



The Autonomy–Burnout Crisis in the Modern Workforce

Julie A. Overbey, Ph.D., MSA

Pamela Ann Gordon, Ph.D.

Table of Contents

1	Introduction
1	Organizational Ramifications and Leadership Implications of Burnout
2	Psychological Foundations of Autonomy and Burnout
2	Theoretical Frameworks Associated with Autonomy
2	Self-Determination Theory
2	Job Demands–Resources (JD-R) Model
2	Cognitive Appraisal Theory
3	Autonomy and Organizational Perspectives
3	Evidence-Based Interventions
4	Individual Level
4	Team and Managerial Practices
5	Systemic and Policy Level
5	Conclusion
6	References

Introduction

Employee burnout continues as a worrisome trend in the 21st century workplace. Adler (2020) defined burnout as “a work-related experience of exhaustion and detachment and a sense of low personal accomplishment” (p. 217). Symptoms are complex and varied, spanning the spectrum of mental, emotional, and physical signs which produce a compounding dilemma for individuals, coworkers, and organizations. Individuals become disengaged at work, negatively affecting the morale of coworkers, which may lead to decreased organizational productivity, increased turnover, and a tarnished organizational reputation with customers (Smirnova et al., 2024). It is important to note that implementing autonomy may be a double-edged sword regarding burnout: positive when allowing work creativity; negative when this same freedom causes work overload or excessive monitoring (Maisonneuve et al., 2025). A quick and simple solution to this ongoing problem does not exist. Greater understanding of burnout, company policies, providing focused resources, and promoting a supportive, autonomous-oriented work environment are needed (Adler, 2020). This paper explores organizational impacts and leadership implications, as well as related theoretical frameworks related to burnout and autonomy, and suggestions for evidence-based interventions.

Organizational Ramifications and Leadership Implications of Burnout

Research statistics present a clear picture of the critical job burnout situation with two-thirds of the American workforce feeling its negative effects and 82% of 18-34-year-old workers being the most affected (Robinson, 2025). Additional statistics revealed causes related to overwork, worker shortages, limited resources, and lack of appropriate tools (Robinson, 2025). Burnout impacts the sustainability of the organization. Absenteeism risks increase by 57% and the likelihood of turnover increases by 2.8% (Harrah, 2025). There also appears to be an association between workplace burnout, violent behaviors, and bullying which may lead to legal consequences and costs (Center for Workplace Mental Health, 2025).

HR personnel play a crucial role in developing strategies for diminishing and preventing burnout. Ntinas (2024) noted that burnout may become contagious due to the prevailing negative atmosphere within the organization. This implies that change strategies are needed. The first step requires an overall assessment of the problem and possible causes. The assessment is followed by development of policies, practices, resources, and support. As in all change initiatives, the final step is to ensure the initiatives become part of the corporate culture. “Only leadership can get change to stick by anchoring it in the very culture of an organization” (Kotter, 1996, p. 30). Creating a positive organizational work culture ensures employee well-being. Santiago-Torner (2025) used the term benevolent climate to emphasize the needed emotional states of employee collaboration and camaraderie coupled with a dedication to social responsibility for the basis of a healthy organizational culture.

Organizational leaders implement the HR initiatives for preventing and diminishing burnout. Leaders translate policy language into observable standards. The practical implication for leaders requires implementing supportive resources, as well as guiding and fostering

employee empowerment to ensure each employee feels like a valued member of the organization. Implementing job autonomy may serve as the catalyst to diminish burnout support a positive work culture (Santiago-Torner, 2025). Purcell and Hutchinson's (2007) research results showed a direct link between HR practices, leader behaviors, and employee responses.

Psychological Foundations of Autonomy and Burnout

The shift from industrial-production to service and knowledge-based models shifted hierarchical, routine, factory-style work to more fluid, cognitively demanding roles. Granting employees autonomy and discretion in how, when, and where performed tasks are not simply a feature of modern jobs but a defined characteristic of knowledge work and an essential component of organizational adaptability (Juyumaya et al., 2023). In vibrant environments characterized by complexity and change, higher autonomy and perceived work meaningfulness shaped behaviors, enabling employees to adapt to professional roles and contribute to organizational flexibility (Nie et al., 2023).

