



OPEN ACCESS

EDITED BY

Luis Felipe Dias Lopes,
Federal University of Santa Maria, Brazil

REVIEWED BY

Andreas Tsounis,
Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, Greece
Nada N. Marić,
University of Banja Luka,
Bosnia and Herzegovina

*CORRESPONDENCE

Beata Mańkowska
✉ beata.mankowska@ug.edu.pl

RECEIVED 20 December 2024

ACCEPTED 28 February 2025

PUBLISHED 24 March 2025

CITATION

Mańkowska B (2025) Burnout phenomenon still unresolved. The current state in theory and implications for public interest. *Front. Organ. Psychol.* 3:1549253. doi: 10.3389/forgp.2025.1549253

COPYRIGHT

© 2025 Mańkowska. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution License \(CC BY\)](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/). The use, distribution or reproduction in other forums is permitted, provided the original author(s) and the copyright owner(s) are credited and that the original publication in this journal is cited, in accordance with accepted academic practice. No use, distribution or reproduction is permitted which does not comply with these terms.

Burnout phenomenon still unresolved. The current state in theory and implications for public interest

Beata Mańkowska *

Department of Social Science, Institute of Psychology, University of Gdańsk, Gdańsk, Poland

Occupational burnout currently poses one of the greatest threats to professionally active individuals. Despite nearly 50 years of research on the phenomenon, its complex mechanisms are still under investigation. The lack of agreement among scholars in this regard makes it challenging to accurately diagnose the problem and effectively prevent it. The aim of this article is to delineate commonalities and differences among leading researchers who have been engaged in a longstanding debate about the nature of burnout. The criticisms presented serve as a provocation aimed at mobilizing and uniting scientific communities to deepen their understanding of the essence, mechanisms, and accurate diagnostic methods of this pressing issue. These topics are crucial for the public interest and wellbeing of citizens worldwide.

KEYWORDS

occupational burnout, models of burnout, measurement tools, prevention, public health

Introduction and scope

Occupational burnout currently poses one of the most significant threats and challenges to professionals worldwide. Moreover, the COVID-19 pandemic, spanning from 2020 to 2022, has exacerbated burnout and related forms of workplace distress across various industries. Consequently, organizations have become increasingly aware of burnout and more concerned about implementing measures to mitigate its effects (Maslach and Leiter, 2021).

Despite over 50 years of research, there remains a lack of consensus on a comprehensive definition of occupational burnout, its intricate mechanisms, or relevant measurement tools (De Beer et al., 2024; Bakker and Demerouti, 2007; Freudenberg, 1974; Kristensen et al., 2005; Maslach et al., 1996; Maslach and Leiter, 2021, 2011; Santinello, 2008; Schaufeli, 2021; Schaufeli and De Witte, 2023; Şek, 2004; Shirom, 2005). Controversies surrounding the very essence of burnout extend to doubts about whether this phenomenon exists at all as a distinct phenomenon or whether it constitutes one of the manifestations and stages of depression, as some research suggests strong correlations between both phenomena within their symptoms (Bianchi et al., 2021). However, the authors suggest that this line of research should be continued due to the existing limitations, including, among others, the representativeness of the study sample and methodological imperfections (Bianchi et al., 2013). Some researchers equate burnout with a state of chronic exhaustion

resulting from the demanding requirements of work. Among them is [Shirom \(2005\)](#), who defines burnout as a state of chronic physical, cognitive, and emotional exhaustion. In turn [Tage Kristensen \(Kristensen et al., 2005\)](#) describes it as a state of exhaustion resulting from excessive workload, taking into account its various sources. The researcher distinguishes three subtypes of burnout: personal burnout—exhaustion stemming from general life stressors, work-related burnout—fatigue and frustration arising in response to professional demands and client-related burnout—exhaustion caused by intense interactions with people at work, particularly in caregiving or service-oriented professions. Despite distinguishing three dimensions of burnout, the researcher conceptualizes each as a manifestation of exhaustion that develops and is expressed across different contexts. This progression ranges from the broadest, most general experience of exhaustion throughout an individual's life, to a more specific focus on the occupational domain and its inherent organizational risk factors, culminating in the most narrowly defined yet distinct aspect—professional relationships—which carry the potential for emotional depletion and, consequently, burnout.

