

THE IMPACT OF SIDE HUSTLE AND ROLE CONFLICT ON BURNOUT: THE MODERATING ROLE OF WORK-LIFE BOUNDARY

¹Mohamad Fatoni^{1*}, Barkah Adi Putra²

^{1,2}Human Resource Management Study Program, Faculty of Management, Universitas Pamulang
South Tangerang, Indonesia

Author's email:

¹mhmdfatoni31@gmail.com; ²adiputrabarkah11@gmail.com

***Corresponding author:**

mhmdfatoni31@gmail.com

Abstract. Side hustle activities have become part of modern work behavior as individuals seek additional income, flexibility, and career development outside their primary jobs. However, the psychological impact of side hustle may depend on how individuals manage multiple roles and role boundaries. This study examines the effect of side hustle and role conflict on burnout, with work-life boundary as a moderating variable. A quantitative survey was conducted involving 78 working respondents with varying levels of side hustle involvement. Data were analyzed using Structural Equation Modeling-Partial Least Squares (SEM-PLS). The measurement model met the criteria for reliability, convergent validity, and discriminant validity after several low-loading indicators were removed. The results show that role conflict has a positive and significant effect on burnout, while side hustle does not have a significant direct effect. Work-life boundary also does not significantly affect burnout and does not moderate the relationship between side hustle and burnout or between role conflict and burnout. The model explains 38.68% of the variance in burnout and demonstrates predictive relevance with a Q^2 value of 0.1698. These findings indicate that burnout in modern work arrangements is more strongly associated with role conflict than with side hustle itself. This study contributes to human resource management literature by highlighting role conflict as a key factor in explaining burnout among individuals who manage multiple work and personal responsibilities.

Keywords: Burnout; Role Conflict; SEM-PLS; Side Hustle; Work-Life Boundary

1. INTRODUCTION

The transformation of work in the digital era has changed the way individuals build income, manage careers, and define professional identity. Work is no longer limited to one formal position within an organization. Many working individuals now try to expand their income sources through additional activities outside their main employment, commonly referred to as side hustle. These activities may include freelance work, online selling, tutoring, content creation, small business activities, or other paid work performed beyond regular employment. The growth of digital platforms, social media, and flexible work systems has made side hustle more accessible, especially for young workers who seek financial flexibility, skill development, and alternative career opportunities. Kuhn and Maleki (2017) explain that platform-based work has expanded nonstandard employment and created broader opportunities for individuals to earn income beyond traditional jobs.

In the Indonesian work context, side hustle has become increasingly relevant because many workers, particularly younger workers, face the need to improve income security while still maintaining their main employment. For some individuals, side hustle is not merely an additional job, but also a way to develop personal capability, build networks, and explore future career options. From a human resource management perspective, this phenomenon is important because employees are no longer fully attached to a single organizational role. They may work as employees in their primary jobs while also carrying other roles as freelancers, sellers, creators, service providers, or small business owners. This condition shows that modern workers often manage more than one work identity at the same time.

Side hustle can provide positive value when individuals are able to manage it properly. It may increase income, support self-development, strengthen autonomy, and create a sense of personal achievement. However, side hustle may also create pressure when additional work demands begin to interfere with the main job, personal life, and recovery time. The problem does not always come from side hustle itself, but from the overlapping responsibilities that may appear when individuals have to manage several roles with limited time, energy, and attention. Therefore, side hustle should not be viewed only as a source of opportunity or only as a source of stress. It needs to be examined more carefully by looking at the role pressure that may emerge around it.

Role conflict becomes an important concept in explaining this condition. Role conflict occurs when individuals face incompatible demands from different responsibilities. Greenhaus and Beutell (1985) explain that conflict between roles may arise through time pressure, strain, and incompatible expectations. In the context of side hustle involvement, role conflict may occur when time used for additional work reduces rest time, when fatigue from one role affects performance in another role, or when individuals feel mentally divided between work, side work, and personal responsibilities. This conflict can make individuals feel that they are constantly switching roles without having enough space to recover.

Burnout is a relevant psychological outcome in this situation. Burnout refers to a prolonged response to chronic work-related stress and is commonly reflected through emotional exhaustion, cynicism, and reduced professional efficacy (Maslach & Leiter, 2016). Burnout does not simply occur because a person has many activities. It is more likely to occur when continuous demands are not balanced with recovery, control, and sufficient psychological resources. Working individuals with varying levels of side hustle involvement may experience burnout when their work roles become difficult to separate and when role demands repeatedly compete with personal recovery time.

