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# **Section 1. Comparing Two Research Methodologies**

## 1.1 Research Problem:

The widespread issues of stress, burnout, and exploitation significantly affect both employees' well-being and organizational productivity (Khan and Khurshid, 2017). Workplace stress has been shown to lead to Unmet expectations ,lower Job satisfaction, decreased autonomy, job instability, and overall detriment to employee well-being (Loo et al., 2023). Factors such as disruptions in work dynamics, heavy workloads, insufficient social support, and the erosion of work-life balance contribute to a high-pressure environment, resulting in increased burnout among employees (Chua, 2022). Despite increasing awareness, there remains a substantial disparity in understanding the specific effects of these issues on individuals and the broader organizational context (Meinhardt, Junge, and Weiss, 2018).

The research problem centres on understanding how stress, burnout, and exploitation collectively impact employee well-being and organizational productivity. The research question thus is: "How do workplace stress, burnout, and exploitation affect employee well-being and productivity, and what measures can organizations implement to mitigate these negative effects?"

## 1.2 Selected Key Readings:

Workplace stress and burnout have surged to alarming levels, particularly with high-stress industries (Sonnentag, Venz & Casper, 2017). Employees facing these conditions often contend with mental and physical health issues, diminished productivity, and heightened absenteeism (Leiter & Maslach, 2016). Workplace exploitation, characterized by unfair remuneration, excessive workloads, and inadequate support, exacerbates these challenges (Schaufeli, 2017). It is imperative to address these issues comprehensively to foster a healthier work environment, enhance employee engagement, and ensure sustainable organizational performance. Prioritizing employee well-being and equitable compensation is not only ethically imperative but also conductive to long-term business (Schanufeli, 2017).

This report will focus on three aspects which include: (1) exploring the growing concerns on workplace stress, burnout and exploitation, (2) consequences of these and (3) the need to find a lasting solution to the menace with fair compensation and prioritizing of employees of workers health.

Hans Selye first introduced the term “stress” in 1936, describing it in biological terms as “a non-specific response of the body to any demand for change” (Aboa-Éboulé et al., 2007). Work-related stress is influenced by work organization, job design, and labour relations. It arises when job demands surpass the worker's capabilities, resources, or needs, or when there is a mismatch between the individual's or group's knowledge and abilities and the expectations of the organizational culture (Håkansson and Ahlborg, 2016). Freudenberger first coined the term burnout in 1974 when he observed reduced motivation and commitment among volunteers at a mental health clinic. (Freudenberger, 1974). Maslach later created the Maslach Burnout Inventory (MBI), which became the most widely utilized tool globally for measuring burnout (Maslach and Jackson, 1981). According to Maslach, burnout results from excessive work stress and is characterized by emotional exhaustion, a negative and detached attitude towards others (depersonalization), and a reduction in feelings of competence and accomplishment at workn;

(Maslach, 1998).

Employees who are overworked and underpaid are susceptible to significant physical and mental health issues. Burnout, stress, and exhaustion frequently result from workplace exploitation, severely impacting an employee's overall well-being. Exploitation of these sorts can foster a toxic work environment where employees are pitted against one another for resources and recognition. This competitive atmosphere can breed mistrust and hostility, negatively affecting everyone involved (Bulathsinghala, 2023). Employee well-being encompasses their health and overall wellness, and it is the employer's duty to create a work environment that fosters this well-being (Smith, 2023). Physical well-being supports mental health, and together, they enable individuals to achieve a balance between work and life. (Johnson, 2022) When employees are satisfied and happy with their organization, they are more committed and can more easily balance their work and personal lives (Khan and Khurshid, 2017).

The most extensively studied workplace stressors encompass inadequate organizational support, excessive workloads, various stressors, and non-standard work schedules, such as extended hours has been identified as contributing factors (Rowe, 2011; Zohar, 1999; Ostraw, 2011; Shagvaliyeva & Yazdanifard, 2014).Previous studies indicate that increased expectations, insufficient breaks, and unrealistic deadlines add to work-related stress, with individuals reacting differently to these stressors (Shiamzu & Kosugi, 2003). Gender significantly influences how stressors, such as work overload, are managed. Women frequently experience significant stress when conflicts arise between organizational and family responsibilities, whereas men are more stressed by their roles within the organization (Vagg, Spielberger, & Wasala, 2002). Employees who indicate higher levels of "overwork" also report greater stress, signs and a deterioration in health and self-care. Prolong working hours negatively impact personal life and health, increasing the risk of accidents, reducing work productivity, and affecting employees' long-term health, ultimately raising costs for the organization (Khan and Khurshid, 2017).

