



BURNOUT AND WORKLOAD IN ACADEMIC MEDICINE: A META-ANALYTIC REVIEW

Rosalynn Josefa DG. Papa, MD¹, Reynaldo A. Cabual, PhD²

¹College of Medicine, Nueva University of Science and Technology, Cabanatuan City 3100, Philippines,

²Graduate School & College of Education, Nueva Ecija University of Science and Technology, Cabanatuan City 3100, Philippines ORCID 0009-0004-6704-5913

Article DOI: <https://doi.org/10.36713/epra30885>

DOI No: 10.36713/epra30885

ABSTRACT

Burnout among medical faculty is a significant occupational concern shaped by the intersecting demands of teaching, clinical service, research, and administration. This meta-analytic review examined the pooled prevalence of burnout among medical faculty across Asia, North America, and Europe; identified workload-related factors associated with burnout; and evaluated the effectiveness of individual, organizational, and integrated interventions in reducing burnout. A random-effects model was applied to synthesize quantitative data from 48 peer-reviewed studies published between 2015 and 2025, representing approximately 21,400 participants retrieved from PubMed, Scopus, and Web of Science. Findings revealed an overall pooled burnout prevalence of 47.6%, with the highest rate observed in Asia (52.4%), followed by North America (45.9%) and Europe (39.8%). Work-life imbalance ($r = 0.46$) and clinical duty hours ($r = 0.42$) were the strongest positive predictors of burnout, while institutional support, autonomy, peer collaboration, and job tenure functioned as protective resources. Integrated interventions demonstrated the greatest effectiveness in reducing burnout (SMD = -0.31), followed by organizational (SMD = -0.24) and individual approaches (SMD = -0.12). These findings affirm the Job Demands-Resources Framework and underscore that burnout is a structurally produced outcome requiring system-level institutional responses. Educational managers must adopt humane, evidence-based leadership practices that address workload equity, faculty support, and sustainable academic work environments.

KEYWORDS: Burnout Prevalence, Academic Medicine, Workload Demands, Job Demands-Resources Framework, Medical Faculty, Intervention Effectiveness, Meta-Analysis.

INTRODUCTION

Burnout has become a critical issue in academic medicine, where medical faculty are required to balance multiple and often competing responsibilities in teaching, clinical service, research, and administration. The cumulative demands associated with these roles may expose faculty members to chronic occupational stress, with adverse consequences for individual well-being, professional effectiveness, and institutional performance. Within academic medical settings, burnout may also compromise instructional quality, continuity of patient care, research productivity, and the long-term sustainability of the academic workforce (Maslach & Leiter, 2016; West et al., 2020; De Hert, 2020; Shanafelt & Noseworthy, 2017).

Burnout is widely understood as a multidimensional syndrome characterized by emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and reduced personal accomplishment. Although substantial scholarship has examined burnout among physicians, residents, and other healthcare professionals, comparatively limited attention has been given to medical faculty as a distinct group within academic medicine. This gap is significant because faculty members operate within a professional environment shaped by intersecting clinical, instructional, scholarly, and administrative demands. Accordingly, workload-related factors such as clinical duty hours, teaching load, administrative responsibilities, research pressure, and work-life imbalance warrant careful examination as possible determinants of burnout among medical faculty

(Maslach & Leiter, 2016; Dyrbye et al., 2019; Rotenstein et al., 2018; Bakker & Demerouti, 2017; West et al., 2020).

As burnout is increasingly recognized as both an occupational and organizational concern, it is important to examine not only its prevalence but also the interventions that may mitigate its effects. Existing studies suggest that interventions may be implemented at the individual, organizational, or integrated level, with organizationally anchored approaches often yielding more sustainable outcomes than interventions focused solely on individual coping. Thus, this meta-analytic review was conducted to determine the pooled prevalence of burnout among medical faculty across Asia, North America, and Europe; identify the workload-related factors associated with burnout; and evaluate the effectiveness of individual, organizational, and integrated interventions in reducing burnout in academic medicine (Shanafelt et al., 2017; West et al., 2016; Page et al., 2021).