Previous studies on burnout have mostly focused on formal organizational settings, such as workload, job demands, job stress, leadership, organizational support, and work-family conflict. These studies provide important explanations, but many of them still place workers within a single-job framework. This perspective may be less sufficient to explain the condition of modern workers who manage both primary employment and additional work activities outside the organization. The side hustle phenomenon creates a different work arrangement because pressure may not only come from the formal job, but also from additional self managed work and personal responsibilities. This creates a research gap in understanding whether burnout is directly related to side hustle or more strongly explained by role conflict that emerges from multiple-role demands.

Work-life boundary is also important in understanding this issue. Work-life boundary refers to the extent to which individuals are able to separate work responsibilities from personal life. Boundary theory explains that individuals differ in the way they organize work and nonwork domains. Some individuals prefer clear separation between roles, while others allow work and personal responsibilities to overlap. Ashforth et al. (2000) explain that role boundaries may vary in flexibility and permeability. When boundaries are clear, individuals may have better control over when to work, when to manage personal life, and when to recover. When boundaries are blurred, work-related matters may enter personal time more frequently and reduce opportunities for psychological recovery. Allen et al. (2014) also emphasize that boundary management is important for understanding how individuals regulate transitions between work and nonwork roles.

In the context of side hustle involvement, work-life boundary may function as a personal resource. Individuals with stronger boundaries may be better able to manage the demands of primary work, additional work, and personal life. They may also have greater control over when to respond to work-related matters and when to disengage from them. In contrast, individuals with weak or blurred boundaries may find it more difficult to separate responsibilities, which

can increase fatigue and emotional pressure. Therefore, work-life boundary is positioned in this study as a moderating variable that may influence the relationship between side hustle, role conflict, and burnout.

Although side hustle has become more visible in modern work life, empirical studies that integrate side hustle, role conflict, burnout, and work-life boundary in one research model remain limited, especially in the Indonesian context. Existing studies have examined burnout and work-life issues, but fewer studies focus on working individuals with varying levels of side hustle involvement. This study addresses this gap by separating side hustle as an additional work-related activity from role conflict as a psychological pressure mechanism. This distinction is important because side hustle should not automatically be assumed as the main cause of burnout. The more critical issue may be whether side hustle and other responsibilities create conflict that drains individual resources.

This study aims to analyze the effect of side hustle and role conflict on burnout, with work-life boundary as a moderating variable. The study uses a quantitative survey involving working individuals with different levels of side hustle involvement. The data are analyzed using Structural Equation Modeling-Partial Least Squares (SEM-PLS) because the research model includes multiple predictors and interaction effects. Through this approach, the study seeks to provide a clearer explanation of whether burnout is directly associated with side hustle or whether it is mainly shaped by role conflict.

The contribution of this study lies in its attempt to understand burnout in a modern multiple-role work arrangement. For human resource management, this issue is important because employees may experience pressure not only from formal organizational demands, but also from external work activities and personal responsibilities. The findings are expected to provide insight for individuals and organizations in managing role demands, improving recovery awareness, and strengthening healthy work-life boundaries. By distinguishing side hustle from role conflict, this study offers a more balanced understanding of how additional work involvement relates to employee well-being.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Side Hustle and Multiple Work Roles

Side hustle refers to additional income-generating activities performed outside an individual's main employment. These activities may include freelance work, online selling, tutoring, content creation, small business activities, or other paid work that is not part of the primary job. In the digital era, side hustle has become more visible because online platforms, social media, and flexible work systems make additional work opportunities easier to access. Kuhn and Maleki (2017) explain that platform-based work has expanded nonstandard employment and enabled individuals to participate in work arrangements beyond conventional organizational boundaries.

Side hustle can provide several benefits for working individuals. It may increase income, support skill development, strengthen autonomy, and provide opportunities for career exploration. Sessions et al. (2021) explain that side hustle may create psychological empowerment because individuals can experience greater meaning, control, and self directed growth through work activities outside their full-time employment. This perspective suggests that side hustle should not always be viewed as a negative behavior. For some individuals, side hustle can become a personal resource that supports motivation, learning, and financial security.

However, side hustle may also create additional demands when individuals have to divide their limited time, energy, and attention between primary work, additional work, and personal responsibilities. Side hustle may become more challenging when it reduces recovery time, increases mental workload, or creates interference with other roles. Therefore, the relationship between side hustle and burnout should be understood carefully. Side hustle does not

automatically lead to burnout, but it may contribute to burnout when additional work activities create pressure that is difficult to manage.

