GLI EVIDENCE CHECK(TM) / ISSUE 02

Can Resilience Training Fix Burnout?

What research suggests about individual coping, working conditions, and organizational responsibility.

FREQUENTLY OVERSTATED

THE CLAIM

Teaching employees resilience can solve workplace burnout.

The Short Answer

Resilience training can be useful. It may help people develop coping skills, emotional awareness, recovery practices, and strategies for responding to stress. Research suggests that some individually focused interventions produce modest reductions in burnout symptoms.

But resilience training cannot correct chronic overload, inadequate staffing or resources, limited control, insufficient support, unfair treatment, poor recognition, or persistent conflicts between employees' values and organizational demands.

When burnout is treated mainly as a deficit in employee coping, responsibility can quietly shift from the conditions of work to the person trying to endure them.

THE BETTER QUESTION

What individual and organizational changes are needed to reduce the conditions contributing to burnout?

What Burnout Means

The World Health Organization describes burnout as an occupational phenomenon resulting from chronic workplace stress that has not been successfully managed. It is characterized by exhaustion, increased mental distance or cynicism related to one's job, and reduced professional efficacy.

Burnout is not classified by the WHO as a medical condition. It refers specifically to the occupational context, which makes the conditions of work central to understanding it.

Why Resilience Training Is Appealing

Individual programs are visible, portable, and comparatively easy to launch. A workshop, app, or course can be offered across teams without redesigning roles, staffing, decision rights, performance systems, or workload.

They may also provide real value. Employees can benefit from learning skills that support recovery, perspective, emotional regulation, boundary-setting, and help-seeking.

The problem is not offering resilience support. The problem is allowing it to stand in for examining why so many people need extraordinary resilience simply to meet ordinary work expectations.

A USEFUL DISTINCTION

Support people in managing stress, and reduce avoidable sources of chronic workplace stress.

What Intervention Research Suggests

Reviews of burnout interventions find that individually focused approaches can produce small improvements, but effects vary and are often limited by study quality, setting, follow-up period, and intervention design.

Organizational interventions also show mixed results. That does not mean working conditions are irrelevant. It reflects the difficulty of changing complex systems, uneven implementation, and the fact that organizational interventions differ substantially in scope and quality.

The strongest practical conclusion is not that one side has won. Individual support and organizational change address different parts of the problem. A credible response considers both, while refusing to treat coping skills as a substitute for healthy job design.

The Six Areas of Worklife

Area	What leaders should examine
Workload	Are demands sustainable within the time, staffing, and resources available?
Control	Do people have meaningful influence over how they do their work and respond to changing demands?
Reward	Are contribution, effort, growth, and results recognized in credible ways?
Community	Do people experience support, trust, respect, and constructive working relationships?
Fairness	Are decisions, opportunities, processes, and expectations experienced as equitable and transparent?
Values	Can people do work in ways that are consistent with their professional and personal values?

This framework helps leaders move beyond a narrow focus on personal stamina and look at the fit between people and their work environment.

When Resilience Becomes a Deflection

Resilience language becomes risky when it asks people to adapt indefinitely to conditions the organization has the authority to change.

Warning signs include:

- Well-being programs are added while workload, staffing, or role ambiguity remain unexamined.
- Employees are encouraged to set boundaries but are penalized for using them.
- Leaders describe exhaustion as a mindset problem without reviewing job demands.
- People are given recovery tools while schedules make recovery difficult.
- Burnout data are collected, but patterns across teams, managers, roles, or systems are not investigated.
- The organization celebrates endurance more consistently than it removes unnecessary strain.

Organizational Responsibility Is Not Organizational Omnipotence

Organizations cannot remove every stressor or guarantee that no employee will experience burnout. People bring different circumstances, needs, health conditions, and stressors to work. Some roles also involve unavoidable pressure, emotional labor, uncertainty, or peaks in demand.

