social sciences

MDPI

Article

Classification of Determinants of Burnout Syndrome in Terms of Personality Traits of Public Administration Managers

Eva Brijová [1], Veronika Mlynárová [1], Peter Mlynár [1], Zuzana Birknerová [1] and Ivan Uher [2,*]

[1] Faculty of Management and Business, University of Prešov, 080 01 Prešov, Slovakia
[2] Institute of Physical Education and Sport, Pavol Jozef Šafárik University in Košice, 040 11 Košice, Slovakia
* Correspondence: ivan.uher@upjs.sk

Abstract: Burnout syndrome is considered a disease of modern societies. Research has shown that burnout is related to reduced performance in the workplace. Many times, burnout syndrome occurs in helping professions, such as healthcare or social services. The aim of this explanatory research is to determine the relationship between the degree of burnout syndrome, personality traits, and determinants of burnout syndrome of managers in public administration. The Maslach Burnout Inventory (MBI) has been used to measure burnout syndrome. Personality traits, i.e., neuroticism, extraversion, openness to experience, five-factor inverters (NEO FFI), and assessing the determinants of burnout syndrome (PDSV) have been considered. The research sample consisted of (n = 226) managers in public administration. Based on the determined three hypotheses, we brought together sufficient evidence to provide more than a tentative conclusion that there is a positive association between NEO FFI and PDSV, MBI and PDSV, as well as MBI and NEO FFI. It can be inferred that a high workload and a lack of resources are some of the most compelling aspects that can instigate burnout. In addition to what has been assumed, there is argumentation among professionals about what is burnout, its symptoms, diagnostic criteria, environment of its occurrence, which demands further investigation to waive the vagueness and ambiguity of the concept of burnout syndrome.

Keywords: burnout syndrome; public administration managers; personality traits; determinants

check for updates

Citation: Brijová, Eva, Veronika Mlynárová, Peter Mlynár, Zuzana Birknerová, and Ivan Uher. 2022. Classification of Determinants of Burnout Syndrome in Terms of Personality Traits of Public Administration Managers. *Social Sciences* 11: 413. https://doi.org/10.3390/socsci11090413

Academic Editor: Nigel Parton

Received: 4 August 2022
Accepted: 1 September 2022
Published: 8 September 2022

Publisher's Note: MDPI stays neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.

Copyright: © 2022 by the authors. Licensee MDPI, Basel, Switzerland. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

1. Introduction

Organizations in recent decades have seen a high level of development and change in the workplace. Thus, social, demographic, economic, and technological changes occur, resulting in an increases work demands of managers, which affects the quality of work, performance, and productivity of the individual and organization. Common for burnout syndrome is that it occurs slowly and imperceptibly, with no differences, in gender; it can affect both sexes. Burnout in specific professions is explored in studies by Schaufeli et al. (2009). We focused on the existence of statistically positive correlations between the value of the burnout syndrome and the personality traits in the manager in public administration. For comparability of our outcomes, we targeted research that investigated the relationship between burnout syndrome and personality traits: Louw (2014), Alarcon et al. (2009), Swider and Zimmerman (2010), Bakker et al. (2006), Anvari et al. (2011), Makasheva et al. (2016). The advantage of this study is the summarization of the assessed connections of the analyzed phenomenon of manager burnout syndrome in public administration, specifically in a Slovak environment. Public administration managers may encounter various negative phenomena at the workplace, which cause undesirable effects on their behavior, leading to stressful situations and the exhaustion of public administration managers (Horzinková and Novotný 2010). We affirm that it is necessary to address the issues of physical, occupational, and psychological exhaustion caused by exposure to the effects of an excessive amount of work which causes burnout in public administration managers.

2. Literature Review

Generally, we can consider burnout syndrome a pressing phenomenon. The burnout syndrome cannot be classified or defined; we treat it as a three-dimensional psychological syndrome (Maslach et al. 2001). The problem of burnout was initially identified among healthcare workers, but burnout affects not only medical and social service personnel but also in the managers, teachers, therapists, company employees, etc. It occurs primarily in those professions where the critical component of the work activity is working with people or at least being in contact with people (Franková 2008; Gómez-Polo et al. 2021).

Freudenberger (1974, 1975, 1977), Freudenberger and Richelson (1980) and Ginsburg (1974) were the first to use the term burnout syndrome. Maslach and collaborators performed the scientific description of the phenomenon. Freudenberger published other publications focusing on burnout syndrome in 1975, 1977, and 1980 by Freudenberger and Richelson (1980), so Freudenberger is considered the creator of the concept of burnout syndrome.

Kaschka et al. (2011) define burnout syndrome as a reaction to chronic work stress. They are accompanied by personal experience of feelings, knowledge, and attitudes that cause psycho-physiological changes in the employee and have negative consequences on employees of the organization. These physical, psychological, and emotional changes (Heinemann and Heinemann 2017) are manifested in employees by physical, psychological, and emotional exhaustion. Maslach et al. (2001) claim that organizational employee burnout results from a long-term reaction to chronic stressful interpersonal relationships and emotional stressors at work.

We suspect that even if burnout syndrome is defined as being caused by work stress, it can affect the way of life of the person who suffers from it. And this transforms psychological reactions into organic changes, which in turn create disbalances that affect work, social, and the employee family life. The most common symptoms of burnout, anxiety, and depression are the reason for most employee's incapacity for work. Freudenberger (1977) indicates that the leading causes of burnout syndrome are the work environment and working conditions. Siegall and McDonald (2004) state that employee who was permanently exposed to, among other things, high stress, excessive workload, low job autonomy, poor working relationships, insufficient support in his environment, lack of training to perform tasks, etc., may suffer from chronic subliminal stress, which eventually causes burnout. Based on that, the relationship between stress and burnout can be powerful (Wolpin et al. 1991; Lee and Ashforth 1996; Lu and Gursoy 2016; Cheng and O-Yang 2018).

According to Freudenberger (1974, 1975), the main symptoms of burnout syndrome in employees are feelings of exhaustion, failure, helplessness, low self-esteem, lack of personal accomplishment, a permanent state of nervousness, difficult concentration, aggressive behavior, absenteeism, low work performance, inappropriate communication, irritability and impatience, boredom, headaches, muscle tension, insomnia, chronic fatigue, accelerated heart rhythm (tachycardia), gastritis, ulcers, depression, anxiety, obsession, frustration. Moreover, further symptoms include weight change, impotence, alcoholism, drug use, etc. (Gold and Chrousos 2002). The prevention of employee burnout should start first in the employee's organization. Appraisal of the situations that cause stress and anxiety in the employee and then taking appropriate measures to reduce it, focusing on job satisfaction, respect, care, and integration into the employees working life should be among the first steps according (Bruce 2009; Hyett and Parker 2015). Human resources personnel play an essential role in eliminating burnout syndrome in the workplace in the form of effective measures in the work environment. These measures should primarily be aimed at the organizational level to eliminate stress at work and increase the comfort and engagement of employees (Castanheira and Chambel 2010). Another aspect is regular work breaks according to the needs of employees (Peart 2021; Chamorro-Premuzic 2021).

Burnout syndrome affects not only professional life, but also personal life. In the workplace, it is generally associated with an increase in the organization's financial costs, such as costs related to employee absenteeism and reduced productivity (Weber and Jaekel-

Reinhard 2000; Haar 2006). Naseh et al. (2012) jointly state that employment is one of the primary sources of psychological stress and burnout and is one of the main work problems that is usually seen as a response to employment and organizational tension among employee's organization. According to Staten and Lawson (2017), the consequence of burnout syndrome is permanent and frequent increased work demands and pressures. When the employee feels stressed in the work environment, and if the situation continues without change, the employee feels burnt out. Maslach et al. (2001) consider job burnout a psychological symptom of emotional burnout, de-personalization, and lack of individual achievement.

Since 28 May 2019, World Health Organization has classified burnout syndrome as a "syndrome" resulting from "chronic stress at work that has not been successfully resolved" that includes "factors affecting the state of health or contact with health services." The International Classification of Diseases (ICD-11) of the World Health Organization (2019) is included in the overview of diseases as a professional classification of health status.

2.1. Basic Theoretical Resorts of Burnout Syndrome in Managers

Managing people is the essence of every manager's work, and it follows that he works mainly with human resources (Rudy et al. 2013). In his management, the manager performs many different roles that cannot be separated from each other. Kassay (2013) points to three managerial positions: Interpersonal roles—the ability of managers to treat and communicate with employees and clients, is crucial for the company's overall success.

