Job Performance and Burnout in the Sustainable Planning of Education Projects

Meilyn E. Campusano-Polanco [1], Cándida M. Domínguez-Valerio [2], Miguel Ángel Solano-Sánchez [3], José E. Ramos-Ruíz [3]

[1] *University of Cordoba, Adarve Street, 30, 14071, Cordoba, Spain*
[2] *Universidad Tecnológica de Santiago, Av. Estrella Sadhalá, Santiago de los Caballeros, Dominican Republic*
[3] *University of Cordoba, Plaza de Puerta Nueva, s/n., 14071, Cordoba, Spain*

Abstract **– This research aims to understand the influence of burnout on the relationship between job performance and sustainable planning in higher education. Through a survey of administrative personnel in Dominican institutions, variables were measured using validated questionnaires and analyzed with PLS-SEM. The findings indicate a significant correlation between performance and sustainable planning. Contrary to expectations, burnout did not significantly impact planning, although it did negatively affect job performance. These results highlighted the importance of integrating sustainability into project planning by addressing both theoretical and practical dimensions. The study highlights how burnout affects project success, emphasizing the need for comprehensive strategies to mitigate it. Furthermore, it suggests that sustainable project planning improves traditional management theories by adding ethical, social, and environmental considerations.**

Keywords **– Job performance, burnout, sustainable planning, education projects.**

DOI: 10.18421/TEM134-36
https://doi.org/10.18421/TEM134-36

Corresponding author: Cándida M. Domínguez-Valerio,
Universidad Tecnológica de Santiago, Av. Estrella Sadhalá, Santiago de los Caballeros, Dominican Republic
Email: *candidadominguez1@docente.utesa.edu*

Received: 30 May 2024.
Revised: 17 September 2024.
Accepted: 11 November 2024.
Published: 27 November 2024.

1. Introduction

Sustainable project planning is fundamental within the field of project management, due to its ability to incorporate sustainability principles in all phases of a project [1]. This approach focuses on achieving short-term objectives, as well as ensuring long-term viability and accountability, focusing on economic, social and environmental impacts [2]. In this context, work performance during the execution of the project acquires high relevance, since the ability of the project to adapt and respond to the sustainability principles integrated in its planning largely depends on it [1]. Sustainable project planning involves a dynamic and continuous process that extends beyond the initial design and approval phase [3]. This process requires constant review and adjustment of strategies and practices to align with changes, both internal and external, that may arise during project execution [4]. This dynamic guarantees that the project fulfils the technical requirements and meets the expectations of the various stakeholders, but also contributes positively to the well-being of the community and the natural environment, minimizing negative impacts and enhancing long-term benefits [5]. In this framework, work performance in the project becomes a critical element, since the work team is responsible for implementing sustainability practices in the daily life of the project [6]. The effectiveness with which team members adopt and promote these sustainable principles is directly related to the quality and success of the project [7]. Therefore, it is essential that teams are made up of individuals trained in the necessary technical competencies, but also committed to sustainability values [8]. Thus, academic research has begun to more deeply explore variables that may affect the relationship between work performance variables and sustainable and constant project planning [9].

Recent studies have suggested paying attention to the burnout syndrome (also called professional exhaustion) produced by the project in the different actors [10]. This syndrome is a condition of physical, mental and emotional exhaustion that arises from extended exposure to emotionally challenging work environments [11]. This phenomenon is especially relevant in project management, where tight deadlines, high expectations, and constant pressure can lead workers to experience significant levels of stress [12]. In the context of projects, burnout affects the well-being of individuals, in addition to compromising the effectiveness with which tasks are executed, directly impacting productivity and team morale [13]. Proper management of human resources in projects, therefore, must include strategies to identify, prevent and mitigate burnout, thus ensuring the sustainability and efficiency of project planning and execution [10]. In this way, the aim of this research is to examine the impact of burnout syndrome on the relationship between job performance and sustainable project planning within higher education centers. Specifically, it seeks to identify how burnout affects the effectiveness with which members of the administrative staff carry out their tasks, and how this influences the overall planning of the project. Thus, focusing this research on higher education institutions is relevant because these represent highly demanding environments where administrative staff faces high pressures during the design, planning and implementation of a project. These pressures can lead to burnout, negatively affecting job performance and the ability to implement sustainable project planning, essential for institutional advancement and educational quality.

2. Review of the Literature and Statement of Hypotheses

This section presents the background on job performance, sustainable project planning, burnout syndrome at work and the research hypotheses.