The study is important because faculty burnout has implications not only for personal health but also for the quality and sustainability of academic medicine. Its findings provide evidence that may guide educational management decisions on workload planning, faculty support systems, wellness programming, and leadership practices in medical schools and teaching hospitals.

This study is anchored in the Job Demands-Resources (JD-R) Framework, which explains burnout as a work-related outcome that develops when job demands exceed the resources available to employees. In academic medicine, medical faculty



are required to manage multiple and often competing responsibilities, including clinical service, teaching, research, and administrative work. These responsibilities represent major job demands because they require sustained physical, cognitive, and emotional effort. When such demands are prolonged and insufficiently supported, they can contribute to chronic occupational stress and eventually to burnout.

Within the context of this study, the primary job demands include clinical duty hours, teaching load, administrative responsibilities, research pressure, and work-life imbalance. These demands may increase the likelihood of burnout by depleting faculty members' time, energy, and psychological capacity. According to the JD-R framework, continued exposure to excessive job demands may lead to emotional exhaustion and depersonalization, while also reducing a faculty member's sense of personal accomplishment.

The framework also identifies job resources as protective factors that can buffer the negative effects of excessive demands. In this study, the relevant resources include institutional support, autonomy or role control, and peer collaboration. Institutional support may take the form of mentoring, administrative assistance, supportive leadership, and flexible scheduling. Autonomy enables faculty to exercise control over their tasks, schedules, and professional decisions, while peer collaboration provides emotional support, collegiality, and shared problem-solving. These resources are important because they may reduce stress, improve work engagement, and protect faculty members from burnout even in demanding academic environments.

The JD-R framework further supports the study's emphasis on intervention effectiveness. Since burnout is influenced not only by individual coping but also by the organization of work, strategies that improve institutional conditions are expected to be more effective than interventions focused solely on the individual. Individual interventions may help faculty members manage stress, but organizational and integrated interventions are more likely to produce meaningful and sustained reductions in burnout because they directly address workload structures, support systems, and institutional practices. The framework thus provides a clear theoretical basis for examining the pooled prevalence of burnout, the workload-related factors associated with burnout, and the comparative effectiveness of individual, organizational, and integrated interventions among medical faculty.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

This study employed a meta-analytic quantitative design to synthesize findings from published empirical studies on burnout among medical faculty. This design was appropriate because the study aimed to estimate pooled burnout prevalence, examine workload-related factors associated with burnout, and evaluate the effectiveness of interventions through statistical synthesis of multiple studies. The design involved a systematic process of identifying, screening, selecting, and synthesizing quantitative studies that met the established inclusion criteria. A random-effects model was used in the analysis to account for heterogeneity among the included studies, which differed in terms of regional setting, participants, and contextual conditions. By incorporating such variation into the analysis, the model provided more realistic and generalizable estimates

of burnout prevalence, associated workload factors, and intervention effectiveness.

Because this study employed a meta-analytic review, it did not involve a single physical research site. Instead, the site of the study consisted of published scholarly works retrieved from PubMed, Scopus, and Web of Science — widely recognized sources of peer-reviewed literature in medicine, health sciences, and interdisciplinary academic research. The studies included in the review represented academic medicine settings across Asia, North America, Europe, and other regions, thereby giving the investigation a broad international scope. The use of these scholarly databases as the research site strengthened the comprehensiveness and credibility of the study, as these databases contain peer-reviewed and indexed research that has undergone academic scrutiny.

The participants in this study were not directly recruited. Instead, the study synthesized previously published quantitative investigations involving medical faculty. Across the 48 eligible studies included in the meta-analysis, the combined sample represented approximately 21,400 participants — faculty members working in academic medicine, including those engaged in teaching, clinical service, research, and administrative functions within medical schools, colleges of medicine, and affiliated teaching hospitals.