Information roles constitute a necessary part of the company's functioning is a high-quality systematic exchange of information. Decision-making roles can have a significant impact on the entire company. Quality managerial decisions measure their value and effectiveness for the company (Kassay 2013; Drucker 2000). Here, the manager must correctly decide what the critical strategic decisions and solutions to the company's problems will be, which is why it is also essential from our point of view how the manager approaches them.

Makasheva et al. (2016) jointly stated that the unfavorable socio-economic situation and the alarming results of the international and political situation in recent years cause managers to feel depressed, suppressed, and insecure. The complexity and variability of the modern world require the company manager to be constantly ready for changes, adapt to new conditions, and meet the growing demands in the field of professional activity. These factors often lead to stress and burnout syndrome, which causes a change in the manager's organism's reaction and negatively impacts the work environment, the manager's health, and the psycho-emotional state, ultimately reducing his vital functions. The importance of solving the burnout syndrome is also confirmed by the development of specific areas of management in the company, which aim at managing stress, predicting stress, and managing employees based on modern technologies to protect employees against stress and burnout.

The constant stressful work of managers can, as Kvesko et al. (2015), pointing out cause burnout syndrome, manifested by an emotional reaction of the manager's organism, or interpersonal relations at the workplace between the manager and employees become conflictual. The depletion of emotional resources leads to a loss of personality, i.e., a state when the manager has a feeling of social isolation, which is reflected in a cynical approach to work and colleagues; by reducing individual results, feeling unfit for work and failure (Kvesko et al. 2015; Haberleitner et al. 2009). Signs, such as exhaustion and hypertension, characterize burnout syndrome in managers. The profession of a public administration manager is not very different from a manager in the private sector. Here, however, from our point of view, by the term manager, we mean a senior employee of public administration at all levels of public administration management (top, middle and lowest). In public law, the manager's activity is formally defined precisely within the established job position and, at the same time, specifies his position in relation to other leaders and rank-and-file employees of the public administration. Managers, in accordance with their job position, have certain decision-making rights and responsibilities for achieving public administration results.

Managers ensure that public administration works and are responsible for achieving the desired results. They are granted certain powers with respect to people working in each part of public administration and are responsible for the performed activity (Armstrong and Stephens 2008; Jedinák 2012).

2.2. Components of Burnout Syndrome

In their study, Maslach and Jackson (1981a) point to three main components of the burnout syndrome: Emotional Exhaustion, Depersonalization, and Personal Accomplishment.

According to Janssen et al. (2004) and Halbesleben and Bowler (2007), emotional exhaustion is the most severe factor of burnout syndrome. Demerouti et al. (2010) jointly explains that *Emotional Exhaustion* occurs when permanent physical, emotional, and cognitive loads from the aspect of work requirements persist for a long time (Maslach et al. 2001). Managers who suffer from lack of sleep, have family problems, use alcohol or drugs excessively, feel stress from the workload and work environment. Exhibit a lack of mental or emotional energy are Emotionally Exhausted (Maslach and Goldberg 1998; Lloyd and King 2004; Anvari et al. 2011; Khan et al. 2014; Rodriguez et al. 2017). Emotional exhaustion is a state in which the manager thinks he does not have sufficient capacity to handle the daily grind on a psychological level.

Depersonalization represents burnout from work, which is characterized by a persistent or recurring feeling of separation from one's own body or one's mental processes, such as that the manager perceives himself as an external observer of life (Depersonalization) and/or has a feeling of complete disconnection from the environment (derealization). Depersonalization means that the manager creates defensive attitudes towards other managers, thereby psychologically distancing himself from them (Cordes and Dougherty 1993; Schaufeli and Buunk 2003; Shirom 2003). According to Maslach and Jackson (1981a), depersonalization usually leads to absenteeism, reduced commitment, performance, and satisfaction of managers (Lee and Ashforth 1996; Low et al. 2001; Halbesleben and Buckley 2004).

Personal Accomplishment is characterized by a state in which the manager tends to negative evaluation, self-depreciation, and humiliation of himself and his professional work (Rodriguez et al. 2017). When the manager loses his satisfaction, he acquires negative self-esteem and experiences fears about the future and job stability. He feels guilt, personal incompetence, low self-esteem related to the given profession, and uselessness. He lowers the evaluation of his achievements in working life and himself and is not interested. He doesn't even seek a job that could improve his work. In this stage, the manager performs work only to a certain extent, which we judge to be only the necessary minimum (Janowska et al. 2005; Anvari et al. 2011).

3. Materials and Methods

3.1. Model

The difference between public and private administration (considering the facts) lies in the degree of legally binding and in the achieved goal. Public administration is bound by the legal order negatively and positively by determining the scope and authority of each of its executors separately; a private company only negatively. The public administration is obliged to perform the tasks set out in laws and other legal regulations or based on the resolution of representative bodies or superior bodies. A private company determines its goals and tasks as well as the methods necessary to achieve the goals itself. From it, we can conclude that managers in public administration encounter a diverse group of clients (residents of the city) and a private company with a homogeneous group (employees). We conclude that managers in public administration may experience burnout earlier than managers in private administration, and therefore we decided to find out whether managers in public administration suffer from burnout according to their personality traits. We aimed to determine whether there is a statistical relationship in the assessment of the

determinants of burnout syndrome (PDSV) and personality traits of managers (NEO FFI), the determinants of burnout syndrome (PDSV) and the measure of manager burnout syndrome (MBI), and, lastly, burnout measure (MBI) and personality traits of managers (NEO FFI). Data collection was conducted employing online questionnaires from November 2021 to April 2022.

Hypothesis 1. *We assume the statistical link between personality traits (NEO FFI) and burnout syn-drome (PDSV) determinants in public administration managers.*

Hypothesis 2. *We hypothesize that there are statistical associations between the degree of burnout (MBI) and the determinants of burnout (PDSV) of public administration managers.*

Hypothesis 3. *We hypothesize that there are statistical associations between the degree of burnout (MBI) and public administration managers' personality traits (NEO FFI).*

3.2. The Sample

The research sample consisted of n = 226 public administration managers, of which 74 (32.74%) were males, and 152 (67.26%) were females. Distribution of respondents by education—the majority, 144 (63.72%), were managers with a university degree, and 82 (36.28%) were managers with secondary education. Managers ranged in age from 19 to 63 years (M = 42.65, SD = 9.04), with experience ranging from 1 to 49 years (M = 16.37, SD = 9.68). As shown in Table 1, there were 84 (37.17%) managers from a representative sample at the lower level of management. Middle management included 78 (34.51%) managers, and top management comprised 64 (28.32%) managers. We obtained the necessary data through the questionnaires. The obtained data were processed by mathematical and statistical methods using Statistica 22 and IBM SPSS 27 software.

Table 1. Distribution of public administration managers by position in the organization.

Managers	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
Managers of first level management	84	37.17	84	37.17
Middle management managers	78	34.51	162	71.68
Top management managers	64	28.32	226	100.00
Total	226	100.00	226	100.00

3.3. Methods and Measures

The Maslach Burnout Inventory (MBI).

The Maslach Burnout Inventory (Maslach and Jackson 1981b) was used to determine the burnout of public administration managers who encountered other people. Based on a seven-point Likert scale, public administration managers had the opportunity to answer from "Not at all" (1) to "Very much" (7). The questionnaire contained 22 items that were divided into three factors of burnout syndrome: Emotional Exhaustion (EE), Depersonalization (DP), and Personal Accomplishment (PA).

Five-factor personality inverter NEO FFI.

The NEO FFI standardized questionnaire of personality traits (McCrae and Costa 1987) was administered, which consisted of 60 items, to which public administration managers answered on a five-point Likert scale: 0—it does not apply to me at all, 1—it applies to me a little, 2—a neutral answer, 3—it mainly applies to me, 4—it applies to me completely. The NEO FFI questionnaire was divided into five personality traits: Neuroticism (N), Extraversion (E), Openness to Experience (O), Agreeableness (A), and Conscientiousness (C).

Assessing the determinants of burnout in PDSV managers.

Questionnaire PDSV contained 32 items. Seven items were focused on the socio-demographic characteristics of public administration managers, and 25 inventory were

divided into five items per determinant: Conflict (C), Stress (S), Fatigue (F), Despondency (D), and Self-Deprecation (SD), to which public administration managers answered on a five-point Likert scale: 1—disagree entirely, 2—disagree, 3—neither agree/neither agree, 4—agree, 5—agree completely.

4. Results

To verify our assumption (hypotheses 1–3), we used Cronbach's alpha to guarantee the reliability of the MBI, NEO FFI, and PDSV concepts. The reliability of methodological analysis is guaranteed if the result of Cronbach's alpha is not less than 0.7 based on acceptable standards (Nunally and Bernstein 1994). We identified a framework MBI as (α = 0.73), the NEO FFI (α = 0.75), and PDSV (α = 0.88), respectively. We also determined the reliability of individual MBI burnout measures, NEO FFI personality traits, and PDSV determinants using Cronbach's alpha. The resulting values of Cronbach's alpha for personal items of the MBI, NEO FFI, and PDSV methodologies disclose (Tables 2–4) that the given internal compactness of the individual modules was on the border of acceptable reliability.

