam LT, Lam MK, Reddy P, Wong P. Factors Associated with Work-Related Burnout among Corporate Employees Amidst COVID-19 Pandemic. Int J Environ Res Public Health 2022;19:1295.
14. Skunpimonrat P. Burn out syndrome in the employee of The Vee Rubber Corporation Limited Company. [Thesis]. Bangkok: Silpakorn University; 2013.
15. Yongcharoen P. Prevalence and Associated Factors of Burnout Syndrome among Ship Officers of The Royal Thai Navy. [Thesis]. Bangkok: Chulalongkorn University; 2019.
16. Lerthattasilp T. Burnout among psychiatrists in Thailand: National survey. J Psychiatr Assoc Thailand 2011;56: 437-48.
17. Oakman J, Kinsman N, Stuckey R, Graham M, Weale V. A rapid review of mental and physical health effects of working at home: how do we optimise health? BMC Public Health 2020;20:1825.
18. Therdthoonphuphuch WS. Work Stress and Burnout Among Lawyers Who Have Licenses to Practice Law at Thai Lawyers Council under The Royal Patronage. [Thesis]. Bangkok: Chulalongkorn University; 2015.
19. Ampornmunee N. Prevalence and Associated Factors of Burnout Syndrome in Inquiry Officials in the Metropolitan Police Bureau. J Psychiatr Assoc Thailand 2021;66:39-52
20. Bretland RJ, Thorsteinsson EB. Reducing workplace burnout: The relative benefits of cardiovascular and resistance exercise. Peer J. 2015;3:e891.
21. Peterson SA, Wolkow AP, Lockley SW, O'Brien CS, Qadri S, Sullivan JP, et al. Associations between shift work characteristics, shift work schedules, sleep and burnout in North American police officers: a cross-sectional study. BMJ Open [Internet]. 2019 [cited 2021 Feb 22]; 9(11):[e030302 p.]. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2019-030302.
22. Metlaine A, Sauvet F, Gomez-Merino D, Elbaz M, Delafosse JY, Leger D, et al. Association between insomnia symptoms, job strain and burnout syndrome: a cross-sectional survey of 1300 financial workers.

BMJ Open. 2017;7(1):e012816.

23. Barreck A. Navettage et épuisement professionnel selon la région et le moyen de transport : les résultats de l'étude SALVEO [Thesis]. Quebec (CA): Université de Montréal; 2015.
24. Nuallaong W. Burnout symptoms and cycles of burnout: The comparison with psychiatric disorders and aspects of approaches. Burnout for experts: Springer; 2013. p. 48.
25. Aydemir O, Icelli I. Burnout: risk factors. Burnout for experts: Springer; 2013. p. 119-43.
26. Lertwilai W. Job burnout and related factors among medical technologist, Bangkok. [Thesis]. Bangkok: Chulalongkorn University; 2020.
27. Choi YG, Choi BJ, Park TH, Uhm JY, Lee DB, Chang SS, et al. A study on the characteristics of Maslach Burnout Inventory-General Survey (MBI-GS) of workers in one electronics company. Ann Occup Environ Med [Internet]. 2019 [cited 2021 Feb 22]; 31: [e29 p.]. Available from: https://doi.org/10.35371/aoem.2019.31.e29.
28. Xiao Y, Zhang T, Gu X, Lee J, Wang H. The Roles of Individual and Psychosocial Factors in Predicting Quality of Life Among Working Women in Shanghai. Int J Environ Res Public Health 2020;17:1751.
29. Lin Q-h, Jiang C-q, Liu Y-m, Guo J-y, Lam TH. [Analysis of influential factors for job burnout among managers in a joint venture in Guangzhou, China]. Zhonghua Lao Dong Wei Sheng Zhi Ye Bing Za Zhi. 2013;31(12): 902-5.
30. Di Mattei VE, Perego G, Milano F, Mazzetti M, Taranto P, Di Pierro R, et al. The "Healthcare Workers' Wellbeing (Benessere Operatori)" Project: A Picture of the Mental Health Conditions of Italian Healthcare Workers during the First Wave of the COVID-19 Pandemic. Int J Environ Res Public Health 2021;18: 5267.