FROM TEACHER BURNOUT TO STUDENT BURNOUT

Noushad P P*

Abstract (20/07/2008)

Originally, Burnout was a common work related phenomena resulting of severe stress. Burnout is considered to be a long-term stress reaction that particularly occurs among professionals who work with people in some capacity—like teachers, nurses, social workers, or. Although various definitions of burnout exist, it is most commonly described as a psychological syndrome of emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and reduced personal accomplishment. Emotional exhaustion refers to feelings of being emotionally overextended and depleted of one's emotional resources. Depersonalization refers to a negative, callous, or excessively detached response to other people who are usually the recipients of one's services or care. Reduced personal accomplishment refers to a decline in one's feelings of competence and successful achievement in one's work. Now, there is a growing trend of using the term burnout in non industrial and non professional settings, especially with students. This paper discusses theoretical concept of burnout and its applications in educational settings and students' learning.

Introduction

Traditionally, burnout is considered as a three-dimensional syndrome (i.e. emotional exhaustion, depersonalisation, and reduced personal accomplishment) that is measured with the Maslach Burnout Inventory-Human Services Survey (MBI-HSS; Maslach & Jackson, 1981). Emotional exhaustion, which refers to feelings of being depleted of one's emotional resources, is regarded as the basic individual stress component of the syndrome. Depersonalisation, referring to negative, cynical, or excessively detached responses to other people at work, represents the interpersonal component of burnout. Finally, reduced personal accomplishment refers to feelings of decline in one's competence and productivity, and to one's lowered sense of efficacy,

*Lecturer, Farook Training College, Calicut, Kerala, India

representing the self-evaluation component of burnout (Maslach, 1998). To date, well over 1,000 studies have used the MBI to assess burnout so that it can be considered the "gold standard" for measuring the construct (Schaufeli & Enzmann, 1998).

Origin of Burnout Theory

The first use of the term burnout occurred in the novel *A Burnt-Out Case,* (Greene, 1961). According to a *New York Times* critic (Davis, 1961), the novel concerned a tired and detached architect, who, having lost his motivation to work, could "neither suffer nor laugh" (¶ 3). Because symptoms such as the inability to laugh or suffer provided no physical signs of injury, the literally novel concept of burnout was not perceived as a workplace hazard (Maslach & Leiter, 1997).

The term burnout was first introduced in academic scenario by Freudenberger (1974), who defined it as "to fail, to wear out, or become exhausted by making excessive demands on energy, strength, or resources" (p.159). The concept of burnout was further popularized with the development of the Maslach Burnout Inventory (Maslach & Jackson, 1981). Research on burnout originally focused on people in various occupational groups, including human service workers, teachers, nurses, and psychologists. Although several studies of burnout among college residential assistants (RAs)have been conducted (e.g., Hardy & Dodd, 1998), little is known about burnout among college students in general, and that is the focus of the current study.

Earning little scholarly consideration, burnout was deemed "pop psychology" (Maslach et al., 2001, p. 398), "fad" (Farber, 2000a, p. 589), and "psychobabble" (Schwab, 1983, p. 21). According to early scholars of burnout theory (Farber, 1984; Maslach, 1976; Maslach & Jackson, 1981) burnout gradually emerged as a phenomenon worth studying because of the early works of Freudenberger (1974), a psychiatrist who examined health care workers who had become demoralized while caring for drug addicts (Farber, 1991). While recognizing Freudenberger's germinal work, Cordes and Dougherty (1993) differentiated Freudenberger's studies as qualitative, based on personal experiences, noting that the empirical study of burnout did not begin until the 1980s through the work of researchers like Iwanicki, Schwab, Maslach, and Jackson. Another difference between Freudenberger's early work on burnout and that of others was Freudenberger's belief (1980) that workers worked harder when faced with emotional

exhaustion. By contrast Maslach and Pines (1977) and Maslach and Jackson (1981) found the opposite, namely work productivity deteriorated. The belief in deterioration of work quality continued through the decades to present time (Evers et al., 2002; Schwab, 1983; Maslach et al., 1996; Taris et al., 2004). While early burnout research focused primarily on care-giving occupations such as nursing (Farber, 2000a; Maslach & Jackson, 1981; Maslach et al., 2001), teachers quickly emerged as the care-giving group most readily identified with the burnout phenomenon (Farber, 1991). As investigations into burnout continued, researchers (Farber, 1984; Gold, 1984; Gold & Bachelor, 1988, Hock, 1988; Maslach & Pines, 1977; Nummela, 1982; Whiteman, 1985) identified a variety of problems related to teacher burnout. Gold (1985) enumerated them as follows: "disruptive behavior, students' lack of interest in their work, new programs, accountability testing, and excessive paperwork. The list [was] endless" (p. 255). Gold's 1985 findings demonstrate that accountability testing was recognized early as a problem related to teacher burnout, the psychological syndrome whose symptoms are now reviewed.

