

Staff Burnout and Leadership Styles towards Job Performance during Critical Period

Aflinda Mokhtar¹ & Noor'ain Mohamad Yunus²

¹Credit Guarantee Corporation Malaysia Berhad, Business Division, Malaysia

²Universiti Teknologi MARA, Faculty of Business and Management, Malaysia

*aflinda@cgc.com.my, noorainyunus@uitm.edu.my

Abstract: Recent pandemic of COVID-19 has heightened the need for mental and emotional health and the demands for specific types of leadership styles toward performance. The researcher believes that burnout and leadership styles are interrelated towards the job and the organization's performance during the critical period. Hence, this study aims to investigate the relationship between staff burnout and leadership styles toward job performance during the critical Movement Control Order (MCO) period due to COVID-19 in Malaysia. A questionnaire was used as the main instrument in the data collection process. A total of 180 online surveys in the form of Google Form format were distributed among Credit Guarantee Corporation Malaysia Berhad (CGC) employees through a convenience sampling technique. Multiple regression analysis was used to investigate the relationship between determinants of staff burnout and leadership styles toward job performance. The data collected was analyzed using SmartPLS, one of the most popular software applications for Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modelling (PLS-SEM). The result indicated a significant relationship between burnout (personal accomplishment) and leadership styles (autocratic, democratic, and laissez-faire) toward job performance. In comparison, burnout (emotional exhaustion and depersonalization) has no significant relationship with job performance. The researcher suggested that future research conduct another study with different populations of respondents by considering the larger sample size, including all levels of employees in an organization from all the companies in the same industries.

Keywords: *Burnout, Leadership Styles, Job Performance, Autocratic, Democratic, Laissez-Faire*

1. Introduction and Background

One of the latest global issues is when the World Health Organisation (WHO) on 11 March 2020 declared the outbreak of Coronavirus Novel 2019 or COVID-19 as a worldwide pandemic. The world has changed due to the COVID-19 pandemic, and the crisis has affected all aspects of everyday life and work and heavily impacted the global economy. The new COVID-19 pandemic in Malaysia has raised public health problems and required a reorganization of health services. Therefore, as a precautionary measure, the Malaysian government has gazetted the Movement Control Order (MCO) implementation on 18 March 2020 (Shah et al., 2020).

Over the past thirty years, burnout and leadership styles have been an object of research. According to Maslach and Jackson (1981), burnout is a symptom of emotional exhaustion and cynicism that frequently happens among individuals who do "people work". Burnout is reported as an occupational condition in the 11th edition of the International Classification of Diseases (ICD-11). Thus, it is not categorized as a health condition. Under ICD-11, burnout is a conceptualized condition because of persistence. Pressure in the workplace has not been adequately controlled. Three dimensions define this as feelings of energy depletion or fatigue, enhanced emotional detachment from one's work, negativity or cynicism relevant to one's job role and decreased professional effectiveness. It is more comprehensive than ICD-10 (World Health Organisation [WHO], 2019).

Over the past years, there has been a dramatic increase in leadership style studies. According to Kelly et al. (2020), an increasing number of studies have considered the protective role of leadership on employee burnout in a healthy organization, recognizing various types of leadership styles that may raise the risk of burnout. The issue of leadership styles has received considerable critical intention during the current crisis of the COVID-19 pandemic. Katerberg & Blau (1983) stated that successful job performance is vital to individuals and organizations at a more general level. Hence, based on the above discussion, this study aims to investigate the relationship between staff burnout and leadership styles toward job performance during the critical period of MCO due to COVID-19 in Malaysia.

2. Literature Review

Job Performance: The worldwide expansion of every organization and the many obstacles they confront in achieving their objectives and competing to be more successful than their competitors are hallmarks of today's competitive climate. Every employee plays an essential role in accomplishing the goals and performance. As a result, "performance" is often used in all management areas to describe an organization's overall performance. Performance is an achievement of a particular job performed against predetermined clear performance targets, completeness, expense, and time. Several published studies describe job performance as a central construct in industrial or organizational psychology (Austin & Villanova, 1992; Campbell, 1990; Murphy & Cleveland, 1995; Schmidt and Hunter, 1992, as cited in Viswesvaran et al., 2000). Setiawan et al. (2016) found that the employee's job performance is a consequence of or a reflection of the values of behavior shown by them while carrying out their duties and obligations.

The performance of human resources must be considered since it can affect the progress of the organization and the objectives that must be achieved (Wuryani et al., 2021). When the leaders give autonomy to the employees, they would be more loyal and motivated to perform efficiently, which would enhance organizational productivity with better outcomes, as stated by Baig et al. (2019). According to Viswesvaran et al. (2000), the current job performance model has linked task performance, contextual performance, and organizational citizenship behavior. As noted by Koopmans et al. (2012), the four primary elements of individual job performance were determined based on the conceptual grouping of individual job performance factors found in the literature, which are the execution of tasks, contextual performance, counterproductive work behavior, and adaptive performance. The researcher observed three dimensions of job performance: task performance, contextual performance, and counterproductive work behavior.

According to Kalia et al. (2019), task performance emphasizes the instrumentality of performance for organizational goals. It refers to those required outcomes and behaviors that directly serve the organization's goals. Gao et al. (2021) mention task performance as the ability to function based on conscientiousness in the "Big Five" personality domains. People with high task performance also tend to have significant conscientiousness. In other words, they are more self-controlled, responsible, and persistent. As a result, they focus well on tasks and earn better grades. Task performance includes self-control, responsibility, and perseverance. Viswesvaran (2000) claimed that task performance is defined as the level of proficiency with which incumbents perform activities formally recognized as part of the routine. Additionally, the activities that contribute to the organization's technical core, either explicitly by incorporating part of its production system or indirectly by providing it with the products or services it needs. Task performance is measured by the number of times incumbents spend on each task. According to Koopmans et al. (2012), mostly all frameworks identified task performance as a critical feature of individual job performance that should be considered. Koopmans et al. (2012) further update that Murphy and Campbell were among the first to describe the domain of individual work performance. By describing the significant features of generic job performance, we may narrow the realm of individual work performance.