Theoretical Frameworks Associated with Autonomy

Self-Determination Theory

Self-determination theory (SDT) positions autonomy as one of three innate psychological needs essential for optimal functioning, motivation, and well-being. When employees experience autonomy with ownership over decisions, methods, or scheduling, the basic psychological need for self-direction is met, in turn fostering autonomous motivation, engagement, and sustained performance (McAnally & Hagger, 2024). Autonomy-supportive work environments enhance job satisfaction, reduce controlled motivation, and buffer against burnout and turnover intentions (McAnally & Hagger, 2024).

Job Demands–Resources (JD-R) Model

The JD-R model conceptualizes workplace characteristics as either job demands or job resources. Job resources have two central functions: (a) directly fuel motivational processes such as engagement and meaningfulness, and (b) buffering the negative effects of job demands on strain and burnout (Bakker et al., 2023). Autonomy is one of the most powerful job resources, enhancing work engagement, which in turn improves job performance (Tummers & Bakker, 2021). Systems intelligence, resilience, and occupational self-efficacy augment the positive effects of job resources on performance and well-being, maximizing the effect of autonomy when employees possess the capacities to leverage discretion effectively (Girardi et al., 2024).

Cognitive Appraisal Theory

Cognitive appraisal theory posits that individuals assess situations along two dimensions: (a) primary appraisal, evaluating if a situation is threatening or challenging; and (b) secondary appraisal, evaluating coping resources. Autonomy is strongly linked to both appraisals through the mechanism

of perceived control. Baig et al. (2022) found that innovative work behavior is influenced by how workers cognitively appraise job autonomy: autonomy appraised as a challenge enhances work engagement and innovation, while autonomy appraised as a threat undermines both.

Autonomy and Organizational Perspectives

From a psychological perspective, autonomy is more than a job design feature; it is a fundamental human need. Autonomy support from supervisors buffers burnout and enhances professional fulfillment, indicating that social-contextual supports for autonomy play a critical role in preventing strain (Parker & Grote, 2025). Autonomy positively predicts adaptive behaviors such as job crafting and helping behavior through enhanced mindfulness and personal resource investment, illustrating how autonomy functions as a psychological resource to prevent burnout and promote engagement (Ok & Lim, 2022).

Work autonomy evolved significantly from the industrial era to the knowledge economy. Early industrial labor emphasized standardization, routinization, and minimal discretion. Modern knowledge work increasingly values innovation, problem-solving, and professional judgment, all of which require greater autonomy. Employees in self-managing organizations experience substantially higher decision and method autonomy, along with greater job crafting, engagement, and satisfaction compared to those in traditionally structured workplaces (Doblinger, 2023). Job autonomy and meaningful work jointly encourage job crafting behaviors, markedly in volatile, uncertain, complex, and ambiguous (VUCA) environments (Nie et al., 2023).

The shift toward hybrid and remote work coincides with a marked increase in digital monitoring and algorithmic surveillance. While these technologies are often justified for productivity tracking or security, employees frequently report that monitoring systems reduce perceived autonomy and sense of trust, undermining personal well-being (Baygi et al., 2024). Surveillance tools create asymmetrical power dynamics and may transform autonomy into a merely symbolic construct (Schlund & Ritek, 2024). Even when structural autonomy exists (for example, flexible schedules), perceived autonomy may diminish when task-level behavior is continuously monitored, leading to elevated stress and negative appraisals of work conditions (Li & Wang, 2024).