Accumulating empirical evidence suggests that burnout is a process that gradually develops across time (Leiter, 1993; Maslach & Leiter, 1997; Schaufeli & Enzmann, 1998). The first stage is characterized by an imbalance between resources and demands (stress). In human services professions considerable stress is caused by the emotionally demanding relationships with recipients (e.g., pupils, patients, clients, or prisoners) that eventually may result in the depletion of one's emotional resources. Next, a set of negative attitudes and behaviors is developed, such as a tendency to treat recipients in a detached and mechanical manner or a cynical preoccupation with gratification of one's own needs. Essentially, these negative attitudes and behaviors that constitute the depersonalization component of burnout are to be considered as defensive coping mechanisms. In order to reduce emotional exhaustion, the burnout candidate creates a psychological distance in an attempt to protect him- or herself against the stressful social environment. However, this is an inadequate coping strategy that increases stress rather than reduces it because it diminishes the relationship with recipients and aggravates interpersonal problems. As a result, the professional is less effective in achieving his or her goals so that personal accomplishment diminishes and feelings of incompetence and self doubt might develop. A suchlike sense of reduced personal accomplishment is considered to be the third component of the burnout syndrome. In a somewhat similar vein, burnout has been described as a process of increasing disillusionment: "a progressive loss of idealism, energy, and purpose experienced by

people in the helping professions as a result of conditions in their work" (Edelwich & Brodsky, 1980, p. 14). The initial idealistic expectations and noble aspirations are regarded as built-in sources of future frustration and therefore as major causes of burnout. In their progressive disillusionment model of burnout Edelwich and Brodsky distinguish four stages: (1) enthusiasm, (2) stagnation, (3) frustration, and (4) apathy. Quite remarkably, their process model of burnout closely matches observations on the typical CO career path: "Watching their entrance into the prison can be quite an experience. The hopes on their faces, the positive anxiety of their motivated gait—at first, it's all there. Then slowly and almost methodically, the smiles wane, the expectations atrophy, and the desires to perform in a positive fashion succumb to escapist fantasy and verbally acknowledged skepticism" (Wicks, 1980, p. 1).

According to scholars of burnout (Farber & Ascher, 1991; Maslach, 1976; Maslach & Jackson, 1981; Maslach & Pines, 1977), burnout impedes job performance. Burnout represents "the index of the dislocation between what people are and what they have to do, . . . a malady that spreads gradually and continuously over time, putting people into a downward spiral from which it's hard to recover" (Maslach & Leiter, 1997).

Student Burnout

Originally, all three dimensions of the MBI-HSS referred to contacts with recipients like students, patients, or clients. However, nearly a quarter of a century of research and practice has shown that burnout also exists outside the realm of the human services. Therefore, the concept of burnout was broadened to include *all* employees and not only those who do "people work" of some kind (Maslach & Leiter, 1997). Consequently, the original version of the MBI was adapted for use outside the human services. This new version was called MBI-General Survey (MBI-GS; Schaufeli, Leiter, Maslach, & Jackson, 1996) and consists of the three dimensions that parallel those of the original MBI in the sense that they are more generic and do not refer to other people one is working with. For instance, the first MBI-GS dimension "exhaustion" is measured by items that tap fatigue but do not make direct reference to other people as the source of one's tiredness. The items that measure cynicism reflect indifference or a distant attitude towards work in general, not necessarily with other people. The latter was called "despersonalisation" in the MBH-HSS. Finally, professional efficacy has a broader focus compared to the corresponding MBI-HSS scale, encompassing both social and non-social aspects of occupational

accomplishment. Psychometric research with the MBI-GS using confirmatory factor analysis demonstrated that this three-factor structure is invariant across occupations such as Canadian clerical and maintenance employees, technical staff, nurses, and managers (Leiter & Schaufeli, 1996), Dutch software engineers and university staff (Taris, Schreurs, & Schaufeli, 1999), Dutch, Swedish, and Finnish blue-collar and white-collar workers (Schutte, Toppinen, Kalimo, & Schaufeli, 2000), Spanish and Dutch information and communication workers (Salanova, Schaufeli, Llorens, PeirÃ³, & Grau, 2000), Norwegian police officers, traffic controllers, journalists, and managers (Richardsen & Martinissen, 2005), and Dutch human services professionals and other occupational groups (Bakker, Demerouti, & Schaufeli, 2002). In addition, the factor-structure of the MBI-GS proved to be cross-nationally invariant across samples from Sweden, Finland, and The Netherlands (Schutte et al., 2000), and Spain and The Netherlands (Salanova et al., 2000).