2.1. Job Performance

Job performance is defined as the action, behaviors, and measurable outcomes that employees carry out or influence, which are connected to and contribute towards achieving organizational objectives [14]. The antecedents of job performance encompass a range of factors that influence an individual's performance in the workplace. These antecedents can be classified into organizational, work-related, or individual role factors [15].

Also, task performance, which includes core job responsibilities, is primarily influenced by factors such as skill and experience [16]. In addition, contextual performance, which encompasses behaviors that contribute to the overall functioning of the organization, can be influenced by work engagement [17]. Job knowledge has also been identified as an antecedent of job performance [14]. Additionally, job satisfaction has been connected to job performance, with studies investigating the relationship between them and the influence of factors like effort and compensation structure [18]. Likewise, organizational commitment has been found to be important in job performance, where affective organizational commitment can lead to improved performance [19]. Moreover, work engagement has consistently been identified as a key precursor to organizational performance [20]. Various studies have investigated the antecedents of job performance, considering factors such as job characteristics, leadership styles, and individual traits such as core self-evaluation and perceived organizational support [21]. Additionally, the relationship between work engagement, organizational performance and transformational leadership has been explored, highlighting the importance of work engagement in driving organizational results [22].

2.2. Sustainable Project Planning

Sustainable project planning involves the integration of environmental, economic and social considerations into project delivery processes to benefit stakeholders in a transparent, fair and ethical manner [23]. This planning constitutes a relevant aspect of sustainable project management, ensuring that projects prioritize long-term environmental, social and economic sustainability [24]. Research indicates that sustainable project planning is positively associated with project success, underscoring the importance of integrating sustainability principles into project planning [25]. Furthermore, the participation of actors who promote the sustainability of projects is key to improving project sustainability [26]. Likewise, sustainable project planning is vital to evaluate project objectives, select sustainable execution alternatives, and maintain sustainable facilities throughout their life cycle [24]. This planning involves continuous decision-making processes that consider sustainability throughout the implementation and operation of the project [27]. In this way, when sustainability is integrated into project portfolio management, organizations can incorporate sustainability considerations into the strategic planning of multiple projects [28].

2.3. Burnout Syndrome at Work

Burnout syndrome is a condition that arises from chronic stress at work, leading to a state of cognitive wear, physical fatigue and emotional exhaustion [29]. This is observed by aspects related to overwhelming exhaustion, negative attitudes, lack of commitment, and dissatisfaction with job performance [30]. Burnout can manifest at various levels, including cognitive, physical, and emotional aspects [29]. Studies have shown that burnout syndrome can result in adverse consequences such as fatigue, insomnia, family problems, absenteeism, and job discontent [31]. Additionally, it is associated with decreased interest, feelings of frustration, and a negative impact on individual performance and overall work quality [32]. Also, burnout has been linked to factors such as poor interpersonal relationships, lack of support at work, and high job demands [33]. Additionally, burnout syndrome has been recognized as a significant issue among healthcare professionals, with studies highlighting its prevalence and impact on people working in high-stress environments, such as emergency units during the COVID-19 pandemic [34]. Burnout syndrome is also linked to a heightened risk of depression and other mental health problems [35].

2.4. Hypothesis Statement

Sustainable project planning is essential to improve the work performance of project personnel [7]. Effective sustainable project planning involves establishing a clear mission and vision for the project, engaging in early and ongoing planning for sustainability involves developing and adhering to a realistic project plan while identifying alternative strategies to ensure the project's long-term viability [36]. Project sustainability strategies are relevant to the success of sustainable construction projects, highlighting the importance of the project manager's competence and training in sustainability issues [26]. Sustainable project management involves the planning, monitoring, and control of project delivery processes, taking into account economic, social and environmental aspects, with the aim of realizing benefits for stakeholders in an ethical and transparent manner [23].

The job performance of project employees is related to sustainable project planning. First, high job performance allows staff to channel their efforts more effectively, knowing exactly what needs to be achieved and why it is important in the context of sustainability [37].

Second, sustainable planning involves the judicious allocation of resources, including human capital, ensuring that tasks are assigned according to the skills and experience of individuals [38].