As defined by Ling et al. (2020), contextual performance refers to behaviors that improve organizational effectiveness through its effects on the psychological, social, and organizational aspects of the job done by employees. Contextual performance also called organizational citizenship behavior (OCB), was defined as behaviors that, in the aggregate, across time and persons, contribute to organizational effectiveness (Johari et al., 2018). According to Jan Luca (2021), counterproductive work behavior, commonly also referred to as workplace deviance, can be defined as "voluntary behavior that violates significant organizational norms and threatens the well-being of an organization, its members, or both". Mercado et al. (2018) stated that counterproductive work behaviors are scalable actions and behaviors that employees engage in that detract from organizational goals or well-being and include behaviors that bring about undesirable consequences for the organization or its stakeholders. Koopmans et al. (2012) defined counterproductive work behavior as behavior that harms the organization's well-being, which has increased in recent years. Viswesvaran et al. (2000) claimed that counterproductive behaviors have a negative value for organizational effectiveness and have been proposed as constituting a distinct dimension of job performance.

As one of the frontlines under the essential services sector, this study allows the researcher to explore and investigate the implication of staff burnout and leadership style toward job performance during the critical

period of MCO due to the COVID-19 pandemic in Malaysia. The researcher attempted to investigate the critical department's functionality during this critical period of the situation in CGC. Amongst the critical departments during this period are the Client Service Centre (CSC), Loan Monitoring and Rehabilitation (LMR), Guarantee and Financing Evaluation (GED and FED), Subrogation and Recovery (SRD), and branches all over Malaysia. Most of these critical departments and branches deal with and manage customer inquiries, moratoriums, loan and financing applications, and internal inquiries. During this critical period, most employees are working from home (WFH) and simultaneously required to perform their tasks and responsibilities. As a part of these team members, the researcher has confidence in the increased workload and inconsistency of working hours, which is more than the actual working hours, i.e., 9 hours per day. Thus, from the researcher's point of view, it can be related to the entire company, where the researcher believes that job and company performance is not stand-alone or independent. Both are interrelated and contribute to achieving the company's vision and mission. To date, several studies have investigated job performance. The researcher attempted to evaluate the impact of staff burnout and leadership styles on job performance during the critical period in CGC.

Burnout: Lubbadeh (2020) described job burnout as a condition precipitated by prolonged susceptibility to stress at work. It has many costs for the organization and the employees themselves. The value of job burnout is outlined by its association with various types of unfavorable organizational outcomes. Monique (2016, November) found that stress is perceived because of professional life, but severe and uncompromising stress could lead to a dangerous condition known as "burnout." For many years, burnout has become a common issue or experience. It has encouraged many researchers to keep on the study and investigate in depth what is behind it and why it seems to occur even though massive studies have continuously been done. In Freudenberger's original 1974 journal, he defines burnout as the condition of being tired due to exerting a significant burden on one's energy, strength, or resources in one's place of work (Freudenberger, 1974). He further claimed that physical signs of burnout include tiredness, fatigue, recurrent headaches and gastrointestinal issues, insomnia, and shortness of breath, among other things. Maslach (1982) revealed that employees who work in "people work" are almost always at risk of developing burnout, with the most precise definition of burnout to be defined as a syndrome of emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and diminished personal accomplishment that can occur among people who work in "people work" of any kind.

The Maslach Burnout Inventory (MBI) developed by Maslach and Jackson (1981) has been used most widely by researchers to determine the three components syndrome of burnout. The scale has had the most substantial psychometric properties. Monique (2016, November) claimed that because of the pioneering research of psychologist Christina Maslach and several collaborators, the research field had made to know that burnout has three components syndrome that responds to a chronic stressor on the job. Emotional exhaustion is the main symptom of burnout, known as the first element. This causes massive physical, cognitive, and mental fatigue that affects the ability of people to work effectively and to feel happy about what they are doing. This could continuously occur due to the constant demand on organizational culture, time pressure or enormous workload. Wright et al. (1997) referred to experiencing sensations of being overextended and weary due to the emotional demands of one's job, defined as emotional exhaustion. The second element of burnout is depersonalization which represents the destruction of engagement. It usually is a mode of emotional distance away from work. Depersonalization can primarily result from work overload, but it can also likely happen in unfairness or conflict. Gorji (2011) claimed that depersonalization is associated with more or more minor adverse reactions of individuals to various working conditions, resulting in negative perceptions and the feeling of being unaccepted, and ultimately the appearance of a disconnect between them the individuals and their job prospects.

Diminished personal accomplishment is the third element of burnout syndrome. It is about the sense of ineffectiveness and lack of efficiency and achievement. Several studies by Wright et al. (1997), Maslach et al. (2001), Sonnentag (2005) and Abdullah & Yuen (2011) have been distinguished to cope with the emotional strain of one's job and also an immediate reaction to exhaustion. Depersonalization is an attempt to put spacing between oneself and the patient's cognition and emotions by continuing to develop an insensitivity or suspicious behavior and mentally detaching oneself from overpowering job requirements. Previous research has established a correlation between burnout and job performance.

Leadership Styles

A leader is a person in charge who convinces others to participate. A true leader encourages faith in humanity and drives them to motion. A leader can motivate their followers with their leadership style. A leader with a good practice of leadership styles always has enormous followers. Velu et al. (2017) claimed that a leader's style is as varied as how they may lead in every organization. People are more likely to follow great leaders because they are honest, have a clear vision for the future, encourage others, effectively manage projects, and interact with others on their teams. In addition, it should be selected and adapted to fit organizations, situations, groups, and individuals.