It is accurate to state that the level of stress a person experiences depends on how much the demand exceeds their perceived expectations and the varying rewards they anticipate for meeting or failing to meet that demand (ILO Content Manager, 2022). McGrath suggests that stress can manifest in several ways, such as "Cognitive-appraisal," where the stress experienced is dependent on an individual's perception of the situation. In this context, the individual’s interpretation of the objectives or external stressor plays a major role in shaping emotional, psychological, and behavioral reactions (McGrath, 1987).

The consequences of workplace exploitation are profound. At an individual level, it leads to financial insecurity, poor health outcomes, and diminished quality of life (Rasool et al., 2021). Exploitation also perpetuates a cycle of poverty, as workers are unable to improve their economic status despite their labor contributions (Hamann and Bertels, 2017). At a societal level, workplace exploitation undermines social cohesion and perpetuates systemic inequities, contributing to broader economic and social instability (Wietzke, 2015).

## 1.3. Two Appropriate Research Method

From research, findings point to the most suitable research method adopted by scholars in carrying out studies about workplace performance, employees’ productivities and factors that constitute a challenging or hostile work environment. This report will entail both qualitative method (in-depth interview model) and quantitative method (survey research) to propose reliable survey design, sample selection and the modes of data collection and analysis.

### **1.3.1 Qualitative In-depth interview**

The interview model in qualitative research provides profound insights into complex and nuanced issues, such as workplace stress, burnout, and exploitation (Prentice et al., 2022). An in-depth interview is a method of qualitative research that involves showing detailed conversations with a small group of participants. Unlike other qualitative research techniques, this approach requires researchers to spend a substantial amount of time with each participant, engaging in a conversational format (Rutledge and Hogg, 2020). In-depth interviews entail carrying out thorough, open-ended dialogues with participants to explore their experiences, perceptions, and feelings. This method is particularly suited for understanding the complex and nuanced aspects of workplace stress and burnout. According to Kvale and Brinkmann (2015), interviews are a powerful tool for uncovering the lived experiences of individuals, providing rich, detailed data that quantitative surveys might miss. Researchers typically use an interview guide to ensure consistency across interviews while allowing flexibility for participants to express their thoughts freely (Dursun, 2023).

Interviews can be conducted with employees at various levels within an organization to understand the diverse factors contributing to workplace stress and burnout (Vallasamy, Muhadi and Kumaran, 2023). For example, interviews can explore how specific management practices, workplace cultures, and job designs exacerbate stress and burnout (Gabriel and Aguinis, 2021). By probing deeply into employees' personal and professional lives, researchers can identify underlying causes and potential solutions that are context-specific and actionable.

Merriam (1998) asserts that the primary aim of interview technique is to gather a specific type of information. Patton (2015), on the other hand, emphasizes that interviews are necessary because people's feelings, thoughts, information, and intentions cannot be directly observed or inferred. According to Patton (2015), interviews are essential for understanding how individuals interpret phenomena and assign meanings to them, as these insights can only be obtained by asking research questions during interviews. Patton highlights that the goal of an interview is to "enter into another person's perspective," aiming to comprehend an individual's inner world and viewpoint. By employing the interview method, researchers attempt to understand facts from the participant's perspective, thus enabling the evaluation of their viewpoint through their own explanations. The ability to acquire detailed and thorough data through the interview technique is why social researchers refer to it as a "digging tool" (Benny and Hughes, 1984). Similarly, Kvale (1996) explained the qualitative interview using a miner's metaphor, comparing the researcher's effort to collect in-depth data to a miner's effort to reach minerals deep underground. The researcher asks study-related questions in a conversational style (Bogdan & Biklen, 1998) and seeks to uncover the participants' accessing their knowledge, intentions and thoughts according to their answers.