Additionally, environmental considerations woven into the fabric of sustainable planning guide project staff to incorporate environmentally friendly practices into their workflows [39]. This integration could improve job satisfaction by instilling a sense of purpose and responsibility [40]. Furthermore, sustainable planning emphasizes stakeholder participation throughout the project life cycle, encouraging collaboration and support from all parties involved [41]. Finally, sustainable planning cultivates a culture of continuous improvement, where reflection, learning and adaptation are encouraged [42]. This approach enables staff to evolve professionally, improving their skills and work performance over time [43]. Therefore, sustainable planning could optimize productivity while mitigating the risk of burnout or inefficiency arising from lack of alignment [10]. However, research indicates that factors such as workload, staffing levels, and work environment can contribute to burnout among professionals [44]. Burnout affects the physical and mental health of staff and can lead to lower job performance and organizational burnout, affecting overall efficiency and work quality [45]. Additionally, burnout has been linked to higher rates of absenteeism, reduced productivity, and job turnover [46], [47]. Likewise, burnout among project staff can influence sustainable project planning, as this has been positively correlated with project success, indicating the importance of addressing burnout to ensure project sustainability [25]. Burnout can lead to lower job performance, increased absenteeism, and turnover rates, affecting the overall success and sustainability of projects [12]. In this context, the following hypotheses are proposed:

- H1: The job performance of project personnel is closely associated with sustainable project planning.
- H2: The job performance of project staff influences staff burnout syndrome (project burnout).
- H3: Staff burnout syndrome (project wear and tear) influences sustainable project planning.

3. Methodology

This section presents the study context, the sample, the data collection process, the questionnaire design, and the stages of data analysis.

3.1. Context of the Study, Sample and Data Collection Process

Data were gathered from administrative personnel who manage projects in the Dominican Republic. This country has a chapter of the Project Management Institute (PMI), which is a prominent international institution in the field of project management. In the Dominican Republic, PMI has an active presence providing resources, educational events and networking opportunities for project management professionals in the country. They offer training programs, internationally recognized certifications (such as the PMP - Project Management Professional certification) and promote best practices in project management. In this organization, in its local chapter, there are various institutions, such as universities. The survey data was collected using simple random sampling method. A researcher sent the survey by email to educational project managers at PMI and local universities. Previously, a preliminary test was conducted, carried out during the last week of February 2024, involving 10 university project managers. Subsequently, data collection occurred from March 2024 to May 2024. 141 valid surveys were obtained, this number being an adequate size according to the G*Power software [47]. That is, according to this software, the sample of 141 surveys was considered sufficient to perform covariance-based structural equation modeling [48].

3.2. Preparing the Questionnaire

The items used were extracted from previous studies. To measure job performance, five items adapted from the Wu *et al.* scale have been used. [49]. Likewise, the five items to measure burnout syndrome have also been adapted from Wu *et al.* [49]. For its part, sustainable project planning consisted of five items, adapted from Chow et al. [25]. To measure each item, a five-point Likert scale was used. Also, control variables were used to ensure the validity of the results, including demographic items (gender, age, educational level and experience at the institution).

Once the first draft was designed, and before applying the previous test, the questionnaire was evaluated by two academics, to guarantee the clarity and understandability of the instrument. Furthermore, to mitigate common methods bias (CMB), some strategies were adopted. Firstly, with the application of the questionnaire, the anonymity of the respondents was guaranteed, informing them that all the answers are valid [50]. Secondly, and following the recommendations of Podsakoff et al. [51], procedural solutions have been applied, using simple and familiar terms, and avoiding syntactic complexity. This was verified in the previous pre-test applied. Thirdly, once the questionnaires were tabulated, Harman's single factor test was applied, which indicates that the single factor must present a percentage of variance less than 50%, obtaining a lower percentage in our study (43.033%). Suggesting a negligible threat of CMB on the validity and reliability of research results [52]**.**

3.3. Data Analysis Stages

First, a descriptive analysis was performed using SPSS. Subsequently, a partial structural equation modeling (PLS-SEM) approach was used to analyze the data, using SmartPLS. Initially, the measurement model of the Mode A and Mode B constructs was evaluated. This process involved validating the reliability and validity of the scales used to measure these constructs. Subsequently, the structural model was evaluated, where the relationships between the constructs were examined and the formulated hypotheses were contrasted. The use of PLS-SEM in this HR study is recommended for several reasons [53]. First, PLS-SEM is suitable for complex models involving the interaction of various psychological and organizational variables. Furthermore, PLS-SEM allows exploring causal relationships between variables without requiring large samples, which is advantageous for this research.

4. Results

This section presents the analysis of the results, first presenting the sample profile, then the evaluation of the measurement model and, finally, the structural evaluation.