Organizational responsibility means taking reasonable ownership of the conditions the organization creates, rewards, permits, and can influence. It means examining patterns instead of assuming that recurring strain is simply an individual weakness.

THE LEADERSHIP TEST

Before asking people to become more resilient, ask which demands are necessary, which are preventable, and which resources are missing.

A More Complete Burnout Response

Support People Experiencing Strain

Provide access to appropriate benefits, accommodations, time away, confidential support, and evidence-informed skills. Make it safe to raise concerns and ask for help.

Reduce Preventable Demands

Review workload, staffing, low-value tasks, meeting load, conflicting priorities, role ambiguity, administrative friction, and expectations that routinely extend beyond available capacity.

Increase Resources and Control

Clarify priorities, improve tools and information, strengthen manager support, create meaningful autonomy, and give teams influence over how work is organized.

Monitor Patterns, Not Only Symptoms

Look for concentration by team, manager, role, shift, workload cycle, demographic group, or organizational change. Repeated patterns are signals about systems, not merely individuals.

A complete response does not force a choice between caring for individuals and improving the workplace. It asks what support is needed now and what must change so the same conditions do not keep producing the same harm.

DESIGN PRINCIPLE

Pair support for people with accountability for the system of work.

What the Evidence Does Not Show

- Resilience training has no value.
- All burnout is caused by the workplace.
- Organizational interventions always outperform individual interventions.
- Every demanding job can be made low-stress.
- A single policy or program will prevent burnout across every role and context.
- Leaders can diagnose the cause of an individual's distress without appropriate professional input.

Questions Leaders Should Consider

1. Where is burnout or sustained exhaustion concentrated in the organization?	2. What changed before the pattern emerged?
3. Which demands are essential, and which have accumulated without review?	4. Do staffing, time, tools, and authority match the work expected?
5. Where do employees lack meaningful control over their work?	6. Are competing priorities forcing people to fail at one expectation to meet another?
7. What behaviors are rewarded, even if they undermine recovery or sustainable performance?	8. Can people raise workload and well-being concerns without fear of penalty?
9. Do managers have the capacity and skill to respond constructively?	10. What would improve the fit between demands and resources?
11. How will leaders know whether an intervention changed the conditions of work?	12. What individual support should be available while organizational changes are made?

THE BOTTOM LINE

Resilience can support people. It cannot make an unhealthy work system healthy.

Key Evidence

Aronsson, G., Theorell, T., Grape, T., et al. (2017). A systematic review including meta-analysis of work environment and burnout symptoms. BMC Public Health, 17, 264. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-017-4153-7

Bes, A., Lau, B., Breines, J. G., et al. (2023). The effects of organizational interventions on burnout in the workplace: A meta-analysis. International Archives of Occupational and Environmental Health, 96. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00420-023-02009-z

Kiratipaisarl, W., Kaewpornsawan, K., Tirawattanasak, N., et al. (2024). Burnout intervention in resident physicians: A systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. BMC Medical Education, 24, 1234. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12909-024-06195-3

Leiter, M. P., & Maslach, C. (1999). Six areas of worklife: A model of the organizational context of burnout. Journal of Health and Human Services Administration, 21(4), 472-489.

Maslach, C., Schaufeli, W. B., & Leiter, M. P. (2001). Job burnout. Annual Review of Psychology, 52, 397-422. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.52.1.397

Panagioti, M., Panagopoulou, E., Bower, P., et al. (2017). Controlled interventions to reduce burnout in physicians: A systematic review and meta-analysis. JAMA Internal Medicine, 177(2), 195-205. https://doi.org/10.1001/jamainternmed.2016.7674

World Health Organization. (2019). Burn-out an occupational phenomenon: International Classification of Diseases. https://www.who.int/mental_health/evidence/burn-out/en/

ABOUT THIS SERIES

GLI Evidence Checks examine common workplace claims and translate current research into questions leaders can use. Classifications are editorial summaries, not formal evidence grades. This resource is educational and is not medical, psychological, or legal advice.

goodleaderinstitute.com