To be considered eligible, a study had to be (a) peer-reviewed, (b) published between 2015 and 2025, (c) focused on burnout among academic medical faculty, and (d) reporting at least one of the following outcomes: burnout prevalence, associations between workload-related factors and burnout, or intervention outcomes related to burnout reduction. Studies centered primarily on medical students, residents, nurses, or non-academic healthcare professionals were excluded unless findings specifically included academic medical faculty as a distinct group. Studies that did not provide usable statistical indicators — such as prevalence estimates, correlation coefficients, or intervention effect sizes — were likewise excluded.

Data collection began with a systematic search of PubMed, Scopus, and Web of Science using combinations of relevant keywords such as 'burnout,' 'medical faculty,' 'academic medicine,' and 'workload.' After the initial search, collected records underwent screening based on established inclusion criteria. Titles and abstracts were first reviewed, followed by full-text review of potentially eligible studies. Once eligible studies were identified, the researchers extracted quantitative and descriptive data from each study, including sample size, geographic region, burnout prevalence, correlation coefficients for workload-related predictors, and intervention outcomes. Because the study was meta-analytic in nature, data collection did not involve direct administration of instruments or direct contact with respondents.

The data gathered from the included studies were analyzed using a random-effects meta-analytic model. For the first research question, prevalence rates reported in individual studies were combined to produce an overall pooled estimate, and subgroup analyses were undertaken by region across Asia, North America, and Europe. For the second research question, correlation coefficients (r) were statistically synthesized to determine the strength and direction of associations between workload-related factors and burnout. For the third research



question, the effectiveness of interventions was assessed using standardized mean differences (SMD) as the indicator of intervention effect size, grouped by type: individual, organizational, and integrated.

The analysis also considered confidence intervals, p-values, and heterogeneity statistics (I^2) to support interpretation of the findings. These quantitative indicators strengthened the rigor of the analysis and provided a comprehensive basis for interpreting the prevalence, predictors, and intervention outcomes related to burnout among medical faculty.

Validation was established through the systematic and transparent procedures inherent in meta-analytic quantitative research. One important method was the use of explicit inclusion criteria for selecting studies, which reduced the likelihood of arbitrary selection and improved consistency in the review process. The use of multiple reputable databases — PubMed, Scopus, and Web of Science — enhanced the comprehensiveness of the evidence base. The random-effects model accounted for variability among the included studies, while heterogeneity statistics contributed to validation by showing the degree of variation across studies. Quantitative indicators of robustness — including confidence intervals, p-values, and effect sizes — functioned as objective bases for evaluating the strength of the evidence. Regional subgroup analyses and intervention comparisons further enhanced the internal coherence of the study.

Because this study was based on a meta-analytic review of already published peer-reviewed literature, it did not involve direct interaction with human participants, administration of research instruments, or collection of primary personal data. The major ethical responsibilities centered on (a) proper selection and fair representation of source studies, (b) accurate extraction and honest interpretation of data, (c) proper acknowledgment of intellectual sources through accurate citation, and (d) transparent reporting of findings without distortion or selective misrepresentation. The study declared that no external financial support was received in its conduct. Although no direct human participation was involved, ethical conduct remained essential because the synthesized evidence may influence institutional policies, faculty well-being programs, and future research directions in academic medicine.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

1. Pooled Prevalence of Burnout Among Medical Faculty Across Asia, North America, and Europe

The study found that the overall pooled burnout prevalence among medical faculty was 47.6%, indicating that burnout is a highly prevalent condition in academic medicine. This means that nearly one out of every two faculty members represented in the included studies experienced burnout, underscoring the magnitude and seriousness of the problem. Regional analysis further showed that burnout prevalence was highest in Asia at 52.4%, followed by North America at 45.9% and Europe at 39.8%.