Autonomy is positively associated with engagement, performance, and creativity (McAnally & Hagger, 2024; Tummers & Bakker, 2021). Through motivational (SDT) and resource (JD-R) pathways, autonomy promotes vigor, dedication, and absorption, both key components of work engagement. Autonomy reduces counterproductive work behavior and fosters organizational citizenship through mechanisms such as professional growth and enhanced self-efficacy. Autonomy is not universally beneficial: without adequate support or clarity, it becomes an additional demand, known as autonomy overload. Although this concept is grounded in 21st century scholarship, its relevance is amplified in complex and self-directed work environments (Aftab et al., 2022).

Evidence-Based Interventions

The following initiatives drawn from scholarly literature reflect an integrative approach to

employee well-being and autonomy . The following suggestions provide a balanced perspective where leaders and employees openly communicate and work collaboratively to create a healthy, sustainable organization.

Individual Level

Training to reinforce the self-efficacy theory results in positive outcomes. Employees bring knowledge, skills, and abilities to the workplace; therefore, any reinforcement of these qualifications builds a confidence level that promotes resilience during stressful times (Erschens et al., 2024). A training course may consist of session that includes a clear explanation of self-efficacy, followed by participants role playing how professional expertise and personal confidence promote “can do” behaviors.

In addition to self-confidence, workplace autonomy works best when clear boundaries and trust are established. The two extremes, hand’s off management and micromanagement, do not work. Gouldsberry (2023) noted that autonomy is achieved by encouraging calculated risk-taking for innovation and agreed upon levels of decision-making.

Job crafting presents another opportunity to prevent burnout and promote autonomy. This bottom-up approach allows a worker to design a preferred best-fit job role that aligns with professional skills and abilities while meeting departmental and company needs (Ok & Lim, 2022). Limitations to job crafting exist. Not all jobs allow the flexibility that job crafting requires, and not all employees have a readiness level for job crafting which may cause jealousy and disgruntlement among coworkers (Peng et al., 2025). Job crafting may increase the employee’s workload and since this initiative does not include an increase in pay, scheduled check-ins are a must to monitor workload and job satisfaction levels (Ok & Lim, 2022). To ensure the effective and realistic use of job crafting, care must be taken; this is not a panacea, but a valuable option to consider.

Team and Managerial Practices

An individual leader cannot accomplish all tasks alone. Task overload and a finite number of individual capabilities limits innovative and creative outcomes. Implementing focused delegation is a effective practice managers and team members use to promote autonomy and shared leadership. Delegation also prevents leader burnout and offers individual and team members professional growth opportunities (Employers Council Staff, 2025). The main components leading to effective delegation are to build trust through open communication and identify the skills and interests of each employee. The combination of trust and capability when delegating encourages an entrepreneurial ownership mindset in the individual or team.

Rewarding and recognizing autonomous endeavors becomes not only a feedback mechanism but also reinforces the value of individual or team efforts. Just as burnout becomes contagious in a negative workplace environment, rewards and recognition of autonomous efforts may motivate others to accept more task and decision-making responsibilities (Gouldsberry, 2023). Agarwal (2025) suggested that when developing any reward and recognition program for the diverse 21st century

workforce, HR personnel should consider employee surveys to determine reward and recognition preferences to eliminate the one-size fits all mentality

Seminal research results determined “that structural changes, aimed at facilitating participative or autonomy-supportive management are of great value” (Deci et al., 1989, p. 589). Strategies that align with leader autonomy support are: (1) actively listen to employees, (2) provide the necessary information without limitations, (3) emphasize ownership, and (4) promote creativity and innovation (Papasotiriou, 2025). An autonomy supportive leadership style makes employees feel valued, which leads to a healthier work environment and a more productive organization.

Systemic and Policy Level

At the organizational level, developing policies and procedures for workplace autonomy requires balance, as noted previously. To accomplish a supportive autonomous-oriented organization, HR and policy makers must focus on (1) building a culture of trust and flexibility, (2) invest in continuous training and development, (3) utilize technology for tools and support, and (4) measure progress and embrace change (Papasotiriou, 2025; Sanne, 2021). Trust requires open communication and honest feedback throughout the hierarchical organizational structure. Flexibility includes options for where and how the work is completed leading to creative job descriptions and job design. Training and development provides the latest information on process best practices, as well as employee health and safety topics. Encouraging the responsible use of technology is needed to enhance the entire workplace experience. Measuring the success of the policies and practices requires the commitment to change for continuous improvement. The outcomes of these structural interventions provide many benefits including increased job satisfaction, higher levels of employee engagement, and a positive, healthy work atmosphere.