Table 2. Results in predictors of MBI burnout methodology: α, M, SD.

Predictors of MBI	α	M	SD
Emotional Exhaustion	0.91	3.19	1.17
Depersonalization	0.80	2.57	0.98
Personal Accomplishment	0.79	5.03	0.83

Note: M = α = Cronbach's Alpha, Mean, SD = Standard Deviation.

Table 3. Results of the methodology of personality traits NEO FFI: α, M, SD.

Personality Traits NEO FFI	α	M	SD
Neuroticism	0.79	1.66	0.59
Extraversion	0.78	2.55	0.52
Openness to Experience	0.70	2.15	0.43
Agreeableness	0.71	2.71	0.41
Conscientiousness	0.85	3.03	0.54

Note: M = α = Cronbach's Alpha, Mean, SD = Standard Deviation.

Table 4. Results in the determinants of burnout syndrome PDSV methodology: α, M, SD.

Determinants of PDSV	α	M	SD
Conflict	0.70	2.98	0.58
Stress	0.71	2.78	0.60
Fatigue	0.80	2.65	0.74
Despondency	0.81	2.31	0.66
Self-Deprecation	0.79	2.44	0.72

Note: M = α = Cronbach's Alpha, Mean, SD = Standard Deviation.

Data collected by online questionnaires were administered and verified using the linear regression analysis in the statistical program SPSS 22.

We hypothesized the statistically linear regression relationships between personality traits (NEO FFI) and determinants of burnout syndrome (PDSV) of public administration managers: Hypothesis 1. To be feasible in the number of correlations to distinguish the relationships between the independent and dependent variables of public administration managers, linear regression analysis models were used to test the relationships. Burnout syndrome (PDSV) was established as the dependent variable, and public administration managers' personality traits (NEO FFI) were determined as independent variables. F-statistic defines the relationship between the variable input and output. The greater the value than 1, the higher the confidence in the relationship between the input and output variable. Subsequent linear regression analysis predicted the existence of a statistically

linear regression correlation between personality traits (NEO FFI) and determinants of burnout syndrome (PDSV) of public administration managers (Table 5).

Table 5. Regression between determinants of burnout syndrome (PDSV) and personality traits (NEO FFI) of public administration managers.

Determinants of Burnout Syndrome (PDSV) Conflict						
Personality Traits (NEO FFI)			F (5.220) = 9.732; $p < 0.000$			
N = 226	b*	Std. Err of b*	b	Std. Err of b	t	*p*-value
Intercept			2.631	0.433	6.071	0.000
Neuroticism	0.385	0.075	0.377	0.073	5.147	0.000
Extraversion	0.066	0.080	0.073	0.089	0.829	0.408
Openness to Experience	0.017	0.061	0.022	0.077	0.280	0.780
Agreeableness	−0.149	0.069	−0.216	0.100	−2.165	0.031
Conscientiousness	0.023	0.075	0.025	0.079	0.314	0.754
Personality trait (NEO FFI) and Conflikt						0.009
Determinants of Burnout Syndrome (PDSV) Stress						
Personality traits (NEO FFI)			F (5.220) = 8.829; $p < 0.000$			
N = 226	b*	Std. Err of b*	b	Std. Err of b	t	*p*-value
Intercept			2.011	0.456	4.409	0.000
Neuroticism	0.400	0.075	0.409	0.077	5.311	0.000
Extraversion	−0.006	0.081	−0.007	0.093	−0.073	0.942
Openness to Experience	0.042	0.062	0.055	0.081	0.675	0.501
Agreeableness	0.031	0.069	0.047	0.105	0.450	0.653
Conscientiousness	−0.042	0.075	−0.047	0.084	−0.562	0.574
Personality trait (NEO FFI) and Stress						0.012
Determinants of Burnout Syndrome (PDSV) Fatigue						
Personality traits (NEO FFI)			F (5.220) = 12.487; $p < 0.000$			
N = 226	b*	Std. Err of b*	b	Std. Err of b	t	*p*-value
Intercept			4.743	0.544	8.723	0.000
Neuroticism	0.157	0.073	0.198	0.092	2.154	0.032
Extraversion	−0.131	0.078	−0.186	0.111	−1.674	0.096
Openness to Experience	−0.088	0.060	−0.142	0.097	−1.470	0.143
Agreeableness	−0.331	0.067	−0.618	0.125	−4.936	0.000
Conscientiousness	0.015	0.073	0.021	0.100	0.210	0.833
Personality trait (NEO FFI) and Fatigue						0.009
Determinants of Burnout Syndrome (PDSV) Despondency						
Personality traits (NEO FFI)			F (5.220) = 17.698; $p < 0.000$			
N = 226	b*	Std.Err of b*	b	Std.Err of b	t	*p*-value
Intercept			3.874	0.466	8.313	0.000
Neuroticism	0.263	0.070	0.297	0.079	3.770	0.000
Extraversion	−0.088	0.075	−0.112	0.095	−1.181	0.239
Openness to Experience	−0.031	0.057	−0.045	0.083	−0.548	0.584
Agreeableness	−0.270	0.064	−0.453	0.107	−4.215	0.000
Conscientiousness	−0.116	0.070	−0.142	0.085	−1.662	0.098
Personality trait (NEO FFI) and Despondency						0.004

Table 5. *Cont.*

Determinants of Burnout Syndrome (PDSV) Self-Deprecationt						
Personality traits (NEO FFI)	F (5.220) = 22.657; $p < 0.000$					
N = 226	b*	Std.Err of b*	b	Std.Err of b	t	*p*-value
Intercept			3.624	0.485	7.477	0.000
Neuroticism	0.298	0.067	0.364	0.082	4.442	0.000
Extraversion	−0.189	0.072	−0.259	0.099	−2.621	0.009
Openness to Experience	−0.019	0.055	−0.030	0.086	−0.350	0.727
Agreeableness	−0.362	0.062	−0.654	0.112	−5.859	0.000
Conscientiousness	0.181	0.067	0.240	0.089	2.706	0.007
Personality trait (NEO FFI) and Self-Deprecationt						0.003
Personality trait (NEO FFI) and Determinants of Burnout syndrome (PDSV)						0.033

Note: Detailed regression results: coefficients of independent variables b* and dependent variables b; authoritative error from b* and authoritative error from b; *t*-values of t statistics; *p*-values of the respective significance test.

The linear regression model interpreting the dependent variable determinant of burnout syndrome Conflict was shown to be statistically significant [F (5.220) = 9.732; $p = 0.000$]. Of the independent variables, Neuroticism ($p = 0.000$), Extraversion ($p = 0.408$), Openness to Experience ($p = 0.780$), Agreeableness ($p = 0.031$), Conscientiousness ($p = 0.754$) predicted the dependent variable determinant of burnout syndrome Conflict.

The linear regression model interpreting the dependent variable determinant of burnout syndrome Stress was shown to be statistically significant [F (5.220) = 8.829; $p = 0.000$]. Of the independent variables, Neuroticism ($p = 0.000$), Extraversion ($p = 0.942$), Openness to Experience ($p = 0.501$), Agreeableness ($p = 0.653$), Conscientiousness ($p = 0.574$) predicted the dependent variable determinant of burnout syndrome Stress. Overall statistical results of independent variables personality traits (NEO FFI) ($p = 0.012$) predicted the dependent variable determinant of burnout syndrome Stress.

The linear regression model interpreting the dependent variable determinant of burnout syndrome Fatigue was shown to be statistically significant [F (5.220) = 12.487; $p = 0.000$]. From the independent variables Neuroticism ($p = 0.032$), Extraversion ($p = 0.096$), Openness to Experience ($p = 0.143$), Agreeableness ($p = 0.000$), Conscientiousness ($p = 0.833$) predicted the dependent variable determinant of burnout Fatigue syndrome. The overall statistical result of the independent variable personality traits (NEO FFI) ($p = 0.009$) predicted the dependent variable determinant of burnout syndrome Fatigue.

The linear regression model interpreting the dependent variable determinant of burnout syndrome Despondency was shown to be statistically significant [F (5.220) = 17.698; $p = 0.000$]. From the independent variables Neuroticism ($p = 0.000$), Extraversion ($p = 0.239$), Openness to Experience ($p = 0.584$), Agreeableness ($p = 0.000$), Conscientiousness ($p = 0.098$) predicted the dependent variable determinant of burnout Despondency syndrome. The overall statistical result of the independent variable personality traits (NEO FFI) ($p = 0.004$) predicted the dependent variable determinant of burnout syndrome Despondency.