An alternative approach to burnout, however, assumes its more complex, multidimensional nature, going beyond a chronic state of exhaustion, effectively stress, and it is this perspective that this debate will focus on.

The two dominant concepts presented below, which have been clashing and somewhat competing with each other for many years, generate controversy and, instead of leading to a common conclusion, divide scientific communities worldwide. Given the dominance of these two perspectives, reinforced by the undeniable authority of their originators, undertaking an analysis of both approaches may serve as a distinct appeal to these scholars to finally reach a consensus after more than half a century of debate on the true nature of occupational burnout and effective strategies for its prevention.

Thus, this paper aims to illustrate the current state of knowledge about the phenomenon of occupational burnout, emphasizing two leading conflicting paradigms and warning against the further consequences of such division in the scientific world, which does not serve the public interest.

The article thus serves as an appeal to the scientific community to continue exploring the phenomenon of burnout and to fully understand its complex nature. Only cohesive and comprehensive knowledge in this area can guarantee accurate diagnosis and effective prevention in the service of the public interest.

Two prevailing conceptualizations of burnout

Over 50 years of research into the phenomenon of burnout have resulted in the development of two dominant models of occupational burnout. These models have served as the primary theoretical frameworks guiding empirical research in the field. The first is the three-dimensional model of burnout developed by Christina Maslach, a pioneering figure in burnout research and a globally recognized authority in the field. Maslach is renowned for creating the Maslach Burnout Inventory (MBI), the first scientifically validated measure of burnout widely utilized

in research worldwide. She is a professor at the University of California, Berkeley ([Maslach and Jackson, 1981](#); [Maslach, 2011](#); [Maslach and Leiter, 2021](#)). The second is the two-dimensional model of burnout known as the Job Demands-Resources model, proposed by European researchers including ([Demerouti et al., 2001](#)).

According to Maslach, burnout is a multifaceted syndrome characterized by exhaustion, cynicism, and a diminished sense of self-efficacy. It arises as a consequence of prolonged stress experienced in the workplace, exacerbated by areas of mismatch between the individual and their work environment. Maslach identifies various mismatch areas that serve as risk factors for burnout, including work overload, lack of control over work, inadequate compensation, breakdown of community, lack of fairness, and conflicting values in the workplace ([Maslach et al., 1996](#); [Maslach and Leiter, 2006, 2005, 2021](#)).

The second prevailing theory frequently referenced by burnout researchers is the Job Demands-Resources (JD-R) model of burnout ([Demerouti et al., 2001](#); [Schaufeli and Bakker, 2004](#); [Bakker and Demerouti, 2007](#)). According to this model, burnout is a two-dimensional phenomenon characterized by physical, emotional, and cognitive exhaustion, as well as a lack of commitment to work. Burnout arises from insufficient resources to meet the demands and conditions of work. Working conditions are broadly categorized into two groups: job demands and job resources, which are associated with specific outcomes differently. Job demands primarily contribute to the exhaustion component of burnout, while (lack of) job resources primarily contribute to disengagement ([Demerouti et al., 2001](#); [Schaufeli and Bakker, 2004](#)).

Both models do not complement each other but rather compete with each other, which does not facilitate accurate diagnosis and the broader public health prevention efforts ([Maslach and Leiter, 2021](#); [Schaufeli, 2021](#); [Schaufeli and De Witte, 2023](#)). At this point, it is worth revisiting [Kristensen's \(2005\)](#) earlier attempt to conceptualize burnout, which was promptly and sharply criticized by both Maslach and Schaufeli, who regarded it as anachronistic and lacking a scientific foundation. They assert that chronic physical or mental exhaustion is a challenge faced by many individuals in both their personal and professional lives. However, there is no scientific justification for reducing the term “burnout” solely to exhaustion. Ultimately, they summarized Kristensen's proposal with the following words: “Hence, our view is that reducing burnout to mere exhaustion boils down to putting new wine (burnout) in very old bottles (workplace fatigue)” ([Maslach and Leiter, 2009](#), p. 112). Thus, the attempt to provide an alternative explanation of the nature of burnout encountered resistance from authorities who had long defended their status quo and monopoly on existing knowledge. It even led to a temporary consolidation of forces between “both paradigmatic camps”, only for them to revert to their previously divergent positions and mutual controversies once the competing perspective had been eliminated.