Interviews provide detailed and nuanced data that capture the complexity of employees' experiences with stress, burnout, and exploitation. This method allows researchers to explore the specific organizational contexts and personal factors that contribute to these issues. For instance, Yin (2017) emphasizes that case studies and interviews offer insights into the unique environments that foster burnout, which can inform tailored interventions. The qualitative data obtained from in-depth interviews can help develop new theories or refine existing ones (Dunwoodie, Macaulay and Newman, 2022). Identifying common themes and patterns across interviews, can help in proposing new dimensions of the burnout experience or highlight previously unrecognized sources of stress. Charmaz (2014) argues that grounded theory, which often relies on interview data, is instrumental in building and expanding theoretical frameworks based on empirical evidence.

In-depth interviews capture the emotional depth and personal narratives of employees, providing a human perspective on workplace stress and burnout. This can lead to a more empathetic understanding of the issues and inform interventions that address the emotional and psychological needs of employees. Seidman (2013) underscores the importance of understanding participants' stories to develop meaningful and effective organizational strategies.

In-depth interviews provide rich, detailed data that capture the complexity and context-specific nature of workplace stress, burnout, and exploitation (Kvale, 1996). Also, interviews facilitate the development and refinement of theoretical frameworks, and by exploring participants' interpretations and attributions of stress and burnout, researchers can generate new insights and hypotheses, enhancing theoretical advancements in organizational psychology and management (Charmaz, 2014). This approach is human-centered as it focuses on the subjective experiences and emotions of employees. This perspective is crucial for designing interventions and policies that effectively address workplace stress and burnout (Seidman, 2013).

The primary limitation of in-depth interviews is that the results cannot be readily generalized to a broader population (Boyce and Neale, 2006). The rich, detailed data obtained from a small sample may not represent the experiences of all employees in different organizational settings. Merriam and Tisdell (2015) caution that while qualitative data provide deep insights, they often lack the breadth needed for broad applicability. The qualitative aspect of in-depth interviews implies that data analysis is subjective, relying significantly on the researcher's interpretation. This can lead to bias and influence the reliability and validity of the findings. Creswell and Poth (2018) suggest using techniques such as triangulation, member checking, and creating audit trail to strengthen rigor and decrease bias.

Conducting in-depth interviews and analyzing the resulting data is time-consuming and resource-intensive (Delve, 2024). This can limit the number of participants and the scope of the research, making it challenging to cover a wide range of experiences and contexts. Rubin and Rubin (2011) highlight the significant investment required in terms of time and resources, which can be a constraint for many research projects. Although studies have investigated burnout and stress risk factors in employees, there has been limited exploration in to their personal experiences and views of these phenomenon.

### **1.3.2 Quantitative Method**

Survey research involves systematically collecting data from a sample of individuals using standardized questionnaires, which allows researchers to gather quantitative insights into various aspects of workplace phenomena. According to Cohen et al. (2017), surveys are effective in capturing broad patterns and trends across different organizational contexts, providing a snapshot of employees' perceptions and experiences.

Surveys are particularly valuable for exploring the extent of burnout among employees. By measuring factors such as emotional fatigue, depersonalization, and diminished sense of achievement, researchers can identify risk factors and protective factors within organizational settings (Agresti & Finlay, 2009). Moreover, survey research allows for the quantification of the prevalence of exploitation practices, such as overwork or inadequate compensation, which are detrimental to employee well-being (De Vaus, 2014).

Quantitative research methods, particularly surveys using questionnaires, are instrumental in studying workplace stress, burnout, and exploitation. Questionnaires are structured instruments designed to collect data from respondents through a series of questions. They are commonly used in survey research to gather quantitative data about various aspects of workplace phenomena. The application of questionnaires involves several key steps: designing the instrument, selecting a representative sample, administering the survey, and analyzing the data. According to De Vaus (2014), careful design is crucial to ensure that the questions are clear, concise, and relevant to the research objectives. Questionnaires can be distributed through various modes, including online platforms, paper forms, and telephone interviews, to reach a broad audience efficiently (Dillman, Smyth, & Christian, 2014).

Questionnaires contribute significantly to the theoretical and empirical understanding of workplace stress and burnout. They enable researchers to quantify the prevalence and intensity of these issues across large populations, providing a comprehensive overview of their impact. For example, the Maslach Burnout Inventory (MBI) is a widely used questionnaire that assesses the dimensions of burnout: emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and reduced personal accomplishment (Agresti & Finlay, 2009). The use of such standardized instruments allows for the comparison of findings across different studies and contexts, enhancing the generalizability of results.