The linear regression model interpreting the dependent variable determinant of burnout syndrome Self-Deprecation was shown to be statistically significant [F (5.220) = 22.657; $p = 0.000$]. From the independent variables, Neuroticism ($p = 0.000$), Extraversion ($p = 0.009$), Openness to Experience ($p = 0.727$), Agreeableness ($p = 0.000$), Conscientiousness ($p = 0.007$) predicted the dependent variable determinant of burnout Self-Deprecation syndrome. The overall statistical result of the independent variable personality traits (NEO FFI) ($p = 0.003$) predicted the dependent variable determinant of burnout syndrome Self-Deprecation.

The statistical results of the linear regression analysis of the independent variables personality traits (NEO FFI) ($p = 0.033$) predicted the dependent variables determinants of burnout syndrome (PDSV), from which we extrapolated that there are statistically linear regression relationships. Hence, Hypothesis 1 was verified and confirmed.

The detailed results of the linear regression of the coefficients of independent variables b* and dependent variables b and the values of t statistics show the highest values between the independent variable personality trait Neuroticism and the dependent variables determinants of burnout syndrome (PDSV). The personality trait Neuroticism in managers in public administration is one of the five domains of personality, which can be identified as fear, sadness, anxiety, and nervousness. Managers suffer from Fatigue, Despondency, and Self-Deprecation. They have constant worries and doubts and often feel depressed, angry, insecure, and unpleasant. Think about their fears, exaggerate their importance, are frustrated with other managers and employees, and rarely manage common Conflict and Stress factors at work and in everyday life. We can conclude that managers with the Neuroticism personality trait tend to experience negative emotions. From the above, we can infer that the personality trait Neuroticism was directly related to the determinants of burnout syndrome Conflict, Stress, Fatigue, Despondency, and Self-Deprecation among managers in public administration.

We hypothesized the statistically linear regression relationships between public administration managers' burnout index (MBI) and determinants of burnout syndrome (PDSV): Hypothesis 2. The correlations were evaluated to distinguish the relationships between public administration managers' independent and dependent variables. Linear regression analysis models tested the connections. Determinants of burnout syndrome (PDSV) were determined as dependent variables and burnout index (MBI)) of public administration, managers were determined as independent variables. Subsequent linear regression analysis predicting the existence of statistically linear regression correlations between burnout index (MBI)) and determinants of burnout syndrome (PDSV) of public administration managers is illustrated in Table 6.

The linear regression model interpreting the dependent variable determinant of burnout syndrome Conflict was shown to be statistically significant [F (3.222) = 9.398; p = 0.000]. From the independent variables, Emotional Exhaustion (p = 0.000), Depersonalization (p = 0.560), Personal Accomplishment (p = 0.225) predicted the dependent variable determinant of burnout syndrome Conflict. The overall statistical result of independent variables personality traits (NEO FFI) (p = 0.003) predicted the dependent variable determinant of burnout syndrome Conflict.

The linear regression model interpreting the dependent variable determinant of burnout syndrome Stress was shown to be statistically significant [F (3.222) = 13.530; p = 0.000]. From the independent variables, Emotional Exhaustion (p = 0.000), Depersonalization (p = 0.003), Personal Accomplishment (p = 0.031) predicted the dependent variable determinant of burnout syndrome Stress. The overall statistical result of independent variables personality traits (NEO FFI) (p = 0.000) predicted the dependent variable determinant of burnout syndrome Stress.

The linear regression model interpreting the dependent variable determinant of burnout syndrome Fatigue was shown to be statistically significant [F (3.222) = 47.913; p = 0.000]. Of the independent variables, Emotional Exhaustion (p = 0.000), Depersonalization (p = 0.005), Personal Accomplishment (p = 0.003) predicted the dependent variable determinant of burnout syndrome Fatigue. The total statistical result of the independent variables personality traits (NEO FFI) (p = 0.000) predicted the dependent variable determinant of burnout syndrome Fatigue.

The linear regression model interpreting the dependent variable determinant of burnout syndrome Despondency was shown to be statistically significant [F (3.222) = 31.154; p = 0.000]. Of the independent variables, Emotional Exhaustion (p = 0.000), Depersonalization (p = 0.715), Personal Accomplishment (p = 0.134) predicted the dependent variable determinant of burnout syndrome Despondency. The overall statistical result of the independent variable personality traits (NEO FFI) (p = 0.004) predicted the dependent variable determinant of burnout syndrome Despondency.

Table 6. Regression between the determinants of burnout (PDSV) and the burnout rate (MBI) of public administration managers.

Determinants of Burnout Syndrome (PDSV) Conflict						
Burnout Index (MBI)			F (3.222) = 9.398; $p < 0.000$			
N = 226	b*	Std. Err of b*	b	Std. Err of b	t	*p*-value
Intercept			2.869	0.355	8.088	0.000
EmotionalExhaustion	0.317	0.070	0.157	0.034	4.557	0.000
Depersonalization	−0.046	0.078	−0.027	0.046	−0.584	0.560
Personal Accomplishment	−0.092	0.075	−0.064	0.052	−1.217	0.225
Burnout Index (MBI) and Conflikt						0.003
Determinants of Burnout Syndrome (PDSV) Stress						
Burnout Index (MBI)			F (3.222) = 13.530; $p < 0.000$			
N = 226	b*	Std. Err of b*	b	Std. Err of b	t	*p*-value
Intercept			3.092	0.361	8.561	0.000
EmotionalExhaustion	0.385	0.068	0.199	0.035	5.680	0.000
Depersonalization	−0.228	0.077	−0.141	0.047	−2.981	0.003
Personal Accomplishment	−0.160	0.074	−0.116	0.053	−2.174	0.031
Burnout Index (MBI) and Stress						0.000
Determinants of Burnout Syndrome (PDSV) Fatigue						
Burnout Index (MBI)			F (3.222) = 47.913; $p < 0.000$			
N = 226	b*	Std. Err of b*	b	Std. Err of b	t	*p*-value
Intercept			2.294	0.377	6.081	0.000
EmotionalExhaustion	0.420	0.058	0.267	0.037	7.300	0.000
Depersonalization	0.183	0.065	0.139	0.049	2.820	0.005
Personal Accomplishment	−0.189	0.062	−0.169	0.056	−3.029	0.003
Burnout Index (MBI) and Fatigue						0.000
Determinants of Burnout Syndrome (PDSV) Despondency						
Burnout Index (MBI)			F (3.222) = 31.154; $p < 0.000$			
N = 226	b*	Std. Err of b*	b	Std. Err of b	t	*p*-value
Intercept			1.825	0.364	5.015	0.000
EmotionalExhaustion	0.516	0.062	0.294	0.035	8.339	0.000
Depersonalization	−0.026	0.070	−0.017	0.047	−0.365	0.715
Personal Accomplishment	−0.101	0.067	−0.081	0.054	−1.502	0.134
Burnout Index (MBI) and Despondency						0.004
Determinants of Burnout Syndrome (PDSV) Self-Deprecation						
Burnout Index (MBI)			F (3.222) = 22.136; $p < 0.000$			
N = 226	b*	Std. Err of b*	b	Std. Err of b	t	*p*-value
Intercept			1.937	0.411	4.709	0.000
EmotionalExhaustion	0.477	0.065	0.294	0.040	7.365	0.000
Depersonalization	−0.060	0.073	−0.044	0.054	−0.826	0.410
Personal Accomplishment	−0.074	0.070	−0.063	0.061	−1.046	0.297
Burnout Index (MBI) and Self-Deprecation						0.003
Burnout Index (MBI) and Determinants of Burnout syndrome (PDSV)						0.007

Note: Detailed regression results: coefficients of independent variables b* and dependent variables b; authoritative error from b* and authoritative error from b; *t*-values of t statistics; *p*-values of the respective significance test.

The linear regression model interpreting the dependent variable determinant of burnout syndrome Self-Deprecation was shown to be statistically significant [F (3.222) = 22.136; $p = 0.000$]. From the independent variables, Emotional Exhaustion ($p = 0.000$), Depersonalization ($p = 0.410$), Personal Accomplishment ($p = 0.297$) predicted the dependent variable determinant of burnout syndrome Self-Deprecation. The total statistical result of the independent variable personality traits (NEO FFI) ($p = 0.003$) predicted the dependent variable determinant of burnout syndrome, Self-Deprecation.