The higher prevalence in Asia may be associated with heavier clinical workloads, limited institutional resources, more rapidly evolving academic infrastructures, and greater pressure to fulfill multiple professional roles simultaneously. In many institutions, faculty members may be expected to provide clinical service, teach learners, complete administrative tasks,

and sustain research productivity without clearly protected time for each responsibility. The relatively lower prevalence in Europe may reflect more regulated work hours, stronger labor protections, more clearly defined institutional roles, and broader support systems for faculty well-being.

North America, although lower than Asia, still reported a substantial prevalence rate of 45.9%, indicating that burnout remains a serious concern even in well-established academic medicine environments. This suggests that the availability of advanced healthcare systems and academic infrastructure does not automatically protect faculty members from burnout. The regional variation found in this study points to the importance of examining burnout not as a uniform phenomenon, but as a condition influenced by how academic work is structured, supported, and valued within specific institutional environments.

These prevalence findings suggest that burnout has become a normalized risk within academic medicine. When nearly half of the population represented in the review experiences burnout, the issue signals that the system itself may be producing conditions that are difficult to sustain over time. Institutions must not only monitor burnout rates but also critically examine the academic and clinical structures that make burnout so common.

2. Workload-Related Factors Associated with Burnout Among Medical Faculty

The study found that work-life imbalance had the strongest positive association with burnout, with a pooled correlation coefficient of $r = 0.46$. This was followed by clinical duty hours ($r = 0.42$). Teaching load, administrative responsibilities, and research pressure also showed positive associations with burnout, indicating that these factors contribute to the cumulative burden experienced by medical faculty.

Work-life imbalance appears to be particularly important because it reflects the degree to which work responsibilities intrude upon personal life, family obligations, rest, and emotional recovery. When the boundaries between professional and personal life become increasingly blurred, faculty members may experience chronic stress without sufficient opportunity to recover. Clinical duty hours emerged as a strong predictor because when extended duty hours are combined with academic obligations, the burden becomes even more difficult to manage. Faculty members who spend substantial time on patient care may have less time for lesson preparation, research writing, mentoring, and administrative compliance, thereby increasing feelings of inadequacy and role conflict.

Administrative responsibilities contribute to burnout because they often consume time without providing the same level of professional fulfillment associated with teaching or patient care. Documentation, meetings, reports, committee work, and compliance tasks may gradually erode the time available for more meaningful academic functions. Research pressure reflects the demand to publish, secure grants, and remain academically productive, intensifying stress in highly competitive academic environments.

The findings also identified protective factors. Institutional support showed a negative association with



burnout, as did autonomy or role control, peer collaboration, and job tenure. These results imply that burnout is less likely when faculty members work in environments characterized by supportive leadership, collegial relationships, administrative assistance, and greater control over their professional responsibilities. This shifts the discussion from a purely deficit-based view of burnout to one that also recognizes the value of institutional strengths.

3. Effectiveness of Individual, Organizational, and Integrated Interventions in Reducing Burnout

The study found that integrated interventions produced the strongest effect in reducing burnout, with a standardized mean difference of $SMD = -0.31$. Organizational interventions followed with an effect size of $SMD = -0.24$, while individual interventions demonstrated the smallest effect at $SMD = -0.12$. These results indicate that interventions are most effective when they address both the personal and structural dimensions of burnout.

Although individual interventions such as mindfulness training, counseling, resilience-building activities, or stress management workshops may provide short-term psychological relief, they do not alter the structural conditions that generate chronic strain. A faculty member may learn to cope better with stress, but if clinical loads remain excessive, administrative burden remains high, and protected time remains absent, the underlying causes of burnout continue to operate.

Organizational interventions address the workplace conditions that contribute directly to burnout — including workload redistribution, schedule redesign, reduction of unnecessary administrative tasks, improved staffing, enhanced leadership support, and the creation of protected time for research or recovery. The stronger effect size for organizational interventions indicates that meaningful burnout reduction requires institutional willingness to modify the conditions of work rather than simply expect individuals to endure them more effectively.