In this study, side hustle is viewed as a form of multiple-role work involvement. Individuals with higher side hustle involvement may experience greater demands because they need to manage both their primary job and additional work activities. When this condition is not balanced with adequate recovery and role management, side hustle may increase the risk of burnout. Based on this argument, the first hypothesis is proposed as follows:

H1: Side hustle has a positive effect on burnout.

2.2 Role Conflict and Burnout

Role conflict occurs when individuals face incompatible demands from different roles. Greenhaus and Beutell (1985) explain that interrole conflict can occur through time-based conflict, strain-based conflict, and behavior-based conflict. Time-based conflict occurs when time spent in one role reduces the time available for another role. Strain-based conflict occurs when pressure from one role affects the ability to perform another role. Behavior-based conflict occurs when behavior expected in one role is not compatible with behavior expected in another role.

In the context of modern work arrangements, role conflict becomes increasingly relevant because individuals may manage several responsibilities at the same time. Working individuals may need to complete their main job, manage additional income activities, respond to personal responsibilities, and maintain recovery time. When these responsibilities compete with one another, individuals may experience difficulty in deciding which role should be prioritized. This situation can create psychological pressure because time, attention, and energy are limited resources.

Role conflict is theoretically more direct in explaining burnout because it reflects the pressure caused by incompatible demands. While side hustle refers to additional work involvement, role conflict explains the psychological tension that may emerge when several responsibilities interfere with one another. Therefore, burnout may not be caused merely by having side hustle activities, but by the conflict that appears when side hustle, primary work, and personal life compete for the same resources.

Burnout is a prolonged psychological response to chronic work-related stress. Maslach and Leiter (2016) explain that burnout is commonly reflected in emotional exhaustion, cynicism, and reduced professional efficacy. Emotional exhaustion occurs when individuals feel emotionally and mentally drained. Cynicism appears when individuals become less enthusiastic or emotionally distant from work. Reduced professional efficacy occurs when individuals feel less capable or less effective in completing their responsibilities.

Role conflict can increase burnout because it places individuals in a condition where several demands must be fulfilled simultaneously. When individuals continuously experience competing expectations without adequate recovery, their psychological resources may become depleted. This condition can increase emotional exhaustion and reduce work motivation. Based on this reasoning, role conflict is expected to have a positive effect on burnout. Therefore, the second hypothesis is proposed as follows:

H2: Role conflict has a positive effect on burnout.

2.3 Work-Life Boundary and Burnout

Work-life boundary refers to the extent to which individuals are able to separate work responsibilities from personal life. This concept is important in modern work arrangements because technology and flexible work systems make work easier to access outside formal working hours. Boundary theory explains that individuals differ in the way they separate or integrate work and nonwork domains. Ashforth et al. (2000) explain that role boundaries may

vary in flexibility and permeability. Flexible boundaries allow individuals to move between roles more easily, while permeable boundaries allow matters from one role to enter another role.

Work-life boundary can become a personal resource when individuals are able to determine when to work, when to manage personal responsibilities, and when to rest. Allen et al. (2014) state that boundary management is important for understanding how individuals regulate transitions between work and nonwork roles. Stronger boundaries may help individuals protect personal time, reduce unnecessary work interference, and support psychological detachment. Psychological detachment is important because individuals need mental distance from work demands to recover from stress.

In the context of side hustle involvement, work-life boundary becomes more important because individuals may not only manage one work role. They may need to separate primary work, additional work, and personal life. When boundaries are weak, work-related matters may enter personal time more frequently. Individuals may continue thinking about tasks during rest periods or feel pressured to respond to different work demands at the same time. This condition can reduce recovery opportunities and increase the risk of burnout.

Stronger work-life boundaries are expected to reduce burnout because individuals with clearer boundaries may be better able to manage role transitions and preserve recovery time. However, the effectiveness of work-life boundary may depend on how consistently individuals apply it and how strong the demands from each role are. Based on this argument, the third hypothesis is proposed as follows:

H3: Work-life boundary has a negative effect on burnout.

2.4 Work-Life Boundary as a Moderating Variable

Work-life boundary may also act as a moderating variable in the relationship between side hustle, role conflict, and burnout. A moderating variable affects the strength or direction of the relationship between an independent variable and a dependent variable. In this study, work-life boundary is expected to influence whether side hustle and role conflict lead to higher burnout.