In recent years, the number of studies about burnout has increased spectacularly and the study of burnout has been extended to almost every job, and even to non-occupational samples, for example students (Balogun, Helgemoe, Pellegrini, & Hoeberlein, 1996; Chang, Rand, & Strunk, 2000; Fimian, Fastenau, Tashner, & Cross, 1989; Gold, Bachelor, & Michael, 1989; MartÃnez, Marques, Salanova, & Lopez da Silva, 2002; McCarthy, Pretty, & Catano, 1990; Schaufeli, Salanova, GonzÃ¡lez-RomÃ¡, & Bakker, 2002b; Yang, 2004). These studies assessed "academic burnout" in students, using a slightly modified version of the MBI-GS. Although, formally speaking, students are neither employed nor do they hold jobs, from a psychological perspective their core activities can be considered "work". Thus, they are engaged in structured, coercive activities (e.g. attending classes, completing assignments) that are directed towards a specific goal (i.e. passing exams). Hence, being a work-related phenomenon, burnout may also exist in students, where it manifests itself by feeling exhausted because of study demands, having a cynical and detached attitude towards one's study, and feeling incompetent as a student (see also McCarthy et al., 1990; Meier & Schmeck, 1985). In a similar vein, several studies on stress in academic life have considered students as a kind of employee as well (e.g. Chambel & Curral, 2005).

Burnout's Symptoms

A review of literature on burnout discloses the many symptoms associated with the syndrome: (a) feeling inconsequential, ineffective, or worn out (Farber, 2000a; Juhasz, 1990; Pines & Maslach, 2002); (b) feeling helpless, physically depleted, and emotionally drained (Gold, 1984); (c) withdrawing and caring less (Mearns & Cain, 2003); and (d) emotional callousness, diminished sense of personal accomplishment, and negative self-assessment (Cordes & Dougherty, 1993; Friedman, 2000). An early study of teacher burnout (Gold, 1985) reported that burned-out teachers had described themselves as "empty, alienated, wasted, let down, and even used-up" (p. 254). The Gold study described burnout itself as "the end product of stress" (p. 254), the symptom which is now discussed. Maslach and Leiter (1997) described the physical as well as psychological problems associated with burnout, for example, "headaches, gastrointestinal illness, [and] high blood pressure" (p. 19). Although Selye's (1976) germinal work on stress theory identified stress as a major influence on such physiological problems, the similaritybetween the stress and burnout syndromes did not necessarily equate the two syndromes: Literature often confuses or equates "stress" with "burnout." Though these two concepts are similar, they are not identical. Stress may have both positive and negative effects (Seyle, 1976); indeed, a certain amount of stress is necessary to motivate action. Moreover, burnout is most often the result not of stress per se (which may be inevitable in teaching) but of unmediated stress – of being stressed and having no "out" (Farber, 1984, p. 326).

Agreeing with Farber (1984) was Friedman (1995), who stated that burnout differed from stress in that burnout was the result of an "unmediated stress" (p. 281). Likewise, Kyriacou (1987) maintained that stress was the experience of unpleasant emotions, frustration or anger, while burnout resulted "from prolonged . . . stress, primarily characterized by physical, emotional and attitudinal exhaustion" (p. 146). Other scholars on burnout theory (Maslach et al., 1996) distinguished burnout from stress further by describing how the two syndromes manifested differently in the workplace. Whereas occupational stress had an opposite, namely a general sense of well being and relaxation, occupational burnout did not.

Rather than consider the differences between burnout and stress, Cherniss (1980) identified similarities between the syndromes, noting that neither stress nor burnout, should they occur, were necessarily total or permanent. Farber (1991) added more insight into the differences between stress and burnout by observing that stress could be positive or negative, whereas

burnout was distinctly and exclusively negative. Similarities and differences notwithstanding, Farber argued that ultimately, "in the absence of empirical data or extensive observational reports they [burnout and stress] are *practically* [original italics] difficult to distinguish" (p. 32). The clearest distinction between stress and burnout involves the multidimensional aspects of the burnout phenomenon (Maslach & Jackson, 1981; Maslach et al., 1996; Maslach et al., 2001) as manifested by: (a) emotional exhaustion; (b) depersonalization; and (c) reduced personal accomplishment also referred to as inefficacy or ineffectiveness (Maslach & Leiter, 1997). The three symptoms of burnout are now discussed.