The extent of shared agreements regarding the concept of burnout

Despite the absence of a singular coherent model that fully captures the essence and symptoms of burnout in the same

manner, both concepts of burnout are interconnected through a transactional approach to stress and burnout. This approach is rooted in an imbalance between the resources available to the individual and the demands and expectations placed on them by the workplace environment. Regardless of the specific risk factors associated with different professions, inadequate resources within the individual or the work environment can lead to professional burnout when job demands exceed the individual's capacity to manage them (Demerouti et al., 2001). According to researchers worldwide who adhere to the current transactional view of stress, burnout results from chronic workplace stress that individuals struggle to manage effectively (Şek, 2004). Furthermore, the majority of researchers believe it is a crisis in professional activity arising from a mismatch between individuals and their jobs (Maslach and Leiter, 2005; Demerouti et al., 2001). Recent studies aimed at identifying risk factors for burnout have reinforced the belief in its contextual nature, suggesting that burnout develops in response to challenging job requirements, working conditions, and organizational factors rather than specific job duties (Maslach and Leiter, 2005; Schaufeli and Bakker, 2004; Schaufeli, 2021).

Psychosocial stressors have become particularly significant in the etiology of occupational burnout, recognized by researchers worldwide as key risk factors for its development. Psychosocial hazards are defined as “aspects of work design, organization, and management, and their social and environmental context, which may have the potential to cause psychological or physical harm” (Cox and Griffiths, 1995, p. 127). These factors can lead to psychological, physical, or social harm through the stress mechanism (Freudenberger, 1974; Demerouti et al., 2001; Maslach and Leiter, 2005; Pines and Aronson, 1988; Schaufeli, 2006; Schaufeli et al., 2009; Maslach, 2011).

Apart from this commonality, both concepts share more similarities than differences, despite the consensus between the two leading research centers on burnout.

Efforts to establish consensus on the definition of burnout

The absence of agreement regarding the nature of burnout has resulted in a multitude of definitions and measures for this construct. This situation has hindered the reliable estimation of its occurrence and prevalence and has detrimentally impacted the quality of research on this phenomenon. Given the increasing reports of burnout and the recognition of work incapacity due to mental health issues, the necessity for a unified definition of this concept appears pressing. The process of developing and achieving consensus on the definition of burnout occurred within the Network for the Coordination and Harmonization of European Occupational Cohorts (OMEGA-NET) in 2021. During the panel, 50 experts endeavored to formulate a coherent definition of burnout based on 88 definitions found in the literature. In the second stage, 11 definitions were chosen through semantic analysis, leading to consensus in the form of a shared definition—a consensual definition that effectively reduces burnout to mere exhaustion. This definition reads as follows: “In a worker,

occupational burnout or occupational physical and emotional exhaustion state is an exhaustion due to prolonged exposure to work-related problems” (Canu et al., 2021, p. 95). Interestingly, neither C. Maslach nor Schaufeli participated in the scientific forum. The absence of these leading researchers and unquestioned authorities on this topic raises a troubling question: why did such an open space for scientific discourse occur without their presence? Perhaps such an international confrontation was uncomfortable for these esteemed authorities in light of the lack of mutual understanding on the fundamental issue of what burnout truly is.

However, neither Maslach nor Schaufeli left the events without comment, and once again, in a critical tone, they addressed the outcomes of the work of European experts, emphasizing the strengths of their own conceptualizations of burnout. In the same year, both Maslach and Schaufeli independently commented on the essence and measurement of burnout. Schaufeli criticized the outcomes of the panel and the work of the international group of researchers. He argued that exhaustion alone does not fully capture the complexity of the burnout phenomenon, as it would essentially equate it with the concept of stress. Schaufeli emphasized that while exhaustion is a necessary component of burnout, it is insufficient on its own. Therefore, he proposed that mental distancing should be recognized as the second constituting dimension of burnout. Furthermore, Schaufeli contended that due to the pragmatic approach of the panel, their definition of burnout lacks proper theoretical underpinning (Schaufeli, 2021).