The relationship between side hustle and burnout may be weaker when individuals have stronger work-life boundaries. Individuals with clearer boundaries may be better able to schedule their additional work activities without sacrificing rest time. They may also have better control over when to engage in side hustle and when to disengage from work-related responsibilities. In contrast, individuals with blurred boundaries may allow side hustle tasks to interfere with personal life or recovery time, which can increase fatigue and emotional strain.

Work-life boundary may also influence the relationship between role conflict and burnout. Role conflict creates pressure because individuals face competing demands from different responsibilities. However, stronger boundaries may help individuals control role transitions and prevent one role from interfering too deeply with another role. For example, individuals who can clearly separate working time, side work time, and personal time may experience lower psychological strain even when they face multiple responsibilities.

Nevertheless, the moderating role of work-life boundary should be understood as a possibility rather than a certainty. Strong boundaries may help reduce the negative impact of role demands, but they may not fully protect individuals when workload, time pressure, and role conflict are already high. Therefore, this study examines whether work-life boundary can moderate the effect of side hustle and role conflict on burnout. Based on these arguments, the following hypotheses are proposed:

H4: Work-life boundary moderates the relationship between side hustle and burnout, such that the positive effect of side hustle on burnout becomes weaker when work-life boundary is stronger.

H5: Work-life boundary moderates the relationship between role conflict and burnout, such that the positive effect of role conflict on burnout becomes weaker when work-life boundary is stronger.

3. RESEARCH METHODS

This study used a quantitative research approach to examine the effect of side hustle and role conflict on burnout, with work-life boundary as a moderating variable. A quantitative approach was considered appropriate because the study tested relationships among latent variables using numerical data collected from respondents. The research design was explanatory because it aimed to analyze direct and moderating effects among side hustle, role conflict, work-life boundary, and burnout.

The population of this study consisted of working individuals who had different levels of involvement in side hustle activities. The sampling technique used was purposive sampling because respondents needed to meet criteria relevant to the research objective. The respondents were individuals who were currently working as permanent employees, contract employees, or freelancers, and were willing to complete the questionnaire voluntarily. A total of 78 responses were obtained and used in the analysis. Based on the respondent profile, 50% of respondents reported having side hustle activities, while the remaining 50% did not have side hustle activities. This composition allowed the study to examine side hustle as a construct with varying levels of involvement among working individuals.

Data were collected through an online questionnaire using a five-point Likert scale, ranging from 1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree. The questionnaire measured four main variables: side hustle, role conflict, burnout, and work-life boundary. Side hustle was measured using indicators related to involvement, time intensity, commitment, and the perceived importance of additional work activities. Role conflict was measured through indicators related to time conflict, pressure from multiple roles, difficulty in dividing attention, and role overload. Burnout was measured through indicators related to emotional exhaustion, physical and mental fatigue, reduced enthusiasm, and decreased work effectiveness. Work-life boundary was measured through indicators related to the ability to separate work and personal life, control work-related interference, and psychological detachment during personal time.

The questionnaire items were developed based on the theoretical dimensions discussed in the literature review and adjusted to the context of working individuals with varying levels of side hustle involvement. The side hustle construct was developed based on the concept of additional work involvement and empowerment from side-hustle activities (Sessions et al., 2021). Role conflict was developed based on the dimensions of interrole conflict, particularly time-based conflict, strain-based conflict, and incompatible role demands (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985; Carlson et al., 2000). Burnout was developed based on the dimensions of emotional exhaustion, cynicism, and reduced professional efficacy (Maslach & Leiter, 2016), supported by the Job Demands-Resources perspective that prolonged demands may lead to exhaustion (Demerouti et al., 2001). Work-life boundary was developed based on boundary theory and boundary management literature, including role separation, permeability, boundary control, and psychological detachment (Ashforth et al., 2000; Allen et al., 2014; Kossek et al., 2012; Sonnentag & Fritz, 2007). The items were not directly copied from existing instruments, but were formulated based on relevant theoretical dimensions to fit the research context.

The data were analyzed using Structural Equation Modeling-Partial Least Squares (SEM-PLS). The SEM-PLS evaluation criteria followed Hair et al. (2019), including the assessment of reliability, validity, explanatory power, predictive relevance, effect size, and path significance. SEM-PLS was selected because the research model included several latent variables and moderating effects. The analysis consisted of two main stages: measurement model evaluation and structural model evaluation. The measurement model was evaluated using outer loading, Cronbach's Alpha, Composite Reliability, Average Variance Extracted (AVE), and the Heterotrait-Monotrait Ratio (HTMT). The assessment of discriminant validity using HTMT also followed Henseler et al. (2015). Several indicators of work-life boundary were removed because their outer loading values did not meet the acceptable threshold. The retained indicators were used

after all constructs met the required criteria for reliability, convergent validity, and discriminant validity.