Autocratic Leadership Styles: Erdem (2021) stated that in the autocratic leadership style, a frequently seen type of leadership in organizations and societies, the authority to manage and leaders are the only ones who have the right to make decisions. According to Iqbal et al. (2015), the autocratic leadership style is considered the philosophy of "I tell", in which the leader will instruct subordinates on what to do. The authoritarian leader typically decides without any advice or guidance from anyone. They seem to do it on their own. Autocratic leaders also often create an atmosphere which very structured and hierarchal. In this situation, less communication and interaction are expected between leaders and subordinates. Generally, autocratic leaders are firm when a decision has been made. This type of leader has the assumption that they think that the employees have little guidance and need to observe and closely monitor. Therefore, it would lead to the weaknesses of this leadership style, which are a decrease in the employee's morale level, an increase in turnover rate, the disaffection of employees, and commitment. Note from the explanation, the researcher believes that confident leaders still implement this autocratic leadership style in specific organizations today. Whether it is good to be practiced depends on the environment and current situation.

Democratic Leadership Styles: Consequently, another type of leadership style is referred to as democratic leadership. Leaders practicing democratic leadership styles generally recognize every employee's value and esteem. Velu et al. (2017) identified the democratic leadership style as an "I share" philosophy where decisions are made among team members, with each member having equal involvement. The leader decides after communicating and discussing with their team members. All ideas are counted and appreciated. Democratic leadership is conceptually distinct from positions of authority; instead, it is defined as the performance of three functions: distributing responsibility among the membership, empowering group members, and aiding the group's decision-making process (Fakhri et al., 2021). According to Mawoli et al. (2013), there is evidence from previous literature that in democratic leadership styles, leaders consult with subordinates on proposed actions and decisions. They also encourage participation from the subordinates. In addition, this has confirmed the possibility that the leader can conquer their team members' cooperation and motivate them positively and effectively. This style also enables employees to provide commentaries and recommendations on central issues. Subordinates are given full authority and accountability, encouraging them to become competent and active in their leadership development. However, there is some argument on the effectiveness of democratic leadership styles where NawoseIng'ollan et al. (2017), on their point view that democratic leadership has several drawbacks that must be overcome to ensure its effectiveness in organizations. Apart from that disagreement, most studies have developed the effectiveness of democratic leadership styles. Mawoli et al. (2013) stated that democratic leadership works best when the leaders have part of the information and the employees have another part. Therefore, the leader is not to expect to know everything. Using this leadership style is a mutual benefit, especially when it allows the employees to become a part of the team and allows the leader to make better decisions. As a result, when a job is well-structured, and the leader and their employees have a solid working connection, their effectiveness is high.

Laissez-Faire Leadership Styles: Velu et al. (2017) claimed that the laissez-faire leadership style is the style of leadership where authority and power are given to employees to determine the objectives. The leader provides less or no direction to the employees. Under a laissez-faire leadership style, leaders will give freedom to their subordinates. According to Mintzberg (cited in Mawoli et al., 2013), laissez-faire leadership is a "free-rein leader" who does not lead but leaves the group entirely to itself. In other words, the leader has little control and less supervision over subordinates. However, some research criticized the laissez-faire leadership style, which they found would have an adverse effect on the organization. According to Ronald (2011), a laissez-faire leader could lead the team members to anarchy, chaos, and inefficiency, leading to layoffs and being labeled as impractical.

According to a recent survey from a professional feedback platform, Rachel (2020, May 12) has stated that more than seven out of ten professionals today suffer from burnout due to the COVID-19 epidemic. The inability of employees to maintain a clear distinction between their professional and personal lives is a significant source of frustration. Previous studies (Mirkamali et al., 2019, Wafaa, 2019, Abdullah & Yuen, 2011) have specified that burnout is generally assumed to be related to lowered job performance. Organizations need to concentrate on employees' emotions interrelated to the critical period to maintain productivity and improve job performance. If burnout is left unsupervised, such sentiments will disrupt the morale and commitment of the employees, lead to reduced quality of performance and failures, and eventually impact the capacity of the company to thrive in this critical period.

The organization must deliver a clear objective and always provide regular updates, which will help employees remain focused and energetic and have a sense of purpose. Several studies thus far have linked burnout and job performance. There is a positive relationship between staff burnout and job performance in some aspects of burnout and job performance (Akca et al., 2019; Karatepe et al., 2008; Ashtari et al., 2009; Abdullah & Yuen, 2011 and Gorji, 2011). Detailed examination of burnout and job performance has shown that the employee's performance decreases due to increased emotional exhaustion and depersonalization. Still, the studies clearly stated that the lack of personal accomplishment has no relation or low correlation with employee performance. Unlike Akca et al., (2019), Karatepe et al., (2008), Ashtari et al., (2009); Abdullah & Yuen, (2011), Gorji, (2011) & Wright et al., (1997) argued that a negative relationship was established between some aspects of burnout and job performance. The studies presented thus far provide evidence that there is no consistent relationship between burnout and job performance. Because of that, the researcher will study the correlation of the three elements in burnout toward job performance during the critical period.

Previous studies show that staff burnout (emotional exhaustion) relates to job performance. This statement has been supported by Abdullah & Yuen. (2011), in their studies with regards to the impact of burnout on job performance among nurses, disclosed that there was a significant relationship between some of the burnout's elements, such as emotional exhaustion, depersonalization and personal accomplishment towards job performance.

H1: Burnout (emotional exhaustion) has a significant relationship with job performance during the critical period of MCO due to COVID-19 in Malaysia.

Previous studies show a positive relationship between staff burnout (depersonalization) and job performance. This statement has been supported by Abdullah & Yuen. (2011) in their studies on the impact of burnout on job performance among nurses, which disclosed that there was a significant relationship between some of the burnout's elements, such as emotional exhaustion, depersonalization and personal accomplishment towards job performance.

H2: Burnout (depersonalization) significantly correlates with job performance during the critical period of MCO due to COVID-19 in Malaysia.

Ashtari et al., (2009) in their previous studies have proven a relationship between staff burnout (personal accomplishment) and job performance. This study disclosed the significant relationship between some burnout elements, such as emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and personal accomplishment toward job performance.

H3: Burnout (personal accomplishment) has a significant relationship with job performance during the critical period of MCO due to COVID-19 in Malaysia.