The statistical results of the linear regression analysis of the independent variables, the burnout index (MBI) ($p = 0.007$), predicted the dependent variables determinants of burnout syndrome (PDSV), from which we interpret the conclusion that there are statistically linear regression relationships. Hence, Hypothesis 2 was verified and confirmed.

The detailed results of the linear regression of the coefficients of independent variables b* and dependent variables b, and the t statistic values show the highest values between the independent variable, the burnout index (MBI) Emotional Exhaustion, and the dependent variables determinants of burnout syndrome (PDSV). Public administration managers who suffer from self-deprecation, despondency, fatigue, or lack of sleep have family problems, indulge in alcohol or drugs, get into conflict and stress situations from their workload, and lack mental or emotional energy, where emotional exhaustion can occur. From the above results, we concluded that the degree of burnout syndrome Emotional Exhaustion was directly related to the determinants of burnout syndrome Conflict, Stress, Fatigue, Despondency, and Self-Deprecation among managers in public administration, as depicted in Table 6.

We theorize positive linear regression correlations between the burnout index (MBI) and public administration managers' personality traits (NEO FFI): Hypothesis 3. We employ linear regression analysis models to evaluate and distinguish the relationships between public administration managers' independent and dependent variables. Personality traits (NEO FFI) were determined as dependent variables, and burnout index (MBI) values of public administration managers were determined as independent variables. The existence of a statistically linear regression correlation between burnout index (MBI) and personality trait (NEO FFI) of public administration managers is depicted in Table 7.

Neuroticism was shown to be statistically significant [F (3.222) = 45.599; $p = 0.000$]. Of the independent variables Emotional Exhaustion ($p = 0.000$), Depersonalization ($p = 0.132$), Personal Accomplishment ($p = 0.000$) predicted the dependent variable personality trait Neuroticism. The overall statistical outcome of the independent variable personality traits (NEO FFI) ($p = 0.001$) predicted the dependent variable determinant of burnout syndrome Neuroticism.

Extraversion was shown to be statistically significant [F (3.222) = 41.461; $p = 0.000$]. Of the independent variables Emotional Exhaustion ($p = 0.000$), Depersonalization ($p = 0.000$), Personal Accomplishment ($p = 0.000$) predicted the dependent variable personality trait Extraversion. The statistical result of the independent variables personality traits (NEO FFI) ($p = 0.000$) predicted the dependent variable determinant of burnout syndrome Extraversion.

Openness to Experience was shown to be statistically significant [F (3.222) = 0.046; $p = 0.000$]. Of the independent variables Emotional Exhaustion ($p = 0.865$), Depersonalization ($p = 0.855$), Personal Accomplishment ($p = 0.735$) predicted the dependent variable personality trait Openness to Experience. The altogether statistical outcomes of the independent variables personality traits (NEO FFI) ($p = 0.011$) predicted the dependent variable determinant of burnout syndrome Openness to Experience.

Agreeableness was shown to be statistically significant [F (3.222) = 28.361; $p = 0.000$]. Of the independent variables, Emotional Exhaustion ($p = 0.377$), Depersonalization ($p = 0.000$), Personal Accomplishment ($p = 0.040$) predicted the dependent variable personality trait Agreeableness. The overall statistical result of the independent variables personality traits (NEO FFI) ($p = 0.002$) predicted the dependent variable determinant of burnout syndrome, Agreeableness.

Table 7. Regression between personality traits (NEO FFI) and burnout measure (MBI) in public administration managers.

Personality Trait (NEO FFI) Neuroticism						
Burnout Index (MBI)	F (3.222) = 45.599; $p < 0.000$					
N = 226	b*	Std. Err of b*	b	Std. Err of b	t	*p*-value
Intercept			2.274	0.302	7.520	0.000
Emotional Exhaustion	0.476	0.058	0.240	0.029	8.193	0.000
Depersonalization	−0.099	0.065	−0.060	0.039	−1.511	0.132
Personal Accomplishment	−0.344	0.063	−0.244	0.045	−5.463	0.000
Burnout Index (MBI) and Neuroticism						0.001
Personality Trait (NEO FFI) Extraversion						
Burnout Index (MBI)	F (3.222) = 41.461; $p < 0.000$					
N = 226	b*	Std. Err of b*	b	Std. Err of b	t	*p*-value
Intercept			1.018	0.273	3.727	0.000
Emotional Exhaustion	−0.349	0.059	−0.157	0.027	−5.911	0.000
Depersonalization	0.267	0.067	0.143	0.036	4.006	0.000
Personal Accomplishment	0.527	0.064	0.331	0.040	8.222	0.000
Burnout Index (MBI) and Extraversion						0.000
Personality Trait (NEO FFI) Openness to Experience						
Burnout Index (MBI)	F (3.222) = 0.046; $p < 0.000$					
N = 226	b*	Std. Err of b*	b	Std. Err of b	t	*p*-value
Intercept			2.354	0.299	7.863	0.000
Emotional Exhaustion	−0.013	0.074	−0.005	0.029	−0.171	0.865
Depersonalization	−0.015	0.083	−0.007	0.039	−0.183	0.855
Personal Accomplishment	−0.027	0.080	−0.015	0.044	−0.339	0.735
Burnout Index (MBI) and Openness to Experience						0.011
Personality Trait (NEO FFI) Agreeableness						
Burnout Index (MBI)	F (3.222) = 28.361; $p < 0.000$					
N = 226	b*	Std. Err of b*	b	Std. Err of b	t	*p*-value
Intercept			2.879	0.220	13.065	0.000
Emotional Exhaustion	−0.056	0.063	−0.019	0.021	−0.884	0.377
Depersonalization	−0.411	0.071	−0.167	0.029	−5.807	0.000
Personal Accomplishment	0.141	0.068	0.067	0.033	2.069	0.040
Burnout Index (MBI) and Agreeableness						0.002
Personality Trait (NEO FFI) Conscientiousness						
Burnout Index (MBI)	F (3.222) = 29.667; $p < 0.000$					
N = 226	b*	Std. Err of b*	b	Std. Err of b	t	*p*-value
Intercept			1.901	0.299	6.368	0.000
Emotional Exhaustion	−0.001	0.062	−0.001	0.029	−0.020	0.984
Depersonalization	−0.173	0.070	−0.096	0.039	−2.467	0.014
Personal Accomplishment	0.421	0.068	0.274	0.044	6.219	0.000
Burnout Index (MBI) and Conscientiousness						0.004
Burnout Index (MBI) and Personality traits (NEO FFI)						0.018

Note: Detailed regression results: coefficients of independent variables b* and dependent variables b; authoritative error from b* and authoritative error from b; *t*-values of t statistics; *p*-values of the respective significance test.

Conscientiousness was shown to be statistically significant [F (3.222) = 29.667; p = 0.000]. Of the independent variables, Emotional Exhaustion (p = 0.984), Depersonalization (p = 0.014), Personal Accomplishment (p = 0.040) predicted the dependent variable personality trait Conscientiousness. The comprehensive statistical results of the independent variable personality traits (NEO FFI) (p = 0.004) predicted the dependent variable determinant of burnout syndrome, Conscientiousness.

The statistical results of the linear regression analysis of the independent variables, the burnout index (MBI) (p = 0.018), predicted the dependent variables' personality traits (NEO FFI), from which we can extrapolate the assumption that there is linear regression relationship. Hence, Hypothesis 3 was confirmed.

The detailed results of the linear regression of the coefficients of independent variables b* and dependent variables b, and the values of t statistics show the highest values between the independent variable the burnout index (MBI) Personal Accomplishment and the dependent variables Personality trait (NEO FFI). From the above correlations, we concluded that burnout syndrome, Emotional Exhaustion, and Depersonalization levels were directly related to the personality trait. Neuroticism and the level of burnout syndrome Personal Accomplishment were directly related to the personality traits of Extraversion, Openness to Experience, Agreeableness, and Conscientiousness in managers in public administration. Public administration managers with the personality traits of Extraversion, Openness to Experience, Agreeableness, and Conscientiousness achieve high levels of Personal Accomplishment, from which we conclude that they are more prepared for their workload than managers with the personality trait of Neuroticism.

Degree of MBI Burnout Index of Public Administration Managers (N = 226)

For the MBI burnout index of burnout syndrome Emotional Exhaustion and Depersonalization, high values correspond to a high degree of burnout, while for Personal Accomplishment, low values correspond to burnout. The evaluation consists of the sum and then the average of all points in individual predictors by the number of managers of public administration:

Degree of Emotional Exhaustion (EE): Low 0–16; Medium 17–26; High 27 and over = burnout!

Degree of Depersonalization (DP): Low 0–6; Medium 7–12; High 13 and over = burnout!

Degree of Personal Accomplishment (PA): High 39 and over; Medium 38–32; Low 31–0 = burnout!