4.1. Sample Analysis

Table 1. External loads or weights (VIF)

Construct	**External loads / weights (VIF)**
Job performance CA = 0.938; Rho_A = 0.942; Rho_C= 0.953; AVE= 0.801	
I perform the essential aspects of my job effectively	0.917
I adapt well to changes in main tasks	0.899
I complete assigned tasks well according to plan	0.896
I invest a great deal of energy into my work on the project	0.867
Proper planning process	0.893
Sustainable project planning CA = 0.885; Rho_A = 0.898; Rho_C= 0.917; AVE= 0.690	
Our project plan incorporates management control measures for overseeing project implementation	0.870
We carry out project tasks in alignment with the management control measures outlined in the project plan	0.920
Potential project risks were identified during the project planning process	0,696
We will adhere to the steps of the predetermined project plan to implement the project in a sustainable manner	0.883
Our team members always negotiate conflicting project issues together	0.765
Project burnout	
The project leaves me feeling physically and mentally exhausted	0.235 (2.830)
The project tasks make me feel as though I'm on the verge of collapse	0.096 (3.854)
Since starting this project, I have become increasingly disinterested in my work	-0.425 (3.864)
I am no longer as enthusiastic about my job and my colleagues as before	0.026 (3.321)
Working all day is incredibly stressful for me.	0.119 (2.364)

Source: self-made. CA = Cronbach's alpha

The gender of the sample is represented, at 64.5%, by women. Ages from 30 to 39 years (29.8%) stand out, by the age group between 50-59 years (19.9%) and 18-29 years (19.1%). 97.9% of the sample have completed university studies. People with 6 or more years in the institution stand out (71.6%), followed by those with a period between one year and three years (25.5%).

4.2. Evaluation of the Measurement Model

The data analysis of the measurement model was carried out based on the Mode A (Job Performance and Sustainable Project Planning) and Mode B (Burnout Syndrome) composites, selected according to the scientific literature. For Mode A, convergent validity and internal consistency were evaluated through the factor loadings, Cronbach's alpha, rho_A, rho_C and the calculation of the average variance extracted (AVE) [54]. The findings in Table 1 show that all factor loadings exceeded the recommended threshold.

Cronbach's alpha, rho_A, and rho_C values were all above 0.60, and the average variance extracted (AVE) values were higher than the suggested minimum of 0.50 [54].

In summary, the results of the Mode A composite analysis are optimal. The indicators of the Mode B composites have been tested using the variance inflation factor or VIF test [55]. These values have not been higher than 4 (Table 1), so there are no multicollinearity problems between the indicators of the Mode B compounds.

The discriminant validity of the measurement model can be calculated with two methods (table 2) [56]. In relation to discriminant validity, both the Fornell-Larcker criterion and the Heterotrait-Monotrait (HT-MT) ratio were used. The Fornell-Larcker criterion demonstrates that the square root of the AVE for each construct exceeded its correlations with other constructs within the model [57]. Meanwhile, the HT-MT ratio values were found to be below 0.9 [56]. Consequently, the application of these criteria affirms the presence of discriminant validity.

Table 2. Discriminant validity

Constructs	Job performance	Sustainable project planning (SPP)
Job performance	**0.895**	0.786
SPP	0.727	**0.831**

Finally, it is highlited that the fit of both the saturated model and the estimated model is optimal, both at the level of SRMR (0.060), d_ULS (0.426) and d_G (0.214).

Table 3. Evaluation of the structural model, R^2 and Q^2

Constructs	**R^2**	**Q^2**
Project burnout	0.138	0.089
Sustainable project planning	0.528	0.524

Source: self-made.
Subsequently, the hypotheses were tested.

Table 4 presents that H_1 has been supported and the other two hypotheses (H_2 y H_3) have not been supported.

Source: self-made. The values in black on the diagonal a
re the square root of the AVE.
Below, Fornell-Larcker
values and, above, HTMT values.

Table 4. Hypothesis contrast

Hypothesis	Path coefficient	f^2	Statisticians t	p-values	IC 95%		Hypothesis results
					2.50%	97.50%	
$H_{1: JP \rightarrow SP}$	0.716	0,939 (0.043)	8.396	0.000	0.513	0.845	Supported
$H_{2: JP \rightarrow BS}$	0.371	0,160 (0.003)	0.937	0.349	-0.478	0.458	Not supported
$H_{3: BS \rightarrow SP}$	0.027	0,001 (0.942)	0.342	0.733	-0.122	0.177	Not supported

Source: self-made. JP = Job performance; SP = Sustainable project planning; BS = Burnout syndrome.

4.3. Evaluation of the Structural Model

The next step was to analyze the structural model and the hypotheses. Table 3 shows that the R^2 and Q^2 values were calculated, seeking to know the percentage of explained variance and the effect size (f^2). The R2 values were 0.138 (weak and significant) and 0.528 (moderate and significant), indicating that the model has an outstanding fit. In addition, as the Q^2 values are greater than 0, there is a certain predictive relevance of the model, especially in the construct of sustainable project planning.