The strongest results were found for integrated interventions, which combine individual-level and organizational-level strategies. This suggests that the most effective response to burnout is one that recognizes both the human and structural dimensions of the problem. An institution that offers counseling or wellness workshops while also reducing workload, improving administrative support, and increasing flexibility is likely to achieve better outcomes than one that provides only one type of response.

4. Implications for Educational Management

The pooled prevalence of burnout of 47.6% indicates that burnout among medical faculty is not an isolated concern but a widespread organizational issue that must be addressed through educational leadership, institutional policy, and strategic management. From an educational management perspective, this level of prevalence suggests that faculty well-being should be regarded as a central condition for sustaining instructional quality, research productivity, clinical supervision, and institutional effectiveness.

The findings imply that educational management must adopt a more proactive and systems-based approach to faculty welfare. Educational leaders such as deans, department chairs,

program directors, and hospital-based academic administrators must regularly assess the work environment in which faculty members carry out their responsibilities — examining workload structures, performance expectations, staffing patterns, administrative burden, role clarity, and access to institutional support systems.

The strong associations of burnout with work-life imbalance, clinical duty hours, teaching load, administrative responsibilities, and research pressure suggest that educational managers must evaluate faculty workload in its totality rather than as separate and unrelated functions. Workload assignment should become more integrated, data-informed, and realistic, with attention given to protected time, fair task distribution, and the cumulative burden imposed on faculty members across all professional domains.

The intervention findings suggest that educational management should prioritize organizational and integrated approaches. Faculty development and wellness programs should be embedded within broader institutional reforms so that support for individuals is matched by meaningful changes in the work environment. Educational management should also incorporate faculty well-being into strategic planning, quality assurance, and institutional evaluation through regular burnout assessments, workload audits, and climate surveys. Educational leaders who promote flexibility, fairness, shared responsibility, and supportive professional cultures are more likely to sustain faculty vitality and institutional performance over time.

CONCLUSIONS

1. Burnout among medical faculty is highly prevalent across Asia, North America, and Europe, as evidenced by the overall pooled prevalence of 47.6%. This level of prevalence indicates that burnout constitutes a serious and widespread occupational condition within academic medicine rather than an isolated or occasional difficulty. The regional differences further support the conclusion that burnout is shaped by institutional, organizational, and contextual conditions that vary within particular academic and healthcare environments.

2. Burnout among medical faculty is strongly associated with multidimensional workload demands, particularly work-life imbalance ($r = 0.46$) and clinical duty hours ($r = 0.42$), as well as teaching load, administrative responsibilities, and research pressure. At the same time, the negative associations of institutional support, autonomy, peer collaboration, and job tenure with burnout indicate that these factors function as protective resources that mitigate the harmful effects of excessive demands.

3. Integrated and organizational interventions are more effective than individual interventions in reducing burnout among medical faculty. This conclusion indicates that burnout is more successfully addressed through strategies that target both the structural and personal dimensions of the problem. While individual interventions may provide temporary relief or supportive benefit, they are insufficient when the institutional conditions that generate chronic strain remain unchanged.

4. Effective management of academic medicine requires an educational leadership framework that recognizes faculty well-being as indispensable to institutional excellence. The findings demonstrate that burnout is not merely an



individual psychological response, but a structurally produced condition influenced by workload organization, institutional support, and the nature of intervention strategies. Educational management must therefore move toward more humane, balanced, and evidence-informed practices that address **both the demands placed upon faculty and the resources made available to them.**

RECOMMENDATIONS

For Administrators

- Adopt institution-wide policies that address burnout as a strategic organizational concern. Deans, department chairs, program directors, and hospital-based academic leaders should establish regular systems for monitoring faculty well-being, such as burnout assessments, workload audits, and institutional climate reviews. These measures enable the early identification of patterns of strain and allow for timely, data-informed interventions.
- Develop more equitable, transparent, and integrated workload management systems. Faculty responsibilities in teaching, clinical service, research, and administration should be assessed as interconnected rather than as separate functions. Administrators should provide protected time for research and recovery, reduce unnecessary administrative burden, ensure fair task distribution, and align performance expectations with realistic faculty capacity.
- Prioritize organizational and integrated interventions rather than relying solely on individual-focused wellness activities. Structural reforms such as schedule redesign, staffing support, strengthened leadership practices, mentoring systems, and faculty support services should complement resilience seminars and counseling programs to foster healthier academic work environments.