Components of burnout

While comparisons have been drawn between the burnout dimension of emotional exhaustion and stress, Cordes and Dougherty (1993) argued that burnout's two other dimensions, depersonalization and reduced personal accomplishment, distinguished burnout from stress. Cordes and Dougherty, whose work on burnout has been described as comprehensive (Maslach et al., 2001), called burnout's three-component model "unique as a stress phenomenon" (Cordes & Dougherty, p. 625). Identifying the traditional stress variable of emotional exhaustion as burnout's core, Cordes and Dougherty viewed depersonalization as a new construct to stress literature, noting further that while personal accomplishment had been part of stress literature, examining diminished levels of the variable was a new concept. Ultimately, researchers argued against using the word burnout as a general term (Maslach & Jackson, 1981; Cordes & Dougherty, 1993), believing that to do so minimized the importance of burnout's three subscales, each of which is now described.

Emotional exhaustion. Emotional exhaustion "is a clear signal of distress in emotionally demanding work" (Maslach et al., 1996, p. 20). Characteristics associated with emotional exhaustion include feeling tired and listless (Maslach & Leiter) as well as restless and nervous (Farber, 1991). Emotionally exhausted workers feel emotionally drained and frustrated (Maslach & Jackson, 1981; Maslach et al., 1996) and are, therefore, psychologically unable to provide for their clients. Teachers suffering from burnout's emotional exhaustion are unable to "give of themselves to students as they once could" (Maslach et al., 1996, p. 28). "I have nothing left to

give" (Farber, 1991, p. 73) reflects the tone of the teacher suffering from burnout's emotional exhaustion.

Depersonalization. Depersonalization, also referred to as cynicism (Maslach et al.), poses a serious problem within human service careers since it is marked by indifference toward both work and client. Workers suffering depersonalization feel callous and negative towards their clients and consequently treat them impersonally by distancing from them (Maslach et al., 2001). Characteristics associated with depersonalization include feeling cynical, cold, and distant (Maslach & Leiter, 1997). Relinquishing ideals and donning cynical indifference serves as a self-protecting mechanism (Maslach & Leiter, 1997). Anger associated with depersonalization is directed "at those perceived as having caused the problem – for example, unruly students" (p. 75). Teachers suffering from burnout's depersonalization and cynicism are found "tuning out students through psychological withdrawal" (p. 28). "I'd rather spend time doing paper work than interacting with students; most of the kids don't try, why should I?"(Farber, 1991, p. 82) reflects the tone of the teacher suffering from burnout's depersonalization.

Inefficacy/Reduced personal accomplishment. Reduced personal accomplishment is the burnout symptom concerning workers who evaluate themselves negatively (Maslach et al., 1996) especially regarding their work with clients (for teachers, students). Characteristics of individuals suffering from reduced personal accomplishment include a general unhappiness and dissatisfaction with themselves, their professional abilities, and their effectiveness (Maslach & Jackson, 1981; Maslach et al., 1996; Maslach et al., 2001). Other characteristics include loss of confidence and a lost sense of adequacy (Maslach & Leiter, 1997). Teachers suffering from burnout's reduced personal accomplishment "no longer feel they are contributing to students' development. [Consequently] they are vulnerable to experiencing profound disappointment. . . . both severe and enduring" (Maslach et al., 1996, p. 28). "Ill try but it's a losing cause" (Farber, 1991, p. 82) reflects the tone of the teacher suffering from burnout's reduced personal accomplishment. The review of burnout's symptoms concludes with information concerning whether the three subscales develop parallel to each other or sequentially (Cordes & Dougherty, 1993; Maslach et al., 2001). Schwab and Iwanicki (1982) believed burnout was not necessarily a process of one component leading to another. On the other hand, Lee and Ashford believed it

was, to some degree, indeed, a sequential process. Shirom (1989) viewed burnout as a combination of physical fatigue, emotional exhaustion and cognitive weariness" (p. 589). Similarly, Koeske and Koeske (1989) proffered a differentconceptualization of burnout whereby emotional exhaustion was "the essence" (132) anddepersonalization and personal accomplishment related variables but not part of the burnout construct. By contrast, others (Maslach et al., 2001; Cordes & Dougherty, 1993) argued that to use exhaustion as a lone criterion was to lose sight of burnout as a multidimensional phenomenon altogether.

The "Third Dimension": Efficacy or Inefficacy

The past 25 years of research on burnout have answered many questions and have increased our understanding of workers (and students) well-being (see Schaufeli & Buunk, 2002, for an overview). However, a main question about the structure of burnout still needs to be answered; namely the role of the so-called "third dimension" of burnoutâ€'lack of professional efficacy. Three kinds of criticism have been raised against the burnout construct that pertain to the exceptional role of professional efficacy.