In the same year, Maslach and Leiter (2021) published an article titled “How to Measure Burnout Accurately and Ethically”, in which they caution against the improper use of the MBI measurement tool. They provide examples of misuse and unethical practices in this domain. This serves as a troubling call to specialists and various professional circles, indicating that, in their view, many do not grasp the true essence of burnout or how to diagnose it correctly. Alternatively, these signs of excessive discretion or misuse could also be seen as a reflection of the chaos and lack of coherence in understanding what burnout truly entails and how to identify it. Maslach warns that incorrect utilization of the MBI can lead to further confusion about the nature of burnout, and some of these misapplications may even be deemed unethical.

Abuses of the MBI measurement tool include, for instance, attributing depression to the dimension of exhaustion due to strong correlations between the two variables. Some researchers also disregard the dimension of loss of professional effectiveness because it appears to be relatively independent of other dimensions of burnout. Another error is equating burnout with an employee's illness or disability, leading to their treatment as a burden by the employer after revealing high burnout scores. Additionally, a methodological mistake involves arbitrarily dividing the sample of respondents in half and incorrectly assuming that the half with more negative scores is experiencing burnout, while the other half is not. Some researchers have also misused score descriptions, dividing the range into thirds (lower, mid-range, upper), and then inaccurately claiming that “a third of the group is highly burned out” when their study replicates that same range (Maslach and Jackson, 1981; Maslach and Leiter, 2021).

Manifestations and consequences of theoretical and methodological discrepancies

The latest developments in predominant burnout paradigms

In the past 3 years, there has been a notable reassessment of the stances of both researchers regarding the conceptualization and utilization of burnout measurement tools, as evidenced by publications from both Maslach and Schaufeli.

Maslach, advocating for accurate practices, clarifies that the Maslach Burnout Inventory (MBI) evaluates each of the three dimensions of burnout separately: feelings of energy depletion (exhaustion), increased mental detachment from one's job (cynicism or negativism), and diminished professional efficacy. Additionally, Maslach points out that research endeavors have aimed to explore the factors associated with each of these dimensions, as well as whether burnout typically begins with exhaustion, leading subsequently to cynicism and reduced professional efficacy, or if alternative pathways to burnout exist.

Recent research has unveiled a method to integrate all three dimensions of the MBI into a comprehensive and meaningful framework. This novel scoring approach for the three dimensions yields five distinct profiles of individuals' work experiences: Burnout (characterized by negative scores on exhaustion, cynicism, and professional efficacy), Overextended (featuring a strong negative score on exhaustion only), Ineffective (displaying a strong negative score on professional efficacy only), Disengaged (showing a strong negative score on cynicism only), and Engagement (marked by strong positive scores on exhaustion, cynicism, and professional efficacy). All five of these experiences require deeper understanding, not just the extreme poles of burnout and engagement. When assessed accurately, evidence suggests that only 10–15% of employees align with the true burnout profile, while the engagement profile occurs approximately twice as often, at around 30%. This leaves over half of employees scoring negatively in one or two dimensions—not experiencing burnout *per se*, but potentially on the path toward it.

Maslach emphasizes that organizations should not rely solely on the Maslach Burnout Inventory (MBI). Instead, they should integrate its findings with those from other assessment tools to identify potential causes behind the five profiles. A simple summary of employees' MBI scores does not offer meaningful insights into the underlying reasons or suggest pathways for improvement (Maslach and Leiter, 2021).

As a result, Maslach shifts away from her long-standing recognition of the developmental nature of burnout, wherein the syndrome progresses over time from exhaustion, through cynicism, to diminished professional effectiveness. An individual experiencing exhaustion may develop a defensive stance of cynicism, distancing themselves from further engagement in their work, ultimately leading to a loss of professional effectiveness. This final symptom has been the most challenging from the outset to the present day, as it remains relatively unaffected by workplace stress, which is considered a prerequisite for burnout development

(Mańkowska, 2018). There has been little attempt to elucidate the low factor loading of this dimension, its low reliability coefficient, let alone its vague and multifaceted nature. While the term for the second symptom, and simultaneously the stage of burnout—depersonalization—evolved over time to cynicism, reflecting the societal rather than clinical aspect of this symptom compared to its previous conceptualization, the symptom of diminished sense of professional effectiveness, previously referred to as the loss of personal accomplishment, professional achievements, or even professional satisfaction, remains somewhat enigmatic and contentious.