5. Discusion

This study addressed the association between job performance and sustainable project planning, with a particular focus on how burnout syndrome mediates this relationship. The literature review established that while job performance is intrinsically related to the effectiveness of sustainable planning, burnout can severely compromise both aspects [11]. The data of this research show that, consistent with the literature, there is a significant association between job performance and sustainable project planning [25].

However, unlike the hypotheses raised, burnout did not show a significant impact on sustainable planning, although it did negatively affect job performance. This suggests that while burnout may impair individual performance capacity, its effect on project-level planning practices may be mediated by other organizational or structural factors that were not fully captured in this study.

5.1. Theoretical Implications

Sustainable project planning is a growing discipline that emphasizes the integration of sustainable principles throughout the life cycle of a project. From a theoretical perspective, this approach is based on a holistic understanding of sustainability, encompassing economic, social and environmental dimensions [2]. Work performance, especially in high-demand contexts such as projects in educational institutions, is essential for the effective application of these sustainable practices [7]. Burnout syndrome, which emerges as a consequence of chronic work stress, has been identified as a significant factor affecting both individual productivity and overall project effectiveness [10]. Current theories suggest that burnout may act as a mediator between job performance and the effectiveness of sustainable planning [11]. This raises the need to consider burnout mitigation strategies in project planning, suggesting a review of project management and human resources theories. From a theoretical point of view, research on sustainable project planning expands the field of project management by incorporating ethical and responsible dimensions, which is a critical expansion of traditional management theories that often focus solely on in efficiency and economic results [23]. Furthermore, studying the impact of burnout in this context introduces an important psychological dimension to project management theories, which have traditionally minimized human factors in favor of processes and techniques.

5.2. Practical implications

Projects designed with a sustainable approach seek to meet their immediate objectives, in addition to generating a long-term positive impact on communities and the environment [25]. This requires continuous reevaluation of strategies and practices to adapt to new conditions and findings, which can be demanding for the project team.

Recognition of burnout syndrome and its management becomes a critical aspect of maintaining a healthy and productive workforce, especially in high-pressure sectors such as higher education [30].

Strategies such as regularly monitoring employee well-being, implementing support programs, and stress management training are essential to preventing burnout. Additionally, fostering a work environment that promotes work-life balance can help reduce the risk of burnout. Implementing sustainable planning practices also requires training and commitment from all stakeholders involved. This includes training project teams in technical skills and competencies related to sustainability and ethics [26]. Furthermore, stakeholder engagement throughout the project is relevant to ensure that sustainability objectives are effectively integrated and maintained.

6. Conclusions

The present research draws a conclusion that there is a significant association between job performance and sustainable project planning, confirming the initial hypothesis about the relationship between the two. However, contrary to expectations, burnout syndrome did not show a direct impact on sustainable planning, although it did negatively affect individual performance. This suggests that, although burnout reduces personal performance capacity, its effect on project-level planning could be moderated by additional organizational factors not captured in the study. From a theoretical perspective, this finding underlines the need to integrate burnout mitigation strategies into sustainable project planning and highlights the relevance of addressing human factors in project management. In practical terms, effectively implementing sustainability practices requires monitoring of workplace well-being and training in ethical and sustainable competencies for all those involved in the project.

6.1. Barriers and Future Prospects

A barrier of this research is its focus on a single sector and geographic region, which may affect the generalizability of the results. Also, the research relied primarily on self-reports, which could introduce biases such as social desirability into the responses. For future study, it would be beneficial to expand the research to multiple sectors and regions to examine whether the observed patterns hold across different organizational and cultural contexts. Furthermore, it would be useful to further investigate the mechanisms through which burnout specifically affects sustainable planning practices, including the possible role of mediators such as organizational commitment and leadership support.

References:

[1]. Marcelino-Sádaba, S., González-Jaen, L. F., & Pérez-Ezcurdia, A. (2015). Using project management as a way to sustainability. From a comprehensive review to a framework definition. *Journal of cleaner production, 99*, 1-16. Doi: 10.1016/j.jclepro.2015.03.020

[2]. Roseland, M. (2000). Sustainable community development: integrating environmental, economic, and social objectives. *Progress in planning*, *54*(2), 73-132. Doi: 10.1016/S0305-9006(00)00003-9

[3]. Williams, D. E. (2007). *Sustainable design: ecology, architecture, and planning*. John Wiley & Sons.