Conclusion

Integrated analysis highlights how numerous factors collectively shape effective leadership and organizational health. By aligning HR strategies with leadership development, leaders foster an organizational culture that promotes autonomy and resilience. The synthesis of theoretical and practical insights underscores the need for approaches where interventions related to increasing autonomy and decreasing workplace burnout reinforce one another. Sustaining positive organizational outcomes using adaptive leadership practices cultivates both performance and well-being.

References

- Adler, D. (2020). Burnout: Old wine in new bottles. *Psychiatric Services, 71*, 217-218. doi: 10.1176/appi.ps.71302
- Aftab, A., Elahi, A. R., & Butt, M. M. (2022). Factual autonomy predict organizational citizenship behavior and counterproductive work behavior in industry workers mediated by burnout. *Journal of Development and Social Sciences 3*(2). [http://dx.doi.org/10.47205/jdss.2022\(3-II\)46](http://dx.doi.org/10.47205/jdss.2022(3-II)46)
- Agarwal, S. (2025). *How different age groups value rewards and recognition*. LinkedIn. <https://www.linkedin.com/pulse/how-different-age-groups-value-rewards-recognition-smita-agarwal-cmf2f>
- Bakker, A. B., Demerouti, E., & Sanz-Vergel, A. I. (2023). Job demands–resources theory: Ten years later. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior, 10*, 25–53. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-120920-053933>
- Baig, L. D., Azeem, M. F., & Paracha, A. (2022). Cognitive appraisal of job autonomy by nurses: A cross-sectional study. *SAGE Open Nursing, 8*, 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.1177/23779608221127823>
- Baygi, R. M., Introna, L. D., & Ostovar, M. (2024). Beyond categories: A flow-oriented approach to social justice on online labor platforms. *MIS Quarterly, 48*(4), 1663–1690. <https://doi.org/10.25300/misq/2024/18253>
- Center for Workplace Mental Health. (2025). *Workplace violence*. https://workplacementalhealth.org/mental-health-topics/violence-in-the-workplace#section_3
- Deci, E. L., Connell, J. P., & Ryan, R. M. (1989). Self-determination in a work organization. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 74*(4), 580-590. <https://doi.org/10.1037//0021-9010.74.4.580>
- Doblinger, M. (2023). Autonomy and engagement in self managing organizations: Exploring the relations with job crafting, error orientation and person environment fit. *Frontiers in Psychology, 14*. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1198196>
- Employers Council Staff. (2025). *Delegating tasks builds trust and empowers team members*. *Employers Council*. <https://www.employerscouncil.org/resources/delegating-tasks-builds-trust-and-empowers-team-members/>
- Erschens, R., Schröpel, C., Herrmann-Werner, A., Junne, F., Listunova, L., Heinzmann, A., Keis, O., Schüttpelz-Brauns, K., Herpertz, S. C., Kunz, K., Zipfel, S., & Festl-Wietek, T. (2024). The mediating role of self-efficacy in the relationship between past professional training and burnout resilience in medical education: A multicentre cross-sectional study. *BMC Medical Education, 24*(1), 875. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12909-024-05854-9>
- Girardi, D., Dal Corso, L., De Carlo, A., Capozza, D., & Falco, A. (2024). New perspectives on the job demands–resources theory. *TPM: Testing, Psychometrics, Methodology in Applied Psychology, 31*(4), 445–450. doi: 10.4473/TPM31.4.1
- Gouldsberry, M. (2023). Foster autonomy in the workplace to enhance team performance. *Betterworks*. <https://www.betterworks.com/magazine/autonomy-in-the-workplace/>