The current crisis of the COVID-19 pandemic calls for different forms of leadership, and not just one method might perform. Despite tremendous pressure on physical and mental well-being, leaders need to lean into their strengths to ensure their teams are manageable and perform well during this critical period. The intensity and complexity of the COVID-19 pandemic create unprecedented obstacles for the leaders of today's crucial institutions. Leadership is being tested in situations of uncertainty, not dominance, and

COVID-19 has brought much pressure on organizations. It is supposed to pressure leaders as they have not been before. The new circumstances regarding the COVID-19 pandemic are distinct from everything we have experienced in over a century and seem to be a protracted and potentially fatal obstacle for organizations. During this critical period, responsive leaders must adapt and respond to changing organizational situations daily and hourly. Whenever there is a continuous transition to the new regular and conscientious, reflective leaders must brace for a significant change in organizational objectives. As a leader who must make a tough decision with potentially drastic consequences during the day, consistently evaluating the risks and benefits of various alternatives is progressively challenging. Outstanding leadership in the present crisis effectively focuses on the psychological well-being and the subordinates while looking forward to maintaining the performance. When the pandemic occurs, the leader must assume a more significant role in decision-making or risk a sense of confusion and uncertainty irresistible to the community, shaking its group efficacy.

In 1939, Lewin, Lippit and White led early research regarding leadership styles. They also found that each of the three styles mainly affects an organization. During their research, a few leadership styles were identified, which are autocratic, democratic, and laissez-faire. A study by Mawoli et al., 2013 affirms that autocratic, democratic, and laissez-faire styles of leadership all produce different job performance under different situations. Numerous studies have attempted to explain that different leadership styles produce different job performance under different situations (Agarwal et al., 2020; Dastane, 2020). In an outbreak, ineffective leadership may have potentially catastrophic implications for the organizations they lead (Arifah et al., 2018). In addition, although leaders can be directly involved, maintaining their sense of leadership style is the quality that will help continue the sustainability of organizations and achieve the desired outcomes. Almost every research that has been written on leadership styles agrees that there is a significant relationship between leadership styles and job performance. This has been decided by Velu et al. (2017) and Mawoli et al. (2013), where autocratic and democratic leadership styles positively impact job performance, while laissez-faire leadership styles do not correlate with job performance. Together these studies provide important insights for the researcher to investigate the leadership styles related to job performance during the critical period.

Previous studies by Olayisade and Awolusi (2021), Solihah et al. (2021) and Velu et al. (2017) found a relationship between autocratic leadership styles towards job performance. Therefore, the researcher assumes a possible explanation for this result which might be that during certain situations, respondents believe that it is valuable for the company to practice the autocratic leadership style when the business is facing a crisis, or any problem arises which requires an immediate response.

H4: Autocratic leadership styles have a significant relationship with job performance during the critical period of MCO due to the COVID-19 pandemic in Malaysia.

The statement by Firas et al. (2022), Diana et al. (2021) and Velu et al. (2017) supported a relationship between democratic leadership styles towards job performance. The similarities between democratic leadership styles and job performance in this study which these studies reported that democratic leadership styles match with well-organized and skilled employees who are eager to share their knowledge and are suitable for a long-term period which contributes to the employee's performance.

H5: Democratic leadership styles have a significant relationship with job performance during the critical period of MCO due to the COVID-19 pandemic in Malaysia.

Beauty et al. (2022), Addow (2022), and Velu et al. (2017) found a relationship between laissez-faire leadership styles towards job performance where the employees feel confident with the power they have in delivering their tasks. These findings further support the idea of Mawoli et al. (2013) that when the employer sets goals for the employees to achieve, they should perform momentarily without supervision, which this scholar believes is enough for the employer to be a meaningful guide for optimal performance.

H6: Laissez-Faire leadership styles have a significant relationship with job performance during the critical period of MCO due to the COVID-19 pandemic

3. Research Methodology

This study was carried out at one of the Financial Institutions under Bank Negara Malaysia (BNM), CGC. The population of this study contains the employees under the essential service sector from CGC who has been working during the critical period of MCO due to the COVID-19 pandemic in Malaysia. From the information obtained, the total population of the employees from CGC is 563. The sampling technique applied in this study is convenience sampling. Based on 563 of the total population in CGC, the researcher divides the sample size based on the number of departments and branches.

The researcher had chosen the sample size based on the most critical business function in CGC during the critical period of MCO due to the COVID-19 pandemic in Malaysia. Sekaran (2006) described that sample size is the total number of subjects specified as a sample that reflects population characteristics. The sample size for this study was determined by using G*Power software. For this study, the setting measured was effect size f^2 : 0.15, $\alpha=0.05$ and the number of predictors=6 (Burnout: emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and personal accomplishment; Leadership Styles: autocratic, democratic, and laissez-faire). The power was set at 95%. Therefore, for this study, the sample size required was 147. Pilot testing was conducted on 50 participants to ensure the validity and reliability of the constructs in the study. The study's reliability test through Cronbach Alpha coefficient exceeded the minimum threshold of 0.7 for all elements under dependent variables, i.e. job performance (0.865, 0.916 and 0.841 for task performance, contextual performance, and counterproductive work behavior) and independent variables, i.e. burnout (0.909, 0.856 and 0.899 for emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and personal accomplishment) and leadership styles (0.767, 0.870 and 0.770 for autocratic leader, democratic leader and laissez-faire).

The researcher adopted the Maslach Burnout Inventory (MBI) questionnaire to measure staff burnout. The questionnaire measures the three elements of burnout: emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and personal achievement. The questionnaire for leadership styles was adopted from the Leadership Styles Questionnaire (LSQ) developed by Northouse (2011) to measure the leadership styles of autocratic leadership, democratic leadership, and laissez-faire leadership. Apart from that, the researcher also adopted the Individual Work Performance Questionnaire (IW PQ) developed by Koopmans (2014) to measure job performance. The questionnaire is alienated into task performance, conceptual performance, and counterproductive work behavior. The researcher used 5 points Likert Scale to measure the items for job performance, burnout, and leadership styles.

4. Results

In this study, the population was 147 employees consisting of four Head of Section, 32 Senior Executive, 104 Executives and seven non-executives in CGC. A total of 180 surveys via Google Forms were distributed to the respondents via email and WhatsApp, and only 147 questionnaires were returned. Table 1 presents the characteristics of the total sample of employees who participated in the study.