Moreover, questionnaires facilitate the testing of hypotheses and theoretical models. By analyzing the relationships between variables, researchers can identify predictors and consequences of workplace stress and burnout. Hair *et al.* (2019) emphasize the importance of using advanced statistical techniques, such as regression analysis and structural equation modeling, to explore complex interactions and causal pathways. This approach provides robust evidence to support the development of interventions and policies aimed at mitigating stress and promoting employee well-being.

Despite their strengths, questionnaires have certain limitations that create opportunities for further research. One significant gap is the potential for response bias, where respondents may provide socially desirable answers rather than truthful responses (Field, 2018). This bias can affect the validity of the findings and obscure the true extent of workplace stress and exploitation. Additionally, questionnaires often lack the depth and richness of qualitative methods, such as in-depth interviews. They may fail to capture the nuanced experiences and emotions of employees, limiting the understanding of how workplace stress and burnout manifest in different contexts (Patton, 2015). Future research could address these gaps by integrating qualitative methods with quantitative surveys, providing a more holistic view of the phenomena.

Another area for further investigation is the longitudinal assessment of workplace stress and burnout. Most questionnaires provide cross-sectional data, capturing a snapshot of employees' experiences at a single point in time. Longitudinal studies, which collect data over extended periods, can offer insights into the dynamics and progression of stress and burnout, highlighting critical intervention points (Graham, 2012).

Questionnaires allow researchers to collect data from large samples quickly and cost-effectively, making them ideal for studying widespread issues like workplace stress and burnout (Cohen et al., 2017). The quantitative nature of questionnaires enables the measurement of variables and the use of statistical techniques to identify patterns, relationships, and causal effects. This approach provides strong empirical evidence to support theoretical frameworks and inform policy decisions (Hair et al., 2019). Standardized questionnaires facilitate the comparison of findings across different studies and contexts, enhancing the generalizability of the results and contributing to a cumulative body of knowledge (Agresti & Finlay, 2009).

Questionnaires may not capture the full complexity and context-specific nature of workplace stress and burnout, as they rely on predefined questions and response options (Field, 2018). The accuracy of questionnaire data can be compromised by response biases, such as social desirability bias, where respondents provide answers that they believe are socially acceptable rather than their true experiences (Jaccard & Becker, 2019). Most questionnaire-based surveys are cross-sectional, providing only a snapshot of the phenomena at a single point in time. This limitation restricts the ability to understand the temporal dynamics and long-term effects of workplace stress and burnout (Graham, 2012).

# **Section 2: Instrument and Conclusions**

## 2.1 Instrument

The primary objective of the questionnaire is to gather quantitative data on the prevalence and intensity of workplace stress, burnout, and exploitation. The questionnaire aims to identify the sources of these issues and their impacts on employee well-being and organizational outcomes. Through the collection of data, the research would seek to highlight the need for prioritizing employee well-being and fair compensation strategies.

The questionnaire is structured into several sections, each focusing on different aspects of workplace stress, burnout, and exploitation. This structure ensures that all relevant dimensions are covered comprehensively. The first section collects basic demographic data, including age, gender, job role, and tenure. This information is essential for understanding the sample's composition and identifying any demographic trends related to workplace stress and burnout. The second section contains items that measure the sources and levels of workplace stress. Questions are designed to assess various stressors, such as workload, role ambiguity, interpersonal conflicts, and work-life balance. The items are based on established scales like the Perceived Stress Scale (PSS), ensuring the use of validated measures. The third section focuses on burnout, using items adapted from the Maslach Burnout Inventory (MBI). This section measures the three dimensions of burnout: emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and reduced personal accomplishment. These items are critical for quantifying the extent of burnout among respondents and identifying high-risk groups. The fourth section addresses exploitation, with questions related to overwork, unfair compensation, and lack of recognition. These items aim to capture the respondents' perceptions of exploitation and its impact on their job satisfaction and motivation. The final section assesses the impact of stress, burnout, and exploitation on employees’ overall well-being, mental health, job performance, and turnover intentions. This section includes items related to physical health symptoms, job satisfaction, and engagement.