For Faculty

- Engage in professional practices that promote balance, self-awareness, and constructive help-seeking. Faculty members should actively monitor their own workload demands and communicate concerns regarding excessive responsibilities, unclear expectations, or inadequate support to their department heads or institutional leaders, helping to ensure that workload concerns are addressed before they progress into severe burnout.
- Strengthen collegial and professional support networks within academic environments. Participation in mentoring relationships, collaborative work groups, peer discussions, and faculty development activities may help foster a sense of support and shared problem-solving, as peer collaboration and institutional support were identified as significant protective factors.
- Make appropriate use of institutional well-being resources, such as counseling services, wellness programs, mentoring initiatives, and professional development opportunities. Self-care should be viewed not as a substitute for organizational change, but as one component of a broader effort to maintain professional health and effectiveness.

For Future Researchers

- Expand the evidence base on burnout in academic medicine through more focused and context-sensitive investigations. Future studies may examine burnout according to specific medical disciplines, academic ranks, career stages, institutional types, or national settings — including the Philippine context — in order to produce more nuanced insights into the conditions under which burnout develops.
- Explore additional variables not fully captured in the present meta-analysis, such as leadership style, organizational culture, policy environment, digital workload, faculty identity, and institutional governance structures. These variables may provide a richer understanding of the contextual and systemic factors that influence burnout in academic medicine.
- Employ longitudinal, mixed-methods, and intervention-based designs to deepen understanding of burnout and its reduction. Longitudinal research may clarify how burnout develops across time, while mixed-methods studies may provide richer insight into the lived realities behind quantitative trends. Intervention studies evaluating organizational and integrated approaches may further strengthen the evidence on effective practices for reducing burnout.

Integrated Recommendation. The problem of burnout among medical faculty should be addressed through a coordinated effort involving institutional leadership, faculty engagement, and continued scholarly inquiry. Administrators must create supportive and sustainable work environments, faculty members must participate actively in professional support and well-being practices, and researchers must continue to generate evidence that refines institutional responses. Through this shared commitment, academic medicine may move toward healthier, more humane, and more sustainable educational environments.

Acknowledgements

The researcher extends gratitude to the adviser, evaluation panel, language editor, statistics editor, graduate school leadership, Nueva Ecija University of Science and Technology, colleagues, friends, and family members whose guidance and support contributed to the completion of the study, as reflected in the source manuscript.

REFERENCES

1. Acai, A., Stergiopoulos, V., Dewa, C. S., & Sockalingam, S. (2023). A qualitative investigation of burnout and well-being among faculty and residents in a Canadian psychiatry department. *Academic Psychiatry*, 47(2), 159-163. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40596-023-01745-1>
2. Akram, B., Ul Haq, M. A., Saeed, I., & Perveen, S. (2021). Assessment of burnout and associated factors among medical educators. *Pakistan Journal of Medical Sciences*, 37(3). <https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC8155453/>
3. Al-Shami, H. A., Shah, M., & Haghshenas, A. (2024). Assessment of burnout, resilience, and thriving among academic health professionals: Findings from an international study. *Frontiers in Public Health*. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpubh.2024.1366612>



4. Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2017). Job demands-resources theory: Taking stock and looking forward. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 22(3), 273–285. <https://doi.org/10.1037/ocp0000056>
5. Belkić, K. (2025). Toward better prevention of physician burnout: Insights from individual participant data using the MD-specific Occupational Stressor Index and organizational interventions. *Frontiers in Public Health*. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpubh.2025.1514706>
6. Clandinin, D. J., & Connelly, F. M. (2000). *Narrative inquiry: Experience and story in qualitative research*. Jossey-Bass.
7. Claro, R. A. (2024). Burnout and workplace conflicts: A faculty's perspective from Santiago City higher education institutions. *EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research*. <https://doi.org/10.36713/epra15910>
8. Clubbs, B. H., Barnett, C. W., & Cole, S. W. (2020). Pharmacy faculty burnout. *American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education*. <https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC8075153/>
9. De Hert, S. (2020). Burnout in healthcare workers: Prevalence, impact, and preventative strategies. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 11, 563455. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.563455>
10. Deep, S., Hakim, A., & Ahmad, S. (2025). Faculty burnout in higher education: Effects on student engagement, learning outcomes, and AI-driven institutional responses. *Journal of Education and Development Psychology*, 15(1), 29. <https://doi.org/10.5539/jedp.v15n1p29>
11. Dyrbye, L. N., Shanafelt, T. D., Johnson, P. O., Johnson, L. A., Satele, D., & West, C. P. (2019). A cross-sectional study exploring the relationship between burnout, absenteeism, and job performance among physicians. *Mayo Clinic Proceedings*, 94(9), 1681–1692. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mayocp.2019.02.018>
12. Formica, V., Morelli, C., Nardecchia, A., & Roselli, M. (2022). Coping strategies of healthcare professionals with burnout syndrome: A systematic review. *Medicina*, 58(2), 327. <https://doi.org/10.3390/medicina58020327>
13. Hartzband, P., & Groopman, J. (2023). Burnout in academic medicine: A peripandemic assessment. *The Permanente Journal*, 27(2). <https://doi.org/10.7812/TPP/23.042>
14. Lopez, H. G. (2026). Professional burnout stories among physical education teachers: A narrative inquiry. *Journal of Nusantara Studies*, 11(1), 141–154. <https://doi.org/10.24200/jonus.vol11iss1pp141-154>
15. Lotfi, M., Mousavi, S. A., & Sahebi, A. (2025). Assessment of burnout and its related factors in the faculty members and medical staff. *BMC Medical Education*. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12909-025-06360-4>
16. MacLeod, A., Cameron, P., Kits, O., & Tummons, J. (2022). A phenomenological exploration of the impact of COVID-19 on the medical education community. *Medical Education*. <https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC9115140/>
17. Malhotra, R. (2025). Navigating stress in private higher education colleges. *Journal of Contemporary Education Studies in Higher Education*. <https://doi.org/10.69996/jcesh.2025010>
18. Malki, K., Fitzgerald, S., O'Brien, D., & Siau, C. (2023). Understanding and fostering mental health and well-being among university faculty: A narrative review. *Journal of Clinical Medicine*, 12(13), 4425. <https://doi.org/10.3390/jcm12134425>
19. Martín Sánchez, P., González-Ponce, I., & Ramírez-Baena, L. (2025). Physician and medical student burnout, a narrative literature review. *Journal of Clinical Medicine*, 14(7), 2263. <https://doi.org/10.3390/jcm14072263>
20. Maslach, C., & Leiter, M. P. (2016). Understanding the burnout experience: Recent research and its implications for psychiatry. *World Psychiatry*, 15(2), 103–111. <https://doi.org/10.1002/wps.20311>
21. McHenry, C., & Koster, M. (2023). Areas of work-life that contribute to burnout among higher education health science faculty and perception of institutional support. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies on Health and Well-being*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17482631.2023.2235129>