[4]. Schindler, M., & Eppler, M. J. (2003). Harvesting project knowledge: a review of project learning methods and success factors. *International journal of project management*, *21*(3), 219-228. Doi: 10.1016/S0263-7863(02)00096-0

[5]. Misnan, M. S., Ismail, M. Z., & Yan, T. J. (2024). Construction Project Management Issues and Development in Current for Future Construction Project: Challenges and Prospects in Sustainable Project Management. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science, 8*(2), 1997-2011. Doi: 10.47772/IJRISS.2024.802141

[6]. Avotra, A. A. R. N., Chenyun, Y., Yongmin, W., Lijuan, Z., & Nawaz, A. (2021). Conceptualizing the state of the art of corporate social responsibility (CSR) in green construction and its nexus to sustainable development. *Frontiers in Environmental Science*, *9*, 774822. Doi:10.3389/fenvs.2021.774822

[7]. Shaukat, M. B., Latif, K. F., Sajjad, A., & Eweje, G. (2022). Revisiting the relationship between sustainable project management and project success: The moderating role of stakeholder engagement and team building. *Sustainable Development*, *30*(1), 58-75. Doi: 10.1002/sd.2228

[8]. Piwowar-Sulej, K. (2021). Core functions of Sustainable Human Resource Management. A hybrid literature review with the use of H-Classics methodology. *Sustainable development*, *29*(4), 671-693. Doi: 10.1002/sd.2166

[9]. Xiaolong, T., Gull, N., Iqbal, S., Asghar, M., Nawaz, A., Albasher, G., ... & Maqsoom, A. (2021). Exploring and validating the effects of mega projects on infrastructure development influencing sustainable environment and project management. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *12*, 663199. Doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2021.663199

[10]. Govindaras, B., Wern, T. S., Kaur, S., Haslin, I. A., & Ramasamy, R. K. (2023). Sustainable environment to prevent burnout and attrition in project management. *Sustainability*, *15*(3), 2364. Doi: 10.3390/su15032364

[11]. Zheng, J., Gou, X., Li, H., Xia, N., & Wu, G. (2021). Linking work–family conflict and burnout from the emotional resource perspective for construction professionals. *International Journal of Managing Projects in Business*, *14*(5), 1093-1115. Doi: 10.1108/IJMPB-06-2020-0181

[12]. Irfan, M., Khalid, R. A., Kaka Khel, S. S. U. H., Maqsoom, A., & Sherani, I. K. (2023). Impact of work–life balance with the role of organizational support and job burnout on project performance. *Engineering, Construction and Architectural Management, 30*(1), 154-171. Doi: 10.1108/ECAM-04-2021-0316

[13]. Hlubocky, F. J., Dokucu, M. E., & Back, A. L. (2021). The ethical implications of burnout: A moral imperative to prioritize physician well-being, resilience, and professional fulfillment. *Depression, Burnout and Suicide in Physicians: Insights from Oncology and Other Medical Professions*, 87-111. Cham: Springer International Publishing.

[14]. Viswesvaran, C., & Ones, D. S. (2000). Perspectives on models of job performance. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, *8*(4), 216-226. Doi: 10.1111/1468-2389.00151

[15]. Pandey, J. (2018). Factors affecting job performance: an integrative review of literature. *Management Research Review*, *42*(2), 263-289. Doi: 10.1108/MRR-02-2018-0051

[16]. Conway, J. M. (1999). Distinguishing contextual performance from task performance for managerial jobs. *Journal of applied Psychology*, *84*(1), 3. Doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.84.1.3

[17]. Christian, M. S., Garza, A. S., & Slaughter, J. E. (2011). Work engagement: A quantitative review and test of its relations with task and contextual performance. *Personnel psychology*, *64*(1), 89-136. Doi: 10.1111/j.1744-6570.2010.01203.x

[18]. Christen, M., Iyer, G., & Soberman, D. (2006). Job satisfaction, job performance, and effort: A reexamination using agency theory. *Journal of marketing*, *70*(1), 137-150. Doi: 10.1509/jmkg.2006.70.1.137

[19]. Wang, Q., Weng, Q., & Jiang, Y. (2020). When does affective organizational commitment lead to job performance?: integration of resource perspective. *Journal of Career Development*, *47*(4), 380-393. Doi: 10.1177/0894845318807581

[20]. Saks, A. M. (2019). Antecedents and consequences of employee engagement revisited. *Journal of Organizational Effectiveness: People and Performance, 6*(1), 19-38. Doi:10.1108/JOEPP-06-2018-0034

[21]. Chhetri, S. B. (2017). Antecedents and consequences of job engagement: empirical study of bank employees. *Business Perspectives and Research, 5*(2), 167-179. Doi: 10.1177/2278533717692919