This symptom, as assessed by the MBI, has frequently been disregarded by researchers due to inconsistent findings, and such practices of excluding or neglecting a problematic variable should be discouraged. Deviating from the process-oriented nature of burnout, Maslach proposes organizing MBI results into five categories, with only one indicating burnout, while the others—overextended, ineffective, disengaged, or engaged—suggest the dominance of one of the three symptoms included in the tool (Maslach and Leiter, 2021). The researcher suggests that individual symptoms may develop relatively independently of one another, although the rationale for this assertion remains unexplained.

It is challenging to find a theoretical foundation for this relatively novel concept, although it is worth juxtaposing it with various individual predispositions and organizational conditions, which could serve as significant modifiers in shaping different configurations of the triad of symptoms in the MBI.

Schaufeli himself follows a similar trajectory. Recent publications indicate that the researcher is moving away from his previous two-dimensional concept of burnout, which was based on the Job Demands-Resources (JD-R) framework of organizational stress (Schaufeli and Bakker, 2004). This shift is attributed to his redefinition of burnout and the development of a new measurement instrument known as the Burnout Assessment Tool (BAT) (Schaufeli and De Witte, 2023).

In Schaufeli and De Witte's (2023) work, they present a fresh perspective on burnout and its assessment through a redefined conceptualization. Consistently, they criticize the globally dominant definition of burnout proposed by Maslach, emphasizing that although not all scholars agree on the precise definition, the vast majority of scientific literature adopts a three-dimensional model of burnout, comprising exhaustion, mental distancing, and diminished professional efficacy.

However, there are conceptual issues with this definition, as well as psychometric and practical challenges associated with the instrument based on this definition, which is considered the gold standard for measuring burnout: The Maslach Burnout Inventory (MBI) (De Beer et al., 2024; Schaufeli and De Witte, 2023).

It remains unclear on what basis Schaufeli redefines burnout as a four-component syndrome, including exhaustion, mental distancing, and cognitive and emotional impairment. According to this perspective, a lack of energy hinders one's ability to effectively regulate cognitive and emotional processes, while mental distancing serves as an ineffective coping mechanism to alleviate exhaustion by disengaging from work. Building upon this reconceptualization, a new burnout assessment tool was developed, known as the Burnout Assessment Tool (BAT).

In this chapter, evidence is presented regarding the reliability and validity of the BAT, which also includes a brief version. Specifically, it appears that the four-factor structure of the BAT remains consistent across countries, genders, ages, and ethnicities. Additionally, a composite total burnout score can be utilized to evaluate the level of burnout. Furthermore, the reliability, convergent, and divergent validity of the BAT are demonstrated, and burnout, as assessed by the BAT, aligns with the nomological network of the Job Demands-Resources Model.

As anticipated, BAT-burnout demonstrates a positive correlation with job demands and a negative correlation with job resources. Additionally, associations are observed with various outcomes and personal resources, including personality traits. Practically, the BAT can be utilized to evaluate severe burnout in individuals within occupational health settings and to estimate the prevalence of those at risk for burnout in organizations (Schaufeli and De Witte, 2023).

Schaufeli introduces his new tool for measuring burnout, which directly opposes Maslach's conceptualization and measurement approach. However, he justifies his novel approach with the World Health Organization's definition of burnout,¹ which underscores the three-dimensional nature of the phenomenon and explicitly references Maslach's concept. Surprisingly, Schaufeli acknowledges the multidimensional aspect of burnout and incorporates four symptoms. He explains the second symptom, distance from work, following exhaustion, as a maladaptive defense mechanism against exhaustion. It is noteworthy that Maslach has long attributed the appearance of this identical symptom, referred to as cynicism in her concept, to a defense mechanism against exhaustion (Maslach and Leiter, 2005; Maslach, 2011). So, how did Schaufeli conclude that this was his original idea? Could it be that he forgot that Maslach explained this earlier? Why did he omit that? Or perhaps the animosity between the two researchers has led to a lack of mutual acknowledgment and significant oversight? Furthermore, Schaufeli, while citing the WHO definition of burnout, overlooks its clear reference to Maslach's three-dimensional concept. In his current reconceptualization of burnout, Schaufeli finds himself closer to Maslach's concept than ever before, albeit paradoxically denying it. Perhaps this signals a positive step toward unifying perspectives and ultimately developing a cohesive model—for the betterment of public health worldwide.

