


Response to “Rampart of Health-Specific Leadership and Social Support of Colleagues to Overcome Burnout in an Emotionally Demanding Situations: The Mediating Role of Stress” [Letter]

Hadi Prayitno¹, Tri Wahyuni Ismoyowati², Heru Santoso Wahito Nugroho³ 

¹Doctoral Study Program in Public Health, Universitas Jember, Jember, Indonesia; ²Department of Nursing, STIKes Bethesda Yakkum, Yogyakarta, Indonesia; ³Center of Excellence of Community Empowerment in Health, Poltekkes Kemenkes Surabaya, Surabaya, Indonesia

Correspondence: Heru Santoso Wahito Nugroho, Center of Excellence of Community Empowerment in Health, Poltekkes Kemenkes Surabaya, Jl. Pucang Jajar Tengah 56, Surabaya, Jawa Timur, Indonesia, Email heruswn@poltekkesdepkes-sby.ac.id

Dear editor

The article with the title “Rampart of Health-Specific Leadership and Social Support of Colleagues to Overcome Burnout in an Emotionally Demanding Situations: The Mediating Role of Stress” is very useful for human resource health management, because it has the following advantages: 1) focuses on employee psychosocial factors, namely the role of emotional demands, health-specific leadership, and social support from co-workers in influencing work stress and fatigue; 2) data were collected at two different times so that cause-and-effect relationships could be better understood; 3) examines the mediating role of stress in the relationship between social support from coworkers and job burnout, as well as between health-specific leadership and job burnout; 4) contributes to the understanding of factors that can improve employee psychological health, as a basis for developing interventions and management strategies.¹

However, we have also identified the limitations of this research, namely: 1) the sample is limited to technical workers, so the generalization of the findings is limited to this population;² 2) potential perception bias because data were collected through self-report questionnaires;³ 2) the potential for common method bias because the data are obtained from a single source;³ 3) some variables are measured with only a few items;⁴ 4) although this research uses control variables (gender, age, and education), there are other factors that can influence the relationship between variables, which are not measured; 5) the absence of further analysis of contextual factors that might influence the relationship between variables, such as organizational culture or specific job characteristics.

Therefore, to improve the results of this research in the future, we recommend: 1) expanding the research sample to other industries or sectors, also involving respondents from various levels and backgrounds so that more comprehensive insights are obtained; 2) using experimental or longitudinal designs to strengthen analysis of cause-and-effect relationships; 3) use observation or interview methods in collecting data to obtain a more in-depth perspective; 4) control or include other variables in the analysis to understand the influence of contextual variables, such as organizational culture or job characteristics; 5) use path analysis or multilevel analysis to obtain a deeper understanding of the relationship between the variables studied.⁵ It is hoped that the results of this further research will provide better results, which can be used by stakeholders in decision making.

Disclosure

The authors report no conflicts of interest in this communication.

References

1. Javaid MU, Rehman N, Mirza MZ, Ibrahim AM. Rampart of health-specific leadership and social support of colleagues to overcome burnout in an emotionally demanding situations: the mediating role of stress. *J Healthc Leadersh.* 2023;15:121–128. doi:10.2147/JHL.S420584
2. Polit DF, Beck CT. Generalization in quantitative and qualitative research: myths and strategies. *Int J Nurs Stud.* 2010;47(11):1451–1458. doi:10.1016/j.ijnurstu.2010.06.004
3. Brenner PS, DeLamater J. Lies, damned lies, and survey self-reports? Identity as a cause of measurement bias. *Soc Psychol Q.* 2016;79(4):333–354. doi:10.1177/0190272516628298
4. Simundić AM. Bias in research. *Biochem Med.* 2013;23(1):12–15. doi:10.11613/BM.2013.003
5. Nugroho HSW, Acob JRU, Martiningsih W. Healthcare worker's mental health during the epidemic peak of COVID-19 [Letter]. *Psychol Res Behav Manag.* 2021;14:333–334.

Dove Medical Press encourages responsible, free and frank academic debate. The content of the Journal of Healthcare Leadership 'letters to the editor' section does not necessarily represent the views of Dove Medical Press, its officers, agents, employees, related entities or the Journal of Healthcare Leadership editors. While all reasonable steps have been taken to confirm the content of each letter, Dove Medical Press accepts no liability in respect of the content of any letter, nor is it responsible for the content and accuracy of any letter to the editor.

Journal of Healthcare Leadership

Dovepress

Publish your work in this journal

The Journal of Healthcare Leadership is an international, peer-reviewed, open access journal focusing on leadership for the health profession. The journal is committed to the rapid publication of research focusing on but not limited to: Healthcare policy and law; Theoretical and practical aspects of healthcare delivery; Interactions between healthcare and society and evidence-based practices; Interdisciplinary decision-making; Philosophical and ethical issues; Hazard management; Research and opinion for health leadership; Leadership assessment. The manuscript management system is completely online and includes a very quick and fair peer-review system. Visit <http://www.dovepress.com/testimonials.php> to read real quotes from published authors.

Submit your manuscript here: <https://www.dovepress.com/journal-of-healthcare-leadership-journal>

<https://doi.org/10.2147/JHL.S439502>