The questionnaire incorporates validated items extensively used and tested in prior studies through established scales like SPSS and MBI. This strategy improves the validity and reliability of the instrument thereby ensuring accurate measurement of the intended constructs (Field, 2018). The items are worded clearly and concisely to avoid ambiguity and ensure that respondents understand the questions. This clarity is crucial for obtaining accurate responses and reducing the risk of misinterpretation (Dillman, Smyth, & Christian, 2014). The questionnaire covers a wide range of factors related to workplace stress, burnout, and exploitation, providing a holistic view of these issues. This comprehensive coverage is essential for identifying multiple sources and impacts, thereby supporting the development of effective interventions (Cohen et al., 2017). The use of Likert-scale items allows for efficient data collection and analysis. Respondents can quickly rate their agreement or frequency of experiences, facilitating the collection of large amounts of data within a short timeframe (Hair et al., 2019). The questionnaire design includes ethical considerations such as informed consent, confidentiality, and the option to skip questions or withdraw at any time. These measures ensure that respondents feel comfortable and respected throughout the survey process (Bryman, 2016).

While the designed questionnaire is comprehensive and robust, there are inherent limitations. One limitation is the potential for response bias, where respondents may provide socially desirable answers rather than their true experiences. To mitigate this, the questionnaire includes neutral wording and assures respondents of their anonymity.

Additionally, the cross-sectional nature of the survey means it captures a snapshot of respondents’ experiences at a single point in time. Future research could incorporate longitudinal designs to track changes over time and better understand the dynamics of workplace stress and burnout.

## 2.2 Conclusions

The primary research questions focus on understanding the prevalence, sources, and impacts of workplace stress, burnout, and exploitation. The questionnaire addresses these questions through its structured sections. Incorporation of validated scales like the Perceived Stress Scale (PSS) and the Maslach Burnout Inventory (MBI) enables the questionnaire to effective measure the prevalence and intensity of stress and burnout among employees. The inclusion of items specifically tailored to gauge perceptions of exploitation further enriches the data on how widespread these issues are within the organization. The detailed questions in the Workplace Stress and Burnout sections are designed to identify specific stressors and burnout sources, such as workload, role ambiguity, interpersonal conflicts, and overwork. This targeted approach enables a nuanced understanding of the factors contributing to these phenomena. The final section of the questionnaire assesses the broader impacts of workplace stress, burnout, and exploitation on employees’ physical and mental health, job satisfaction, and turnover intentions. This holistic evaluation helps to link individual experiences with organizational outcomes, underscoring the importance of addressing these issues for overall organizational health.

In achieving the set goal, the questionnaire uses established scales to ensure validity and reliability, providing robust and credible data for analysis. Also, the inclusion of multiple sections covering different dimensions of workplace stress, burnout, and exploitation ensures a thorough examination of the research problem. The questionnaire’s clear and concise wording, along with the use of Likert-scale items, makes it user-friendly and efficient for large-scale data collection.

One of the limitations encountered in the design of this research survey is the risk of social desirability bias, where respondents might provide answers that they perceive as favorable rather than their true experiences. Assuring anonymity and emphasizing the importance of honest responses can mitigate this issue. Another limitation is that the questionnaire captures a snapshot of experiences at a single point in time, which may not fully reflect the dynamic nature of workplace stress and burnout. Longitudinal studies could provide deeper insights into how these issues evolve over time.
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# **Section 3: Research Dissemination**

## 3.1 Relevance and Audience

The findings from this research on the consequences of workplace stress, burnout, and exploitation will be highly relevant to several key stakeholders in both the corporate and academic sectors. HR managers and executives are directly responsible for employee well-being and organizational health. Also, CEOs, COOs, and other senior leaders have a vested interest in maintaining a productive and motivated workforce. Understanding the impacts of stress and exploitation on overall performance and turnover can drive strategic decisions that prioritize employee well-being and fair compensation, leading to sustainable organizational growth.

Government agencies and labor organizations can use the research findings to inform policies and regulations aimed at protecting workers' rights and promoting healthy work environments. This is particularly relevant in crafting legislation that addresses fair wages, reasonable working hours, and mental health support in the workplace. Insights from this study will contribute to the broader academic discourse on occupational health psychology, human resource management, and organizational behavior. Researchers can build on these findings to explore new dimensions of workplace stress and well-being, facilitating further advancements in the field. **Finally, employees** themselves, along with unions and advocacy groups, can benefit from the research by gaining a deeper understanding of the issues affecting their work lives.