The structural model was evaluated using R Square, f Square, Q Square, and path coefficient analysis. R Square was used to assess the explanatory power of the model toward burnout as the endogenous construct. f Square was used to evaluate the effect size of each predictor on burnout. Q Square was obtained through the blindfolding procedure to assess the predictive relevance of the model. Hypothesis testing was conducted using the bootstrapping procedure with 5,000 subsamples, a two-tailed test, and a 5% significance level. A relationship was considered significant when the t-statistic was greater than 1.96 and the p-value was lower than 0.05.

The moderating effects were tested by creating interaction terms between side hustle and work-life boundary and between role conflict and work-life boundary. These interaction terms were used to examine whether work-life boundary strengthened or weakened the effect of side hustle and role conflict on burnout. The moderation analysis was conducted using the two-stage approach in SEM-PLS, allowing the study to assess both direct effects and interaction effects within the same structural model.

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

4.1 Respondent Characteristics

This study involved 78 respondents. Based on gender, 44 respondents (56.4%) were male and 34 respondents (43.6%) were female. Based on age, most respondents were in the 18–25 age group, with 63 respondents (80.8%), while 15 respondents (19.2%) were in the 26–40 age group. No respondent was recorded in the age group above 40 years. Based on employment status, 35 respondents (44.9%) were permanent employees, 23 respondents (29.5%) were contract employees, and 20 respondents (25.6%) were freelancers. In terms of work experience, 45 respondents (57.7%) had worked for less than two years, 30 respondents (38.5%) had worked for two to five years, and 3 respondents (3.8%) had worked for more than five years. Regarding side hustle involvement, 39 respondents (50%) reported having side hustle activities, while 39 respondents (50%) did not have side hustle activities.

Table 1. Respondent Characteristics

Category	Classification	Frequency	Percentage
Gender	Male	44	56.4%
	Female	34	43.6%
Age	18–25 years	63	80.8%
	26–40 years	15	19.2%
	> 40 years	0	0.0%
Employment Status	Permanent employee	35	44.9%
	Contract employee	23	29.5%
	Freelancer	20	25.6%
Work Experience	< 2 years	45	57.7%
	2–5 years	30	38.5%
	> 5 years	3	3.8%
Side Hustle Involvement	Yes	39	50.0%
	No	39	50.0%

The respondent profile indicates that the sample was dominated by young workers with relatively short work experience. This condition is relevant to the study because younger workers are more likely to be exposed to flexible work arrangements, additional income activities, and multiple-role demands. The equal proportion between respondents with and without side hustle activities also provides variation in side hustle involvement, allowing the study to examine whether side hustle intensity directly contributes to burnout.

4.2 Measurement Model Evaluation

The measurement model was evaluated using outer loading, Cronbach's Alpha, Composite Reliability, Average Variance Extracted (AVE), and the Heterotrait-Monotrait Ratio (HTMT). During the measurement model evaluation, several indicators of work-life boundary were removed because their outer loading values were below the acceptable threshold. The removed indicators were M1, M2, M4, and M8. The remaining indicators were retained because the construct met the required criteria for reliability and convergent validity. Although several work-life boundary indicators were removed, the retained indicators still represented the core aspects of boundary management related to role separation and psychological detachment.

Table 2. Outer Loading Results

Construct	Indicator	Outer Loading	Decision
Side Hustle	X1.1	0.698	Retained
	X1.2	0.766	Retained
	X1.3	0.784	Retained
	X1.4	0.784	Retained
	X1.5	0.662	Retained
	X1.6	0.693	Retained
Role Conflict	X2.1	0.713	Retained
	X2.2	0.638	Retained
	X2.3	0.851	Retained
	X2.4	0.861	Retained
	X2.5	0.850	Retained
	X2.6	0.848	Retained
Burnout	Y1	0.728	Retained
	Y2	0.737	Retained
	Y3	0.570	Retained
	Y4	0.779	Retained
	Y5	0.654	Retained
	Y6	0.707	Retained
	Y7	0.737	Retained
	Y8	0.786	Retained
Work-Life Boundary	M3	0.883	Retained
	M5	0.767	Retained

Construct	Indicator	Outer Loading	Decision
	M6	0.695	Retained
	M7	0.715	Retained

Most indicators had outer loading values above 0.70. Several indicators had loading values between 0.50 and 0.70, but they were retained because the constructs still achieved acceptable AVE and Composite Reliability values. This decision was made to maintain the theoretical meaning of each construct while preserving the statistical adequacy of the measurement model.