Table 1: Demographic and Geographic Information Pertaining to Respondents (n=147)

Variables	Frequency	Percentage
Gender		
Male	56	38.1%
Female	91	61.9%
Total	147	100%
Age		
18 – 20 years old	0	0%
21 – 30 years old	29	19.7%
31 – 40 years old	85	57.8%
41 – 50 years old	27	18.4%
51 years old and above	6	4.1%
Total	147	100%

Department		
Client Service Centre	13	8.8%
Loan Monitoring and Rehabilitation Subrogation and Recovery	27	18.4%
Guarantee Evaluation	21	14.3%
Financing Evaluation	14	9.5%
Branches	13	8.8%
Total	59	40.1%
Position		
Head of Section	4	2.7%
Senior Executive	32	21.8%
Executive	104	70.7%
Non-Executive	7	4.80%
Total	147	100%
Working Experience		
0 – 5 years	5	3.4%
6 – 10 years	44	30%
11 – 15 years	71	48.3%
16 – 20 years	22	15%
20 years and above	5	3.4%
Total	147	100%

After obtaining the necessary data, the researcher conducted statistical analysis tests and obtained the following result:

Table 2: Hypothesis Test Result

Path	Path Coefficient (β)	Standard Error (SE)	t Values	p Values	CIBC		ct Size (f2)
					5.00%	95.00%	
H1: EE -> JP	-0.123	0.121	1.013	0.156	-0.321	0.078	0.009
H2: DP -> JP	0.129	0.149	0.869	0.192	-0.093	0.368	0.009
H3: PA -> JP	0.457	0.084	5.439	0.000	0.325	0.591	0.299
H4: AL -> JP	0.257	0.107	2.411	0.008	0.088	0.427	0.081
H5: DL -> JP	0.123	0.086	1.428	0.077	-0.023	0.264	0.019
H6: LF -> JP	0.152	0.073	2.083	0.019	0.039	0.281	0.034

A structural analysis was run to test the hypothesis to answer all the Research Questions. The result of the hypothesis testing is summarised in Table 2. Hair et al. (2017) point out that the level of acceptance for one tail path coefficient is ($p < 0.01$, $t > 2.33$), ($p < 0.05$, $t > 1.645$) and ($p < 0.10$, $t > 1.28$). The most surprising aspect of the data is that there is no significant relationship between emotional exhaustion and job performance during the critical period of the COVID-19 pandemic ($\beta = -0.123$, $p > 0.05$). The effect size (f2) is 0.009, suggesting a weak effect size. Thus, H1 was not supported for this study. There was also no significant relationship between depersonalization and job performance ($\beta = 0.129$, $p > 0.05$), with an effect size is 0.009, which also suggested a weak effect size. Therefore, H2 also is not supported. As Table 2 shows, there is a significant relationship between personal accomplishment and job performance ($\beta = 0.457$, $p < 0.01$). The effect is 0.299, which is suggested as a moderate effect size. Hence, H3 is supported.

A positive correlation was found between leadership style and job performance. There is a significant relationship between autocratic leaders and job performance ($\beta = 0.257$, $p < 0.01$) with an effect size of 0.081, which is suggested as a moderate effect size. Then it can be concluded that H4 was supported in this study. Democratic leader and job performance have a significant relationship ($\beta = 0.123$, $p < 0.10$). The effect size is 0.019, which is suggested as weak. H5 was supported. There is also a significant relationship between laissez-

faire leaders and job performance ($\beta = 0.152$, $p < 0.05$), with a 0.034 effect size suggested as a moderate effect size. Therefore, it was quantified that H6 was supported.

Table 3: R Square

	R Square
CP	0.856
CWB	0.133
JP	0.459
TP	0.568

The R Square, as per Table 3, specifies the variance of the dependent variable of job performance is 0.459, which suggests 45.9% of the variance in job performance is explained by burnout, i.e., emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, personal accomplishment and leadership styles, i.e., autocratic leader, democratic leader and laissez-faire leader who are the independent variables for these studies. With regards to the strength of the relationship, it was distinguished that the relationship between personal accomplishment and job performance is the sturdiest with $\beta = 0.457$.

Discussion

This study has been established, and there was no relationship between staff burnout (emotional exhaustion and depersonalization) with job performance. The result did not support the hypothesis, and the researcher concluded that there was no correlation between the variables and the relationship was proven weak. Over the year, several studies thus far have linked burnout with job performance (Wafaa, 2019; Mirkamali et al., 2019; Gorji, 2011; Ashtari et al., 2009). However, this is the most exciting finding where this current study does not support the previous research. The reason for this is not apparent, but it may have something to do with the resilience toward staff burnout (emotional exhaustion and depersonalization). Moroney et al. (2021) identified resilience in generic terms as adjusting effectively while suffering, stress, or tragedy. It may be regarded as a character attribute that individuals apply to establish techniques for bouncing back in adverse situations.

From this study, the result of burnout (emotional exhaustion) may be explained by the fact that the perception of the respondents in dealing with their job while working from home during the period of MCO. Respondents might have strong beliefs in their abilities while performing their job effectively, even if their emotions were drained. They trust that at least they can maintain their job performance as they work from home without confronting their superiors or colleagues compared to working from the office. In view of burnout (depersonalization), respondents might perceive that they succeed in estrangement themselves to the extent that will help them deal with stress. Consequently, they can maintain their job performance. In 2020, Bunga et al. published a paper describing a significant relationship between burnout and resilience. This also implies that as the level of resilience increased, so did burnout and vice versa. The result from this study has concluded that there was a relationship between staff burnout (personal accomplishment) and job performance during the critical period of MCO. Thus, the result obtained supported the hypothesis. In contrast to the earlier findings for staff burnout (emotional exhaustion and depersonalization), these findings match those observed in earlier studies. The present findings seem consistent with other research, which found a significant relationship between burnout (personal accomplishment) and job performance.