First, from an empirical point of view, most studies show consistently that professional efficacy has a relatively low correlation with exhaustion and cynicism (for a meta-analysis, see Lee & Ashforth, 1996). This has led Green, Walkey, and Taylor (1991) to the conclusion that exhaustion and cynicism constitute the "core of burnout". Furthermore, Schaufeli, MartAnez, MarquAs-Pinto, Salanova, and Bakker (2002) have shown that instead of loading on burnout, professional efficacy loads on the opposite, positive concept of work engagement together with vigour, dedication, and absorption, thus leaving exhaustion and cynicism as core burnout dimensions. Moreover, professional efficacy seems to develop in parallel to exhaustion and cynicism (e.g. Leiter, 1992; Taris, Le Blanc, Schaufeli, & Schreurs, 2005). Finally, professional efficacy is particularly related to job resources, whereas both other burnout dimensions are also related to job demands (see Lee & Ashforth, 1996; Schaufeli & Enzmann, 1998).

Second, from a conceptual point of view, instead of a genuine burnout dimension, professional efficacy has been considered similar to a personality construct (Cordes & Dougherty, 1993; Shirom, 2003). Some etiological models also posit that burnout develops out of feelings of inefficiency and that therefore it can be considered a crisis of professional efficacy.

For example, Cherniss (1980, 1993) assumes that the lack of trust in one's own competences is a critical factor in the development of burnout. Also Leiter (1992) regards burnout essentially as an "efficacy crisis". Recent studies seem to confirm the etiological role that lack of professional efficacy plays in the development of burnout (Salanova, Llorens, Cifre, MartÃnez, & Schaufeli, 2003; Salanova, PeirÃ³, & Schaufeli, 2002; Van Dierendonck, Schaufeli, & Buunk, 2001).

Third, clinical experience with burned-out patients suggests that exhaustion and cynicism appear together, whereas lack of professional efficacy is observed much less frequently (Brenninkmeijer & Van Yperen, 2003; Roelofs, Verbraak, Keijsers, De Bruin, & Schmidt, 2005). So it seems that in psychotherapeutic clients, burnout manifests itself by both core dimensions, but not by lacking efficacy. Taken together, empirical, theoretical, and clinical evidence exists for the particular role that professional efficacy plays as the "third dimension" of burnout.

However, the special role of lacking professional efficacy might, at least in part, reflect an artifact. Namely, this "third dimension" of burnout is measured by positively worded items, whereas both other dimensions (i.e. exhaustion and cynicism) are measured by negatively worded items. These positively worded efficacy items are then reversed in order to achieve an indicator of inefficacy or reduced efficacy. In other words, a high score on efficacy is assumed to be equivalent to a low score on inefficacy, and vice versa. This procedure of reversing the scores of efficacy items is questionable, though, because it assumes that efficacy and inefficacy are perfect opposites; or to put it differently, it is assumed that efficacy and inefficacy are scaled along the same uni-polar dimension. However, this is not very likely to be the case. Instead, we argue that efficacy and inefficacy are more likely to be strongly (but not perfectly) negatively related to each other. For instance, imagine a student who has a high score on the efficacy item "In my opinion, I am a good student". Reversing his score on this item makes him score low, meaning that he is not a good student. But not being a good student does not necessarily imply that one is a poor student. This would be the case when the student would agree with the inefficacy item "In my opinion I am a poor student".

Recently, Bouman, Te Brake, and Hoogstraten (2002) reworded the positive efficacy items into negatively framed inefficacy items in a sample of students. Compared to the group

that filled out the traditional efficacy scale, the group that completed the inefficacy scale showed much higher (positive) correlations with exhaustion and depersonalisation. Thus, negatively rewording the efficacy items leads to higher correlations with both other burnout dimensions. So not only the sign, but also the *size* of the correlation changes, which suggests that the low correlations of efficacy with both other dimensions might reflect an artefact caused by reversing positively worded items. Unfortunately, Bouman et al. (2002) used two separate groups that completed an efficacy and an inefficacy scale, respectively, so that their concurrent validity could not be assessed.

In a similar vein, Salanova, Bres, and Schaufeli (2005) showed that efficacy and inefficacy play a different role when it comes to predicting future academic self-efficacy among Spanish and Belgian university students. Results indicated that past performance is positively related to efficacy, and negatively to inefficacy. In its turn, efficacy beliefs seem to be involved in a positive, upward spiral (current efficacy beliefs â†' engagement â†' high future academic self-efficacy), whereas inefficacy beliefs seem to be involved in a negative, downward spiral (current inefficacy beliefs â†' burnout â†' poor future academic self-efficacy).