Flexibility or rather arbitrariness in the use of burnout measurement tools

In response to the existing divergence in theoretical findings, it is customary to employ various instruments to assess burnout. Typically, two predominant tools emerge: the Maslach Burnout Inventory (MBI) by Maslach et al.: MBI-Human Services Survey

(MBI-HSS),² MBI-Educators Survey (MBI-ES),³ and MBI-General Survey (MBI-GS)⁴ favored by scholars in the United States and adherents of the three-dimensional concept of burnout, and the Oldenburg Burnout Inventory (OLBI) developed by Demerouti et al. (2001), predominantly used by European researchers advocating the Job-Demands Resources (JD-R) concept of burnout. While it is true that Schaufeli and De Witte (2023) have introduced a new burnout assessment tool, the Burnout Assessment Tool (BAT), which departs from the two-dimensional model underpinning OLBI, this development has only added to the confusion surrounding the fundamental nature and measurement of burnout (Schaufeli and De Witte, 2023). Additionally, in recent years, the Italian Life and Job Burnout Questionnaire (LBQ) by Santinello (2008) has entered the market, presenting a hybrid approach combining elements of the MBI (psychophysical exhaustion, relational detachment, professional ineffectiveness) with the existential perspective of burnout proposed by Pines and Aronson (1988), as evidenced by the inclusion of the fourth burnout symptom—disillusionment. Despite its alignment with the WHO definition of burnout, robust psychometric properties, and clear accessibility guidelines, this instrument has not gained dominance in the research sphere. Various tools reflecting divergent conceptualizations of burnout continue to be utilized.

And what comes next? Implications to the public interest

Despite over half a century of research on burnout, there remains ongoing debate regarding its essence and developmental mechanisms within the scientific community. This controversy is evident in international discourse among researchers in recent years, yet conclusive findings have not been reached. The current state of knowledge regarding the nature of burnout allows for a wide range of perspectives, which may not necessarily serve the public interest in terms of health protection and comprehensive burnout prevention. The polarization among researchers, with some advocating for the European and others for the American burnout paradigm, has led to division rather than unity within scientific communities. A review of the global literature on burnout reveals that many researchers overlook the fundamental disagreements in understanding the phenomenon, often basing their studies on a single theory and utilizing readily available tools without critical examination. A concerning trend observed in the scientific community is the denial of existing knowledge gaps regarding burnout and the dismissal of attempts to engage in scholarly debate on this issue. Such practices are

1 WHO (2019). International Classification of Diseases (ICD-11) (11th ed.). <https://www.who.int/classifications/icd/en>.

2 MBI-Human Services Survey (MBI-HSS): The original measure that was designed for professionals in the human services. Copyright © 1981 by Christina Maslach and Susan E. Jackson.

3 MBI-Educators Survey (MBI-ES): An adaptation of origin measure for use with educators. Copyright © 1986 by Christina Maslach, Susan E. Jackson, and Richard L. Schwab.

4 MBI-General Survey (MBI-GS): The newest version of the MBI designed for use with workers in other occupations. Copyright © 1996 by Wilmar B. Schaufeli, Michael P. Leiter, Christina Maslach, and Susan E. Jackson.