These findings further support the idea of Wafaa (2019), who found that the relationships between personal accomplishment with job performance are significant when employees have a feeling of doubt about their capabilities and fear that it might not help them to complete their task-based as per expectation as every employee wants to feel a sense of accomplishment in their workplace. During MCO, employees are required to work from home, which will contribute to the limitation in terms of communication when dealing with their job. The Malaysian culture may explain this result in high collectivism, where people typically highly bond to group members and prefer to work in a team. The study by Karatepe (2008) is consistent with our predictions. Diminished personal accomplishment has a positive relationship with job performance. Both studies agree with Ashtari et al. (2009) findings which show a significant relationship between personal accomplishment and job performance where there is a feeling of failure in individual achievement.

This study has been recommended to explore the relationship between autocratic leadership style and job performance during the critical period of MCO due to the COVID-19 pandemic in Malaysia. This study's findings have revealed a relationship between autocratic leadership style and job performance. Therefore, the result obtained supported the hypothesis. In this study, the researcher found that autocratic leadership styles were the most influential effect on job performance. During the period of MCO due to COVID-19, every organization will investigate how they respond to the crisis immediately, not only for the management of CGC. Therefore, the researcher assumes a possible explanation for this result: respondents believe that during certain situations, it is valuable for the company to practice the autocratic leadership style when the business is facing a crisis or any problem that requires an immediate response. These findings are consistent with the previous study by Iqbal et al. (2015), who specified that autocratic leadership has a significant relationship with job performance where all decision-making is centralized. This style of leadership allows a quick decision-making process. These findings agree with Velu et al. (2017), which stated that autocratic leadership styles positively correlate to job performance where autocratic leaders are more efficient.

The researcher also investigates the relationship between democratic leadership styles and job performance in this study. The findings show a relationship between democratic leadership styles and job performance. Hence, the result of these studies supports the hypothesis. Although from the findings, the researcher can conclude that there was a correlation between the variables, the relationship was weak. There are similarities between democratic leadership styles and job performance in this study and those described by Velu et al. (2017). This study reported that democratic leadership styles match well-organized and skilled employees who are eager to share their knowledge and are suitable for a long-term period, contributing to the employee's performance. This study was also supported by Agarwal et al. (2020), Belete (2020) and Iqbal et al. (2015), where democratic leadership styles have a positive relationship with job performance. NawoseIng'ollan et al. (2017) highlighted the result of the studies that democratic leadership style has a significant relationship with job performance. This is on the account that democratic leadership has contributed to improved job performance; even though the result of this study shows a weak relationship between variables, researchers believe that the combination of democratic leadership style with other leadership styles might also contribute to the employee's job performance.

This study also investigates the relationship between laissez-faire leadership style and job performance during the critical period of MCO due to COVID-19 in Malaysia. The findings show a relationship between laissez-faire leadership styles and job performance. Thus, the result supports the hypothesis. The table in the previous chapter shows the moderate relationship between laissez-faire leadership styles and job performance. In accordance with the present result, previous studies have demonstrated the same impact. Iqbal et al. (2015) have confirmed that the laissez-faire leadership style has a more significant positive relationship with job performance, where the employees feel confident with their power in delivering their tasks. These findings further support the idea of Mawoli et al. (2013) that when the employer sets goals for the employees to achieve, they should perform momentarily without supervision, which this scholar believes is enough for the employer to be a meaningful guide for optimal performance. This study supported previous studies where laissez-faire leadership style positively and significantly impacts job performance. The laissez-faire style leads to increased job satisfaction and better employee performance, which may be damaging for employees if the team in charge does not manage their time well or they are not self-motivated to do their work efficiently (Dastane, 2020).

The researcher also intended to investigate the most significant determinants of staff burnout and leadership styles toward job performance during the critical period of MCO due to COVID-19 in Malaysia. Therefore, based on the findings, the researcher found that burnout (personal accomplishment) and autocratic leadership styles were the most influential determinants of job performance. The data has been interpreted and shown in the table from the previous chapter. This variable has the highest β values among the variables. Thus, it can be assumed that burnout (personal accomplishment), autocratic leadership styles and job performance were related to each other during the critical period of MCO due to COVID-19 in Malaysia. The present findings seem consistent with other research (Wafaa, 2019, Mirkamali et al., 2019; Abdullah & Yuen, 2011), which also aligns with this study. They found that the feeling of inefficacy or reduced personal accomplishment is assumed to be related to job performance.

In contrast to earlier findings, however, no evidence of burnout (personal accomplishment) as a factor related to job performance is explained by Karatepe (2008). The studies do not support the findings of previous research. The study cannot explore the significant relationship between burnout (personal accomplishment) and job performance. The autocratic leadership style is founded on the current situation where all actions and decisions must be instantly decided during the critical period. As such, the researcher would like to reiterate Veliu et al. (2017) findings that autocratic leadership styles positively correlate to job performance where autocratic leaders are more efficient.

5. Conclusion and Recommendations

This study has been established, and there was no relationship between staff burnout (emotional exhaustion and depersonalization) with job performance. The result did not support the hypothesis, and the researcher concluded that there was no correlation between the variables and the relationship was proven weak. However, this is the most exciting finding where this current study does not support the previous research. The reason for this is not apparent, but it may have something to do with the resilience toward staff burnout (emotional exhaustion and depersonalization). The result from this study has concluded that there was a relationship between staff burnout (personal accomplishment) and job performance during the critical period of MCO. Thus, the result obtained supported the hypothesis. This study's findings have revealed a relationship between autocratic leadership style and job performance. Therefore, the result obtained supported the hypothesis. In this study, the researcher found that autocratic leadership styles were the most influential effect on job performance. During the period of MCO due to COVID-19, every organization will investigate how they respond to the crisis immediately, not only for the management of CGC.