Table 3. Construct Reliability and Validity

Construct	Cronbach's Alpha	Composite Reliability	AVE	Decision
Burnout	0.862	0.893	0.512	Valid and reliable
Role Conflict	0.887	0.912	0.637	Valid and reliable
Side Hustle	0.845	0.874	0.537	Valid and reliable
Work-Life Boundary	0.792	0.851	0.591	Valid and reliable

The reliability and validity results show that all constructs met the recommended criteria. Cronbach's Alpha and Composite Reliability values were above 0.70, indicating that the constructs were reliable. The AVE values were above 0.50, indicating that each construct had acceptable convergent validity.

Table 4. HTMT Results

Construct Relationship	HTMT Value	Decision
Burnout – Role Conflict	0.598	Accepted
Burnout – Side Hustle	0.211	Accepted
Burnout – Work-Life Boundary	0.362	Accepted
Role Conflict – Side Hustle	0.374	Accepted
Role Conflict – Work-Life Boundary	0.271	Accepted
Side Hustle – Work-Life Boundary	0.173	Accepted

The HTMT values were below 0.90, indicating that discriminant validity was achieved. This means that side hustle, role conflict, burnout, and work-life boundary represent distinct constructs in the model.

4.3 Structural Model Evaluation

The structural model was evaluated using R Square, Q Square, and f Square. The R Square value for Burnout was 0.3868. This means that Side Hustle, Role Conflict, Work-Life Boundary, and the moderating effects explain 38.68% of the variance in Burnout. The remaining 61.32% is explained by other factors outside the model.

Table 5. R Square and Q Square

Endogenous Construct	R Square	Q ²	Interpretation
Burnout	0.3868	0.1698	Moderate explanatory power and predictive relevance

The Q² value of Burnout was 0.1698. Since the value is greater than zero, the model has predictive relevance for the endogenous construct. This indicates that the model has the ability to predict Burnout based on the variables included in the study.

Table 6. f Square Results

Relationship	f ²	Effect Size
Role Conflict → Burnout	0.339	Medium, approaching large
Side Hustle → Burnout	0.001	Negligible
Work-Life Boundary → Burnout	0.057	Small
Side Hustle × Work-Life Boundary → Burnout	0.030	Small
Role Conflict × Work-Life Boundary → Burnout	0.053	Small

The f Square results show that Role Conflict has the strongest practical effect on Burnout, with an f² value of 0.339. This value indicates a medium effect approaching a large effect. In contrast, Side Hustle shows a negligible effect, while Work-Life Boundary and the moderating effects show small practical effects. These findings indicate that role conflict is the dominant predictor of burnout in this model.

4.4 Hypothesis Testing

Hypothesis testing was conducted using the bootstrapping procedure with 5,000 subsamples. The hypotheses were evaluated based on the original sample, t-statistics, and p-values. A hypothesis was accepted when the t-statistic was greater than 1.96 and the p-value was lower than 0.05.

Table 7. Path Coefficients and Hypothesis Testing

Hypothesis	Relationship	Original Sample	T Statistics	P Values	Decision
H1	Side Hustle → Burnout	-0.0327	0.2454	0.8061	Rejected
H2	Role Conflict → Burnout	0.5158	4.9002	< 0.001	Accepted
H3	Work-Life Boundary → Burnout	0.1950	1.9483	0.0514	Rejected
H4	Side Hustle × Work-Life Boundary → Burnout	-0.1415	1.1797	0.2382	Rejected
H5	Role Conflict × Work-Life Boundary → Burnout	0.1900	1.5718	0.1161	Rejected

The results show that Role Conflict has a positive and significant effect on Burnout, with an original sample value of 0.5158, t-statistic of 4.9002, and p-value of < 0.001 . Therefore, H2 is accepted. This finding indicates that higher role conflict is associated with higher burnout.

Side Hustle does not have a significant effect on Burnout, as shown by the p-value of 0.8061. Therefore, H1 is rejected. Work-Life Boundary also does not have a significant direct effect on Burnout at the 5% significance level, with a p-value of 0.0514. Therefore, H3 is rejected. Furthermore, the interaction between Side Hustle and Work-Life Boundary does not significantly affect Burnout, with a p-value of 0.2382. The interaction between Role Conflict and Work-Life Boundary also does not significantly affect Burnout, with a p-value of 0.1161. Therefore, H4 and H5 are rejected.