[22]. Yasin Ghadi, M., Fernando, M., & Caputi, P. (2013). Transformational leadership and work engagement: The mediating effect of meaning in work. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal, 34*(6), 532-550. Doi: 10.1108/LODJ-10-2011-0110

[23]. Larsson, J., & Larsson, L. (2020). Integration, application and importance of collaboration in sustainable project management. *Sustainability, 12*(2), 585. Doi: 10.3390/su12020585

[24]. Yu, M., Zhu, F., Yang, X., Wang, L., & Sun, X. (2018). Integrating sustainability into construction engineering projects: perspective of sustainable project planning. *Sustainability, 10*(3), 784. Doi: 10.3390/su10030784

[25]. Chow, T. C., Zailani, S., Rahman, M. K., Qiannan, Z., Bhuiyan, M. A., & Patwary, A. K. (2021). Impact of sustainable project management on project plan and project success of the manufacturing firm: Structural model assessment. *Plos one, 16*(11), e0259819. Doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0259819

[26]. Aarseth, W., Ahola, T., Aaltonen, K., Økland, A., & Andersen, B. (2017). *Project sustainability strategies: a systematic literature review. International Journal of Project Management, 35*(6), 1071-1083. Doi: 10.1016/j.ijproman.2016.11.006

[27]. Shah, M. A. R., Rahman, A., & Chowdhury, S. H. (2017). Sustainability assessment of flood mitigation projects: an innovative decision support framework. *International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction*, 23, 53-61. Doi: 10.1016/j.ijdrr.2017.04.006

[28]. Schipper, R. R., & Silvius, A. G. (2018). Towards a conceptual framework for sustainable project portfolio management. *International Journal of Project Organisation and Management, 10*(3), 191-221. Doi: 10.1504/IJPOM.2018.093977

[29]. Khammissa, R. A. G., Nemutandani, S., Feller, G., & Lemmer, J. (2022). Burnout phenomenon: neurophysiological factors, clinical features, and aspects of management. *Journal of International Medical Research, 50*(9), 030006052211064. Doi: 10.1177/03000605221106428

[30]. Ivanić, D., Adam, V. N., Srzić, I., Stepić, A., & Pintarić, H. (2017). Burnout syndrome in emergency medicine. *Hong Kong Journal of Emergency Medicine, 24*(6), 290-297. Doi: 10.1177/1024907917740094

[31]. Dadkhah-Tehrani, M. and Adib-Hajbaghery, M. (2022). Burnout in a sample of iranian nurses during covid-19 pandemic. *Journal of Clinical Care and Skills, 3*(1), 41-46. Doi: 10.52547/jccs.3.1.41

[32]. Afonso, A. M., Cadwell, J. B., Staffa, S. J., Zurakowski, D., & Vinson, A. E. (2021). Burnout rate and risk factors among anesthesiologists in the united states. *Anesthesiology, 134*(5), 683-696. Doi: 10.1097/aln.0000000000003722

[33]. Mäkikangas, A., Leiter, M. P., Kinnunen, U., & Feldt, T. (2021). Profiling development of burnout over eight years: Relation with job demands and resources. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 30*(5), 720-731. Doi: 10.1080/1359432X.2020.1790651

[34]. Artanto, A., NurAnggina, D., Ghiffari, A., Huda, D. F., & Ilma, R. (2023). Relationship between Burnout Syndrome Symptoms and Demographic Characteristics among Long-Term COVID-19 Hospital Healthcare Workers in South Sumatra, Indonesia. *International Journal of Human and Health Sciences (IJHHS), 7*(2), 117.

[35]. Zisook, S., Doran, N., Mortali, M., Hoffman, L., Downs, N., Davidson, J., ... & Moutier, C. Y. (2022). Relationship between burnout and Major Depressive Disorder in health professionals: A HEAR report. *Journal of Affective Disorders*, 312, 259-267. Doi: 10.1016/j.jad.2022.06.047

[36]. Aarons, G. A., Green, A. E., Trott, E., Willging, C. E., Torres, E. M., Ehrhart, M. G., & Roesch, S. C. (2016). The roles of system and organizational leadership in system-wide evidence-based intervention sustainment: a mixed-method study. *Administration and Policy in Mental Health and Mental Health Services Research*, *43*, 991-1008. Doi: 10.1007/s10488-016-0751-4

[37]. Lowe, G. S. (2010). *Creating healthy organizations: How vibrant workplaces inspire employees to achieve sustainable success*. University of Toronto Press.

[38]. Pattanayak, B. (2020). *Human resource management*. PHI Learning Pvt. Ltd.

[39]. Hardin, B., & McCool, D. (2015). *BIM and construction management: proven tools, methods, and workflows*. John Wiley & Sons.