With that, the researcher has several recommendations to provide for the improvement of future research. The researcher believes that the recommendation of this study can be used as a guideline and benefit CGC or every organization to ensure the effectiveness of their employee's performance and the organization. The management of the organizations needs to understand that negative feelings toward the job always hinder the performance of the employees at the workplace, whereas a satisfied workforce performs well. The organization should constantly influence leadership behavior to maximize employee productivity. This can be achieved through policy formulation, recruitment, training, and promotion, as well as by enforcing the appropriate organizational behaviors. It is recommended that the organization review its leadership training and selection processes to maximize its leadership pool to maximize employee productivity. Regular pulse checks should be conducted to ascertain the current leadership style in the organization and interventions implemented to ensure the desired leadership style is maintained.

References

- Abdullah, D. N. M. A., & Yuen, F. C. (2011). The impact of job burnout towards job performance among nurses. ISBEIA 2011 - 2011 IEEE Symposium on Business, Engineering, and Industrial Applications, 351–356. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ISBEIA.2011.6088836>
- Agarwal, S. (2020). Leadership Style and Performance of Employees. *International Research Journal of Business Studies*, 13(1), 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.21632/irjbs.13.1.1-14>
- Akca, M., & Küçükoğlu, M. T. (2019). Relationships between Mental Workload, Burnout, and Job Performance. (January), 49–68. <https://doi.org/10.4018/978-1-7998-1052-0.ch003>
- Addow, A. A. (2022). The Influence of Leadership Styles on Employee Performance in Higher Education- A Case Study From The University of Somalia (UNISO). *EPR International Journal of Environmental Economics, Commerce and Educational Management (ECEM)*, 9(7), 13–19. Retrieved from <http://eprajournals.net/index.php/ECEM/article/view/629>
- Arifah, A. R., Tariq, M., Fikri, M. R., Syahirah, S., Hanafiah Juni, M., & Abdul Manaf, R. (2018). Leadership Theories in Disease Outbreak Management. *International Journal of Public Health and Clinical Sciences*, 5(2), 2289–7577.
- Ashtari, Z., Farhady, Y., & Khodaei, M. R. (2009). Relationship between job burnout and work performance in a sample of Iranian mental health staff. *African Journal of Psychiatry*, 12(1), 71–74.
- Baig, S. A.; Iqbal, S.; Abrar, M.; Baig, I. A.; Amjad, F.; Zia-ur-Rehman, M.; Awan, M. U. (2019). Impact of leadership styles on employees' performance with the moderating role of positive psychological

- capital. *Total Quality Management & Business Excellence*, (), 1–21.
- Beauty, M., & Aigbogun, O. (2022). Effects of Leadership Styles on Employee Performance: A Case Study of Turnall Holdings LTD, Harare. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 12(1), 289–305.
- Belete, J. (2020). The Effects of Leadership Style on Employees Performance in Case of Kaffa Zone Government Offices, South West Ethiopia. 10(7), 26756–26773.
- Bunga, E. B.; Eka, Ni G. A.; Hutasoit, Elissa, O. (2020). Relationship between burnout and resilience of nurses at a private hospital in Indonesia. *Enfermería Clínica*, 30(), 49–52. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enfcli.2019.12.025>
- Dastane, O. (2020). Impact of Leadership Styles on Employee Performance: A Moderating Role of Gender. *Australian Journal of Business and Management Research*, 5(12), 27–52. <https://doi.org/10.52283/nswrca.ajbmr.20210512a03>
- Diana, I. N., Supriyanto, A. S., Ekowati, V. M., & Ertanto, A. H. (2021). Factor Influencing Employee Performance: The Role of Organizational Culture. *The Journal of Asian Finance, Economics and Business*, 8(2), 545–553. <https://doi.org/10.13106/JAFEB.2021.VOL8.NO2.0545>
- Erdem, A. T. (2021). The Mediating Role of Work Alienation in the Effect of Democratic and Autocratic Leadership Styles on Counterproductive Behaviors: A Study in Ankara OSTİM Industrial Zone. *OPUS International Journal of Society Researches*, 17 (34), 873–902. <https://doi.org/10.26466/opus.839136>
- Fakhri, M., Syarifuddin, S., Winarno, A., Nurnida, I., & Hanum, S. (2021). Democratic Leadership Practice to Construct Clan Organisational Culture in Family Companies. *The Journal of Asian Finance, Economics and Business*, 8(1), 803–811. <https://doi.org/10.13106/JAFEB.2021.VOL8.NO1.803>
- Firas S. K., Rafiduraida A. R., Ahmad, Z. A., & Anmar, A. K. (2022). Impact of Leadership Style on Employee Performance (A Case Study on a Private Organization in Iraq). *Texas Journal of Multidisciplinary Studies*, 13, 15–32. Retrieved from <https://zienjournals.com/index.php/tjm/article/view/2454>
- Freudenberger, H. J. (1974). Staff Burn-Out. 90(1), 159–165.
- Gao, Xingyuan and Chen, Hongyan and Wu, Jie and Huang, Jingzhong, Task Performance: Report on the Study of Social and Emotional Skills of Chinese Adolescents (I) (30 September 2021). Best Evidence in Chinese Education, 9(1), 1197–1202, 2021, Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=3946012>
- Gorji, M. (2011). The Effect of Job Burnout Dimension on Employees' Performance. *International Journal of Social Science and Humanity*, (January 2011), pp. 243–246. <https://doi.org/10.7763/ijssh.2011.v1.43>
- <https://www.who.int/news/item/28-05-2019-burn-out-an-occupational-phenomenon-international-classification-of-diseases> <https://www.hcamag.com/asia/specialisation/mental-health/covid-19-why-burnout-is-on-the-rise/222207>
- Iqbal, N., Anwar, S. and Haider, N. (2015). Effect of Leadership Style on Employee Performance. *Arabian Journal of Business and Management Review*, 5, 1-6.
- Jan Luca, P. (2021). Why older employees engage in less counterproductive work behavior and in more organizational citizenship behavior: Examining the role of the HEXACO personality traits. *Personality and Individual Differences*, (), -. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2020.110550>
- Johari, J. (2018). Job characteristics, employee well-being, and job performance of public sector employees in Malaysia. 102–119. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJPSM-09-2017-0257>
- Kalia, N. & Bhardwaj, B. (2019). Contextual and Task Performance: Do Demographic and Organisational variables matter? *Rajagiri Management Journal*. 13. 30-42. [10.1108/RAMJ-09-2019-0017](https://doi.org/10.1108/RAMJ-09-2019-0017).
- Karatepe, O. M., & Uludag, O. (2008). Role stress, burnout and their effects on frontline hotel employees' job performance: Evidence from Northern Cyprus. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 10(2), 111–126. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jtr.645>
- Katerberg, R., and Blau, G. J. (1983). "An examination of level and direction of effort and job performance." *Acad. Manage J.*, 26(2), 249–257.
- Kelly, R. J., & Hearld, L. R. (2020). Burnout and Leadership Style in Behavioral Health Care: a Literature Review. *Journal of Behavioral Health Services and Research*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11414-019-09679-z>.
- Koopmans, L., Bernaards, C., Hildebrandt, V., Van Buuren, S., Van Der Beek, A. J., & de Vet, H. C. w. (2012). Development of an individual work performance questionnaire. *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management*, 62(1), 6–28. <https://doi.org/10.1108/17410401311285273>