Burnout and efficacy beliefs

The role of lack of efficacy in the burnout syndrome is rather peculiar, both from a conceptual and empirical point of view. From the onset, lack of efficacy - or "reduced personal accomplishment" as it was called initially - was a special case because it was added on second thoughts as the third constituting dimension of burnout. Looking back at the psychometric construction of the MBI, Maslach (1993, p. 26) writes: "Our working definition of burnout consisted of two components: emotional exhaustion and depersonalization. …Our findings confirmed the components of emotional exhaustion and depersonalization but also revealed a third separate component of reduced personal accomplishment." This third unexpected factor consisted exclusively of positively worded items. Given the fact that the accomplishment factor was added on second thought, it may come as no surprise that the validity of this burnout dimension has been questioned. For instance, lack of efficacy was considered to be similar to a personality characteristic (Cordes & Dougherty, 1993), a way of coping that moderates the effect of exhaustion on mental distancing (Koeske & Koeske, 1989), and as one of the sequels of burnout (Shirom, 2003).

Empirical results confirm the exceptional role of lacking efficacy compared with the other two burnout dimensions, and three types of findings illustrate this. First, lack of efficacy correlates relatively low with exhaustion and cynicism (i.e., depersonalization) compared with the inter-correlations between the other two burnout dimensions. Based on nearly 50 studies, Lee and Ashforth (1996) observed an average correlation between exhaustion and depersonalization of .52, whereas correlations with professional efficacy were only -.33 and -.36, respectively. This consistent result led Green, Walkey, and Taylor (1991) to the conclusion that exhaustion and cynicism constitute the "core of burnout," thereby excluding lack of efficacy. Second, studies among employees who receive professional psychotherapeutic treatment show that those who are diagnosed as "burned-out" - based on a standardized clinical interview - show significantly higher scores for exhaustion and cynicism, but *not* for lack of efficacy, compared with those with other diagnoses (Roelofs, Verbraak, Keijsers, de Bruin & Schmidt, 2005; Schaufeli, Bakker, Schaap, Kladler & Hoogduin, 2001). So, burnout apparently manifests itself by both core dimensions in psychotherapeutic clients, but is not manifested by lacking efficacy. Third, lack of efficacy shows a different pattern of correlations with job characteristics when compared with exhaustion and cynicism. The meta-analyses of Lee and Ashforth (1996) reveal that exhaustion relates positively to job stressors such as work overload, work pressure and role problems, whereas cynicism additionally and negatively relates to (job) resources such as social support from coworkers and supervisors, team cohesion, skill utilization, and family resources (see also Schaufeli & Enzmann, 1998, p. 83-84). In contrast, lack of efficacy is *not* usually related to job stressors, rather to poor job resources and more particularly to poor coping strategies.

Conclusion

In Summery, burnout is a serious academic issue which increases the scope of research in the area of academic and student related stress or burnout. Students stress may be correlated with their socio economic back grounds, familial conditions, teaching styles of teachers, school climate, parental involvement and many other personality characteristics. An intervention programme may be developed to reduce increases academic stress to relieve them from severe emotional exhaustion, depersonalization and inefficacy. There is a number of researches in the area of work related burnout, especially on teacher burnout, burnout among nurses, doctors, managers etc. but very few studies were identified on academic burnout of students. Most of the

studies on academic burnout concentrate on college students. It should be extended to high school students also. Students who are in the age of adolescence experience severe stress in industrial societies. Future researches in the area of student stress may be oriented towards the problems of burnout among adolescence.

REFERENCES

Arbuckle, J.L., & Wothke, W. (1999). Amos users guide version 4.0.

Bakker, A., Demerouti, E., & Schaufeli, W.B. (2002). Validation of the Maslach Burnout Inventory-General Survey: An internet study. *Anxiety, Stress and Coping*, 15, 245-260.

Bakker, A., Demerouti, E. and Schaufeli, W. B. (2002) Validation of the Maslach Burnout Inventory - General Survey: An internet study. *Anxiety, Stress, & Coping* 15 , pp. 245-260.

Balogun, J.A., Helgemoe, S., Pellegrini, E., & Hoeberlein, T. (1996). Academic performance is not a viable determinant of physical therapy students burnout. *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, 83, 21-22.

Bentler, P.M. (1990). Comparative fit indexes in structural equation models. *Psychological Bulletin*, 107, 238-246.

Bouman, A., Te Brake, H., & Hoogstraten, J. (2002). Significant effects due to rephrasing the MBI's PA items. *Psychological Reports*, 91, 825-826.