Degree of Emotional Exhaustion EE: high degree 28.7 = burnout.

Degree of Depersonalization DP: mild degree 12.9 = near burnout.

Degree of Personal Accomplishment PA: high degree 40.2 = high personal satisfaction.

From the above results of the evaluation of the degree of burnout syndrome in all managers of public administration who participated in the research, it can be stated that the number of managers of public administration who are emotionally exhausted is directly related to burnout. In terms of depersonalization, they have not reached the degree of burnout (grade 13 is already directly related to burnout). In terms of personal accomplishment, managers in public administration have achieved high values and are far from being in danger of burnout.

5. Discussion

The obtained results confirmed the existence of statistically significant associations between the value of burnout syndrome, personality traits, and determinants of burnout syndrome in public administration managers. We lean towards the assumption that the personality traits of public administration managers contribute to the ability to manage Conflict and Stress problems that result from their demanding work. We support the value of studies that focus on the importance of adopting assertiveness that helps to eliminate despondency, stress, self-deprecation, emotional exhaustion, and lack of personal accom-

plishment). Emotional Fatigue can be understood as a fundamental factor in the stress syndrome that causes managers' burnout. Managers who have greater work autonomy and creativity and are loyal to their company are more likely to experience Emotional Exhaustion (Makasheva et al. 2016). If we analyze the interrelation between the value of burnout syndrome, personality traits, and determinants of burnout syndrome, the results showed a positive association between Emotional Exhaustion and Neuroticism, Conflict, Stress, Fatigue, Despondency, Self-Deprecation. They were also linked between Depersonalization and Neuroticism, Conflict, Fatigue, Despondency, and Self-Deprecation. Lastly, amid Personal Accomplishment and Extraversion, Openness to Experience, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, and the personality trait Neuroticism and Conflict, Stress, Fatigue, Despondency, Self-Deprecation. Accordance our observations, the connection between Emotional Exhaustion and Neuroticism can be attributed to the emotional attributes of a manager.

Nevertheless, we elucidate the high correlation between the degree of burnout syndrome and the personality trait Neuroticism by the fact that Neuroticism is a factor with a considerable potential for vulnerableness since it can evoke Conflict, Stress, Self-Deprecation, and negative emotions (Alarcon et al. 2009). Managers with a significantly high rating of Openness to Experience can obtain Personal Accomplishment in challenging work conditions, are more flexible, more active, and rarely experience Emotional Exhaustion, which eliminates the burnout syndrome (Louw 2014). The same is true of managers with the Agreeableness personality trait, who are also more flexible, loyal to their company, and take a more responsible approach to their work. These predispositions eliminate burnout syndrome in managers (Swider and Zimmerman 2010) regardless of the diver's cultural background. The most important personality trait for companies is for managers to be Conscientiousness in their work, in that they assume diligence, perseverance, organizational skills, personal accomplishment, and a limited degree of Emotional Exhaustion and Depersonalization. We can conclude that our results are concurrent with (Anvari et al. 2011) investigation where Conflict, Stress, Fatigue, Despondency, and Self-Deprecation had significantly positive associations with the value of burnout syndrome Emotional Exhaustion and Depersonalization, which is additionally in line with (Bakker et al. 2006) research findings. Resisting adverse situations at work can cause conflict, then Stress. In managers, Fatigue gradually occurs, which can increase the level of Despondency and Self-Deprecation, which mitigate the feeling of Personal Accomplishment. Burnout manifests itself in different people at different times, depending on many factors. However, more common in managers who provide services than those in manufacturing industries (Grandey et al. 2012).

Our study shows potential limitations within the addressed research sample. Therefore, our findings must be interpreted cautiously. The investigation was executed in Slovakia, i.e., in one country, culture, and ethnic background. Thus, in the future, it is advisable to expand the sample with managers in other countries to realize the diversity of external and internal influences. The strength is the topicality of the issue of burnout syndrome, as well as the presented interplay of determinants (personality characteristics) and environmental integrands that contribute to the burnout syndrome.

5.1. Consequences of Burnout Syndrome Public Administration Managers

Based on our results, where we focused on public administration managers and personal knowledge, we can approximate the consequences of individual areas of burnout syndrome as follows:

The consequences of the burnout syndrome result from the chronology of areas where Personal Accomplishment is far from being a threat. However, Emotional Exhaustion, together with Depersonalization, poses a danger.

If we focus closely on the results in Personal Accomplishment, where managers in public administration attain a value of 40.2, and according to the degree of MBI burnout syndrome, there is no threat of burnout syndrome, as the risk value is 31 according to

the degree of MBI burnout syndrome. It is evident that Personal Accomplishment and its psychosocial aspects on the profession of manager in public administration strongly influence managers' conditions and give managers profession's status, which is perceived as one of the more attractive, stronger resistance to burnout. Based on this result, strengthening the attractiveness of the profession of manager in public administration can act as one of the tools for preventing burnout syndrome. This area can also have positive consequences, such as being the motivation why managers in public administration decide to stay in their jobs.

Emotional Exhaustion among public administration managers is a real threat, as they represent a value of 28.7, and according to the degree of MBI burnout syndrome, it's confirmed at the level of 27 degrees. Threat to Emotional Exhaustion in public administration managers can depend on work activities, where managers must deal with situations such as strict work rules, limits, and possibilities of decision-making processes in the positions of public administration managers. Managers in public administration often must accept specific customary work rules and internal systems. Frequent adaptation to changes in regulations, absent motivation with modest benefits, and support performance can represent additional threats. Negative feelings manifest the danger and consequences of Emotional Exhaustion during the execution of work as public administration managers, such as sadness, fatigue, frustration, apathy, dissatisfaction, and helplessness. The intense or long-term effect of these emotions can lead to a spillover into the health and psychosomatic level in a negative sense.

The dominant threat of burnout syndrome is in domain of Depersonalization, which is valued at 12.9, and the degree of MBI burnout syndrome is confirmed at 13 points. From the above, it follows that with a high probability, the trigger of burnout syndrome in managers in public administration is Depersonalization. Manifestations of the threat of Depersonalization in managers in public administration can be recorded, for example, by the feeling of the days of the week merging, a weak level of concentration on work, reduced interest in building working relationships, passive communication, as well as the absence of self-reflection and passive acceptance of feedback and lack of interest in further personal or professional development and decreasing self-confidence. The consequences of Depersonalization in public administration managers are possible in the context of the performance of work in situations such as loss of interest in working on new tasks or projects, reluctance, and rejection of changes in work organization, decreasing enthusiasm for teamwork, decreasing willingness towards colleagues, reducing the level of the quality standard of work activities, loss of self-actualization and more.

5.2. Suggestions

5.2.1. Suggestions How to Prevent Burnout Syndrome from the Managers and Point of View the Public Administration Employee

According to Stock (2010), first, valuable working relationships in the workplace and interpersonal relationships in social and private life are crucial for the prevention of burnout syndrome. Family and the environment can provide encouragement to a manager who suffers from burnout by listening. They can provide adequate help, factual or emotional. Secondly, it is the employers who do realize and are aware of the risks of burnout syndrome of their own managers, as well as the fact that efficient and highly effective managers are beneficial to them because they generate financial gain for the organization (Bartošíková 2006; Křivohlavý 2012; Honzák 2013).

5.2.2. Suggestions from the Managers Public Administration View

We suggest to managers as a prevention measure against burnout syndrome to adhere to a full and balanced lifestyle-separate rest and work, take care of their health, pay more attention to kinetics activities, relax, not lose a sense of humor, try to think positively, determine the work goals that they can manage and not take work home, do not use alcohol and drugs. At the same time, we suggest that managers communicate about their

negative experiences and feelings with their colleagues at work, in the family surroundings, or with a friend, and if necessary, seek professional help (Shanafelt and Noseworthy 2017).

5.2.3. Suggestions from the Public Administration Employer's Point of View

We suggest to the employer's public administration regular contact and communication with their managers, also to inform them about any short-term and long-term goals and the intentions of the organization to improve working conditions, reward work, and motivate managers financially and morally. Moreover, to create career opportunities for managers, special holidays, cultural events, or use sports and competition events for managers and employees to bond. Finally, it is important to provide psychological help if necessary (Lee and Cummings 2008).

Furthermore, from our own experience, we propose to the employer of the public administration a *system for evaluating work performance and evaluating managers* as well as public administration employees as there is currently no formal evaluation process, so it is advisable to propose its implementation. The evaluation must be carried out in close cooperation with the personnel management department, where its head has direct responsibility for the management of human resources and managers at all levels of management.