22. McKinley, T. F. (2021). Toward useful interventions for burnout in academic medical faculty. *Journal of Continuing Education in the Health Professions*. <https://doi.org/10.1097/CEH.0000000000000389>
23. Midik, Ö., Baykan, Z., & Arıkan, İ. (2024). Difficulties faced by residents and clues for solutions: A qualitative study. *Inquiry*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00469580241271313>
24. Page, M. J., McKenzie, J. E., Bossuyt, P. M., Boutron, I., Hoffmann, T. C., Mulrow, C. D., et al. (2021). The PRISMA 2020 statement: An updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. *BMJ*, 372, n71. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.n71>
25. Panagioti, M., Geraghty, K., Johnson, J., Zhou, A., Panagopoulou, E., Chew-Graham, C., Dawson, S., & Esmail, A. (2020). Organizational strategies to reduce physician burnout: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Ageing Research Reviews*, 59, 101019. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.arr.2020.101019>
26. Panagioti, M., Panagopoulou, E., Bower, P., Lewith, G., Kontopantelis, E., Chew-Graham, C., Dawson, S., van Marwijk, H., Geraghty, K., & Esmail, A. (2017). Controlled interventions to reduce burnout in physicians: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *JAMA Internal Medicine*, 177(2), 195–205. <https://doi.org/10.1001/jamainternmed.2016.7674>
27. Paradis, K. C., Kerr, E. A., Griffith, K. A., et al. (2024). Burnout among mid-career academic medical faculty. *JAMA Network Open*, 7(6), e2415593. <https://doi.org/10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2024.15593>
28. Ramani, S., & McKean, S. C. (2023). Burnout in academic physicians. *The Permanente Journal*, 27(2). <https://doi.org/10.7812/TPP/23.032>
29. Raza, A., Akram, M., & Khan, S. A. (2024). Addressing burnout and enhancing well-being among academic physicians: A call for future research and organizational support. *PMC*. <https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC11249191/>
30. Revah-Levy, A., Birmes, P., Brenot, P., & Meningaud, J. P. (2021). Workplace environment around physicians' burnout: A qualitative study in French hospitals. *Scandinavian Journal of Work, Environment & Health*. <https://doi.org/10.5271/sjweh.3977>
31. Rotenstein, L. S., Torre, M., Ramos, M. A., Rosales, R. C., Guille, C., Sen, S., & Mata, D. A. (2018). Prevalence of burnout among physicians: A systematic review. *JAMA*, 320(11), 1131–1150. <https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.2018.12777>
32. Shah, D. T., Williams, V. N., Bhatt, D. L., Picchioni, M., Clevenger, C., Sherwood, G., & Bauchner, H. (2017). Restoring faculty vitality in academic medicine when burnout threatens. *Academic Medicine*. <https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC6169302/>
33. Shanafelt, T. D., & Noseworthy, J. H. (2017). Executive leadership and physician well-being: Nine organizational strategies to promote engagement and reduce burnout. *Mayo Clinic Proceedings*, 92(1), 129–146. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mayocp.2016.10.004>
34. Shanafelt, T. D., Dyrbye, L. N., & West, C. P. (2017). Addressing physician burnout: The way forward. *JAMA*, 317(9), 901–902. <https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.2017.0076>
35. Siedel, M., Walker, A., & Schlegel, L. (2022). A qualitative analysis of areas of work-life that lead to burnout and desired



- institutional support among higher education health science faculty. *Respiratory Care*.
<https://doi.org/10.4187/respcare.20223765909>
36. Walling, A., Mikesell, C., & Agrawal, S. (2021). *Origin storytelling in faculty well-being: A pilot study*. PRiMER. <https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC8284488/>
37. West, C. P., Dyrbye, L. N., & Shanafelt, T. D. (2020). *Physician burnout: Contributors, consequences, and solutions*. *Journal of Internal Medicine*, 283(6), 516–529. <https://doi.org/10.1111/joim.12987>
38. West, C. P., Dyrbye, L. N., Erwin, P. J., & Shanafelt, T. D. (2016). *Interventions to prevent and reduce physician burnout: A systematic review and meta-analysis*. *The Lancet*, 388(10057), 2272–2281. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(16\)31279-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(16)31279-X)