Brenninkmeijer, V., & Van Yperen, N. (2003). How to conduct research on burnout: Advantages and disadvantages of a unidimensional approach to burnout. *Occupational and Environmental Medicine*, 60, 16-21.

Byrne, B.M. (2001). Structural equation modeling with AMOS: Basic concepts, applications and programming. Erlbaum: Mahwah, NJ

Chambel, M.J., & Curral, L. (2005). Stress in academic life: Work characteristics as predictors of student well-being and performance. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 54(1), 135-147.

Chang, E.C., Rand, K.L., & Strunk, D.P. (2000). Optimism and risk for burnout among working college students: Stress as a mediator. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 29, 255-263.

Cherniss, C. (1980). Professional burnout in the human service organizations.

Cherniss, C. (1993). Role of professional self-efficacy in the etiology and amelioration of burnout . In W.B. Schaufeli & C. Maslach (Eds.), *Professional burnout: Recent developments in theory and research. Series in applied psychology: Social issues and questions* .Chicago: IL

Cordes, C. L. and Dougherty, T. W. (1993) A review and integration of research on job burnout. *Academy of Management Review* 18 , pp. 621-656

Cordes, C.L., & Dougherty, T.W. (1993). A review and integration of research on job burnout. *Academy of Management Review*, 18, 621-656.

Cudeck, R., & Browne, M.W. (1993). Alternative ways of assessing model fit . In K.A. Bollen & J. Scott Long (Eds.), *Testing structural equation models* .Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Fimian, M.J., Fastenau, P.A., Tashner, J.H., & Cross, A.H. (1989). The measure of classroom stress and burnout among gifted and talented students. *Psychology in the Schools*, 26, 139-153.

Goffin, R.D. (1993). A comparison of two new indices for the assessment of fit of structural equation models. *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, 28, 205-214.

Gold, Y., Bachelor, P., & Michael, W.B. (1989). The dimensionality of a modified form of the Maslach Burnout Inventory for university students in a teacher-training program. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 49,* 549-561.

Gold, Y., Bachelor, P. and Michael, W. B. (1989) The dimensionality of a modified form of the Maslach Burnout Inventory for university students in a teacher-training program. *Educational and Psychological Measurement* 49 , pp. 549-561

Green, D.E., Walkey, F.H., & Taylor, A.J.W. (1991). The three factor structure of the Maslach Burnout Inventory. *Journal of Social Behavior and Personality, 6,* 453-472.

Hoyle, R.H. (1995). *The structural equation modeling approach: Basic concepts and fundamental issues* . In R.H. Hoyle (Ed.), Structural equation modeling: Concepts, issues, and applications .Thousand Oaks*, CA*: Sage.
in theory and research (pp. 1–16). Washington: Taylor & Francis.

JAreskog, K.G., & SArbom, D. (1986). *LISREL user guide version VI* (4th edn.).

Koeske, G. F. and Koeske, R. D. (1989) Construct validity of the Maslach Burnout Inventory: A critical review and re-conceptualization. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Sciences* 25 , pp. 131-132.

Lee, R., & Ashforth, B.E. (1996). A meta-analytic examination of the correlates of the three dimensions of job burnout. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 81, 123-133.

Leiter, M.P. (1992). Burn-out as a crisis in self-efficacy: Conceptual and practical implications. *Work and Stress*, 6, 107-115.

Leiter, M.P., & Schaufeli, W.B. (1996). Consistency of the burnout construct across occupations. *Anxiety, Stress and Coping*, 9, 229-243.

Marsh, H.W., Balla, J.R., & Hau, K.T. (1996). *An evaluation of incremental fit indexes: A clarification of mathematical and empirical properties* . In G.A. Marcoulides & R.E. Schumacker (Eds.), Advanced structural equation modeling techniques .Mahwah, NJ

Maslach, C. & Schaufeli, W. B. (1993). Historical and conceptual development of burn-out. In

Maslach, C. (1998). A multidimensional theory of burnout . In C.L. Cooper (Ed.), *Theories of organizational stress*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Maslach, C., & Jackson S.E. (1981). The measurement of experienced burnout. *Journal of Occupational Behaviour, 2*(2), 99-113.

Maslach, C., & Leiter, M. (1997). *The truth about burnout: How organizations cause personal stress and what to do about it.* San Fransisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

McCarthy, M.E., Pretty, G.M., & Catano, V. (1990). Psychological sense of community and student burnout. *Journal of College Student Development, 31,* 211-216.

Meier, S.T., & Schmeck, R.R. (1985). The burned-out college student: A descriptive profile. *Journal of College Student Personnel*, 26, 63-69.