Introduction of mentoring during the adaptation of managers and public administration employees as the adaptation of newly hired employees mainly consists of their training in the following areas: work with the city information system; training on registry regulations; fire protection and occupational health and safety; basic organizational standards (organizational and work rules, code of ethics); privacy. Currently, training by superior employees takes place rather informally. It is not a methodical and controlled process.

The introduction of a remuneration system. We believe that remuneration of employees is one of the most sensitive personnel activities, which is important not only for the manager and employee, but also for the public administration employer. Currently, the public administration does not have clear remuneration rules. For this reason, we recommend introducing a remuneration system that is determined by the personnel policy, which is based on the personnel strategy. We are convinced that remuneration is the most effective tool for motivating not only managers but also public administration employees and determines their future performance.

Assignment of competencies to public administration managers, since the above-mentioned proposals and recommendations cannot be applied in practice without assignment of competencies to managers, especially in the areas of performance evaluation, employee evaluation, and remuneration of public administration employees.

6. Conclusions

The investigation aimed to accentuate the significant issue of manager burnout syndrome in public administration. By assessing the determinants of burnout syndrome in connection with personality traits and personality attributes concerning the degree of burnout syndrome of managers in public administration, it can be concluded that participants in our investigation were emotionally exhausted, which can eventually lead to burnout. Although Emotional Exhaustion is a necessary part of burnout, it is not the only predictor to trigger burnout syndrome. In fact, it can be said that Emotional Exhaustion reflects the stress level of the burnout syndrome because it does not capture the negative beginnings of the relationship of managers in public administration in their work. To the potential prevention retardant of burnout syndrome, we can include (meaningful leisure-time activity, engagement in games and sports, a balanced diet, quality of sleep, and meaningful relationships). Overall positive changes in one lifestyle and its pillars should be viewed holistically.

Burnout causes a decrease in organizational productivity and efficiency, which causes increasing managerial fluctuation, negative work attitudes, and reducing managerial performance. We have clear evidence that personality affects the individual's response in the

context of long-lasting, stressful situations that can trigger burnout syndrome. Further research can help employers identify people at risk of burnout and thus compose preventive measures to reduce and eliminate the adverse effects of burnout. There is a need for a supplementary investigation to enhance a better understanding of complex constituencies and their interplay. Part of the solution can be viewed in the employer who pays more attention to those managers who provide services of an emotional nature, as Emotional Exhaustion can harm the employee and, at the same time, the organization's health. Moreover, this can enhance or exacerbate the status quo of the management, which encompasses a diverse working environment, socio-cultural background, employees' economic situation, leisure and recreation opportunities, community support, etc., and is ultimately able to decrease the burden and responsibility of the managers at the workplace and beyond.

Author Contributions: Study concept and design: E.B., V.M., P.M., I.U; Methodology: E.B., P.M.,V.M., Z.B; Formal analysis: I.U., Z.B; Resources: E.B; V.M., P.M., Z.B; Writing-original draft preparation: E.B., Z.B., I.U; Writing review and editing: I.U., Z.B. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

Funding: This paper was financed and supported by the scientific grant project GaPU 30/2020 –Grant Agency for Doctoral Students and Young Researchers of the University of Prešov in Prešov.

Institutional Review Board Statement: Ethical review and approval were waived for this study due to nature of this research (internet questionnaire). Did not required Institutional Review Board Statement.

Informed Consent Statement: Patient consent was waived due to the nature of this research (internet questionnaire).

Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare no conflict of interests.

References

Alarcon, Gene, Kevin Eschleman, and Nathan Bowling. 2009. Relationship between Personality Variables and Burnout: A Meta-Analysis. *Work and Stress* 23: 244–63. [CrossRef]

Anvari, Mohammad Reza Akhavan, Nader Seyed Kalali, and Aryan Gholipour. 2011. How does Personality Affect on Job Burnout? *International Journal of Trade, Economics and Finance* 2: 115–9. [CrossRef]

Armstrong, Michael, and Tina Stephens. 2008. *Management a Leadership*. Praha: Grada Publishing. ISBN 8024721774.

Bakker, Arnold, Karen Van Der Zee, Kerry Lewig, and Maureen Dollard. 2006. The Relationship between the Big Five Personality Factors and Burnout: A Study among Volunteer Counselors. *The Journal of Social Psychology* 146: 31–50. [CrossRef]

Bartošíková, Ivana. 2006. *O Syndromu Vyhoření pro Zdravotní Sestry*. Brno: Národní Centrum Ošetřovatelství a Nelékařských Zdravotnických Oborů. ISBN 80-7013-439-9.

Bruce, Susan. 2009. Recognizing stress and avoiding burnout. *Currents in Pharmacy Teaching and Learning* 1: 57–64. [CrossRef]

Castanheira, Filipa, and Maria José Chambel. 2010. Reducing burnout in call centers through HR practices. *Human Resource Management* 49: 1047–65. [CrossRef]

Chamorro-Premuzic, Tomas. 2021. Managing Yourself. *Thriving in the Age of Hybrid Work. Harvard Business Review Digital Article*. Available online: https://hbr.org/2021/01/thriving-in-the-age-of-hybrid-work (accessed on 13 January 2021).

Cheng, Jui-Chang, and Yi O-Yang. 2018. Hotel employee job crafting, burnout, and satisfaction: The moderating role of perceived organizational support. *International Journal of Hospitality Management* 72: 78–85. [CrossRef]

Cordes, Cynthia, and Thomas Dougherty. 1993. A review and an Integration of Research on Job Burnout. *The Academy of Management Review* 18: 621–56. [CrossRef]

Demerouti, Evangelia, Karina Mostert, and Arnold B. Bakker. 2010. Burnout and work engagement: A thorough investigation of the independency of both constructs. *Journal Occupational Health Psychology* 15: 209–22. [CrossRef]

Drucker, Peter Ferdinand. 2000. The change leader. *Wiley Online Library* 19: 13–94. [CrossRef]

Franková, Emílie. 2008. Syndrom vyhoření—Charakteristika problému. In *Management, Economics and Business Development in the New European Conditions [CD-ROM]*. Brno: CERM.

Freudenberger, Herbert. 1974. Staff burn-out. *The Journal of Social Issues* 30: 159–65. [CrossRef]

Freudenberger, Herbert. 1975. The staff burn-out syndrome in alternative institutions. *Psychotherapy: Theory, Research and Practice* 12: 73–82. [CrossRef]

Freudenberger, Herbert J. 1977. Burn-out: Occupational hazard of the childcare worker. *Child Care Quarterly* 6: 90–99. [CrossRef]

Freudenberger, Herbert, and Geraldine Richelson. 1980. *Burn-Out: The High Cost of High Achievement*, 1st ed. Garden City: Anchor Press. ISBN 978-03-85156-64-6.