4.5 Discussion

The results indicate that role conflict is the main factor that explains burnout in this study. This finding supports the argument that burnout is more likely to occur when individuals experience competing demands from different roles. In the context of modern work arrangements, individuals may not only manage their primary job, but also deal with additional work, personal responsibilities, and limited recovery time. When these roles compete for time, energy, and attention, psychological strain becomes more likely. This result is consistent with the role conflict perspective, which explains that incompatible demands from different roles can create pressure and reduce individual well-being (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985).

The significant effect of role conflict on burnout also supports the burnout literature, which views burnout as a response to prolonged exposure to unmanaged demands. Burnout does not only emerge from having many activities, but from the inability to manage role pressure and recover from continuous demands. In this study, role conflict has the strongest effect size, which means that practical attention should be directed toward reducing role interference rather than simply reducing side hustle activities.

The effect of side hustle on burnout was not significant. This result suggests that side hustle does not automatically lead to burnout. Side hustle may function differently for each individual. For some respondents, side hustle may provide financial benefits, personal meaning, autonomy, or opportunities for skill development. Therefore, side hustle may not become a psychological burden when individuals can manage it properly. Another possible explanation is that the sample included respondents with different levels of side hustle involvement, including those who did not actively engage in side hustle activities. This variation may reduce the direct statistical effect of side hustle on burnout.

Work-Life Boundary did not show a significant direct effect on Burnout at the 5% significance level, although the p-value was close to the threshold. It is also important to note that the coefficient direction was positive, while the hypothesis predicted a negative effect. This indicates that stronger perceived work-life boundary did not necessarily reduce burnout in this sample. One possible explanation is that boundary management may not function effectively when individuals already experience high role demands. A person may have the intention to separate work and personal life, but this boundary may become difficult to maintain when several responsibilities demand attention at the same time. Another possible explanation is that work-life boundary may require not only personal control, but also adequate recovery time and supportive work conditions. In this study, Work-Life Boundary showed only a small practical effect and did not reach statistical significance.

The moderating role of Work-Life Boundary was also not supported. This means that Work-Life Boundary did not significantly weaken or strengthen the effect of Side Hustle and Role Conflict on Burnout. This result suggests that boundary management alone may not be sufficient to buffer the psychological pressure created by multiple roles. Strong boundaries may help individuals regulate role transitions, but they may not fully protect individuals when time pressure, workload, and role conflict are already present. The result may also be influenced by

the respondent composition. Since only half of the respondents reported having active side hustle activities, not all respondents experienced direct side hustle demands. This variation may reduce the strength of the interaction effect between side hustle, work-life boundary, and burnout.

Overall, the findings show that burnout among individuals in modern work arrangements is not mainly explained by the existence of side hustle itself. Instead, burnout is more strongly associated with role conflict. This distinction is important because side hustle should not be viewed only as a harmful activity. The more critical issue is how individuals manage overlapping responsibilities and prevent different roles from interfering with one another. From a human resource management perspective, organizations should be aware that employees may experience pressure not only from workload inside the organization, but also from role demands outside the organization. Therefore, organizations can support employee well-being by encouraging workload clarity, realistic expectations, recovery practices, and healthy boundary management.

CONCLUSION

This study examined the effect of side hustle and role conflict on burnout, with work-life boundary as a moderating variable. Using a quantitative approach and SEM-PLS analysis, this study involved 78 working respondents with varying levels of side hustle involvement. The research model was designed to understand whether burnout in modern work arrangements is directly associated with side hustle activities or more strongly explained by the pressure created by conflicting roles.

The findings show that role conflict has a positive and significant effect on burnout. This indicates that burnout is more likely to emerge when individuals experience incompatible demands from different responsibilities. In other words, the main source of burnout is not merely the existence of additional work, but the psychological pressure that occurs when primary work, side work, and personal responsibilities compete for limited time, energy, and attention. This finding confirms that role conflict is an important mechanism in explaining burnout among individuals who face multiple work and personal demands.

In contrast, side hustle does not have a significant direct effect on burnout. This result suggests that side hustle should not automatically be viewed as a harmful activity. Side hustle may provide additional income, autonomy, learning opportunities, and personal development for some individuals. However, it may become problematic when it creates interference with other roles and reduces recovery opportunities. Therefore, the impact of side hustle on well-being should be understood through the quality of role management rather than through the presence of side hustle alone.