Nunnaly, J.C., & Bernstein, I.H. (1994). *Psychometric theory* (3rd edn.).

Richardsen, A.M., & Martinussen, M. (2005). Factorial validity and consistency of the MBI-GS across occupational groups in Norway. *International Journal of Stress Management, 12*, 289-   297.

Roelofs, J., Verbraak, M., Keijsers, G.P.J., De Bruin, M.B.N., & Schmidt, A.J.M. (2005). Psychometric properties of a Dutch version of the Maslach Burnout Inventory-General Survey (MBI-DV) in individuals with and without clinical burnout. *Stress and Health, 21,* 17-25.

Roelofs, J., Verbraak, M., Keijsers, G. P. J., De Bruin, M. B. N. and Schmidt, A. J. M. (2005) Psychometric properties of a Dutch version of the Maslach Burnout Inventory - General Survey (MBI-DV) in individuals with and without clinical burnout. *Stress & Health* 21 , pp. 17-25

Russell, J.A., & Caroll, J.M. (1999). On the bipolarity of positive and negative affect. *Psychological Bulletin, 125*, 3-10.

Salanova, M., & Schaufeli, W.B. (2000). Exposure to information technologies and its relation to burnout. *Behaviour and Information Technology, 19*(5), 385-392.

Salanova, M., Llorens, S., Cifre, E., MartÃnez, I., & Schaufeli, W.B. (2003). Perceived collective efficacy, subjective well-being and task performance among electronic work groups: An experimental study. *Small Groups Research, 34*, 43-73.

Salanova, M., PeirÃ³, J.M., & Schaufeli, W.B. (2002). Self-efficacy specificity and burnout among information technology workers: An extension of the Job Demands-Control Model. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 11-25.

Schaufeli, W.B. and Enzmann, D. (1998) *The burnout companion to study and research: A critical analysis* Taylor & Francis , London

Schaufeli, W.B., & Buunk, B.P. (2002). *Burnout: An overview of 25 years of research and theorizing*. In M.J. Schabracq, J.A.M. Winnubst, & C.L. Cooper (Eds.), Handbook of work and health psychology. Chichester, UK: Wiley.

Schaufeli, W.B., & Enzmann, D. (1998). *The burnout companion to study and research: A critical analysis.* London: Taylor & Francis.

Schaufeli, W.B., Leiter, M.P., Maslach, C., & Jackson, S.E. (1996). *Maslach Burnout Inventory-General Survey*. In C. Maslach, S.E. Jackson, & M.P. Leiter (Eds.), The Maslach Burnout Inventory-Test Manual (3rd edn.). Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.

Schaufeli, W.B., MartÃnez, I., MarquÃ©s-Pinto, A., Salanova, M., & Bakker, A. (2002). Burnout and engagement in university students: A cross-national study. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Studies, 33*, 464-481.

Schaufeli, W.B., Salanova, M., GonzAilez-RomA, V., & Bakker, A. (2002). The measurement of burnout and engagement: A confirmatory factor analytic approach. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 3, 71-92.

Schutte, N., Toppinnen, S., Kalimo, R., & Schaufeli, W.B. (2000). The factorial validity of the Maslach Burnout Inventory-General Survey across occupational groups and nations. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 73,* 53-66.

Shirom, A. (2003). Job related burnout: A review . In J.C. Quick & L.E. Tetrick (Eds.), Handbook of occupational health psychology . Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Shirom, A. (Quick, J. C. and Tetrick, L. E. eds.) (2003) Job related burnout: A review. *Handbook of occupational health psychology* pp. 245-264. American Psychological Association , Washington, DC

Taris, T.W., Le Blanc, P., Schaufeli, W.B., & Schreurs, P.J.G. (2005). Are there relationships between the dimensions of the Maslach Burnout Inventory? A review and two longitudinal tests. *Work and Stress,* 19, 256-262.

Taris, T.W., Schreurs, P.J.G., & Schaufeli, W.B. (1999). Construct validity of the Maslach Burnout Inventory-General Survey: A two-sample examination of its factor structure and correlates. *Work and Stress*, 13, 223-237.

Van Dierendonck, D., Schaufeli, W.B., & Buunk, B.P. (2001). Towards a process model of burnout: Results from a secondary analysis. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 10, 41-52.

W. B. Schaufeli, C. Maslach, & T. Marck (Eds.), *Professional burnout: Recent developments* Washington, DC: *Taylor & Francis.*

Yang, H.J. (2004). Factors affecting student burnout and academic achievement in multiple enrolment programs in Taiwan's technical-vocational colleges. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 24, 283-301.