## 3.2 Communication of Research

To effectively disseminate the research outcomes on workplace stress, burnout, and exploitation, a comprehensive communication strategy is essential. This strategy should include executive summaries for organizational leaders and policymakers, infographics and visual reports for broader engagement, and detailed reports and white papers for academic researchers and industry experts. Furthermore, interactive formats like webinars and workshops will facilitate real-time discussion and engagement among stakeholders.

Professional design is crucial to ensure reports are easily navigable and engaging. Utilizing digital platforms, including websites, social media, and email newsletters, will broaden the reach of the findings. Engaging with media outlets through press releases and feature articles can help raise public awareness. Collaborating with public organizations, NGOs, and professional associations will amplify the research findings and drive policy changes.

# **APPENDIX A**

## Mind Map of Some Selected Key Readings

****

# **APPENDIX B**

## Research Instrument – Questionnaire

### **Questionnaire: Assessing Workplace Stress, Burnout, and Exploitation**

#### Section 1: Demographic Information

1. **Age**:

Under 25

25-34

35-44

45-54

55-64

65 and over

1. **Gender**:

Male

Female

Non-binary

Prefer not to say

1. **Job Role**:

Entry-level

Mid-level

Senior-level

Executive

Other (please specify): \_\_\_\_\_\_\_

1. **Years in Current Position**:

Less than 1 year

1-3 years

4-6 years

7-10 years

More than 10 years

*Please rate how often you have felt or thought a certain way over the last month, using the following scale:*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **SECTION 2** | | | | | | | | |
|  | **1** | | **2** | | **3** | | **4** | **5** |
| **Never** | | **Almost Never** | | **Sometimes** | | **Fairly Often** | **Very often** |
| 1. **In the last month, how often have you felt stressed by your job?** |  | |  | |  | |  |  |
| 1. **In the last month, how often have you felt that you were unable to control the important things in your work life?** |  | |  | |  | |  |  |
| 1. **In the last month, how often have you felt nervous or “stressed out” due to work?** |  | |  | |  | |  |  |
| 1. **In the last month, how often have you felt confident about your ability to handle your work-related problems?** |  | |  | |  | |  |  |
| **SECTION 3 – Burnout** | | | | | | | | |
|  | **1** | **2** | | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** | **7** |
| **Never** | **A few times in a year** | | **Once in a month** | **A few times a month** | **Once a week** | **A few times a week** | **Every day** |
| 1. **I feel emotionally drained from my work.** |  |  | |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. **I feel used up at the end of the workday.** |  |  | |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. **I have become more callous toward people since I took this job.** |  |  | |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. **I feel like I’m not making a meaningful impact through my work.** |  |  | |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Section 4: Exploitation** | | | | | | | | |
|  | **1** | | | **2** | **3** | | **4** | **5** |
| **Never** | | | **Almost Never** | **Sometimes** | | **Fairly Often** | **Very often** |
| I feel that I am often expected to work more hours than I am compensated for. |  | | |  |  | |  |  |
| 1. **I feel that my contributions at work are not adequately recognized or rewarded.** |  | | |  |  | |  |  |
| 1. **I believe that my salary is fair for the work I do.** |  | | |  |  | |  |  |
| 1. **I feel pressured to continue working even when I am not well.** |  | | |  |  | |  |  |
| **Section 5: Impact on Well-Being and Organizational Outcomes** | | | | | | | | |
|  | **1** | | | **2** | **3** | | **4** | **5** |
| **Never** | | | **Almost Never** | **Sometimes** | | **Fairly Often** | **Very often** |
| 1. **My job has a negative impact on my physical health.** |  | | |  |  | |  |  |
| 1. **My job has a negative impact on my mental health.** |  | | |  |  | |  |  |
| 1. **I am satisfied with my job.** |  | | |  |  | |  |  |
| 1. **I often think about leaving my job.** |  | | |  |  | |  |  |

#### Conclusion

Thank you for participating in this survey. Your responses are valuable in understanding and addressing workplace stress, burnout, and exploitation. Your feedback will contribute to creating better work environments and promoting employee well-being and fair compensation.