[40]. Nazir, O., Islam, J. U., & Rahman, Z. (2021). Effect of CSR participation on employee sense of purpose and experienced meaningfulness: A self-determination theory perspective. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management*, *46*, 123-133. Doi: 10.1016/j.jhtm.2020.12.002

[41]. Thabrew, L., Wiek, A., & Ries, R. (2009). Environmental decision making in multi-stakeholder contexts: applicability of life cycle thinking in development planning and implementation. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, *17*(1), 67-76. Doi: 10.1016/j.jclepro.2008.03.008

[42]. Mackay, M. (2017). Professional development seen as employment capital. *Professional Development in Education*, *43*(1), 140-155. Doi: 10.1080/19415257.2015.1010015

[43]. Pulakos, E. D., Hanson, R. M., Arad, S., & Moye, N. (2015). Performance management can be fixed: An on-the-job experiential learning approach for complex behavior change. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, *8*(1), 51-76. Doi: 10.1017/iop.2014.2

[44]. Humphries, N., Morgan, K., Catherine Conry, M., McGowan, Y., Montgomery, A., & McGee, H. (2014). Quality of care and health professional burnout: narrative literature review. *International journal of health care quality assurance*, *27*(4), 293-307. Doi: 10.1108/ijhcqa-08-2012-0087

[45]. Peng, S., Zhang, J., Liu, X., Pei, M., Wang, T., & Zhang, P. (2023). Job burnout and its influencing factors in Chinese medical staffs under China's prevention and control strategy for the COVID-19 pandemic. *BMC public health*, *23*(1), 284. Doi: 10.1186/s12889-022-14945-5

[46]. Ghazwani, E. Y. (2022). Prevalence and determinants of burnout among palliative care clinicians in Saudi Arabia. *Frontiers in Public Health*, *9*, 834407. Doi: 10.3389/fpubh.2021.834407

[47]. Lambert, E. G., Hogan, N. L., Dial, K. C., Jiang, S., & Khondaker, M. I. (2011). Is the job burning me out? an exploratory test of the job characteristics model on the emotional burnout of prison staff. *The Prison Journal, 92*(1), 3-23. Doi: 10.1177/0032885511428794

[48]. Kline, R. B. (2023). *Principles and practice of structural equation modeling*. New York, NY: Guilford publications.

[49]. Wu, G., Hu, Z., & Zheng, J. (2019). Role stress, job burnout, and job performance in construction project managers: the moderating role of career calling. *International journal of environmental research and public health, 16*(13), 2394. Doi: 10.3390/ijerph16132394

[50]. Ibrahim, M. N., Kimbu, A. N., & Ribeiro, M. A. (2023). Recontextualising the determinants of external CSR in the services industry: A cross-cultural study. *Tourism Management, 95,* 104690. Doi: 10.1016/j.tourman.2022.104690

[51]. Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., & Podsakoff, N. P. (2012). Sources of method bias in social science research and recommendations on how to control it. *Annual review of psychology, 63*, 539-569. Doi: 10.1146/annurev-psych-120710-100452

[52]. Ribeiro, M. A., Seyfi, S., Elhoushy, S., Woosnam, K. M., & Patwardhan, V. (2023). Determinants of generation Z pro-environmental travel behaviour: the moderating role of green consumption values. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 1-21. Doi: 10.1080/09669582.2023.2230389

[53]. Legate, A. E., Hair Jr, J. F., Chretien, J. L., & Risher, J. J. (2023). PLS-SEM: Prediction-oriented solutions for HRD researchers. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, *34*(1), 91-109. Doi: 10.1002/hrdq.21466

[54]. Sarstedt, M., Ringle, C. M., & Hair, J. F. (2021). Partial least squares structural equation modeling. *Handbook of market research* , 587-632. Cham: Springer International Publishing.

[55]. Roberts, N., & Thatcher, J. (2009). Conceptualizing and testing formative constructs: Tutorial and annotated example. *ACM sigmis database: The database for Advances in Information Systems*, *40*(3), 9-39. Doi: 10.1145/1592401.1592405

[56]. Henseler, J., Ringle, C. M., & Sarstedt, M. (2015). A new criterion for assessing discriminant validity in variance-based structural equation modeling. *Journal of the academy of marketing science*, *43*, 115-135. Doi: 10.1007/s11747-014-0403-8

[57]. Fornell, C., & Larcker, D. F. (1981). Evaluating structural equation models with unobservable variables and measurement error. *Journal of marketing research*, *18*(1), 39-50. Doi: 10.1177/002224378101800104