Work-life boundary does not have a significant direct effect on burnout and does not significantly moderate the relationship between side hustle and burnout or between role conflict and burnout. This finding shows that work-life boundary, although theoretically relevant, was not statistically strong enough to reduce the effect of role demands on burnout in this study. One possible explanation is that individual boundary control may not be sufficient when role pressure is already high. Strong boundaries may require not only personal discipline, but also realistic workload, recovery time, and supportive work conditions.

The main contribution of this study lies in distinguishing side hustle as an additional work activity from role conflict as a psychological pressure mechanism. This distinction provides a more balanced understanding of burnout in modern work arrangements. The findings imply that side hustle itself is not necessarily the main problem. The more critical issue is how individuals manage competing responsibilities and how organizations understand the role pressure experienced by employees outside formal work settings.

From a human resource management perspective, the results suggest that organizations should not immediately perceive employees with side hustle activities as more vulnerable to

burnout. Instead, organizations need to pay closer attention to role clarity, workload distribution, work expectations, and recovery opportunities. Employees also need to strengthen personal time management, set realistic work boundaries, and evaluate whether additional work activities interfere with their physical and psychological recovery.

This study has several limitations. First, the sample size was limited to 78 respondents, which may affect the generalizability of the findings. Second, the respondents had varying levels of side hustle involvement, with only half reporting active side hustle activities. This equal proportion between respondents with and without side hustle activities may influence the strength of the relationship between side hustle and burnout because not all respondents experienced active side hustle demands. Third, this study used a cross-sectional survey, so it cannot explain changes in burnout over time. Fourth, several work-life boundary indicators were removed during the measurement model evaluation. Although the retained indicators still represented core aspects of boundary management related to role separation and psychological detachment, future studies should refine the measurement of work-life boundary to capture the construct more comprehensively. Future research is recommended to involve a larger sample, focus more specifically on active side hustle workers, and examine other relevant variables such as workload, financial pressure, recovery experience, job autonomy, psychological detachment, and perceived organizational support.

REFERENCES

- Allen, T. D., Cho, E., & Meier, L. L. (2014). Work-family boundary dynamics. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 1, 99–121. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-031413-091330>
- Ashforth, B. E., Kreiner, G. E., & Fugate, M. (2000). All in a day's work: Boundaries and micro role transitions. *Academy of Management Review*, 25(3), 472–491. <https://doi.org/10.5465/AMR.2000.3363315>
- Carlson, D. S., Kacmar, K. M., & Williams, L. J. (2000). Construction and initial validation of a multidimensional measure of work-family conflict. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 56(2), 249–276. <https://doi.org/10.1006/jvbe.1999.1713>
- Demerouti, E., Bakker, A. B., Nachreiner, F., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2001). The Job Demands-Resources model of burnout. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(3), 499–512. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.86.3.499>
- Greenhaus, J. H., & Beutell, N. J. (1985). Sources of conflict between work and family roles. *Academy of Management Review*, 10(1), 76–88. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1985.4277352>
- Hair, J. F., Risher, J. J., Sarstedt, M., & Ringle, C. M. (2019). When to use and how to report the results of PLS-SEM. *European Business Review*, 31(1), 2–24. <https://doi.org/10.1108/EBR-11-2018-0203>
- Henseler, J., Ringle, C. M., & Sarstedt, M. (2015). A new criterion for assessing discriminant validity in variance-based structural equation modeling. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 43(1), 115–135. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11747-014-0403-8>
- Kossek, E. E., Ruderman, M. N., Braddy, P. W., & Hannum, K. M. (2012). Work-nonwork boundary management profiles: A person-centered approach. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 81(1), 112–128. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2012.04.003>
- Kuhn, K. M., & Maleki, A. (2017). Micro-entrepreneurs, dependent contractors, and instaselfs: Understanding online labor platform workforces. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 31(3), 183–200. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amp.2015.0111>
- Maslach, C., & Leiter, M. P. (2016). Understanding the burnout experience: Recent research and its implications for psychiatry. *World Psychiatry*, 15(2), 103–111. <https://doi.org/10.1002/wps.20311>
- Sessions, H., Nahrgang, J. D., Vaulont, M. J., Williams, R., & Bartels, A. L. (2021). Do the hustle! Empowerment from side-hustles and its effects on full-time work performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 64(1), 235–264. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2018.0164>
- Sonnentag, S., & Fritz, C. (2007). The Recovery Experience Questionnaire: Development and validation of a measure for assessing recuperation and unwinding from work. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 12(3), 204–221. <https://doi.org/10.1037/1076-8998.12.3.204>