evident in manuscript review processes, where deficiencies or inconsistencies in the understanding of burnout and its complex mechanisms are overlooked. Reviewers often prematurely conclude that the topic has been thoroughly explored and reject further investigation. Additionally, there is a lack of tolerance for alternative conceptualizations of burnout that deviate from the reviewer's personal perspective, resulting in the rejection of works that do not align with their views. The lack of coherence in this field leads to misunderstandings within scientific communities and even attempts at persuasion that exclude alternative perspectives. This goes against the essence of science. Authoritarian attitudes within the scientific realm can be troubling, especially considering the principle of cognitive falsificationism in science, where any doubt, supported by even a single premise, should be acknowledged, and diverse viewpoints should be permitted to stimulate critical reflection on our actions and their objectives. If there were complete consensus on this matter, why would the scientific community and experts strive in 2021 to reach agreement on the very definition of burnout (Canu et al., 2021)? Why would Schaufeli redefine burnout in 2023 and introduce a new understanding, accompanied by a new measurement tool, while Maslach moves away from the process-oriented nature of the phenomenon she has advocated for nearly 50 years (Schaufeli and De Witte, 2023; Maslach and Leiter, 2021)?

Conclusions

A global debate over the very essence of burnout remains unresolved, with no consensus in sight. Leading researchers advocate for a complex, multidimensional understanding of the phenomenon—one that extends beyond exhaustion, which has long been recognized as a core feature of stress. Unfortunately, proponents of the multidimensional approach have divided into two dominant schools of thought, whose competing viewpoints have fueled long-standing controversies rather than fostering a unified understanding of this critical public health issue.

Lack of agreement among scholars in this respect makes it difficult to accurately diagnose the problem and prevent it effectively. It is therefore necessary to continue the work started in order to fully understand the essence and complex mechanisms, in the service of accurate diagnosis and effective health prevention of professionally active people. Striving to discover facts through open and critical discourse, as well as uniting forces in the service of discovering new facts for the public good, seems to be the duty of every honest researcher and science as the highest form of knowledge.

References

- Bakker, A. B., and Demerouti, E. (2007). The job demands-resources model: state of the art. *J. Manag. Psychol.* 22, 309–328. doi: 10.1108/02683940710733115
- Bianchi, R., Boffy, C., Hingray, C., Truchot, D., and Laurent, E. (2013). Comparative symptomatology of burnout and depression. *J. Health Psychol.* 18, 782–787. doi: 10.1177/1359105313481079

This commentary is an appeal directed to the representatives of science, for whom the pursuit of truth based on factual evidence and the application of knowledge for the greater good are invaluable values. Are we prepared for dialogue and responsible engagement on the issue of burnout, so that cohesive knowledge can be utilized in the protection of citizens' health as the highest public good?

Data availability statement

The original contributions presented in the study are included in the article/supplementary material, further inquiries can be directed to the corresponding author.

Author contributions

BM: Conceptualization, Investigation, Software, Writing – original draft.

Funding

The author(s) declare that no financial support was received for the research and/or publication of this article.

Conflict of interest

The author declares that the research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.

Generative AI statement

The author(s) declare that no Gen AI was used in the creation of this manuscript.

Publisher's note

All claims expressed in this article are solely those of the authors and do not necessarily represent those of their affiliated organizations, or those of the publisher, the editors and the reviewers. Any product that may be evaluated in this article, or claim that may be made by its manufacturer, is not guaranteed or endorsed by the publisher.

- Bianchi, R., Verkuilen, J., Schonfeld, I. S., Hakanen, J. J., Jansson-Fröjmark, M., Manzano-García, G., et al. (2021). Is burnout a depressive condition? A 14-sample meta-analytic and bifactor analytic study. *Clin. Psychol. Sci.* 9, 1–19. doi: 10.1177/2167702620979597

- Canu, I. G., Marca, S. C., Dell'oro, F., Balázs, Á., Bergamaschi, E., Besse, C., et al. (2021). Harmonized definition of burnout: a systematic review, semantic analysis,