- Koopmans, Linda & Bernaards, Claire & Hildebrandt, Vincent & De Vet, Henrica & van der Beek, Allard. (2014). Construct Validity of the Individual Work Performance Questionnaire. *Journal of Occupational and environmental medicine / American College of Occupational and Environmental Medicine*, 56. 10.1097/JOM.000000000000113.
- Lubbadeh, T. (2020). Job Burnout: A General Literature Review. *International Review of Management and Marketing*, 10(3), 7–15. <https://doi.org/10.32479/irmm.9398>
- Maslach, C., & Jackson, S. E. (1981). The measurement of experienced burnout. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 2(2), 99–113. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.4030020205>
- Maslach, C. (1982). Understanding burnout: Definitional issues in analyzing a complex phenomenon.
- Maslach, C., Schaufeli, W. B., & Leiter, M. P. (2001). Job Burnout. 397–422.
- Mawoli, M.A., Mohammed, T.H., & Sarkin-Daji, B.D. (2013). Leadership Styles, Job Performance, Public Health Institutions, Federal Medical Centre, Private Health Institutions, *Lapai Journal of Management Science*, 4(1), 2838
- Mercado, B., Dilchert, S., Giordano, C. & Ones, D. (2018). Counterproductive Work Behaviors.
- Mirkamali, K., Ahmadizad, A., Varmaghani, M. (2019). Determining the Relationship Between Job Burnout and Employee Productivity. *Journal of Ergonomics*, 7(1), 37–44. <https://doi.org/10.30699/jergon.7.1.37>
- Moroney, T., & Strickland, K. (2021). Resilience: is it time for a rethink? *Aust J Adv Nurs*, 38(2). <https://doi.org/10.37464/2020.382.526>.
- NawoseIng'ollan, D. (2017). Influence of Leadership Styles on Employees' Performance: A Study of Turkana County, Kenya.
- Northouse, P. G. (2016). *Leadership: Theory and Practice* (7th Ed.). Los Angeles: Sage Publications.
- Olayisade, A., & Awolusi, O. D. (2021). The Effect of Leadership Styles on Employee's Productivity in the Nigerian Oil and Gas Industry. *Information Management and Business Review*, 13(1(I), 47-64. [https://doi.org/10.22610/imbr.v13i1\(I\).3194](https://doi.org/10.22610/imbr.v13i1(I).3194)
- Ronald, G. (2011). Encyclopaedia of Leadership. (Online: <http://www.knowledge.sagepub.com/view/leadership/n189.xml>). Retrieved on 28 March 2015.
- Scheidlinger, S. (2017). The Lewin, Lippitt and White Study of Leadership and "Social Climates" Revisited the Lewin, Lippitt and White Study of Leadership and " Social Climates Revisited.7284(June). <https://doi.org/10.1080/00207284.1994.11490737>
- Sekaran, U. (2006). *Research methods for business: A skill building approach*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Setiawan, B. M., Putrawan, I. M., Murni, S., & Ghozali, I. (2016). Effect of organizational structure, leadership and trust on job performance of employee: A case study on employee at Universitas Ternama. *International Review of Management and Marketing*, 6(4), 711–712.
- Shah, A., Safri S., Thevadas R., Noordin N., Rahman A., Sekawi Z., Ideris A., Sultan M. (2020) COVID-19 outbreak in Malaysia: Actions taken by the Malaysian government. *Int J Infect Dis*. 2020 Aug; 97:108-116. Doi: 10.1016/j.ijid.2020.05.093. Epub 2 June 2022. PMID: 32497808; PMCID: PMC7264933.
- Solihah, S. & Budiawan, A. & Nugraha, N. (2021). The Asia Pacific Journal of Management Studies The Influence of Autocratic Leadership and Work Discipline on Employee Performance of the "ABC" City Culture and Tourism Office Introduction.
- Sonnentag, S., & Frese, M. (2005). Performance Concepts and Performance Theory. *Psychological Management of Individual Performance*, (October 2017), 1–25. <https://doi.org/10.1002/0470013419.ch1>
- Valcour, M. (2016). Beating Burnout. *Harvard business review*. 94. 98–101.
- Veliu, L., Manxhari, M., Demiri, V., & Jahaj, L. (2017). The Influence of Leadership Styles on Employee's Performance. *Journal of Management Social Sciences Vadyba Journal of Management*, 31(231), 59–69.
- Viswesvaran, C., & Ones, D. S. (2000). Perspectives on Models of Job Performance. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 8(4), 216–226. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-2389.00151>
- Wafaa, M. A. (2019). The Impact of Job Burnout on the Performance of Staff Member at King Abdul-Aziz University. *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, 10, 126-136. <https://doi.org/10.30845/ijbss.v10n4p15>
- Wright, T. A., & Bonett, D. G. (1997). The contribution of burnout to work performance. 18(March 1996), pp. 491–499.
- Wuryani, E., Rodlib, A., Sutarsib, S., Dewib, N & Arifb, D. (2021). Analysis of decision support system on situational leadership styles on work motivation and employee performance. *Management Science Letters*, 11(2), 365-372.