Gómez-Polo, Cristina, Ana-Aida Vilches, David Ribas, Antonio Castaño-Séiquer, and Javier Montero. 2021. Behaviour and Anxiety Management of Paediatric Dental Patients through Virtual Reality: A Randomised Clinical Trial. *J. Clin. Med.* 10: 3019. [CrossRef]
Ginsburg, Sigmund. 1974. The problem of the burned-out executive. *Personnel Journal* 48: 598–600.
Gold, Philip, and George Chrousos. 2002. Organization of the stress system and its dysregulation in melancholic and atypical depression: High vs. low CRH/NE states. *Mol Psychiatry* 7: 254–75. [CrossRef]
Grandey, Alicia, James Diefendorff, and Deborah Rupp. 2012. *Emotional Labor in the 21st Century: Diverse Perspectives on Emotional Regulation at Work*. New York: Routledge/Taylor & Francis Group. ISBN 978-1-84872-949-0.
Haar, Jarrod M. 2006. The downside of coping: Work-family conflict, employee burnout and the moderating effects of coping strategies. *Journal of Management & Organization* 12: 146–59. [CrossRef]
Haberleitner, Elisabeth, Elisabeth Deistler, and Robert Ungvari. 2009. *Führen, Fördern, Coachen. So Entwickeln Sie die Potenziale Ihrer Mitarbeiter*. Munich: Piper Verlag Publishing. ISBN 978-3-492-25343-7.
Halbesleben, Jonathon, and Ronald Buckley. 2004. Burnout in Organizational Life. *Journal of Management* 30: 859–79. [CrossRef]
Halbesleben, Jonathon, and Matthew Bowler. 2007. Emotional exhaustion and job performance: The mediating role of motivation. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 92: 93–106. [CrossRef]
Heinemann, Linda, and Torsten Heinemann. 2017. Burnout Research: Emergence and Scientific Investigation of a Contested Diagnosis. *SAGE Open* 7: 2158244017697154. [CrossRef]
Honzák, Radkin. 2013. *Jak žít a Vyhnout se Syndromu Vyhoření*. Praha: Vyšehrad. ISBN 978-80-7429-331-3.
Horzinková, Eva, and Vladimír Novotný. 2010. *Základy Organizace Veřejné Správy v ČR*, 2nd ed. Plzeň: Vydavatelství a nakladatelství Aleš Čeněk. ISBN 978-80-7380-263-9.
Hyett, Matthew, and Gordon Parker. 2015. Further Examination of the Properties of the Workplace Well-Being Questionnaire (WWQ). *Social Indicators Research* 124: 683–92. [CrossRef]
Janowska, Zdzislawa, Joanna Cewińska, and Katarzyna Wojtaszczyk. 2005. *Dysfunkcje Zarządzania Zasobami Ludzkimi*. Łódź: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Łódzkiego.
Janssen, Peter, Maria Peeters, Jan de Jonge, Inge Houkes, and Gladys Tummers. 2004. Specific Relationships between Job Demands, Job Resources and Psychological Outcomes and the Mediating Role of Negative Work-Home Interference. *Journal of Vocational Behavior* 65: 411–29. [CrossRef]
Jedinák, Peter. 2012. *Profese manažera v organizacích veřejné spávy. Charakteristika manažera, zastavané role a vybrané personální činnosti*, 1st ed. Zlín: VeRBuM. ISBN 978-80-87500-26-2.
Kaschka, Wolfgang, Dieter Korczak, and Karl Broich. 2011. Burnout: A fashionable diagnosis. *Deutsches Ärzteblatt International* 108: 781–87. [CrossRef]
Kassay, Štefan. 2013. *Riadenie. Rozhodujúce hľadiská manažérskej praxe*. Druhá časť. Bratislava: Veda, Vydavateľstvo Slovenskej Akadémie vied. ISBN 978-80-224-1321-3.
Khan, Faisal, Rosman Yusoff, and Anwar Khan. 2014. Job Demands, Burnout and Resources in Teaching a Conceptual Review. *World Applied Sciences Journal* 30: 20–28. [CrossRef]
Křivohlavý, Jaro. 2012. *Hořet, ale nevyhořet*. Kostelní Vydří: Karmelitánské Nakladatelství. ISBN 978-80-7195-573-3.
Kvesko, Raisa, Sergey Ishtunov, Svetlana Kvesko, and Yana Chaplinskaya. 2015. The formation of a constructive relationship to stress: Methodological aspect. Fundamental and applied sciences today. *Journal of Fundamental and Applied Sciences* 3: 154–56.
Lee, How, and Greta Cummings. 2008. Examining relationships between director leadership practices and manager worklife and burnout. *Journal of Leadership Studies* 2: 47–62. [CrossRef]
Lee, Raymond, and Blake Ashforth. 1996. A meta-analytic examination of the correlates of the three dimensions of job burnout. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 81: 123–33. [CrossRef]
Lloyd, Chris, and Robert King. 2004. A survey of burnout among Australian mental health occupational therapists and social workers. *Social Psychiatry Psychiatr Epidemiol* 39: 752–57. [CrossRef]
Louw, Gerrit. 2014. Burnout, vigour, big five personality traits and social support in a sample of police officers. *SA Journal of Industrial Psychology/SA Tydskrif vir Bedryfsielkunde* 40: 1–13. [CrossRef]
Low, George, David Cravens, Ken Grant, and Wiliam Moncrief. 2001. Antecedents and Consequences of Salesperson Burnout. *European Journal of Marketing* 35: 587–611. [CrossRef]
Lu, Allan Cheng Chien, and Dogan Gursoy. 2016. Impact of Job Burnout on Satisfaction and Turnover Intention: Do Generational Differences Matter? *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Research* 40: 210–35. [CrossRef]
Makasheva, Natalia, Julia Makasheva, Anna Gromova, Sergey Ishtunov, and Boris Burykhin. 2016. The problem of professional burnout in stress management. *SHS Web of Conferences—International Conference on Research Paradigms Transformation in Social Sciences* 28: 5. [CrossRef]
Maslach, Christina, and Julie Goldberg. 1998. Prevention of burnout: New perspectives. *Applied and Preventive Psychology* 7: 63–74. [CrossRef]
Maslach, Christina, and Susan Jackson. 1981a. The measurement of experienced burnout. *Journal of Organizational Behavior* 2: 99–113. [CrossRef]
Maslach, Christina, and Susan Jackson. 1981b. *Maslach Burnout Invertory: Manual*. Palo Alto: Consulting Psychologists Press.
Maslach, Christina, Wilmar Schaufeli, and Michael Leiter. 2001. Job burnout. *Annual Review of Psychology* 52: 397–422. [CrossRef] [PubMed]

McCrae, Robert, and Paul Costa. 1987. Validation of the Five Factor Model of Personality across Instruments and Observers. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 52: 81–90. [CrossRef]

Naseh, M., J. Jalilvand, and Mohammad Vahdani. 2012. Relationship between personality dimensions and job burnout of nurses. *Modern Care Journal* 9: 87–94.

Nunally, Jum, and Ira Bernstein. 1994. *Psychometric Theory*, 3rd ed. NewYork: McGraw-Hill. ISBN 978-00-70478-49-7.

Peart, Natalia. 2021. Important Leadership Lessons From The Pandemic For The Future Of Work. *Forbes*. Available online: https://www.forbes.com/sites/nataliapeart/2021/04/19/4--important-leadership-lessons-from-the-pandemic-for-the-future-of-work/?sh=40714b682b51 (accessed on 19 April 2021).

Rodriguez, Ramirez José Andrés, Araiza Albertico Guevara, and Anaya Efrén Viramontes. 2017. Síndrome de burnout en docentes. *IE Revista de Investigación Educativa de la REDIECH* 8: 45–67. Available online: http://www.redalyc.org/articulo.oa?id=521653267015 (accessed on 26 January 2018). [CrossRef]

Rudy, Ján, Rozália Sulíková, Anna Lašáková, Jana Fratričová, and Ľudmila Mitková. 2013. *Management und Organisationsverhalten*. Műnster: MV-Wissenschaft. ISBN 978-3-86991-913-3.

Schaufeli, Wilmar, and Bram Buunk. 2003. Burnout: An Overview of 25 Years of Research and Theorizing. In *The Handbook of Work and Health Psychology*. Hoboken: John Wiley and Sons, Ltd., pp. 383–425. Available online: https://www.wilmarschaufeli.nl/publications/Schaufeli/181.pdf (accessed on 3 September 2004).

Schaufeli, Wilmar, Michael Leiter, and Christina Maslach. 2009. Burnout: 35 years of research and practice. *Career Development International* 14: 204–20. [CrossRef]

Shanafelt, Tait, and John Noseworthy. 2017. Executive leadership and physician well-being: Nine organizational strategies to promote engagement and reduce burnout. *Mayo Clinic Proceedings* 92: 129–46. [CrossRef] [PubMed]

Shirom, Arie. 2003. Job-related burnout: A Review. In Quick James Campbell and Lois Tetrick. In *Handbook of Occupational Health Psychology*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association, USA, pp. 245–64. [CrossRef]

Siegall, Marc, and Tracy McDonald. 2004. Person-Organization Value Congruence, Burnout and Diversion of Resources. *Personnel Review* 33: 291–301. [CrossRef]

Staten, Adam, and Euan Lawson. 2017. *GP Wellbeing. Combatting Burnout in General Practice*, 1st ed. Boca Raton: CRC Press.

Stock, Christian. 2010. *Syndrom vyhoření a jak jej zvládnout*, 1st ed. Praha: Grada Publising. ISBN 978-80-247-3553-5.

Swider, Brian W., and Ryan D. Zimmerman. 2010. Born to burnout: A meta-analytic path model of personality, job burnout, and work outcomes. *Journal of Vocational Behavior* 76: 487–506. [CrossRef]

Weber, Andreas, and A. Jaekel-Reinhard. 2000. Burnout syndrome: A disease of modern societies? *Occupational Medicine* 50: 512–17. Available online: https://watermark.silverchair.com/50-7-512.pdf?token=AQECAHi208BE49Ooan9kkhW (accessed on 1 September 2000). [CrossRef] [PubMed]

Wolpin, Jacob, Ronald Burke, and Esther Greenglass. 1991. Is Job Satisfaction an Antecedent or a Consequence of Psychology Burnout? *Human Relations* 44: 193–209. [CrossRef]

World Health Organization. 2019. Burn-Out an Occupational Phenomenon: International Classification of Diseases. Available online: https://www.who.int/news/item/28-05-2019-burn-out-an-occupational-phenomenon-international-classification-of-diseases (accessed on 28 May 2019).