- and Delphi consensus in 29 countries. *Scand. J. Work Environ. Health* 47, 95–107. doi: 10.5271/sjweh.3935
- Cox, T., and Griffiths, A. J. (1995). "The assessment of psychosocial hazards at work," in *Handbook of Work and Health Psychology*, eds M. J. Shabracq, J. A. M. Winnubst, and C. L. Cooper (Chichester: Wiley and Sons).
- De Beer, L., Van der Vaart, L., Escaffi-Schwarz, M., De Witte, H., and Schaufeli, W. (2024). Maslach Burnout inventory—general survey: a systematic review and meta-analysis of measurement properties. *Eur. J. Psychol. Assess.* doi: 10.1027/1015-5759/a000797. [Epub ahead of print].
- Demerouti, E., Bakker, A., de Jonge, J., Janssen, P., and Schaufeli, W. (2001). Burnout and engagement at work as a function of demands and control. *Scand. J. Work Environ. Health* 27, 279–286. doi: 10.5271/sjweh.615
- Freudenberger, H. J. (1974). Staff burnout. *J. Soc. Issues* 30, 159–165. doi: 10.1111/j.1540-4560.1974.tb00706.x
- Kristensen, T. S., Borritz, M., Villadsen, E., and Christensen, K. B. (2005). The Copenhagen Burnout inventory: a new tool for the assessment of burnout. *Work Stress* 19, 192–207. doi: 10.1080/02678370500297720
- Mańkowska, B. (2018). Wypalenie zawodowe. Dylematy wokół istoty zjawiska oraz jego pomiaru. [Burnout. Dilemmas about the core of the problem and its measurement]. *Polskie Forum Psychol.* 23, 430–445. doi: 10.14656/PFP20180212
- Maslach, C. (2011). Engagement research: some thoughts from a burnout perspective. *Eur. J. Work Org. Psychol.* 20, 47–52. doi: 10.1080/1359432X.2010.537034
- Maslach, C., and Jackson, S. E. (1981). The measurement of experienced burnout. *J. Org. Behav.* 2, 99–113. doi: 10.1002/job.4030020205
- Maslach, C., Jackson, S. E., and Leiter, M. P. (1996). *Maslach Burnout Inventory Manual (3rd ed.)*. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Maslach, C., and Leiter, M. (2021). How to measure burnout accurately and ethically. *Health Behav. Sci.* 211–221. Available online at: <https://hbr.org/2021/03/how-to-measure-burnout-accurately-and-ethically>
- Maslach, C., and Leiter, M. P. (2005). "Stress and Burnout: the critical research," in *Handbook of Stress Medicine and Health, 2nd Edn*, ed. C. L. Cooper (London: CRC Press), 153–170.
- Maslach, C., and Leiter, M. P. (2006). "Burnout," in *Foundations of Health Psychology*, eds H. Friedman and R. Cohen Silver (New York, NY: Oxford University Press), 312–332.
- Maslach, C., and Leiter, M. P. (2009). *The Truth About Burnout: How Organizations Cause Personal Stress and What to Do About It*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Maslach, C., and Leiter, M. P. (2011). Burnout, engagement, and worklife: Areas of worklife as a framework for burnout prevention. *J. Organ. Behav.* 33, 296–298.
- Pines, A., and Aronson, E. (1988). *Career Burnout: Causes and Cures*. New York, NY: Free Press.
- Santiniello, M. (2008). *LBQ Link Burnout Questionnaire. Manuale*. Firenze: Giunti O.S. Organizzazioni Speciali.
- Schaufeli, W., and De Witte, H. (2023). "A fresh look at burnout," in *The Burnout Assessment Tool (BAT)*, eds C. U. Krageloh, M. Alyami, O. N. Medvedev. International Handbook of Behavioral Health Assessment (Cham: Springer).
- Schaufeli, W. B. (2006). The balance of give and take: toward a social exchange model of burnout. *Int. Rev. Soc. Psychol.* 19, 75–119.
- Schaufeli, W. B. (2021). The burnout enigma solved? *Scand. J. Work Environ. Health* 47, 169–170. doi: 10.5271/sjweh.3950
- Schaufeli, W. B., and Bakker, A. B. (2004). Job demands, job resources and their relationship with burnout and engagement: a multi-sample study. *J. Org. Behav.* 25, 293–315. doi: 10.1002/job.248
- Schaufeli, W. B., Leiter, M. P., and Maslach, C. (2009). Burnout: 35 years of research and practice. *Career Dev. Int.* 14, 204–220. doi: 10.1108/13620430910966406
- Sęk, H., (ed.). (2004). *Wypalenie zawodowe. Przyczyny i zapobieganie [Burnout. Causes and Prevention]*. Warsaw: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.
- Shirom, A. (2005). Reflections on the study of burnout. *Work Stress* 19, 263–270. doi: 10.1080/02678370500376649