- Harrah, D. (2025). *Why employee burnout is now an organizational risk – not just an HR issue*. Spring Health. <https://www.springhealth.com/blog/employee-burnout-organizational-risk-hr>
- Juyumaya, J., Torres-Ochoa, C., & Rojas, G. (2024). Boosting job performance: The impact of autonomy, engagement and age. *Revista de Gestao USP*, 31(4), 397. <https://doi.org/10.1108/REGE-09-2023-0108>
- Kotter, J. P. (1996). *Leading change*. Harvard Business School Press.
- Li, S., & Wang, Y. (2024). A study on the positive and negative effects of different supervisor monitoring in remote workplaces. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 15. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2024.1383207>
- Maisonneuve, F., Galy, A., Groulx, P., Chênevert, D., Grady, C., & Coderre-Ball, A. M. (2025). Managing resilience and exhaustion among health care workers through psychological self-care: The impact of job autonomy in interaction with role overload. *Journal of Healthcare Leadership*, 27(17), 53-73. doi: 10.2147/JHL.S501193
- McAnally, K., & Hagger, M. S. (2024). Self-determination theory and workplace outcomes: A conceptual review and research agenda. *Behavioral Sciences*, 14(6). <https://doi.org/10.3390/bs14060428>
- Nie, T., Tian, M., Cai, M., & Yan, Q. (2023). Job autonomy and work meaning: Drivers of employee job-crafting behaviors in the VUCA times. *Behavioral Sciences*, 13(6), 493. <https://doi.org/10.3390/bs13060493>
- Ntinis, K. M. (2024). Staff burnout in intellectual disability services and resistance to change. Implications for leadership support. *Journal of Intellectual Disabilities*, 1-13. doi: 10.1177/17446295241280697
- Ok, C., & Lim, S. (2022). Job crafting to innovative and extra-role behaviors: A serial mediation through fit perceptions and work engagement. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 106. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2022.103288>
- Papasotiriou, S. (2025). *Becoming an autonomy supportive leader*. Engage Employee. <https://www.engageemployee.com/blog/becoming-an-autonomy-supportive-leader>
- Parker, S. K., & Grote, G. (2022). Automation, algorithms, and beyond: Why work design matters more than ever in a digital world. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 71(4), 1171–1204. <https://doi.org/10.1111/apps.12241>
- Peng, H., Wei, F., Zhang, Z., & Laurence, G. A. (2025). Exploring the potential downsides and antecedents of across-boundary task crafting in the workplace. *Journal of Business Research*, 200, 1156166. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2025.115616>
- Purcell, J., & Hutchinson, S. (2007). Front line managers as agents in the HRM-performance causal chain: Theory, analysis, and evidence. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 17(1), 3-20. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1748-8583.2007.00022.x>

- Robinson, B. (2025). Job burnout at 66% in 2025, new study shows. *Forbes*. <https://www.forbes.com/sites/bryanrobinson/2025/02/08/job-burnout-at-66-in-2025-new-study-shows/>
- Sanne, R. (2021). The benefits of creating autonomous work teams. *Industrial Management*, 63(1), 24-27.
- Santiago-Torner, C. (2025). Benevolent climates and burnout prevention: Strategic insights for HR through job autonomy. *Administrative Services*, 15(7), 277. <https://doi.org/10.3390/admsci15070277>
- Schlund, R., & Zitek, E. M. (2024). Algorithmic versus human surveillance leads to lower perceptions of autonomy and increased resistance. *Communications Psychology*, 2(1). <https://doi.org/10.1038/s44271-024-00102-8> PMC+2Ouci+2
- Smirnova, D., Spikina, A., & Mezentseva, D. (2024). Virtual reality (VR) device with biofeedback sensors (ReViSide) to cope with emotional burnout state among employees experiencing stress at workplace: Problem overview and action plan. *Psychiatria Danubina*, 36(2), 354-360.
- Tummers, G., & Bakker, A. B. (2021). Leadership and the job demands–resources model. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.722080>